

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Third Session — Thirteenth Legislature
13th Day

Monday, March 2, 1959

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

BUDGET DEBATE

The Assembly resumed from Friday, February 27th the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Fines: That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair. (The Assembly to go into Committee of Supply).

Mr. A. C. Cameron (Maple Creek): — Mr. Speaker, before going to an analysis of the budget presented, I think we should point out to the Legislature that the Provincial Treasurer stressed economy exercised this year in preparation of the budget. I think those economies are becoming noticeable, and I think that the members themselves have noticed that the red carpet which used to be on the front steps leading up to the Chamber was removed immediately after the opening ceremonies. It used to be there during the whole course of the Session. I think that is one economy that is noticeable.

Another thing that is noticeable in the Session this year, and we are pleased to see it, is the number of Government members who have taken the occasion to come and visit the Opposition, come into our Opposition Members' room — to "case the joint", so to speak, to fit themselves to the chair. We welcome them in that, because we tell them they should get familiar with the surroundings. Comparing notes they said in the Chamber we have one advantage which you people haven't — we have a little better view. We told them that we would even take care of that for them when we moved across. So there are changes taking place as evidenced in this Session.

Before I go into an analysis of the budget proper, there are one or two observations I want to make about the speech of the Provincial Treasurer; while it has no direct bearing on finances, I think it does warrant a comment. On page 12 of his Budget Address, the Provincial Treasurer, in referring to the agricultural machinery administration said:

"This organization has developed in just 12 months an excellent system of inspection, to insure that farm implement dealers carry adequate stock of repairs."

I don't see why the Provincial Treasurer made reference to the agricultural machinery administration in that light because, firstly, his statement as to an excellent system of inspection to ensure that farm implement dealers carry adequate stock is certainly at variance with the facts. Secondly, I think it leaves an impression that machine dealers,

March 2, 1959

prior to those amendments, had been attempting to operate without carrying sufficient repair parts.

Just the other morning in Public Accounts Committee I happened, by chance, to ask the Minister of Agriculture how many machine dealers we had in the province, how many inspections were made, how many complaints were received about these dealers not carrying an adequate stock of repairs. The answer given by the Minister at that time was most interesting. He said there were 1,748 machine dealers in the province and, during the year 1957-58, the administration made only 173 inspections – hardly a ‘most excellent system of inspection’, when at the present rate it would take 10 years to inspect the dealers just once.

I should think that the Provincial Treasurer, before making reference to other departments, would consult with those departments to ascertain what the facts are. Having been a machine dealer for a number of years I was pleased to listen to this; that we have approximately 1,800 machine dealers and only seven farmers complain about them, that is a creditable record. The machine dealers ought to be complimented, I think, for a job well done.

Turning to the economic review as mentioned in the present Budget Speech, after reviewing the present economic conditions and predictions of the future, the Provincial Treasurer notes the general upswing in economic conditions. I think he said further, the financial picture for the current year, is, as we all know, not as bright as last year, but it is remarkably good. It is upon this assessment that he anticipates revenues will increase this coming year by about \$8 million. One would gather, though, from the auditor’s reports that we have received so far in the House on mineral resources, of natural resources, agriculture and others, that they do not seem to share this degree of optimism. These reports do not appear to indicate the present economic situation warrants an estimated \$8 million increase in revenue. The farm net income is estimated at only \$215 million by the Provincial Treasurer, just slightly more than the depressed farm income of 1957 of approximately \$180 million. This is approximately only one-half of the seven-year average, 1948-1956, of \$400 million. It is still true that about 76 per cent of our wealth from primary production comes from the farm.

I notice that the Provincial Treasurer, in his budget, devotes 3.99 per cent of the revenue to Agriculture. This allowance is at the bottom of the ladder, after all the services have been taken care of. The only one beneath it is the amount devoted to the interest on the Public Debt. That is where Agriculture stands in its receipts in the budget.

Mr. Loptson (Saltcoats): – Farmer’s friend!

Mr. Cameron: – Speaking of these auditor’s reports, the Department of Natural Resources, Page 10 of the report tabled in this Legislature, had this to say, and I am quoting from it:

“The economic recession and the levelling off of Saskatchewan’s rural electrification program, resulted in the following reductions in production – lumber, down 17 per cent; power poles, down 51 per cent; railway ties, down 47 per cent; pulpwood, down 45 per cent.”

That doesn’t indicate to me a great upswing. In the mineral wealth of the province, the Provincial Treasurer’s estimates for 1960 appear to reflect this same pattern. The Treasurer has been estimating revenues from mineral resources as follows: if you go back a few years you will find that in the year ending March 31, 1957, he estimated that the revenues received by the Government from mineral wealth would be approximately \$14.6 million. That would bring the revenue up to \$19.8 million for 1958. For the year 1959, he estimated approximately another \$5 million increase in revenue from these resources, bringing the revenues for that year up to \$23.8 million.

The revenue from minerals appeared to run wild in 1958, breaking all anticipated records and bringing revenues for that year not to \$19.8 million as estimated, but to \$24.9 million. In other words, revenues reached approximately \$25 million one year earlier than the Provincial Treasurer estimated they would. We have no figures for the year just ending March 31st this year. The Provincial Treasurer no doubt by now has a fair knowledge of what those revenues will be. The Provincial Treasurer has dropped the estimates, I notice, of the revenue from minerals for 1960 down to \$20.4 million. This would indicate that revenue from minerals reached its peak in 1958 at approximately \$25 million, and has been dropping since. The Provincial Treasurer estimates this revenue will drop from \$25 million in 1958 to \$20.5 million in 1960.

This drop in revenue in 1959 and again in 1960 reveals, I think, that the development phase in petroleum and gas production is about at an end, at any rate for the time being. The companies are turning to production and the development of wells rather than exploring for new ones, because, of course, they think of the restrictive markets. A major factor contributing to this, of course, is the restriction imposed on Canadian oils by the United States. That is general, I think, across Canada. This lack of activity in exploration, I think, is evident since 1958 on, as the estimates of the revenues for this year reveal.

The auditor’s report causes us to give some thought as to just how reliable are the news reports emanating from agencies such as the Travel and Information Bureau, and other Government propaganda agencies. Here are a few of them: “Agriculture takes Back Seat to Industrialized Saskatchewan”; “Non-Farm Production takes Command in Saskatchewan”. I think even the responsible press, though to a lesser extent, has been taken in by this. No one except the conscientious auditors are concerned, it seems, about the realistic conception of the economic picture of the province. Saskatchewan economy in 1958 was healthy, but there were certainly soft spots occurring, and I think that the Provincial Treasurer should have pointed out some of these soft spots in the economy. The Provincial Treasurer did not do so; so, therefore, it becomes my task to point out these

soft spots in our economy.

I don't want to do this as a prophet of doom, but I think we should clear the decks of a lot of this propaganda in order to arrive at a fair assessment of the province's economy. These glowing reports of booming economy may enhance the prestige of the Provincial Treasurer, but I fear they will not make the task of the farmers' March to Ottawa any easier. The development of our natural resources certainly plays a key role in stabilizing our economy. However, I think we must keep it in its proper perspectives; I think the people are entitled to a fair share and a proper appraisal of the conditions of each segment of our economy. What did the auditor point out?

The Auditors' Reports, tabled in the Legislature of the Department of Mineral Resources and Natural Resources, and others, give a different appraisal. Saskatchewan Government Airways, in its report states: "This year has been one of decreased activities for the Corporation." The net result was an operating loss of \$46,701. It goes on to say: "This was brought about by the significant decrease in mineral exploration." Here is another. Saskatchewan Forest Products, in its annual report tabled in this Legislature states: "During the year under review, the lumber market was less than satisfactory. The unsatisfactory state of the market brought about a decline in production."

The value of mineral production is set out in the report of the Mineral Resources report, which says: "The value of copper production decreased by 38.4 per cent, and the value of zinc production decreased by 27.47 per cent. The value of uranium production, in dollars and cents, increased by \$17,654,000." It goes on to point out that the value of the increase in uranium more than offsets the decrease in copper and zinc, to increase the over-all value by some \$7 million, or an increase of approximately 9.3 per cent. Its own report reveals that these increases in production are in themselves deceptive. They point out that revenue from this increase has been dropping.

The same report, speaking of the royalties from copper and zinc stated: "Copper and zinc royalties dropped from \$2,059,000 to \$780,000, a drop of \$1,290,000, or a drop of 62 per cent in the royalties received from copper and zinc production for last year." It goes on to speak of quartz and uranium, and it points out that revenue from quartz and uranium dropped from \$3,057,649 in 1956-57 to \$2,121,131 in 1957-58 – a decrease of \$936,518, or a decrease in the royalties received from quartz and uranium in 1958 from 1957 of almost \$1 million.

The report goes on to show that combined revenue from copper, zinc and uranium – the total revenues, not only royalties, but all the revenues – dropped from a high of \$5 million-odd in 1956-57 to \$2,901,479 in 1957-58, or a drop in the combined revenue of copper, zinc, quartz and uranium of almost \$2¼ million in 1958 compared with what it was in 1957. This was the result of the copper and zinc having depressed prices on the world market. With the threat of over-production on uranium to meet the world markets, and the anticipated removal of the Canadian peg prices, the prospects of increased revenues from these sources are somewhat dimmed.

Now, looking at other minerals of the province, looking at coal, potash, salt, revenues derived from these in 1958 remained approximately the same as in 1957; in 1957, \$3,280,000, and in 1958, \$3,293,000. There is no drop there. The royalties are the basic source of revenue, because the exploration stage once it is completed, bonus bids, lease rentals and the other incidentals will not produce any significant amounts of revenue, and over one-half of the revenue derived from oil and natural gas in 1958, \$12½ million-odd, was as the result of bonus bids – not royalties or the results of production.

These conditions are, in the main, no different from the general production of minerals all across Canada. It does point out, however, that Saskatchewan does not enjoy any isolated booming economy, sheltered in some mysterious way from the ups and downs experienced in the Canadian economy in general. We are subject to those barriers just as much as any other province.

The report of the Mineral Resources also reveals this: if you exclude uranium, take the royalties from copper, zinc, from sodium sulphate, coal, potash and so on, and put them all together, you receive less from those sources in royalties than you receive from the mineral tax on the farmers' land, and the production tax. Royalties from all of those sources netted \$936,380, and from the mineral taxes, \$1,011,000.

These conditions are not as glowing as the C.C.F. reports would indicate. While I am dealing with the mineral tax, I want to take a moment or two and deal with reference to the loss of the farmers' mineral rights and the report of the Royal Commission set up to investigate certain mineral transactions.

You recall, Mr. Speaker, back in 1950 and 1951 the oil play was on, and everyone in the province clamoured for mineral rights. The Minister of Mineral Resources was on his feet every second day, announcing that some deal had been consummated with this or that company. Leases were coming in faster than the Department could handle them; that was another of his statements. There were sensational announcements that led, in those years, to screaming headlines in the press. In the midst of all this uproar, the Liberal Opposition was the only voice that attempted to maintain some sanity in this whole matter. Sure, we were crushed in the tumult and turmoil created by C.C.F. propaganda. Anyone who cares to look up the debates of 1950-51 will realize how vigorously we fought to prevent our resources from falling into the hands of profiteers. No one took more abuse in this House at that time than I, myself, did. When I pointed out how the Premier's 'quick-buck' artists' were moving in to get control of uranium claims, large blocks of Crown leases and petroleum and gas areas, how these same quick-buck artists were getting control of the farmers' minerals rights, now the officials within the Minister's department were taking advantage of inside information to secure leases for their own advantage, what did I receive? I received nothing but abuse. Here are some of the statements (and I have a press clipping to verify them) by the Minister of Mineral Resources, who called my charges a falsification of facts, saying that I had deliberately falsified facts for cheap political purposes, that I had hit a new low in the history of Saskatchewan politics.

March 2, 1959

Hon. Mr. Walker: – Mr. Speaker, would the hon. gentleman give me the date of that?

Mr. Cameron: – April 1, 1951, “Mineral Concession charged by Cameron.” Then on April 11th, 1951, appearing in the ‘Leader-Post’, the Minister says the charge is false, and those statements are included here. Mr. Speaker, it is eight years since then. It is strange how time levels a lot of things out, presents history in a different light. After the barrage of C.C.F. propaganda had died down and time is permitted a fair appraisal, what do we find? We find a host of court cases which now establish the statements I made in those years to be based on fact.

Opposition Members: – Hear! Hear!

Mr. Cameron: – The very things we warned against, and fought to prevent, happened. There is a court case reported in the ‘Leader-Post’ of October 22, 1957 (if the Attorney General is interested), which says: “A witness admitted in Queen’s Bench Court, Monday, he had helped promote an oil and mineral company while employed by the Saskatchewan Government.”

There is another case reported in the ‘Leader-Post’. Another promoter got \$1,000,000 for a 30-per-cent interest in mineral rights procured from the farmers. Mr. Speaker, what did the farmer get for his mineral rights? He got 10 cents per acre, and today, 15,000 farmers are clamoring because they insist there was fraud and misrepresentation a good many of these contracts. That is the position the farmers find themselves in today. Now they find they have lost their mineral rights; and they lost them because this Government refused to lift a finger to protect them.

Opposition Members: – Hear! Hear!

