

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fourth Session — Thirteenth Legislature
24th Day

Tuesday, March 15, 1960

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. James Gibson (Morse): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to draw your attention to a group of school children from the Riverhurst school district and from Lawson school district. I think there are 45 from Riverhurst, and 26 from Lawson, and they are in charge of their teachers, Mr. Krisloff, Mr. Headley, Mr. Nichol and Mr. Smustead. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, we are all in hopes that they will have an enjoyable and prosperous visit.

Mr. D.T. McFarlane (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley): — Mr. Speaker, I would also like to draw your attention to a very distinguished looking young group of high school students from the town of Summerberry, Saskatchewan, many of whose parents I attended that same school with many years ago. I hope their visit here today will be both enjoyable and educational.

Mr. A.T. Stone (Saskatoon City): — Mr. Speaker, I too would like to draw your attention to a group of public school children from the Haultain school, with their teacher, Mr. Barraclough. I am sure all members will join with me in saying how happy we are to have them with us, and hope their trip will be an enjoyable one.

MOTION RE NATIONAL HOSPITAL INSURANCE PLAN

Mr. Fred Neibrandt (Yorkton): — Mr. Speaker, the Resolution that I am moving this afternoon, seconded by Mrs. Cooper is:

“That this Assembly, through the proper channels, urge the Government of Canada to take the necessary steps to implement its pre-election promises to include mental hospitals and T.B. sanatoria in the National Hospital Insurance Plan.”

March 15, 1960

I believe that I am safe in saying that all political parties are in favour of an over-all health insurance scheme for the Canadian people. On a provincial level the difference generally is in time, in degree, in sequences, and in method, and I believe that all provinces have come a long way since this question was first mooted by the Liberal convention in 1919. What was envisaged then was an over-all health insurance program so that greater uniformity in facilities and opportunities for treatment would be available to the people on a more uniform and equitable basis. Not much came of these proposals except as election bait, and at no time was there any attempt to differentials between T.B., mental illness and any other forms of disease. Even as late as 1945 the "Green Book Proposals" set out by the Department of National Health and Welfare did not exclude T.B. and mental sickness from participating in an over-all federally, sponsored plan. However, one positive step in inaugurating the original health program was taken in 1948, when the Federal Government began giving health grants to the various provinces for such health needs as capital costs of hospitals, certain types of equipment, health grants for research, and contagious disease control, and other health needs. This, at least, was a forward step in the right direction, Mr. Speaker.

I think I am on safe grounds in saying that Saskatchewan people have a good record in the field of health – at least compared to the other provinces. They have a health program which is very good. Ever since 1929 free T.B. treatment has been provided in this province. Since then the incidence of this disease has gradually gone down. I can do no better, Mr. Speaker, in bringing this Assembly up-to-date on this program and in associating the anti-tuberculosis league with this work, than to quote some of the highlights of the report of the League to last week's S.A.R.M. convention here in this city as reported by the Leader-Post on March 10, 1960. I am quoting from the report of Doctor Barnett, who is the supervisor, I believe, at the Fort San Sanatorium:

"Dr. Barnett explained that in the past active TB cases were individuals who had recently been infected within a two to five year period, ex-patients and persons who had been infected previously.

The marked decline that we have witnessed in the number of new active cases discovered each year has been due to the elimination of infection in the community. This has been brought about by the early detection of active cases by mass surveys, stationery clinics and hospital admission X-ray.

The number of reactors has shown a satisfactory decline due to modern antibiotics and surgical treatment in the sanatorium, Dr. Barnett said.

This leaves our third source of new cases as our main source, mainly those individuals who had been exposed to tuberculosis in by-gone years.

Dr. Barnett termed the number of these patients ‘a sort of reservoir’, from which new cases rise at a fairly constant rate. He explained that this rate had been present in the past, but had been hidden by the bulk of the cases arising from the other two sources – ex-patients and persons previously infected.

This ‘reservoir’ of cases mentioned by Dr. Barnett is made up of about 20 to 25 per cent of the total population and consists of persons 40 and more who lived in Saskatchewan when tuberculosis infection was more prevalent.

At present there is no satisfactory, economical way that cases can be prevented from developing in this group other than to maintain good health and economic standards.

