

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Third Session – Thirteenth Legislature
33rd Day

Wednesday, April 1, 1959

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

On the Orders of the Day:

REFERENCE TO PRESS REPORT

Hon. C.M. Fines (Provincial Treasurer): I wish to draw the attention of the House to an issue of the 'Leader-Post' with reference to a press report concerning the statement of the hon. Leader of the Opposition, in which it stated: "In a blistering attack on the Provincial Treasurer, C.M. Fines, the hon. Leader of the Opposition said earlier in the debate that it was utter nonsense for him to say that the Provincial Government gave \$4 to municipalities for every \$1 receive from the Federal Government, under the Tax Rental Agreement." And in another place:

"The facts are that the Provincial Government is not giving \$4 to the municipalities for every \$1 received from the Federal Government, Mr. McDonald said."

Now, Mr. Speaker, whether the hon. member said that or not, I do not know. But I have here the records of the House for Tuesday, March 24th, in which I stated:

"One of the things I hope you have noticed is that, in 1956, total amounts we received were just about \$30 million. We are estimating for 1959, and 1960, \$34,200,000. This year we have \$33,900,000. In other words, we have not received anything like the \$36½ million predicted by Mr. Harris . . ."

Mr. Gardiner: Mr. Speaker . . .

Hon. Mr. Fines: I am up on a point of privilege.

Mr. Gardiner: On a point of privilege, then, Mr. Speaker. This isn't a point of privilege. This is a statement which was made by Mr. McDonald, and I don't believe the Provincial Treasurer

April 1, 1959

has the right to make a statement at this time with regard to what Mr. McDonald said yesterday.

Hon. Mr. Fines: I think I'll start over again, Mr. Speaker, then skipping three or four lines:

“When we received \$30 million, we were giving indirect assistance to municipalities of approximately \$20 million. Today we anticipate receiving approximately \$35 million next year, and the amount which we are including for direct assistance to local governments, a total of \$36 million. In other words, we shall be giving to the municipalities and the school districts next year, \$16 million more than we were giving in 1956-57, and yet we are receiving \$4 million more. Or in other words, we are giving to the local school districts and municipalities \$4 dollars for every \$1 additional than we are receiving from the Federal Government at Ottawa.”

Opposition Members: Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Fines: Mr. Speaker, the point of privilege is this – that at no time did I say we were giving four times as much as we are receiving from Ottawa, but four times as much as the ‘additional’ amount that we are receiving.

SECOND READING

ANNUAL HOLIDAYS ACT

Moved by the Hon. Mr. Williams:

That Bill No. 105 – An Act to amend The Annual Holidays Act, be now read the second time.

Hon. Mr. Williams (Minister of Labour): Hon. members will recall that last year, we passed an amendment to The Holidays With Pay Act, whereby employees with over five-years' service would be entitled to an extra week's holiday. The question has come up: presuming there might have been a break in the service and no provision having been made for this break in service, technically the employer could say, “Well, you haven't been with us for five years, so we aren't going to give you the extra week.” All this amendment provides is that, if there is a break in service up to a period of six months, it will not be counted, the service will be considered as continuous, and the employee will be entitled to the extra week's holiday. With that explanation, Mr. Speaker, I would move second reading of Bill No. 105.

The motion for second reading was agreed to, and the Bill referred to a Committee of the Whole at the next sitting.

(Assembly in Committee of the Whole)

The Assembly adjourned at 5:30 o'clock p.m. without question put.