Mr. Cameron: – What is even worse, they assisted in this nefarious undertaking by exempting the promoters from having to register under The Securities Fraud Prevention Act.

Mr. Danielson (Arm River): – Where was the Attorney General then?

Mr. Cameron: – What is my authority for this?

Hon. Mr. Walker: – That is not true.

Mr. Cameron: – That’s not true, the Attorney General says. Well, I presume he is prepared to question the findings of the Royal Commission, because on Page 67 of the report of the Commission on certain Mineral Transactions, (I am quoting from it):

“The contracts being dealt with were entered into in the years 1950-51, and at that time were not considered to come under The Securities Fraud Prevention Act.”

Hon. Mr. Walker: – That was a different thing.

Mr. Cameron: – However, the Act was amended a year or two later to being these promoters and these land men under The Securities Act. They were brought in now – brought in now after the cattle had been stolen, and the pasture was bare. They set up a legal fence to keep the rustlers out, after the farmers had lost their mineral rights.

In this matter, too, I want to take issue with ‘The Leader-Post’ editorial, “Mess over Mineral Rights.” I want to quote something that was said, and I have it on my desk here:

“If a person signs an agreement without first ascertaining the true nature of the content, the fault basically is his. If he wakes up to discover that he has been ‘taken for a ride’ . . . (and it goes on further) The farmers involved can hardly complain about ungenerous treatment in a situation created primarily through their own failure to understand what they were signing.”

Perhaps the writer of that editorial has a special gift in understanding complicated legal documents; but I noticed in the investigation that the learned judges and lawyers had remarked that even they found these contracts most difficult, if not almost impossible, to interpret. Let me point out to my white-collared friends, their standards of living would not perhaps be as high as it is today, if it were not for the back-breaking work and sweat of these so-called “dumb” farmers.

Opposition Members: – Hear! Hear!

Mr. Cameron: – This being Education Week, Mr. Speaker, I want to deal a little more extensively with education than perhaps I would have done otherwise. The budget has provided for a considerable increase for education. It is a welcome increase of some \$4 million, an increase in a tangible form, and it certainly will do something to lighten the burden of education. I may point out, however, these increases are, at the most, only a stop-gap measure. It does nothing to get at the basic cause of the financial plight of the schools and the larger units. The Government still persists in closing its eyes to the basic problems of education in this province. I am extremely disappointed that the Government has not seen fit to adopt as its policy the resolution which I sponsored in the Legislature last year, and which received unanimous reception by every member here today. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, two years ago in this House, we in Opposition urged the adoption of the Foundation Program for Education. At that time the resolution was amended. It was amended in order that this Legislature might put itself on record as supporting federal aid for education, and the motion was agreed to unanimously.

Speaking of federal aid for education, we in the Liberal party made our stand clear at that time about federal aid for education. In essence we said we are in complete agreement with the principle of federal aid for education. We went further than that. We pointed out that, in

instituting federal aid for education, two principles must be clearly enunciated. The first, we could see nothing in the Canadian Constitution that would prevent the Federal Government contributing to the provinces for education any more than contributing to the construction of highways, which is recognized as a provincial responsibility, or contributing to old-age assistance. The second principle we pointed out was this: under the British North America Act, education is the responsibility of the province. Further jurisdiction in matters of education under the B.N.A. Act was left to the provinces. Jurisdiction in the matter of education, Mr. Speaker, is the sole right of each province, and that right must remain. It is on this basis that we would accept federal aid for education, and on this basis only we shall remain adamant in that stand. Responsibility for education is a provincial responsibility, and it is a provincial right. We cannot, and we must not relinquish this right from the province. We must, at all times, I think, jealously guard this right and this responsibility. However, we cannot agree that federal assistance for education need, in any way, encroach upon the provincial rights in this field. Recognizing these rights and these responsibilities, we cannot say that we have done in Saskatchewan all that we can do for education, and it is up to Ottawa to do the rest. Should we do this, we would indicate that we are prepared to place our rights on the bargaining table for monetary gain. This we could never consent to.

Federal aid for education? Yes, but federal aid in the form of dollars – dollars voted in the form of assistance to strengthen and protect our rights, and not to weaken them. Have we, as a province, done all we can for education? Have we a system of education in this province which guarantees to all our children access to the halls of learning? Have we a system which guarantees equal opportunity to all those who seek an elementary and secondary education? Are the moneys allotted for education allotted in a manner to assure a fair and equitable basis of cost on our people? The answer to those questions is evident. It is ‘no’! One need only look at the financial report of our larger units and school districts to find it. I looked into, and perused, the report submitted by the Minister of Municipal Affairs to see about the equalization of mill rates for schools in the province. I asked myself this question: Have we equal opportunities for education, when we realize that it costs an average of \$270 per pupil just to keep that pupil in school, and that some units can afford to spend, and are spending, almost double that per pupil, and other units can afford, and are spending, only half of that sum per pupil? Is that equal educational opportunity? Are the costs of education borne on an equitable basis, when some ratepayers are assessed only 8 mills for education, and others are assessed a burden of 38 mills for education? Is it an equitable basis of cost when some of our citizens are burdened with 38 mills to construct classrooms, engage teachers, maintain their schools, while others are assessed only 8 mills, and, in return, in some cases have better classrooms, better instruction, and more money per child in the classroom? Are costs equally divided when some people in the province are asked to pay 38 mills, some are asked to pay only 8 mills, and thousands of others are not asked to contribute one red nickel towards the cost of education in a direct manner?

If you want to see the inequitable tax burden, take a look at the report of the Minister of Municipal Affairs. I am not going to quote you fictitious figures, as the member for Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) did, last year, in trying to prove a case against the private fur traders, when he called the firms A, B and C and gave some figures. When I rose to ask him for the names of these firms in order that we might investigate these charges, his answer was, "I don't intend to give that information because I don't want to wake up tomorrow morning with a slander suit on my hands." I have no fear of that because I am quoting from the best authority I can find, and that is the Auditors' Report of the Department of Municipal Affairs, tabled in this Legislature just a few days back. I chose two municipalities, because one is in the Regina plains, with a high assessment, and the other is from my own constituency, composed mostly of sub-marginal land, namely, the Fox Valley municipality No. 171, and the Sherwood Municipality, No. 159. I chose those two for the reason that Sherwood Municipality has arable, taxable land of 184,000 acres; Fox Valley has approximately the same area, 204,000 acres of taxable land. The assessment of Sherwood is \$6,844,000, the assessment of Fox Valley is \$1,263,000. The Sherwood municipality has assessed, for municipal purposes, 9 mills and for schools 8 mills, or a total of 17 mills. From that 17 mills they arrive at a revenue of \$141,705. The rural municipality of Fox Valley – same size and area, with an assessment of \$1,263,000 – has a municipal mill rate of 24 mills, and a school mill rate of 35 mills, making a total mill rate of 59 – not 17. They are able to raise that by mill rate \$82,783.

Mr. Speaker, you will notice that the area of each is approximately the same in the number of acres, but the assessment of Sherwood Municipality No. 159 is \$6,844,000 and the assessment of Fox Valley is \$1,263,000. Sherwood municipality is five and a half times as wealthy as Fox Valley municipality, and the total mill rate for school and municipal services in the poorer municipality is 59, and in the rich one 17. The ratepayers in Municipality No. 159 in the Regina Plains pay \$17 per \$1,000 of assessment on their land for school and municipal taxes; the ratepayers in No. 171, of Fox Valley, pay \$59 per \$1,000 of assessment for school and municipal taxes. They pay \$42 per \$1,000 more than they pay on the Regina Plains. For every farmer in Sherwood municipality who is asked to put up \$17 for school and municipal taxes, the farmer in Fox Valley municipality is asked to put up \$59. The farmer in one municipality is taxed 8 mills for schools, and the farmer in the other municipality is taxed 35 mills for schools. For every \$8 the farmer in Sherwood puts up to support his school, the farmer in Fox Valley is called upon to put up \$35, based on the assessed value of the land. The farmer in Fox Valley municipality pays as much each year for education as the farmer in Sherwood pays in four and one-half years. R.M. 159 in the Regina Plains, with its low assessment of 8 mills, raises \$56,000-odd for education; the rural municipality of Fox Valley, with its assessment of 35 mills, nets a budget of \$45,000 for education. Here we have two municipalities, one with an assessment of almost \$7 million and the other with an assessment of \$1¼ million, and the rich one, five and a half times as rich, is only asked to contribute \$11,000 more for education than the poorest municipality in the province.

Mr. Speaker, I didn't choose this as an isolated case. In my own municipality of Enterprise the farmer there also pays \$35 for every \$1,000 worth of assessed land he owns, while other farmers only pay \$8. He also pays for education in one year as much as the farmer in Sherwood pays in four and a half years. This applies to the farmers in Big Stick municipality, the Maple Creek municipality, the Carmichael municipality – all of those municipalities in my constituency. Lest anyone think this applies only to municipalities in my constituency, if you go through the Municipal Reports tabled in the Legislature you will find that same inequality shows up in all areas of the province.

No wonder the Government has turned a deaf ear to the plea that we have presented for a system of equitable distribution of costs! It is in keeping, I think, with this new concept, this new C.C.F. policy of 'ease the rich and soak the poor' because the poor are always with us. I think it is time that we got our thinking straight on a lot of these matters of education. How long must we exist under a system of education that asks our rural communities, our towns and villages, to pay the costs of training our youth, and then see them leave the local community, see them leave to give the benefit of their training to industry in national and international spheres of activity? When are we going to realize that education is a social responsibility; that education is the responsibility of all the people of the province, not the sole responsibility of the taxpayer?

Opposition Members: – Hear! Hear!

Mr. Cameron: – And the leadership – if we are to establish some equity, the leadership in this field must come from those people who have the power first to legislate, and the financial resources necessary to carry it through, namely, the Government itself. I am forced to the conclusion that the Government has failed, and it has failed dismally, in this whole matter of financial aid to schools in this province. This whole pattern of allocating funds to municipal and school authorities, I don't think has deviated one iota from the pattern of the 'thirties. All the evidence around us indicates they have failed to recognize and to see that we must change our whole concept of financial arrangement between provincial and local governments. They have failed in this. They have failed to keep in pace with the changing conditions of this complex age.

They snickered and they laughed when I made reference to the 'thirties. Let me tell you something of the 1930's – I saw this in the 'Reader's Digest' just the other day: "The 1930's was an age long gone by, and people who died in 1929, just three decades past, had never heard of jet aeroplanes, the sound barrier, of split-level houses; had never heard of food-freezers, guided missiles, radar, bull-dozer, V-8 engines, television, foam rubber. They had never heard of Drive-In Theatres, or fibre glass, automatic transmission for the family car, electric razors, frozen vegetables, or the atom bomb, or bubble gum . . .'

Mr. Klein: – Or the C.C.F. Party!

Mr. Cameron: – How far have we come since then? This shows the complex age in which we are living as compared with three decades ago.

Yet in our educational system, the pattern followed is exactly as it was in those days.

I am extremely disappointed that the Government has failed to act on a resolution that was accepted unanimously by this Legislature, last year – the resolution which I sponsored, urging the establishment of a Foundation Program for education. It was accepted unanimously. A resolution in this House urging the Government to proceed at a fast pace with the establishment of just such a program, received unanimous support of every member of the House, including every Cabinet Minister. I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, that the resolution was accepted merely as a face-saving gesture, and it is now collecting dust along with the Report of the Royal Commission of Agriculture and Rural Life. We have advocated this plan as a practical and a sound solution to the chaotic conditions of our educational system. The Minister of Education is quick to pull out his pious platitude about proceeding through equalization grants to accomplish the same thing. People are tired of platitude; they are tired of ineptitude, of inefficient leadership, of the Government's adamant stand against change in our whole educational system.

Because of these chaotic conditions, Mr. Speaker, because of these inequalities in costs (and I notice the Minister of Education snickers; he's laughing) I am sure, Mr. Minister, that the ratepayers in Fox Valley municipality that I just quoted you, and the other ratepayers in other poorer municipalities, will not think that your laugh is very funny when they have to pay \$35 and the other fellow only pays \$8.

I think it is essential that the Foundation Program be outlined again to this Legislature, so that the members know what they voted for. It is estimated that, in the next 20 years, enrolment in our schools will increase approximately three times. The total annual cost of education is approximating \$60 million this coming year; only \$24 million now will come from the Provincial Government – approximately 40 per cent. The cost of operating our classrooms in 1950 was \$29 million; in 1960, it is estimated costs will be between \$34 and \$35 million. To meet these costs, school taxes have been soaring every year, and are \$1½ million higher than they were the year before. Coupled with that, the arrears of school taxes are standing high in the province today.

Education, I think, has a just right to its share of the general resources of the province. We cannot continue to deny education its right, to its share of these new revenues that are coming into the province because of the accelerated pace of the development of our natural resources in oil and gas. A Foundation Program recognizes the fact that education is a social responsibility; that it is the responsibility of all the people in the province, not just the responsibility of just a few. It recognizes that we cannot any longer burden communities with the cost of training these young people, and the turning them out to enter the fields of endeavour far removed from the local area in which the people paid the cost of education. A Foundation Program will remove inequality in financing education, such inequalities as I pointed out in regard to Sherwood municipality and Fox Valley.