It is for this reason that we must continue to carry on with our mass surveys in spite of the fact that we are finding fewer cases. It is also necessary that we maintain facilities for the segregation and treatment of these active cases as they arise.”

Later on in this article, Mr. Howes, who is the secretary of this League, in his report, made this statement:

“According to the report 388 patients were in residence in the three sanatoria on December 31, 1959, compared to 473 on the same date in 1958.

The most encouraging situation is due in a large part to the hard work and co-operation of the people of the province in supporting the various programs to control the disease, and it certainly is a matter of satisfaction when we realize that a couple of generations ago tuberculosis was one of the three great killers, Mr. Howes said.”

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the tenor of the report is quite modest. The Anti-tuberculosis League deserves a lot of commendation for their very excellent work. The article details some of the highlights.

I would like to draw the attention of this Assembly to part of the article that gives recognition to the many people, groups and individuals and, though they weren’t mentioned, our municipal councils and organizations such as the A.C.T. who play such a vital and necessary

March 15, 1960

role in furthering both the prevention and the control program of this disease. In short, Mr. Speaker, I know of no finer example than this, where through the combined co-operation of all concerned such phenomenal improvement in both prevention and control has been brought about to the point where we can now look forward with real hope that this disease will finally be eliminated.

However, the indisputable conclusion must be that with improved techniques and new drugs, and with improved health and social welfare standards and more funds for research and treatment, the greatest progress was possible. As a result, deaths from tuberculosis, which were at 200 per 100,000 population at the turn of the century, have been brought down to 2 per 100,000 in Saskatchewan, with the prospect, as I mentioned, of eliminating this disease altogether. But this will take continued time, effort and money and the continued co-operation of all the people in order to achieve this.

In considering this resolution, there is one point that I would like to stress, Mr. Speaker. We must never lose sight of the fact that it takes more people, more trained personnel and staff and more research and application of new techniques to make people well faster and to save more lives, and this costs more money. It is money that is very well spent. It is, in fact, an example of an investment in human welfare and human lives as can be found anywhere and no finer example of a people mobilizing and pooling their resources for a better objective.

Notwithstanding anything that I have said, I would like to quote an article from last week's 'Time' magazine on the matter of T.B. control and I think that the thoughts expressed here may well apply throughout Canada. This article deals with the progress of T.B. eradication in the United States and concludes on this note:

"There is no time to lose, said the Rockefeller's famed microbiologist, Rene Dubois. The nation's general health and health care were never better and skilful use of drug combinations have kept resistance to tubercle bacilli down to manageable proportions, but delay could be fatal by giving time for resistance strains to get out of hand. In future years, said Dr. Dubois, it will be too late. It is now or never."

Now or never, Mr. Speaker, has not only an air of finality, but an air of urgency, and I believe that this man, who is renowned microbiologist, knows what he is talking about and we should heed the warning. We cannot rest content on our laurels in the progress that we have made, but we should expend greater effort and time throughout Canada by a nationally directed and co-ordinated program with full federal participation in sharing sanatoria costs.

On the subject of mental illness, as pertained to this resolution, Mr. Speaker, I want to say first that mental illness is of great concern to all of us. This disease is no respecter of persons or positions. There are at present, according to the Canadian Mental Health Association, here in Canada one million people suffering from some form of mental illness. A pamphlet put out by this same group states that there are 70,000 at present in our mental hospitals, nearly as many as we have in our general hospitals. They further maintain that 20,000 people are admitted to our mental hospitals every year, and, Mr. Speaker, the Canadian Mental Health Association also says that the average mental hospital in Canada has only five doctors where ten are needed, and six nurses where ten are required, one social worker for every ten we need and six clinical psychologists for every ten that we should have. No wonder, Mr. Speaker, if this is really so, that the average cost is only \$2.70 per patient per day compared to \$10.77 for a general hospital in Canada.

Though I truly believe that our record here in Saskatchewan is much better, this intolerable state of affairs exists simply because the provinces by themselves cannot afford, in a lot of cases, to provide better care. Because of this there is a needless productive loss that could easily run into millions of dollars annually. What is even more serious and should give us all a great deal of concern are the many needless heartbreaks and anguish and frustration that this causes, and which could, at least in part, have been alleviated by more money spent to provide better facilities, better care and better treatment.