Under the Foundation Program, the standard of education will be established for the whole province. That standard will remove inequality

of standards between units in themselves, will assure every student an equal opportunity of education in every unit, and every unit will be able to afford the same expenditure for every pupil to meet the same standard – not one unit that establishes a cost of \$300 per pupil, and another unit that establishes a cost of \$100 per pupil. The Foundation Program will assess every ratepayer a uniform mill rate for education, a mill rate that will assure that the rich will carry the same burden as the poor. This plan would drop the mill rate, in many areas, to less than one-half what they are paying now. It would reorganize education as a social responsibility, and in doing so it would reverse the cost to the ratepayers, with them carrying approximately 40 per cent, and the province 60 per cent, or just the reverse if what it is now. That program seemed to find favour in the Legislature last year, but the Government hasn't the courage to institute it.

The Provincial Treasurer talks about a balanced budget. I never witnessed a statement that created more interest than the actions of the Provincial Treasurer about the balanced budget. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that in January he issued a news release in which he said the province may face a deficit budget this year. He estimated that, to balance the budget for the year ending March 31st, he must find some \$6 million-odd, and he predicted the possibility of a deficit budget. Then in the Budget Speech he comes in with glowing statements, and he throws out his chest, and says, in essence: "I fooled the pundits who have been mainly concerned with the gloomy possibility of a deficit budget."

Mr. McDonald: – Meaning himself!

Mr. Cameron: – Now, Webster's dictionary, Mr. Speaker, says that a 'pundit' is a learned man. The only pundit he fooled was himself! He is the only man, learned or otherwise, who is in a position to know whether or not we would have a deficit budget. May I point out that the Provincial Treasurer would have had a deficit budget had he not taken \$1.8 million of Telephone profits into the general revenue of the province, a thing which has never been done since the Telephone Company was set up in 1908, some 50 years ago. It was always the policy of the Telephone Company to plow back the earning of the Company into its capital expansion program. But the people of the province are alarmed, Mr. Speaker, not of deficit financing, but deficit leadership.

Opposition Members: – Hear! Hear!

Mr. Cameron: – This is far more devastating, and it was never shown with more clarity than in the Legislature this year. Let's take a few examples of evidence of this deficit leadership. I think the most glaring example is the issue of Time.

Premier Douglas: – Stick to the budget subject!

Mr. Cameron: – 'Budget subject', the Premier says. Of course, it is a budget subject, because in the supplementary estimates there is a vote passed on for money spent on the Time question. Have you never looked at your supplementary estimates? Maybe I've done a bit more homework on the budget than you have, then. This issue of Time has plagued this Legislature

like a ghost for the past four years. One has only to recall the performances of the Ministers of the Crown on this issue, to see the chaotic turmoil of a Government in disorderly retreat. This Legislature, I think, could contribute materially to the success of our law schools, particularly if the letters of the Premier, the Minister of Education, Minister of Municipal Affairs and the Attorney General were put into book form, published and contributed to the law school under the title 'Illogical Presentation of a Case' or 'How not to Present a Case'. We may make better lawyers as a result of it, but I am sure it wouldn't enhance the prestige of parliamentarians. I want to read – this is taken from Hansard:

“The Attorney General in this Legislature last year, speaking on the Bills on Uniform Time said: ‘Mr. Speaker, there is teeth in the Act’. He said further: ‘If the Liquor Board orders stores closed at 10:00 o’clock p.m. according to the time defined in the Act, and if the vendor remains open an hour later, it is no defence for him to say that he is on a different time’.”

He goes on to say this:

“If a store wants to stay open until 7:00 o’clock when the rest of the community is on Central Time, by pretending he is on Mountain Time, he would be in violation of the law and he will be prosecuted under the closing regulations of the by-law.”

Then he goes on to say:

“So it cannot be said that the Act has no teeth in it.”

He said this:

“The Act has teeth in it, and anyone who defies it, or ignores it, will do so at his own peril.”

Mr. McDonald: – Great words!

Mr. Cameron: – Those were the words of the Attorney General when he introduced this Bill to the Legislature.

Hon. Mr. Walker: – I stand by those words, too.

Mr. Cameron: – Now he says he stands by those words. Let me show how well he stood by those words. After one-third of the people of this province were in open rebellion against this iniquitous legislation, he found fit to write a circular to all the councillors in the province – he didn't write, no, but he used the Tourist and Information Bureau to

write – and he used this propaganda machine to draw attention to every councillor in the province how unfair the Liberal executive were to say that one-third of the people were in open rebellion and to demand a special session of this Legislature. He said: “I can only conceive that it is for cheap political purposes.”

Mr. McDonald: – Shame on you!

Mr. Cameron: – In the same article he goes on to outline to the council, and says this: “Let us put an end to all the confusion about this matter of time; apparently some people believe that the province is legislating to compel citizens to observe, for all purposes, Mountain Standard Time in the winter and Central Standard Time in the summer. This is definitely untrue.” He says, according to this propaganda outfit . . .

Hon. Mr. Walker: – Read on.

Mr. Cameron: – “. . . that although it was hoped the people might accept the principle of uniformity in their day-to-day activities, there is no compulsion upon them to do so.” What a change in heart! What strength of leadership!

Hon. Mr. Walker: – Read the next paragraph.

Mr. Cameron: – Great fanfare has been made about industries coming into Saskatchewan. We have had some new industries come into this province, and everyone is happy to have them come in. Then there has been a serious increase in freight rates, particularly the last one of 17 per cent passed by our Tory friends in Ottawa. This is an added inducement for industries to come into the Prairies. Many industries contemplating new plants are giving serious thought to establishing these plants on the prairies. They are interested in the dollar-and-cent proposition. Members are aware of the fact that raw material is shipped at lower price rates than the finished product. In some instances, raw material is being shipped from the western plants to eastern Canada, and the finished product is shipped back to the western market.

These freight increases on hauls to the east and back again to the west are constantly adding to the cost of production of these industries. No one would be foolish enough not to admit that industry must make a profit in order to survive; and to assure this profit, they can do one of two things. They can either increase their selling price for the finished product, or they can proceed to reduce the cost of their production. The finished product must be competitive in price, and it becomes essential to cut the cost of operation rather than increase prices. To construct plants on the prairies near the source of the raw materials will not only reduce freight on long hauls, but, what is more important, by selling the products on the prairie market at the same price as firms shipping the finished product long distances, not only saves freight but, in addition, all increases in freight rates mean an addition in profit to them.

The recent increase of 17 per cent means additional money in their pockets. This increase has strengthened the profit potential of the new Steel Plant in the city, and of the Cement Plant. It strengthens their profit potential, because it has reduced the cost of production over their competitors, while selling at the same price as their competitors here on the prairie markets.

I was down east not too long ago, and read an article in one of the Toronto papers. It posed the question of Ontario losing industry to the prairies because of the increased profits to be made there due to the increased freight rates. Because of this favourable climate we are surprised that the Government finds it necessary to pledge the credit of the province to induce industry to come in here. I understand it is necessary to induce industry here, that the people of the province must guarantee the bonds of these companies. The people of Alberta and Manitoba are not asked to guarantee bonds of industry there; they are not asked to back the notes of companies coming in there. The people of Saskatchewan must not only guarantee to put up the losses, but what do they get in return?

I want to deal here with the Cement Plant as an example. In order to sell the proposition of the Cement Plant to the people of Saskatchewan, the Premier and the Provincial Treasurer made commitments in this Legislature, last year. Let me read these commitments. Speaking of the advantages of the Cement Plant in Saskatchewan to the people, the Premier (quoting from Hansard again):

“This undertaking will not only give employment to our people, but will give our people cement at a much more reasonable price than before. They will not be entirely dependent upon a great cement monopoly. I am convinced in the long run this will prove to be of great benefit to the province, not only in terms of industrial development, but in terms of a better price for cement to the consumer of the province.”

The Provincial Treasurer, in selling this to the people of the province, gave more explicit examples and I want to quote what he said:

“I can tell you the competitive advantage there is in having the plant here in Regina, compared to other points. Right in Regina the consumer will have an advantage of \$1.32 per barrel. There are four bags to a barrel, so you can figure that out. That is 28 cents a bag advantage in Regina over the plant at either Exshaw or Winnipeg. In Saskatoon, the advantage is 7 cents per bag; in Weyburn, the advantage is 60 cents per barrel; in Moose Jaw it is 93 cents.”

March 2, 1959

These were the commitments made to the people of Saskatchewan when the Government asked them to guarantee, to the extent of \$5½ million, this venture into cement in Saskatchewan.

Today, people of Regina who buy cement from this Cement Company find they cannot buy it 28 cents per bag cheaper, as promised by the Provincial Treasurer. People of Saskatchewan find that they must pay much more for cement produced in Regina than they do for cement in any other place. Regina's cement prices today are the highest on the North American continent, with a cement plant right in their back-yard. Do the Premier and the Provincial Treasurer want us to think that they were so naïve as to believe that the establishment of a Cement Plant here would give these tremendous advantages to the people of Saskatchewan? Does the Provincial Treasurer now expect the people of Saskatchewan to believe that he knows so little about finances that he was sincere in that commitment of cheap cement to the people of Saskatchewan? Does the Premier now want us to believe that his Economic Planning Board, his Industrial Development Office, did not take him aside and give him the economic facts of life? Do they want to plead innocent now in this whole matter? No, Mr. Speaker, these were calculated steps and calculated risks taken by a Government that was desperate to induce industry to come into Saskatchewan.

A few weeks ago I was very interested in a little gem I saw in 'Time' magazine. In reference to the development of industry in Saskatchewan, 'Time' magazine had this to say:

"Saskatchewan's adventure into heavy industry has not only helped to diversify Saskatchewan's economy; it has helped to make millionaires of a few smart promoters. Saskatchewan's Provincial Treasurer Fines sees no objection to the great millionaires in socialist Saskatchewan. He said, 'I hope we create a lot more'."

From 'Time' magazine.

Now, this Cement Plant in Regina may please the Provincial Treasurer that Saskatchewan now has a few millionaires. This partnership between the officials of the Cement Plant and the Provincial Government may have proved a profitable venture for the Government in big business, but it did so at the expense of everyone who purchased cement for a home, sidewalk or other undertaking. The Government here walked hand-in-hand with big business, and is a partner in this vicious monopoly. If the Government is a partner in this venture, surely it has some responsibility to those who must purchase cement. It is time the Provincial Treasurer became less concerned with the creating of millionaires, and more concerned about carrying out the commitments he and the Premier made to the people of Saskatchewan.

Opposition Members: – Hear! Hear!

Mr. Cameron: – The cement dealers, the contractors, the home-owners of Regina and Saskatoon, and all those who must purchase cement, realize now that they are at the mercy of this monopoly. They realize now they were

sold a false bill of goods by the Premier and the Provincial Treasurer. In place of buying cement cheaper, as promised by the Premier and the Provincial Treasurer, they are now compelled to pay higher prices for cement than any other place on the North American continent.

No, it is not deficit budgeting that the people are alarmed at. It is deficit leadership, and you have a living example of it here, in the Cement Plant.

I want to turn for a moment to the budget remarks in regard to hospitalization. The Provincial Treasurer has estimated that the hospital costs this year will rise from \$22 million to \$33.3 million.

Hon. Mr. Fines: – That is not what was said at all. Read it carefully.

Mr. Cameron: – You expect the costs to be \$33.3 million because of increased services you are putting into the plan.

Hon. Mr. Fines: – Twenty-two million.

Mr. Cameron: – He points out that he is unable to make the \$13,250,000 of Federal reimbursement available for other purposes. Now, under the plan Saskatchewan will receive \$13.2 million from Ottawa for hospitalization care. Of this \$13.2 million, the Government returns \$1.6 million to the taxpayer in the form of reduction of the family personal tax of \$45 to \$35. This still leaves \$11.6 million, which the Provincial Treasurer claims is needed because of additional new groups which were formerly a Federal responsibility. I presume, Mr. Speaker, that includes Indians. Certainly no one believes that, by including Indians into the health plan, this group would cost \$11.6 million.

Hon. Mr. Fines: – Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. I don't mind being misquoted six or eight times, but when the hon. member keeps it up – it is very clear what I said. On page 22, where I said: "Three years ago, hospital costs in Saskatchewan were running at about \$22 million annually. Rising costs, increased utilization and the inclusion of new groups which were formerly a Federal responsibility, have raised these costs to an estimated \$33.3 million."

Mr. Cameron: – Mr. Speaker, that is what I said. Is there any difference in that statement he read and what I said – that from \$22 million the cost was estimated to rise to \$33.3 million. That is exactly what I have been saying. He says, "due to increased costs, in utilization of other groups, he anticipates the plan will be \$33.3 million." He doesn't need to take up my valuable time and contribute nothing.

Hon. Mr. Fines: – My point of privilege was this, Mr. Speaker: that the hon. gentleman said that I was attributing the entire \$13 million to the inclusion of new groups. The major part of it is for the rising costs of the increased utilization.

Mr. McDonald: – He did no such thing.

March 2, 1959

Mr. Cameron: – Mr. Speaker, I made no such reference.

Hon. Mr. Fines: – You certainly did. Look up the records after.

Mr. Cameron: – Let me put it again. I'll try and put it a little more simply for you this time, Mr. Provincial Treasurer.

Mr. McDonald: – If he can understand it.

Mr. Cameron: – Let me put it this way. They received \$13.2 million from Ottawa, under the plan. No one can object to that statement.

Hon. Mr. Fines: – That's right.

Mr. Cameron: – We will return \$1.6 million of this as a reduction to the taxpayers, in the form of family personal taxes, from \$45 to \$35. But, expenditures are anticipated to increase to \$33.3 million. That expenditure will take care of increased costs of operation, increased utilization, and the inclusion of new groups.

Hon. Mr. Fines: – That's better.

Mr. McDonald: – That's what he said in the first place.

Mr. Cameron: – I'm pointing out that bringing these Indian groups under the plan will certainly not use up what is left over, \$11.6 million. I know part of it is going to be used for new geriatric centres under the Hospital Plan this year, and cancer treatment next year. That is an inclusion of services under the Plan for the first time. It is not giving any increased services to the people. It is merely transferring the costs from provincial revenues of the province into the costs of the Hospitalization Plan, because the province was carrying, apart from the Hospitalization Plan, the cost of geriatric centres and of cancer treatment. Those are going to be included under the Hospitalization Plan, so some of the \$11.6 million will go to taking care of that service. It is simply transferring them to the Hospitalization Plan, using part of this remaining \$11.6 million from Ottawa to carry on these geriatric centres, and relieving the funds of the province for other purposes. They have retained the money from Ottawa under the Hospitalization Plan without increasing services, in order to relieve the Government of the financial responsibility for services which were formerly carried on its own.

Under the Federal plan offered to the provinces, Ottawa agreed to pay its share of the costs to any province which included out-patient diagnostic services in its Hospital Plan. As I can estimate from the budget, it shows no indication that it intends to extend the services to cover out-patient diagnostic services, because it isn't mentioned in the Budget. I thought this would certainly be one to be included in the Plan. I think it should have been included. If it is not already done, I would urge that it be done, for two reasons. First, patients who are fortunate enough to be admitted to hospital, where they receive all diagnostic services as an in-patient – there is no charge to them; but people who must receive diagnostic services as an out-patient, and then are hospitalized because of

what the out-patient diagnostic service reveals, are asked to pay \$50 to \$100 for this out-patient service, which the other patients got free because they were in the hospital.

Premier Douglas: – You're wrong there.

Mr. Cameron: – Secondly, I think the inclusion of out-patient services would relieve, to some extent at least, the congested conditions in the hospital, because in many instances, in-patient diagnostic services would become out-patient diagnostic services, if they were both covered under the plan. It would likewise remove this unfairness between those who must pay out-patient diagnostic services, and those who receive in-patient diagnostic services. One person who took it on the outside, because he couldn't get into a hospital at that particular time, has to pay \$50 to \$100, and the other fellow gets it free. I would urge that out-patient diagnostic services be the first thing to be put under the Hospitalization Plan.

Mr. Speaker, I have covered much more than I anticipated, this afternoon, in regard to education and hospitalization and the other problems of the province, and I think it is evident in what I said that this Government has refused to proceed with the establishment of a Foundation Program for Education. They have refused to do this, in spite of a unanimous vote of the Legislature, which asked them to do so. This Government has failed to carry out its commitment of cheaper cement to the people of Saskatchewan; rather it sold the people a false bill of goods when it asked them to back the \$5½ million guarantee to this company. They failed to take action at an appropriate time when it would have aided immensely in assisting the farmers in retaining their mineral rights. In these things the Government has revealed a lack of leadership, and a lack of courage. The Time controversy, which was of its own making, is a living, outstanding example of this lack of leadership and lack of courage. It indicates to us and, I am sure, to the people of the province, that this Government is growing old and tired and arrogant and inept, and because of this, Mr. Speaker, I cannot support the Motion.

Premier Douglas: – Mr. Speaker, I didn't want to interrupt my hon. friend while he was speaking, but I wonder if, before he sits down, I might ask him a question. He referred to the expenditures in the Supplementary Estimates for the Time question, and boasted of the homework he has done. Would you mind telling me where this estimate is?

Mr. Cameron: – I haven't the estimates with me, Mr. Premier, but you will find the whole issue in those estimates.

Premier Douglas: – Well, I'll send this copy over to my friend, Mr. Speaker. I would like him to point out this estimate for me.

Mr. Cameron: – It certainly is a budgetary item.

Hon. Mr. Fines: – Let's have it then.

Mr. Cameron: – Do you mean to say that we were not asked to vote anything for the Time question? Is that what you mean to say, Mr.

March 2, 1959

Premier? Will you tell me whether or not this Legislature has been asked to vote any money for the Time legislation? Answer that question! Who pays for the vote? Where is the money coming from?

Premier Douglas: – I am simply asking the hon. member, Mr. Speaker, where in the supplementary Estimates there is any reference to an expenditure for the Time question. My friend said he had done his homework. Will he please tell me where the item is?

Mr. McDonald: – Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that if the Premier wants an answer to his question, he can get it; and they paid for this vote. If they didn't pay for it, they should have.

Premier Douglas: – I'm checking on the homework. Let's have it.

Mr. McDonald: – You haven't done any homework for 10 years!

Hon. Mr. Walker (Attorney General): – Mr. Speaker, unlike the hon. member who is the financial critic, I have spent some time in the Public Accounts Committee and some time in this House, and when he refers to a supplementary vote to take of the Time question, since there is none in the Supplementary Estimates to take care of the Time plebiscite, I can only presume that he is referred to the increased contribution which is being proposed to take care of part-time employees. If my hon. friend would just attend the Public Accounts Committee once in a while, he would know what that item really is.

Mr. Cameron (Maple Creek): – It is of the off-time committee.

Hon. Mr. Walker: – The hon. member can try to conceal his mystification by braying, but this doesn't conceal the mystification which he enjoyed from being noticed by the other members of the House. The hon. member referred, for example, to the fact that this year for the first time, a dividend is being received from the Telephone Corporation, and I can only say to my hon. friend that, if he would attend Public Accounts Committee, if he would take care of his duties and read the Estimates, he would find, for example, that this was also provided last year. It is not a new item this year. It may be new to my hon. friend, but it is not new to the other members of this House.

My hon. friend went on to some length to say that the Premier and the Provincial Treasurer have broken trust with the people of Regina in connection with a promised reduction in the price of cement. I don't know how much experience he has in the building industry, but I think it is common knowledge to the people of Regina and to the people of Saskatchewan that, in every single year since 1945, a shortage of cement developed in this province, and it had to be imported from places as far away as Sweden, Germany and Central America, and that this cement cost the contractors and the builders fully 50 per cent more than the prevailing price of cement in this province. I know; I bought some. The fact of the matter is, however, that since Saskatchewan now has its own source of this important product, this

importation has become unnecessary, and it has saved the people of this province considerable sums of money through additional costs formerly incurred by importing cement from other parts of the world. My hon. friend can grumble and whine and be as unparliamentary as he likes, but he cannot conceal the facts from the House and from the public. He only succeeds in keeping himself in the dark if he won't listen.

Mr. Speaker, I do not propose at this time to deal with all the flights of fancy which my hon. friend indulged in and the oratory that he exuded in this House, this afternoon. I hope to deal with them, however, before I sit down.

He spent a good deal of time at the beginning of his speech trying to suggest that the revenues from mineral developments in this province were not as good as the Provincial Treasurer had painted, and he suggested that the Government had tried to mislead the House as to the buoyancy of these mineral revenues. The fact of the matter was, however, that the only thing he could produce to refute these revenues were the very reports of the Departments concerned. If the Government were trying to conceal the situation with regard to mineral revenues, certainly it would be most unwise to include them in the reports which were tabled in this Legislature. Every member of the House, I presume, has read these reports and is acquainted with the whole story of mineral development in this province. His complaint finally boiled down to the fact that the peak revenues came in, a year before the Provincial Treasurer had anticipated. I suggest that it is a compliment to the conservative estimating . . .

Mr. McCarthy (Cannington): – You're conservative now?

Hon. Mr. Walker: – . . . of the Provincial Treasurer in these financial matters. However, this, I suggest, ill becomes members of a political party whose party was in power this province for some 34 years at a time when mineral and manufacturing development was rampant throughout Canada, at a time when they were only able to produce revenues to the people of this province of less than half a million dollars, to complain about a \$24 million revenue. I suggest it is not becoming to people who were so unsuccessful, so signally unsuccessful, in encouraging the development of this province when their party was in power.

Then of course, having voiced these complaints about the revenue being much less than the Provincial Treasurer led the country to believe, being much less than the people of Saskatchewan had been led to believe by the newspapers, at the end of his speech he made an impassioned plea that all of these hidden revenues that the Government was enjoying from mineral rights ought to be made available for education. Suddenly he turned about, put on his other cap and discovered that there were large quantities of revenue that the Government wasn't admitting was there, and they had better pay them out, by golly, or it will be serious. Now, of course, it is not possible for people, who have the responsibility of advising Her Majesty, to be as reckless with their facts, to be as changeable in their arguments, and to be as uncertain in their convictions as the hon. members of the Opposition seem to be able to do.

He made the statement, for example, that the initial development of the oil boom resulted in very large revenues and that this could be expected to taper off when production got under way. Now, my friend apparently isn't aware of the fact that this Government, contrary to the usual practice of Governments which enjoy tremendous mineral developments, has elected to take a part of this revenue from the disposal of Crown leases in the form of annual rentals or increased royalties over the years. Undoubtedly, the Government of Saskatchewan could have increased its immediate revenue from the leasing of oil reserves by a substantial amount, by many millions of dollars. This would have meant, of course, that we would have had to confine the auctioning of oil reserves to a cash bid basis. Instead, many parcels of potential and productive oil land have been leased on a net royalty basis which result in royalty payments, over the entire life of the field, running into 50 per cent, 60 per cent and even higher than 70 per cent royalty. This means that the people of Saskatchewan have deferred their profit or their payment for the transfer or for the assignment of these important resources. This means that, through the years, we will have a larger revenue than if we had sold these leases or permits on an outright sale or lease basis for cash bids.

Now, Mr. Speaker, before I sit down, I would like to say something about the view which I take of this budget. I want to congratulate the Provincial Treasurer for having brought in a very workmanlike product this year. The Provincial Treasurer has been faced with many problems in formulating budgets for this province for the last 16 years. This year perhaps he was faced with the most difficult problem of all – the problem of runaway or continuing inflation, where the costs of rendering services have increased by four or five per cent at a time when the revenue income of the Government has become stabilized, and some important revenues had actually fallen off. I suggest this is a tribute not only to the financial wisdom of the Provincial Treasurer but to his acumen as a financial administrator that he was, first of all, anxious to bring in a balanced budget; secondly, that he was able to bring in a balanced budget at this time.

This budget, I am happy to say, is not only balanced, it provides for many worthwhile social projects of interest to all the people of Saskatchewan. This budget represents, in the Department of the Attorney General, continued administrative progress. We have, and I think at this time I would like to comment in some detail on the administration of the Department of the Attorney General in this debate. Undoubtedly, further information will be sought when Estimates are before the House; but I would like at this time to summarize some of the changes in administration which have occurred during the year, and some which are forecast for the coming year.

Hon. members will recall last year passing an amendment to The District Court Act which permitted the abolition of Districts and which invested in the District Court judges a province-wide jurisdiction. At that time it was said we would thereby hope to make possible a substantial reduction in the number of District Court judges and, at the same time, to provide a greater equalization in the amount of work between them. This has been done. The result is that now we have organized the province into seven regional circuits. I may say that this is along the lines of the recommendations made by the Law Reform Committee – by the lawyers through the

Law Reform Committee set up last year by the Government. It is intended, it is hoped, that the judge or judges in each of these circuits will be able to allocate among themselves the various sittings of the court and the work involved. It is hoped that, as a result of grouping the judges into circuits, it will no longer be necessary for the Attorney General's Department to nominate or appoint District Court judges to act in vacant judicial centres. Normally, this was a request which arose every few weeks – that the Attorney General was called upon to name a judge to act temporarily in a district where the judge was either on vacation or where there was no judge resident. This will no longer be necessary because now it will be possible for the judges in that region, now they have coterminous jurisdiction throughout the region and they can assign the work to each other, to arrange the holidays and so on between themselves.

We have, as a result of putting the District Court judges on a circuit basis, been able to greatly increase the number of sittings of the Court without at the same time imposing upon the time of any of the particular judges. By organizing the province into circuits we have been able to limit the number of sittings in each circuit to 20 and, in most cases, 17 or 18 sittings for the year. This equalizes the number of sittings approximately between the various circuits and, at the same time, provides for a substantial increase in the number of sittings at most of the judicial centres. The Judicial Centre of Saskatoon, for example, where in 1957 there were 166 District Court trials, is now provided with 20 sittings instead of 10. This is possible, of course, because we have new and additional facilities in Saskatoon which make it possible for one sitting to overlap with the next following sitting without causing congestion in the court house.

Twenty sittings instead of ten makes it possible now for the Bar to expect an average of about eight trials to each sitting; formerly they had to expect around 16 or 17 trials to each sitting. This meant, of course, if you were toward the end of the list you might have to keep your witnesses dangling around Saskatoon for two or three weeks before knowing just exactly what day your case would be called. By providing more frequent sittings and shorter lists, it is possible for litigants to anticipate more precisely when they will be expected to go on, and thereby reduce by 50 per cent the amount of wasted time which litigants and lawyers have to set aside to take care of litigation.