The second point which I wish to make, Mr. Speaker, is that as a society we must accept the responsibility for our failure to cope with the mental problem by our failure in evolving a social structure in which there would be greater mental stability and physical well-being. Physical ills lead to mental ills, and vice versa. Though a helping hand is still, and ever will be, probably the greatest therapy that can be applied to those who are sick or those who have a problem, it does not excuse society for not accepting the responsibility and for not doing its utmost in providing better care and treatment. Though today there is no longer a stigma attached to mental illness, a stigma will be attached to all of us who fail to understand the needs of these people who are unable to cope with the demands of life. Surely the time has come, Mr. Speaker, when mental illness as a disease should not be set apart from other physical ailments and federal participation should be available for the unfortunates, as is presently shared under the hospitalization plan. There should never be this arbitrary discrimination as mental illness is no different from physical illness and, if anything, deserves more sympathetic consideration and understanding than other diseases.

March 15, 1960

Here in Saskatchewan we may not all agree with a general form of a prepaid hospital and medical scheme, but I think, Mr. Speaker, we are all agreed that public money invested in health and health programs for combating sickness and disease pays dividends in better health and well-being of the people. It pays dividends in better productive fitness of our society and pays the greatest dividends in eliminating the unnecessary heartbreaks and anguish and anxiety of the family that has loved ones in an institution. Disease is an enemy, Mr. Speaker, and the most ruthless are T.B. and mental illness because they are generally of longer duration. Co-ordinating research and mobilizing our resources on a national scale to combat sickness and disease will go a long way in providing equality of treatment for all provinces.

I have already pointed out that by doing so we have made great strides in our T.B. program. Such co-ordination and financial help should come from federal participation in a hospital scheme that at least recognizes the validity that these diseases cannot be divorced from all the other types of diseases that come under the present program shared by the Federal Government.

This resolution if implemented, Mr. Speaker, will bring about better treatment by such co-ordination and financial help. Here in Saskatchewan we have tried to keep pace with the great advancement in the science of medicine, in new procedures, and treatment. We have built a fine university hospital, a medical college, and medical research centre. We have organized health regions, diagnostic and laboratory centres, built hospitals, provided geriatric centres, a training centre at Moose Jaw for handicapped children, built T.B. sanatoria, and pioneered free T.B. treatment. We have improved our mental hospitals, pioneered free cancer treatment, pioneered a prepaid hospital scheme and pioneered air ambulance service for emergency and for those isolated by distance. We are pioneering in mental treatment and will advance this through the community-type mental hospitals. We have pioneered a prepaid health scheme on a regional level and are about to pioneer a prepaid health scheme on a provincial basis.

Saskatchewan people had no doubt hoped that during the inauguration of our hospital scheme and during the various phases in our health program that federal participation would be forthcoming. This has always been promised. This program, the inclusion of T.B. and mental illness in the hospital insurance scheme was advocated while the Conservatives were in opposition and promised during their election campaign. This should be provided as a right, not only for us, but for all the people of Canada. "A promise made is a debt unpaid."

We have here in this province, problems that are unique only to a people living in sparsely settled areas. We have tremendous areas and distances to overcome – tremendous in relation to population. Electrification, highways, adverse freight rates, rural education, roads, telephones, bridges, drainage, and reclamation are but a few examples of

special problems in a province like Saskatchewan. In spite of this we have probably a better record in the field of health than any other province. Though much has been accomplished, much more could be done if more funds were available. The Federal Government receives over 70 cents of the total Canadian tax dollar. Less than 30 cents is left to be divided by the Provincial Government and the municipalities. Having such a wide tax base in relation to that of the province, it is only reasonable, Mr. Speaker, that federal assistance asked for in this resolution should be forthcoming so that the quality of service provided by each province would be immeasurably improved. Without this participation many provinces will continue to lag behind in improved standards of health services. Implementing this resolution would provide that essential uniformity of good health and well-being to which all Canadian people aspire and to which in justice they are entitled to.

I trust, Mr. Speaker, that this Assembly will endorse this resolution without dissent. I take great pleasure in moving this resolution.

Mrs. J.E. Cooper (Regina City): — Mr. Speaker, I don't think it is necessary to speak at length at all on this resolution, because I feel it is not a controversial resolution. It is a resolution on which every member in this House can agree. The Prime Minister of Canada promised, before he was elected, that they would include mental hospitals and T.B. sanatoria in the health plan, but this has not taken place.