Regina, with 163 District Court trials, had ten sittings last year, increased this year to eleven. Nothing better can be done for Regina at the present time because of the limited facilities in the Regina Court House. However, I am sure the House is happy to know that the administration of justice in the Regina area will be facilitated, as it is now in Saskatoon, by the addition of a new court house to be constructed partly during this fiscal year and the next fiscal year.

In Prince Albert, with 54 trials in 1957, the number of sittings has been increased from five to seven. Yorkton, with 55 District Court trials in 1957, has had the number of sittings increased from five to seven. Moose Jaw, with 74 District Court trials, had the number of sittings increased from four to six. Battleford, with 29, has had the number increased from four to eight. The reason for the large number in Battleford is the

fact that many litigants have to come so far and the cost and expense is so much greater. By additional sittings the lists can be kept smaller. We expect an average of perhaps three to four trials on each sitting at Battleford, which fixes much more precisely the date on which the parties will be heard. Melville, with 47 District Court trials, has had the number of sittings increased from five to six. Kerrobert, with only five District Court trials in 1957, has been increased from three to five. It should, however, be pointed out that at Kindersley, which is now functioning on a part-time basis, most of the trials originating in that area will likely be taken to Kerrobert, this will encourage people to go to the place where there is excellent court house facilities, namely, Kerrobert.

Humboldt, with only 16 District Court trials in 1957, has had the number of sittings increased from four to five. Weyburn, with 18 District Court trials in 1957, has had the number increased from four to five. Wynyard, with only six District Court trials in 1957, has had the number increased from four to five.

A reduced number of sittings has been provided in all centres having less than ten District Court trials a year, and they are: Arcola, Assiniboia, Kindersley, Shaunavon and Wilkie. In the other Judicial Centres, the number of sittings have been left just as they were before. This, of course, makes allowance for the fact that, over the past 40 years, the volume of judicial work has shifted, and larger amounts are done in some Judicial Centres than was formerly the case, and smaller amounts are done in others. This is the first time in that lengthy period that there has been an over-all readjustment in the number of sittings provided.

I am pleased to say that the Queen's Bench Court has done substantially the same thing. Of course, in their case the judges themselves fix the frequency of sittings, and they have done substantially the same thing in increasing the number of sittings, particularly in Yorkton, Prince Albert, Regina and Saskatoon.

This new legislation has made it possible for us to continue a general reorganization of the staff of the Judicial Districts. There was, last year, a reduction in the staff of the Judicial Districts by five. This represents a reduction of about eight per cent in the total staff, and this was brought about because we anticipated the savings which would occur when the new legislation went into effect. We struggled along, under some difficulty, for a few months until the new legislation went into effect, with a slight under-staffing in many places. In the present fiscal year, we have eliminated two full-time positions in Arcola and substituted a half-time employee there; in Moosomin, we have eliminated one full-time position and substituted a half-time employee there; in Shaunavon, we eliminated two full-time positions and substituted a half-time employee; in Wynyard, we eliminated one position without substituting anyone. This means a new reduction in the Department of four, after making allowances for some increases that were justified in some of the other Judicial Centres. We have, therefore, reduced the staff by nine in two years, which is an over-all reduction of something like 12 per cent or 13 per cent in two years. I say that this has been made possible by reason of the legislative reforms which were

passed at the last Session of the legislature.

I am not taking into account here, of course, the number of judges, because they are paid by the Federal Government; but this would also make possible, as I indicated last year, a reduction in the number of judges of probably five or six.

I would like to say something about the Land Titles system. In 1958-59, we have continued the reorganization of the Land Titles system along the lines that were promised to the House at that time. Hon. members will recall that, last year, an increase of some \$325,000 was made in the vote for Land Titles administration. That \$325,000 made it possible to replace all of the furniture, all of the equipment in the Land Titles offices and, too, made it possible to streamline and modernize the administrative processes there. We now have, of course, a new form of title which, I may say for the benefit of hon. members who haven't seen it, has resulted in glowing praise from everyone who has taken the trouble to write me about it. It is a simple form, a shorter form, and much more easy to discover whether or not encumbrances are still extant against the title. Instead of simply endorsing every encumbrance and every withdrawal, they are carried along in horizontal lines with columns. All you have to do is look down the column till you come to a blank where nothing appears on a withdrawal or cancellation, and then go across and read the encumbrance. You don't have to read all the endorsements but only those which are still in effect. I would caution (as I think my hon. friend from Humboldt would) that, in searching titles, you should read all of the notations; but it is more convenient to read them in the new form. You should read all the notations because sometimes a withdrawal is only a partial withdrawal, and sometimes there is still some effect or substance left to the document which has purportedly been withdrawn. In addition to that, we have acquired new microfilming equipment for all of the ten Land Titles Offices together with, of course, a large amount of microfilm. We have acquired photocopy equipment in all the Land Titles Offices so that they are now able to do two things. They are now able to microfilm all of the documents in the Land Titles Offices and file them away in a safe place so that, in case an office is destroyed by fire, flood or hydrogen bomb, we will still have all of the data necessary to reconstruct every single document in that office.

This microfilming was started on the conversion date in each office on a progressive basis, microfilming everything that comes into the office after that date. Then, the reduction in staff which will be made possible by the new administrative processes will free two, three or four people in each office who have nothing to do in the ordinary processes of registration, and they will be engaged in microfilming the tremendous backlog of documents which have already been registered. In the course of a year or two, we will have complete records of all offices in duplicate on microfilm. Then, the photocopy equipment makes it possible for Land Titles Offices to supply exact copies of all documents on file for the public at lower cost than typing them and reading them back and forth comparing them. This new service, I am sure, will be a great assistance to the public and will be welcomed.

The conversion process has gone on first in the office at Moose Jaw. Moose Jaw seemed to lend itself to the first conversion operation, and

the operation there was completed in December. The staff in Moose Jaw has now reduced, as a result of the conversion, from a total of 24, two years ago, to 14 now, three of whom are on the surplus list and are simply tidying up the microfilm records of the old documents. This kind of saving will be possible more or less in the various offices throughout the province. Moosomin, Humboldt, Prince Albert, Arcola and Battleford are now in the process of conversion, and they are scheduled to be completed by March 1st – that would be yesterday. The conversion is presently under way in Regina, Yorkton, Swift Current and Saskatoon offices also, and it is expected to have all of these offices fully converted by May 1st next.

I said something about staff reduction. At the beginning of the current fiscal year, provision was made for the staff of 145 permanent staff, and the estimates which will be before you now provide for 135. Now, there are still 11 more to be reduced, so that the 21 which were reduced last year, the 10 this year, and the 11 more to be reduced, will represent a saving altogether in staff of some 30 per cent in the operation of the Land Titles system.

This, of course, will be reflected in greater savings to the Government of Saskatchewan. It will also be reflected in greater service to the people of Saskatchewan through speedier, more efficient, registration of documents, and a more reliable system of registration that will protect the public from error, causing them to lose their interest in property.

I should say that something new has been launched in the Criminal Investigation expenditure vote this year. In the past, it had been the practice of the Government to retain agents of the Attorney General on a fee-for-service basis, following a tariff or schedule of fees prescribed by Order in Council. This tariff had not been increased much since the war. This year, in response to pressure brought to bear on us by two things, first of all, by the growing dissatisfaction of the agents who are doing this work, and secondly, by the very great difficulty we have in securing agents to act for us in some judicial centres, an increase of about 30 per cent was allowed. This, of course, has meant that in three or four judicial centres the fees are apt to be fairly substantial, in order for them to amount to peanuts in other judicial centres. You have to pay the same rate in all centres, of course, and there are three or four centres where the amount is running into fairly substantial sums. This means that we are now able to contemplate converting some of these positions into salaried positions. We have experimented, this year, in the city of Prince Albert by providing a full-time salaried prosecutor there. This is too early to say if the thing has saved any money, but we are able to say it has resulted in the greatest measure of satisfaction to the police and the other authorities who have, in practice, to rely upon the agent for the Attorney-General for their legal advice.

This has resulted, also, in a great deal of improvement in the dispatch with which criminal prosecutions have been disposed of in that judicial centre. I hope to announce, shortly, the filling of a similar position in the city of Saskatoon. It is now the policy of the Government to employ the solicitors in the department to do many of the prosecutions in the city of Regina. This will not mean that in Regina and Saskatoon

we will be able to dispense with the agents who are now serving the Department; but it will be possible, at least, to confine their work to the amount which can be reasonably done by one man. At the present time they have been so swamped with work that they have had to employ their partners and students to help them to discharge their responsibilities. This will mean that now one full-time man will carry the work in each of these places, and the surplus will be carried by the present agent in both places, with the result, I am confident, as it did in Prince Albert, in an increase in the efficiency of the prosecutions services, and also a reduction in the cost to the taxpayers of this province.

I should say something about our police agreement. It seems that, each year, the requirement is for an increase in the number of R.C.M. Police personnel to maintain law and order in Saskatchewan. I recall that, when I first took this appointment, there were some 323; now the number, next year, will go up to 380. Part of this increase results from the greater amount of traffic that is on our roads, and the need for more stringent highway patrolling. I am pleased to be able to say that part of this increase is probably reflected in the reduction of the number of fatal automobile accidents in 1958. Next year, as I have said, the number will be 380, which is an increase of seventeen over the number that we are paying for in the current fiscal year. For the first time, the total cost for the force will run over a million dollars for the year; the total cost per man is, this year, a little higher than last year – \$2,707 for each man stationed in the province, except for 10 per cent of the total number which are allowed for administrative overhead purposes.

I am happy to report, as Provincial Secretary, that that Department has had a good year. Registrations of joint stock companies continues to flow in apace. We have, this year, the largest number of registrations we have ever had, an increase of about 3 per cent over last year, and that, of course, is compounded by a further 3 per cent increase over the year before. The number this year was 1,071 compared to 295 in 1944, and having a total capitalization this year of \$706 million, compared with \$8 million in 1944.

I am pleased to be able to report that, if you disregard certain grumblings that emanate in one particular community in Saskatchewan, the operation of The Commercial Agents Act, which went into effect on January 1, is meeting with the support of retail merchants, urban municipal organizations in towns and villages and cities generally, and that the Act is producing beneficial results. One of the reasons why the Act was introduced was because there was a growing feeling on the part of the Government that the old Hawkers and Peddlers Act and The Book-Agents Act were not really serving the purpose for which they were intended. The number of people who were ignoring the two Acts in question was far more than the number of people who were paying any attention to the Acts. This means, of course, that people were going about selling from door to door without any licence. There isn't any doubt but what this is true, although any cases which were reported to us were, of course, prosecuted in the ordinary course of events. The feeling persisted nevertheless that there really was no adequate method of licensing or patrolling this kind of operation, and it was, I think, a big improvement when we substantially lowered our provincial fee for registration, when we provided for the bonding of all licensed commercial

March 2, 1959

agents, and when we provided a compulsory payment of the tax to the town or village or municipality in which the agent was operating.

Under the old Act, a salesman could go into a town or a city and operate for five or ten days, and then, if he was being pursued, simply get out of town and, as a result, the town never, or mostly never, collected any municipal licence fee at all. In many cases they had bylaws which provided for a very substantial fee, and received no revenue from this source at all, because nobody was ever registered. The new Act, however, provides a really iron-clad assurance to the municipality that they will get their fee if they hear of an agent operating in their environs, even if they only take action to get it a year or two years later, because one of the terms and conditions of the bond which we require these agents to have is that the bond company will stand good for any municipal fees which these agents fail to take care of during the time that they have a licence. The companies, of course, who are interested in these bonds being upheld and honoured, are very insistent that their agents put themselves in the clear with the local municipal officials before they start their business in the municipality.

This has the distinct advantage, so far as the Government is concerned, that before, not after, a man goes into a municipality, the municipal officials have an opportunity to make some inquiries about his reputability, about his reliability and about his ethical standards. If they find they cannot recommend him as likely to uphold those standards, they are then able to submit the facts which they gather to the Provincial Secretary, who may then take steps to cancel the provincial licence. This is so much more satisfactory than the old system, where the village or town simply said to the man, "There is the road, get moving"; and he moved, where to? To the next town, and kept up his operation. There was no real method of prevention of unethical or sharp practices or unethical people from engaging in this kind of business.

We have no evidence of any increase in the number of agents operating in the province. As a matter of fact, we are requiring that they be residents of Saskatchewan before we grant them a provincial licence. We, therefore, have a record of where they have been and how long they have been in Saskatchewan, before giving them a licence, and there is no evidence at all that there has been any increase in the number of people entering this province to engage in this business, yet the fact remains that, this year, we already have 274 of these people licensed compared with only 83 on this date last year. This means that these 274 people are all bonded. It means that, if they go into any municipality in Saskatchewan and make a single sale, and the municipality doesn't hear about it until later, the municipality is entitled to collect its fee from the bond company, and of course, if they have to collect from the bond company, the bond will immediately be cancelled, and so will his provincial licence. This offers a real measure of satisfactory control over this kind of thing.

In addition, I may say that, under the new Act, we also have authority to license these salesmen who go out selling memberships in discount clubs. We did not have authority under the old Act to license this class of people, and I may say, purely from the point of view of public policy, we have decided in the Department and in the Government that we will not

license this kind of operation. There are none of these people who may be going around selling memberships in discount clubs, licensed in this province. I may say further, that every single case that is reported to the Department is promptly reported to the R.C.M. Police, and I believe some prosecutions are now in process or pending.

The message that I would like to get across to the public is that, in every case where people are selling this kind of a proposition, get their names and if possible where they are staying that night, and go immediately to the police and report it. The police have been asked to give first attention to these things and, likewise, commercial agents who are not licensed. Whether they are selling memberships in discount clubs, or anything else, they should be reported promptly to the police, because the prosecution will immediately be undertaken.

Having said those few words in reporting on the activities of my Departments, I would like to reserve some of my other comments on the Budget, and with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I would like to adjourn the debate.

(Debate adjourned)

TIME QUESTION

Moved by the Hon. Mr. Walker, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Lloyd:

“That, in view of the recommendation of the Select Standing Committee on Municipal Law adopted by this Assembly on April 4, 1957, viz: –

“1. That the whole Province of Saskatchewan be placed in the same time zone, and that Mountain Standard Time obtain during the winter months and Central Standard Time during the summer months.

“2. That the necessary legislation to give effect to the said recommendation be prepared with all convenient speed for presentation to the Assembly at the earliest date possible,

and recognizing that The Statute Law Amendment Act, 1958, was enacted on a trial basis,

“The Statute Law Amendment Act, 1958, be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Municipal Law for review, with instructions that the said Committee shall have power to pursue its study of the question of time in such manner as it deems fit, and to report at this Session its observations thereon;

“and, further, that, for purposes of the said study, the Committee be augmented by the addition of the following Members: Messieurs Horsman, Kramer, Kuziak, Walker, and Mrs. Batten.”

Hon. Mr. Walker (Attorney General): – Mr. Speaker, I now find myself speaking on a subject on which I am an authority.

In rising to move the motion to refer the Time Question to a Committee, we are faced again with the same problem of two different time zones. If we follow the proper boundaries of the time zones, Saskatchewan is the only province west of the Maritimes which falls entirely within a single time zone. In contrast, every other province is divided by the time zones. Take British Columbia as an example. The northern coastal regions of British Columbia are in the next time zone beyond the Pacific time zone. The boundary between the Pacific and the Mountain time zone falls about the middle of the province of Alberta. The boundary between the Mountain and the Central time zones passes almost through the middle of Manitoba, in the vicinity of Brandon. In every case the provinces are divided by time zones, except Prince Edward Island and Saskatchewan; but in almost every case, without exception, the provinces of Canada have established uniformity of time within their borders.

In the early years of this province a portion of the eastern part of the province, no doubt wishing to be on the same time as the city of Winnipeg, adopted the custom of following the Central Time Zone. The boundary between the Central Time Zone and the Mountain Zone, which had been bent at the time of the formation of the province of Manitoba, out to the Manitoba border, was then bent still further to include the communities lying along the eastern side of this province. As a result, the judicial districts of Estevan, Arcola, Moosomin, Melville and Yorkton were officially placed on Central Standard Time by act of this Legislature, by amendment to The Court Officials Act.

The official time in these districts, although it was the legal time, was not adhered to by the people. The boundaries of the time zone, in practice, were at a different place than the boundaries of those judicial districts; so my hon. friends can take what satisfaction they wish out of the fact that the time legislation in this province has always been flouted by the people of the province – if that is the way they want to put it.

In 1957, the Legislative Committee recommended that we have uniform time throughout Saskatchewan by adopting fast time for the whole province in the summer, and slow time in the winter.

It is sometimes said that Saskatchewan should solve this problem by doing the same as Alberta did. It is worth noting, however, that if we did what they did in Alberta, we would take the time which prevailed along the eastern boundary of the province and extend it right to the west boundary. Alberta, when confronted with two different times, took the time in the eastern part of the province and extended it right to the west boundary. This would mean, of course, that Saskatchewan would be put on Central Standard time the whole year. There may be some merit in that proposal, but many of the people who say that we should do what Alberta did, when I tell them

what Alberta did, say: "Oh well, we don't want Central Standard Time over the whole province!" There aren't really many people that I know of who really want to adopt the solution that Alberta adopted in regard to this problem.

Alberta also passed a different type of legislation than we did in Saskatchewan. It provides that every person in the province shall observe the uniform time which was adopted by the legislation, and they make it a punishable offence for any person to adopt or follow any other kind of time. This distinction between our legislation and the legislation of Alberta was very clearly brought to the attention of the House, last year, and I recall that one of my hon. friends, who doubted it, actually came across and read the Alberta Act and satisfied himself on that point.

In view of the fact that an overwhelming majority of the people of Saskatchewan observe, and for a long time have observed, fast time in the summer months, and an overwhelming majority observed, and have long observed, Mountain Standard Time in the winter months, it was thought by the Legislative Committee that this represented a happy solution to the problem – that instead of most of us being on fast time in the summer and standard time in the winter, we would all have fast time in the summer and we would all have standard time in the winter. It was pointed out to the House, when this legislation was presented, that the Government was not wedded to this solution to the problem; but since it represented the views of the majority of the members of the Committee, the Government undertook to try it for one year on an experimental basis.

It was also pointed out to the House that, since there was a large minority of people in Saskatchewan who were accustomed to Mountain Standard Time in the summer months and Central Standard Time in the winter, it may not be desirable to impose these times for all purposes, or to provide a penalty for disregarding these times. In other words, the Government merely provided, by legislation, that only those activities that were regulated by statute, bylaw, or private contract, would be affected by this legislation. Quite frankly, it was hoped that the people whose activities were not regulated by the legislation might be influenced to follow the legal time prescribed by the legislation.

Experience has justified the wisdom of the Government's action in this respect. Experience has shown that there is a large minority of the people of Saskatchewan who don't intend, or aren't willing, even for the sake of uniformity, to adopt any other than the time which they have been accustomed to observe. So, I say, the Government was wise in not putting in legal clauses or penalty sections in the Act, as was recommended by some of my hon. friends across the House. It would, of course, have made it possible for us to use up the time of the police in picking people up and prosecuting them, and if they wouldn't pay their fines they would be thrown in gaol; but this is not the approach which the Government thinks should be adopted in solving this problem of day-to-day convenience.

When there were so many conflicting interests in the question, and since we felt in this Legislature that it was not a matter of life or

death, not even a matter of basic community wellbeing, it was the Government's view that this should be done, if possible, by persuasion rather than by compulsion. The Government had hoped if these recommendations of the Committee seemed to offer a solution to the basic problem without at the same time doing violence to the prevailing customs of the majority of the people, that the solution deserved a trial.

It should be pointed out, Mr. Speaker, that this solution did not originate with the Government, and that many of the members of the Government, including myself, voted against this proposal when it was presented to this House by the Legislative Committee. The Government has no vested interest in this particular solution to the time problem, and it was put forward by the Government as a reasonable solution and one which was more likely to succeed in gaining public acceptance than any other solution that appeared to be at hand.

Now that it has been tried for a year, I propose that the Government fulfil the commitment which it made to this House, namely, that it would give this Legislature an opportunity to consider whether or not the legislation has been successful, whether or not any change in approach should be made to this question, or whether or not the Legislature should abandon any attempt to introduce uniformity of time in Saskatchewan.

I therefore move, Mr. Speaker, the aforementioned Resolution, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Lloyd.

Mr. A.H. McDonald (Leader of the Official Opposition): – Mr. Speaker, I feel it is rather unfortunate that the Legislature has spent some considerable time (about four years) reviewing the Time Question, and has been unable to come up with a satisfactory answer to this particular problem. I realize that it is a problem to have a division of time zones within the boundaries of our province of Saskatchewan. I think that all the people would be better satisfied if we were located in such a position that we could have uniform time throughout the whole of the province.

However, it seems to me that Saskatchewan's location means that there is a natural boundary for a time change some place within the boundaries of the province. I hope that some members of the Committee to which we are referring this particular matter will have information that probably wasn't available to the past Committee. I am not a member of this particular Committee. I only wish I were, but it is not possible for all members to be members of every Committee that is set up. But I do hope that the Committee will be able to bring in a report that will be more satisfactory to all parts of our province. Unless we are able to get a solution that meets public opinion better than the one which we tried last year, then it might be better to abandon the whole question of Time, because it seems to me that the people in the area of the province which I am in, will never be satisfied to go on the same time that would satisfy people who live on the western boundaries of our province.

I know that, according to the natural time of the horizon or setting of the sun, there isn't too great a variation between our eastern and western boundaries, but I also know from personal experience, having lived and travelled in both the eastern and western extremities of this province, that there is a considerable difference in the darkness either in the morning or the evening. I am one of those who is opposed to trying to put all of our people on uniform time, because of that particular situation – with the sun rising earlier and setting later on the different boundaries of our province. As I say, according to the actual hour, there isn't too much difference, but in practical experience there seems to be far more difference than the hour would indicate. I do hope that the Committee will be successful in either bringing in a report that will be acceptable to the people of our province, or perhaps will recommend an abandonment of the Time question altogether.

Premier Douglas: – Mr. Speaker, I will only take a few moments of the time of the House. Like the Leader of the Opposition I have not been on any of the Committees which have worked on this problem, but I certainly sympathize with those who were, because I don't know any other question on which I have received as much correspondence and as much free advice, over the last four or five years, as I have received on the Time question.

From what little study I have been able to give the matter, I am convinced that a good deal of the difference of opinion has really nothing to do with either the sun or the distance one area is from another, or not nearly so much as the social habits which we have built up. In my own constituency I have two communities which are less than 10 miles apart. The eastern community has always gone on Central Time and the western community has always gone on Mountain Time. You can drive from one community to the other in 10 minutes, but the fact remains that the people in the eastern community swear by all that is sacred that when they go on Mountain Time their children have to come home in the dark, and the people in the western community, 10 miles away, tell me that, when they have to go on Central Time in the summer, their cows won't milk and the children have to go to school too early. Now the sun doesn't make that much difference in a distance of eight or nine miles, but the people have developed these habits and they cannot break long-established habits very easily.

Mr. Loptson (Saltcoats): – It has been satisfactory for over 50 years.

Premier Douglas: – Yes, it has been satisfactory, but it has created problems. It is quite wrong to say that everybody was satisfied. I can speak only for the Government; but I am sure that other groups have had the same experience that we have had, and that is that almost every year we received resolutions from the Rural Municipal Association, the Farmers Union, from various farm organizations, asking us to put the whole province on Mountain Time, or at least on one time. We have received from the S.U.M.A. and city groups resolutions asking for daylight saving time, and we have had representations from lawyers, who have to go to different District Court meetings, protesting the fact that they may start out

March 2, 1959

to go to a town and they don't know what time it is on. Sometimes they start out to a town thinking it is on Mountain Time and then find it is on Central Time, and they are late for their appointment. We have had a great many complaints from tourists going through the province. They find that they may stop in a town and it is only five minutes to twelve; it is too early to eat their dinner; so they wait until they get to the next town and find that it is a quarter past one, and the hotel isn't serving dinner by that time. I have had hundreds of these various types of complaints.

Another thing that has further complicated the situation and which did not exist 20 or 50 years ago, or 25 years ago, is that now more and more children are being taken by bus into the towns for school. In one community I can think of – I don't know whether the members behind me will know the community I am referring to, but it came almost to civil war – the people in the surrounding area wanted Mountain Time and the people in the town wanted Central Time and, because the children were being taken into the town by bus, of course the people in the country claimed they had to get the children up an hour earlier. There was a terrific division in the community with the result that, for a while, the community was boycotted by the farmers of the surrounding district. The Board of Trade appealed to us to see if we couldn't work out some compromise.

It isn't really a simple problem; there is no simple solution to this problem. I think that the Committee which brought in their last report were endeavouring to find what looked like a reasonable compromise. There isn't any doubt that, if you go up and down the eastern third of the province everybody will agree with you that there should be a uniform time – but it should be Central Time; if you go up and down the western third of the province, they agree that there should be one time – but it should be Mountain Time. To find a time that is satisfactory to everybody is extremely difficult.

As the Attorney General has pointed out, this is not a matter of life and death; it is not a matter of community wellbeing; it is not a matter of any criminal action because some community wants to have a different time from another. Uniform time would have some advantages. It would give the province a community of interest. It would certainly make the people along both of our borders feel that they belonged in Saskatchewan, rather than having them feel that, because they have the same time as Alberta and Manitoba, their centre really isn't here in the centre of Saskatchewan. If you are going to build up a community feeling you have to have a community of interest. The only way you are going to have a community of interest is having the same time, with radio and TV programs at the same time, and central functions of any sort at the same time. It has some advantages; but I don't think there is any doubt that the advantages are not great enough to compel people to adhere, or to cause any bad feeling.

I have felt all along that, if the people co-operated with the legislation the Legislature has passed last year and gave it a fair trial, the great majority of the people would get to like it. But I also felt that if the people weren't prepared to support it, we would be just as well to abandon the legislation and go back to the system we had before and let the

people try to work it out on a regional basis.

I am convinced that, with the passage of time, some form of uniform time will come, if not by legislation, then by general agreement. I have seen – as the member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. McFarlane) will know – in the last 25 years the Central Time zone move all the way from Broadview bit by bit until every town east of here except, I think, Maclean, is now on Central Time all the year around. I have seen the same thing happen farther south. The time used to change at Arcola, and now Forget and Stoughton and Griffin – and even Weyburn is talking about going on Central Time all the year around. The line seems to be moving bit by bit and, by a process of adaptation, we may come to uniform time, if we cannot find general agreement.

The Leader of the Opposition mentioned the fact that he was not on the Committee. I may have misunderstood him, but I gathered that he felt he would like to be on the Committee. I, for one, would be very glad to –

Mr. McDonald: – No thanks!

Premier Douglas: – I would be very glad to do two things. One would be to move that his name be added, and secondly I would be glad to give him a box of aspirin.

Mr. McDonald: – I'll go on it, if you will.

Premier Douglas: – I think I have nothing to add to the Committee, or nothing further to add to the debate, except to say that I don't think this is one of the questions which calls for any policeman-like attitude at all. I think this is a matter of trying to get people to agree on what would be more convenient. If we can't agree, then the only alternative left is for us to get along as best we can with a system of Time set by the people in the local communities.

Mr. L.N. Nicholson (Nipawin): – Mr. Speaker, I will only take just a moment of your time, but I want to say that should we revert back to the former system, I do not feel that we are solving anything in certain parts of the province.

I happen to live in one of those parts of the province where you find a difference of opinion between the rural and town people, and if it is at all possible to bring an end to this question by finding a uniform time that is acceptable to the people I, for one, would like to see that happen. In my area, several times to my knowledge, people have almost become enemies over this thing, and I do not think it is that important. Once the people become aware of, or satisfied with, a change, I think it can be ironed out without any bloodshed or any terrific upheaval. The people won't attempt to boycott the city of Regina, or maybe not the town of Nipawin; but the people in the small villages are the ones who will be boycotted.

This situation may be graver than we think. Last winter, in Committee, I made a motion that we take the 3rd Meridian as a dividing line.

It was seconded by Mr. Weber. We did not receive any support for that motion then; but if we are going to have a dividing line it looks to me that that is the only possible place that you could make a division in Time. If you don't make a division in Time there what the answer will be I don't know; but I would like to see an answer, if one can be worked out.

Mr. D.T. McFarlane (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley): – Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a few brief remarks on this motion, because I think the people of my constituency have had probably more inconvenience with the legislation that was passed last Session than people of any other constituency. If you will recall the news reports you will have seen where the residents of different towns in my constituency rose in open rebellion against the legislation.

I would mention here again today, as I mentioned in this Assembly last year, when the Bill came before the House, when I said that as far as I was concerned it was bad legislation, and I couldn't see why we should pass legislation that would disrupt the normal living habits of the people. I said at that time that it would be better not to pass it than to try and rescind bad legislation at a later date.

In my constituency, the part that disrupted the people most was the interference with their home life. For instance, a man and a wife who were both working and the man would come home for meals probably an hour before the wife was allowed to come for her meal, due to probably misunderstandings of the Act and the types of jobs that they were employed in, they didn't want to flout the law and they thought they had better play safe and the net result was complete disruption in their home life at that time.

The stand that I believe is best for the people of the province, especially the people in my constituency, is to revert to the time we had before the Act was passed; leave the time as it was at that time. I didn't hear nearly as many complaints of that time in my short lifetime as I have heard in the last two or three months under the present legislation.

So, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the people in my constituency, I would suggest that this House go on record as giving back to the people the time that they had been accustomed to and get rid of all this confusion, trouble and disruption within the family life and the business procedure in the local towns of Saskatchewan.

Mr. J.W. Gardiner (Melville): – Mr. Speaker, I would like to say just a word on this. I believe, as the hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley stated, alone with his constituency mine is also one which is affected to a great extent by the Government action, in that the constituency which I represent is one which has always had a division of time within it all down through the years. We had the previous system under which six towns in a row (as I mentioned, last year) were all on different times. You had to change your watch six times as you travelled along one highway, in order to get from here to the town in which I live. So you can see that

the loyalties and the wishes of the people of the constituency I represent were somewhat divided even previous to the time that this legislation was placed on the statute books.

However, I do believe that many people in the particular area which I represent did feel (as I did myself) that this was legislation passed by this Legislature and that they should make some attempt to observe it and give it a fair trial. However, as they saw other communities in other parts of the province more or less, in some cases, with the co-operation (it seemed to them) of the Government, or even the encouragement in some instances, going back to the other time and not observing the legislation which was placed on the statute books, dissension within my constituency took place as well as in other places in that part of the province. We have the example of people in a community, over an issue which many of us felt was possibly unimportant, who had been good friends before, and when this issue came up they were not even speaking to each other, and some of them are still not speaking at the present time, because of the feelings that have been generated through their discussions. Some people on school boards, some people on councils, felt that they should try to observe and co-operate with the Government and give this matter a fair trial. Others felt that they should, if possible, upset the law and go back to the time they had before.

I think it has been a very unfortunate experience, no matter who is responsible for what has happened; but I can say here that I think, actually, most people in the constituency I represent would prefer Central Standard Time all the year around. I think that would probably be preferable even to those who have lived for some time on Mountain Standard Time – for instance in a community such as Abernethy.

With the possible exception of the communications that have been mentioned by the Premier here, this afternoon, there are many who would like to have their communications system on the same time, particularly since we, in that area, are connected more closely with the city of Regina, as far as communications go, than we are with any other centre in the province. There will always be that problem in existence as far as communications are concerned between the people of my constituency and the people in the city of Regina.

I would hope, for many reasons, that some solution could be found to this problem that would mean that municipal councils and school boards would not be put to the test of whether they are going to observe the laws of the province or not, or whether they are not going to carry out the wishes of the Legislature of this province. If we are not prepared to put in legislation that we feel the people should observe, then I think possible we should not have any legislation placed on the statute books by this Legislature at all, unless we are prepared to have it enforced. So I would say, if we cannot come to an agreement I feel that we should let the system revert back to what it was before, because that is all it has been in any case in many areas.

Mrs. Mary Batten (Humboldt): – Mr. Speaker, I would like to add just a few words to what has already been said, only to keep the record straight. I have no alternative, nor do I suppose any other members have, but to support this motion, untasty as it is, for this reason: It is quite obvious that the Government doesn't know what to do next and needs some assistance from a Committee, otherwise there would be no need to send this back to Committee at all.

I think, Mr. Speaker, the only reason this motion is necessary is because of a lack of responsibility on the Government's part. It was quite clear that, if this year of experiment has shown anything, it should have taught the Government to accept its responsibility and do something about the situation. I don't think there was a single person on the Committee, before the report was handed down, who didn't express his or her opinion in detail; certainly the feelings of each member are on the Committee records. Everybody knows what they think, and I don't know what they are going to add by going back into Committee, except to formulate another policy behind which the Government can hide. But just in the hope that something can be done by this Committee to straighten it out, I will support this motion.

I want to say, too, at this time, that the Attorney General is on record as putting it quite clearly that the results of the plebiscite for which he was responsible showed very clearly that this province cannot be on one time zone, that it necessitates two time zones, shown by a line drawn through the province.

When the thing came back into the House the law was entirely different, so it is very difficult to find any consistency. I know that once we go back into Committee everything that is said in Committee will be used against the Opposition members as it has been before, and I want it to be made quite clear to the people of this province that every single Liberal member on this side of the House voted against this legislation which now has to be reviewed and considered. In spite of the fact that we told this Government, to start off with, that this Act would not provide what the people of this province wanted, they didn't follow our advice; so now they are apparently going to come to us and ask for our advice again, and for that reason I will support the motion.

Premier Douglas: – What was your advice?

Hon. Mr. Walker (closing debate): – Mr. Speaker, there are just one or two things that were said that I think cannot be allowed to go without being commented on. First of all, it was said by one of the hon. members that the Government should take the responsibility. I say, Mr. Speaker, that every member of this Legislature has a certain responsibility.

This is not, I repeat, a measure which was brought forward by this Government. This measure was brought forward by a Committee of the Legislature.

Mr. Loftson (Saltcoats): – It was brought forward by yourself.

Hon. Mr. Walker: – As a matter of fact, it was not brought forward by myself. This proposal constituted the report of the Committee and, as for the member for Saltcoats, I don't care how ignorant he looks or how ignorant he might act, but I just wish that he would allow the other members to have the record straightened.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that the member for Humboldt (Mrs. Batten) can say that the Government should take some responsibility, but it was the private members of this Legislature who submitted this solution that was adopted by the Committee, and was recommended by this Legislature to the Government. I say that the private members of the Legislature should take some responsibility, including the member for Humboldt.

The member for Humboldt can say that it is a waste of time to go back into Committee, because all of the members of the Committee are on record from last year; but we have had a good deal of history since this time last year. We tried a noble experiment and its success or failure is something which the members of the Committee will want to appraise. The hon. member for Humboldt, apparently, doesn't care what knowledge or facts she has: She is on the record and facts be damned, she is going to stay on the record! I think we should all pay some attention to the facts and not just say, as the hon. member for Humboldt said: "There is no use of me going back into Committee; I am already on the record and so is every other member of the Committee."

The fact is we are interested in doing public business and we are interested in using the best judgment we have, and our judgment ought to be controlled by the facts, not by our prejudices or our pre-conceived ideas, as the hon. member for Humboldt seems to think.

The hon. member for Humboldt says that the Government is not taking its responsibility in this matter.

Mr. McDonald: – Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Walker: – Well, as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I sat on this Committee and I have some recollection of what transpired there, and the records, of course, will substantiate what I say. The hon. member for Humboldt and the hon. member for Melville (Mr. Gardiner), who now say the Government ought to take some responsibility for this, were two members who made a motion that we ought to have uniform time throughout the province, but that the Government should decide which time it should be. Now it comes very ill from the mouths of two members who, sitting on a private members' committee, refused to take any responsibility at all but insisted that the Government should take the responsibility. As a matter of fact, if the hon. members for Humboldt and Melville really believed what they said – that the Government should take the responsibility for setting the time – one can only construe that they really didn't care which time it was, as long as it was uniform. That is, in effect, what their motion said. They said there should be uniform time and the Government should decide which time it should be.

If that is the view which those two members hold then they are in favour of either time as long as the Government decides what it is to be. They are in favour of uniform time but they don't care what it is – that is what their motion said.

Mrs. Batten: – Oh, no.

Hon. Mr. Walker: – If that is so, Mr. Speaker, what are they complaining about? They had no preference for one or the other. All they wanted was uniform time.

Mrs. Batten: – Mr. Speaker, on a matter of privilege, it is not true. I certainly did not say that I had no preference as to which time it was; and that is a direct misrepresentation of my words.

The question being put, the motion was agreed to.

SECOND READINGS

LIQUOR LICENSE BILL

Moved by the Hon. Mr. Fines:

That Bill No. 11 – An Act to provide for the Licensing of Liquor Outlets, subject to Local Option – be now read the second time.

Hon. Mr. Fines (Provincial Treasurer): – Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 11 – An Act to provide for the Licensing of Liquor Outlets, has been in the hands of the members since the beginning of this Session. Copies of the regulations to be considered have been in the hands of hon. members for some time.

I have not wanted to proceed with the second reading of this Bill until all hon. members had ample time to read the Bill and the accompanying regulations. The legislation is based upon the report of the Saskatchewan Liquor Sales Outlets Committee appointed at the last Session of the Provincial Legislature. The legislation makes provision for the on-premises consumption of alcoholic beverages in different types of outlets such as beverage rooms, dining rooms, restaurants, cocktail rooms and clubs.

The legislation provides that none of these outlets shall be established until such time as a favourable vote in the local option area has been held. The local option area will include not only the village, town or city, but the surrounding territory as well.

The Committee and the Government have both emphasized that they are not advocating the establishment of any of the new types of outlets in the province. The legislation merely makes it possible for these outlets to be established if the people of any community wish to have them. I do

not feel that, on second reading, it is necessary to go into any of the details of the Bill or into details of the operation of the various types of outlets. I think that this can best be done in Committee of the Whole, where the Bill will be examined very thoroughly.

There is, however, one thing I would like to emphasize and that is that this legislation is being introduced as the result of the request of many organizations and many individuals. I would also like to emphasize that it is not being introduced as the result of any requests from the liquor interests or any one associated with them. To the best of my knowledge, not a single manufacturer of any alcoholic beverage has given any indication of support for these new types of outlets. I mention this because of certain reports that indicate this legislation is being asked for by the liquor interests. That, Mr. Speaker, is the farthest thing that could possibly be from the truth.

I would also like to emphasize that it is not the intention of the Government to change its policy with regard to the promotion of alcoholic beverages in the province. Saskatchewan has, for many years, been the only major province in Canada which does not allow agents of liquor companies to promote sales within the province, nor does it allow advertising of any kind in any publication within the province. It will be the intention of the Government to intensify its temperance education campaigns, and to enlarge the functions of the Bureau of Alcoholism. Provision has been made in the Estimates for these purposes.

In conclusion, in moving the second reading of this Bill, I can assure the House that it will be the purpose of the licensing authorities to carry out the recommendations of the Committee in adopting a policy of moving slowly in the issuing of new licenses and of requiring a high standard of premises. It is our hope that the establishment of new outlets will not result in an increase of alcohol consumption, but will prove to be an improvement over the present Act.

It is also our hope that this new law will be held in very high respect by the citizens of our province, and that the use of liquor with food will result in less drunkenness.

I would like to express the appreciation of the Government to those members of the Committee who so willingly gave up their time, last summer, to study this problem and to present the very excellent report which has already been tabled.

Mr. Speaker, with these few remarks I would move second reading of this Bill.

Mrs. J.E. Cooper (Regina City): – Mr. Speaker, I have a few remarks that I think I should make. I was puzzled to know whether I should make them right now, when we are discussing the principle of the Bill, or later on when we are dealing with it in Committee. As the remarks I have to make are certainly involving the principle of this Bill,

March 2, 1959

however, I thought possibly I would like to say most of what I have to say on the subject at this point, and probably add to it a little later on when we come to the Committee of the Whole.

First of all, I would like to say that I considered it a very great privilege to serve as a member of this Committee, and I don't think I ever worked with any group of people where I felt that every member of the Committee was more keenly aware of their responsibilities, because they realized that whatever we said in our report might have very far-reaching consequences for the people of Saskatchewan. Certainly, it was after a great deal of study and research and a lot of soul-searching on the part of all the members of the Committee, that we came to our decision in this report. It was my feeling, in working with the various members of the Committee, that every member of the Committee tried to view the facts before it as objectively as possible; I think every member listened very carefully and very sympathetically to all the briefs that were presented; and it was in the light of all the facts before us that the recommendations in this report were finalized.

There is one thing I would like to say here. I, myself, have had letters, and I have seen certain letters in the press, written by people suggesting that there was no need for the Liquor Committee to merely try to copy what was done in other provinces. I would like to say, categorically, on my own behalf and I am sure on behalf of the other members, that to bring our legislation into conformity with other provinces had no part in our thinking whatsoever. We visited other provinces. We tried to see what was good in other provinces and what wasn't; and we tried to make our recommendations in line with what would be good for the people of Saskatchewan and not just to conform with other provinces. This had no part in it.

There was quite a degree of unanimity amongst the members of the Committee, particularly as to the aims that we were trying to accomplish in this report, and as to the aims that are outlined in the postulates that we have in this report. But there was some divergence of opinion, Mr. Speaker, as to how these aims could best be achieved. There are certain reservations in the report by two members of the Committee. I would like to deal particularly with my own reservations, as expressed in the report. I would like to explain a little more fully why I made these reservations, and why I am going to stand by those reservations now.

Wherever we went we were advised by people who had a lot of experience in liquor legislation to adopt a 'go slow' policy. It is a lot easier to give additional privileges than it is to take away privileges that are already given; and, indeed, you will find this recommendation here in Postulate 6 of the Report, on Page 29; "that a 'go slow' policy be adopted in the issuance of licences for any new type of sales outlet that may be incorporated into the system."

Then we also state that we do not wish to increase outlets unduly. You will find that in Postulate 4 – and I will just read that:

"It is not the desire of the Committee that the number of retail sales outlets presently in existence be unduly increased or multiplied, but

rather its aim is to introduce variety in types of outlets, without adding unduly to the number of premises licensed for alcoholic beverages.”

I do not see how we can follow this postulate, if we are to permit the establishment of all the outlets that are suggested in this report – that is, licensed restaurants and hotel dining rooms, cocktail bars, beverage rooms, more club licenses, in addition to the beer parlour licences. I do not see how we can keep from a fairly substantial increase. In Manitoba, since their new laws came into being, I am told that there were 228 new outlets established, and that this may not be the end.

We also state that we consider, after studying what the experts had to say, that liquor with food is very much better than liquor alone. People will drink less if they are eating, and also they will be less readily impaired and less likely to go out and kill someone on the highways; and we state that we wish to introduce into Saskatchewan types of outlets which will slow the tempo of drinking, make for more moderation, for more sensible, reasonable patterns. In other words, we are stating that we want to try to change the pattern of drinking, to have drinking associated with food, or incidental with food. You will find that statement in Postulate 5, Page 29:

“That recognizing the abuse of alcohol as a social evil the Committee seeks to inject a greater degree of continence into the present drinking habits, to slow the tempo of drinking and to alter the present pattern, to the end that temperance and moderation may be engendered.”

Now with all these postulates, Mr. Speaker, I am in complete agreement.

We also state that if new outlets are to be permitted, in view of the aims which we wish to achieve, the licensed restaurant and the hotel dining rooms are the most desirable outlets. They are the most consistent with the aims and objects of the Committee. In view of these statements and in support of the position I am taking, I would suggest that, if new outlets are to be permitted on the local option basis, we should at this time confine ourselves to two new types of outlet – that is, the hotel dining room and the restaurant – as I say, for the time being at least.

Speaking of the beverage rooms, Mr. Speaker, while in some ways this may be a somewhat better outlet than the beer parlour, yet it is still an outlet where the main emphasis, in fact, almost the entire emphasis, is on drinking. Food is permitted, but from my observations on our trip we found that food was seldom eaten. I saw nothing in the beverage rooms that I visited that would indicate that there was any slowing of the tempo of drinking. I am convinced that beverage rooms will increase drinking, particularly among women, far more than a licensed restaurant or a hotel dining room will do.

The beverage room, to my way of thinking, contains most of the evils of the beer parlour. I realize that if such a mixed drinking outlet is well conducted and efficiently managed and the law very strictly enforced, it could be a better outlet than the present male beer parlour, but if there is

any laxity, it can be a very much worse outlet, and a very much greater danger. I know some of the mixed outlets that we saw certainly proved this to me. The success of the whole thing is on management and enforcement, rather than on the sex of the patrons in the licensed premises. I think anyone who thinks that merely by admitting women to these licensed premises it is going to change the whole atmosphere, is going to be very disappointed.

Besides all this, an important point in my mind is that, in the representations that we had from the various briefs and from submissions that came to the Committee, there was very, very little demand for the beverage rooms. This was particularly noticeable in rural areas where we got no demand for the beverage rooms. Another thing I noticed was that there wasn't a single demand from a women's organization or a single demand from any woman in the province for beverage rooms; and as far as cocktail bars are concerned we had only one woman appear, with a group, supporting cocktail bars. But we did have a great many representations from women's organizations in the province, and from individual women, strongly opposing beverage rooms and cocktail bars. Now I agree, Mr. Speaker, that because they did not come to see us does not mean that there aren't a great many women who would like to see these things; but at least it does mean that they weren't sufficiently concerned to request them.

Speaking of cocktail bars, I have three objections to this type of outlet. My first objection is the same objection that I have to the beverage rooms – that is, that they are outlets that are primarily for the purpose of drinking. Food is almost no factor at all; even though it must be available, it is not a significant factor. The second objection is that it glamourizes drinking, with the dim lights and the luxurious settings and fancy bars and, in some cases, we saw red-coated waiters. All of these things glamourize drinking. I think that all the members will agree with me that one of the things that has changed our drinking pattern in this country has been the glamourization of drinking that we see in the movies and, more lately, on the television. So it seems to me that this glamourization aspect isn't too good. Then, of course, the third objection is that it specializes in hard liquor, which has a much higher alcoholic content than beer.

I realize there is a limiting factor in the cocktail bars, and the limiting factor is the price, because the drinks are so expensive I don't know how anyone could afford to get intoxicated in a cocktail bar. The prices of the drinks, I found, went from 65 cents to (I think the most expensive was) \$1.95. It was called a 'zombie' or something like that, and heaven only knows what was in it! But anyway, price is a limiting factor in the cocktail bars.

I must also add that, in my opinion, it would be inconsistent for us to permit cocktail bars for those who can afford to pay 65 cents to \$1.50 for a drink, and refuse an outlet, like the beverage rooms, for those who cannot afford those high prices, and wish to drink beer, which is a much less expensive beverage. I would like to point out again that both of these outlets are purely drinking outlets in which food is a very small factor.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, that if, for the present at least, we were to merely permit, on the local option basis, licensed restaurants and

hotel dining-rooms, we would have a much better chance of achieving our aims as set out by this Committee. It would give people at least a year or two to get used to the new outlets, as the only public outlets, and they would get used to associating liquor with food, with liquor incidental to food, and that is what we have said, all the way through, that we want to do. But if we open the beverage rooms and the cocktail bars at the same time then I feel there is much less chance of achieving this desired change in our drinking pattern.

Also, in order to qualify for a restaurant licence or a hotel dining-room licence, the operators are going to have to put a great deal of expense into renovating their premises and getting them ready to qualify for licences. I feel that, if the considerable competition that will be there from beverage rooms and cocktail bars was eliminated, there would be more encouragement for owners to make these necessary expenditures.

In the briefs presented to the Committee there was a great divergence of opinion, from those who wanted prohibition to those who wanted almost no restrictions at all; and, of course, it is impossible to satisfy all these opposing points of view. But the main requests we got were these three. First, they wanted an improvement in our present beer parlours, and there are many recommendations, some of which have already been carried out, that I think will make a very great improvement in our beer parlours. Secondly, they wanted stricter enforcement of the Act, and this is envisaged, too. The third greatest complaint we got was that there was no legal outlet where a man could take his wife or his girl friend or a business acquaintance, or where a tourist and his female friends could go in a have a drink. This was one of the main objections. If we had licensed restaurants and hotel dining-rooms that objection would be met. It could no longer be said that we haven't any legal outlets for mixed drinking; and we would have probably the best type of legal outlets for mixed drinking.

It seems to me that this one step at the present time – the licensing of restaurants and hotel dining-rooms – would do more to reconcile the very great divergence in points of view that were presented to the Committee than any other course that we could possibly take. If this course proves to be successful, than I believe that the demand for these less desirable types of outlets might disappear; and, of course, if they don't disappear there is still a chance, at a later date, to do something about further outlets if they are considered necessary, having given the first types of outlets a chance to work. I believe that, if we make the improvements that we are suggesting in our beer parlours and, on a local option basis, permit the licensing of restaurants and dining-rooms, and at the same time carry out a vigorous educational program for temperance and increase our assistance in the rehabilitation of alcoholics; if we do these things, Mr. Speaker, I believe we will have gone a long way towards achieving the aims set out in the Postulates in the report of the Committee.

Mrs. Batten (Humboldt): – Would the hon. member permit a question? I didn't want to interrupt while the member was speaking. Is the hon. member going to support this Bill?

Mrs. Cooper: – I am going to support the Bill with the exception of the

March 2, 1959

reservations which I have made in the Committee Report. I am not going to support the permission for cocktail bars or beverage rooms. I am going to follow out exactly what I have stated in the reservations in my report. Is that what you wanted to know?

Mrs. Batten: – What I really meant was: is the hon. member going to support the principle of the Bill in second reading, which is the question now.

Mrs. Cooper: – I shall support the principle of the Bill but I wanted it understood that these particular parts of the Bill I will oppose.

The motion for second reading was agreed to, and Bill No. 11 referred to a Committee of the Whole at next sitting.

LIQUOR ACT

Moved by the Hon. Mr. Fines:

That Bill No. 6 – An Act to amend The Liquor Act – be now read the second time.

Hon. Mr. Fines: – Mr. Speaker, the Act to amend The Liquor Act is mostly for the purpose of taking out those sections which are now being transferred to the licensing Bill. The Liquor Act will be administered by the Liquor Board and the proposed licensing Bill will have the Commission, and it is deemed advisable to have the two separate. That is what is being done in Bill No. 6. I would, therefore, move the second reading of this Bill.

Mr. McDonald: – I wonder if I might ask a question. Have the members of this licensing authority been picked?

Hon. Mr. Fines: – Of course they can't be until such time as the Bill is passed.

Mr. McDonald: – Why bring this Bill in now until you know what is going to happen to the other one?

Hon. Mr. Fines: – We will see that it won't be proclaimed until the other one is passed.

Mr. Danielson (Arm River) – Will this House know when that personnel is going to be determined?

Hon. Mr. Fines: – I really hadn't thought about it; I will be glad to consider it.

The motion for second reading of Bill No. 6 was then agreed to, and the Bill referred to a Committee of the Whole at next sitting.

LIQUOR BOARD SUPERANNUATION

Moved by the Hon. Mr. Fines:

That Bill No. 8 – An Act to amend The Liquor Board Superannuation Act – be now read the second time.

Hon. Mr. Fines: – Mr. Speaker, these are some minor amendments which have already been explained in connection with the other superannuation Bill. In addition, this one makes provision for allowing the employees of the proposed new licensing board to be eligible for superannuation under the Liquor Board Superannuation Plan instead of setting up a separate scheme. The employees who are already with the Liquor Board will continue to pay into that, and those who may be appointed from outside, who join the staff at some time in the future, would also be eligible to participate in the Liquor Board Superannuation Plan. That is the purpose of this Bill, together with the other amendments which have already been discussed previously. I would, therefore, move the second reading of Bill No. 8.

Mr. McDonald: – This makes it possible, then, for an employee of the Liquor Board, if he was in the future employed by the Licensing Board – his superannuation would continue?

Hon. Mr. Fines: – That's right.

Mr. McDonald: – And any new employee of either Board would come under this Plan?

Hon. Mr. Fines: – That is right. In other words, they would all be in the one superannuation Plan.

The motion for second reading was then agreed to, and Bill No. 8 referred to a Committee of the Whole at the next sitting.

The Assembly adjourned without question put at 10:10 o'clock p.m.