Now we waited a long time before we go national participation in our health plan and we had hoped that when a national hospital plan was introduced into Canada, at long last, that it would be a full plan and that it would not be just half a plan as this plan is today, because half of our hospital beds are filled with people who are mentally ill and people in T.B. sanatoria. There is no reason that I can see for any artificial division between certain types of illness and certain types of people. Everyone who is in our general hospitals or in our mental hospitals is there because he is ill and needs care.

We have gone ahead very rapidly in providing good hospital care, good facilities, and staffs in our general hospital across the country, but all across Canada there has been a tremendous lag in improving facilities for the mentally ill. It seems to me that these people, of all people, who are nervously and mentally disturbed need more care, and more understanding, and more individual attention than any other group of people. I think possibly the reason they have been the neglected and the forgotten group in Canada, generally speaking, is the fact people felt for so many years that is a person becomes mentally ill it was a hopeless case and that all they needed to do was provide custodial care.

March 15, 1960

Well, modern medical science has shown us that this is far from the truth and that people who are mentally ill can be cured and are being cured, but the process could be speeded up much more rapidly if we could have the proper facilities, the proper number of doctors, the proper care for our mentally ill. The disparity all across Canada between the care of the mentally ill and the physically ill is much too great. Even in this province, where we are leading in the field of the care of the mentally ill, I think we would be the last people to say that we had reached the ultimate. We have been making progress and, as I say, we are leading in the field, and I am so delighted that we are starting out with the Saskatchewan plan of a small mental hospital. All of these things cost a lot of money and if we are going to improve, we are going to put a lot more money into this care.

Those people who are concerned with the mentally ill, and especially our Mental Health Association, have been urging and trying to persuade and educate people that there is not stigma attached to mental illness, and that the needs of the mentally ill are just as great as those of the physically ill. This is concurred in by our Minister of Health and Welfare, so I can see absolutely no reason why, in a national plan, there should be an artificial division like this. Certainly all of these groups should come in under the plan, and until they do we can look to see the facilities in our general hospitals improve greatly, and less care, less understanding and less help for the mentally ill.

As I said at the start, I think the mover of this resolution outlined it very well and very carefully and I am sure everyone in this Legislature will agree that there is absolutely no reason why our hospital insurance plan shouldn't be a full hospital insurance plan, taking in the mentally ill and those who are in the sanatoria, so I urge, with the mover of this resolution, unanimous support for the resolution.

Mr. Isaak Elias (Rosthern): — Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to say very much in the debate on this motion except to indicate that I and my colleagues will support the motion. I am satisfied that the majority, if not all, members of this House are in favour of the motion.

In view of the stand taken previously by the Prime Minister of Canada, it should not even be necessary for such a motion to be discussed in this House. However, in view of his present attitude by completely ignoring his pre-election promises, this has become necessary and it is fitting that such a motion should come from Saskatchewan, one of the Canadian provinces that pioneered in health insurance programs.

It is being recognized more and more that good health is essential to the well-being of a nation. The welfare of our people demands first consideration, and no health plan can be considered comprehensive as long as certain groups of people are discriminated against. It does not seem as though the Federal Government has recognized the health of its citizens to be of first importance. I say this because only 2.9 per cent of the Federal Government's expenditure goes for national health and welfare, and 1.1 per cent of the Federal Government's contribution to the Hospitalization Act. Adding these two together shows that only 4 per cent of their total expenditure goes for the promotion of health of the Canadian people.

When the national health plan was debated in Ottawa, the provinces pressed for the inclusion of patients in tubercular hospitals and hospitals for the mentally ill. The exclusion of hospital benefits to these was received with deep regret because it was the denial of a right to these patients. It should be remembered, Mr. Speaker, that the Federal Government takes over 70 per cent of the Canadian tax dollar and therefore it is only right that we as a Provincial Government press vigorously for the inclusion of mental hospitals and T.B. sanatoria in the national health-hospital insurance plan. As is, the cost of mental hospitals and sanatoria are borne solely by the provinces, which is wrong.

There is a very sharp increase in the number of patients in the mental institutions. This increase is no doubt intensified by our modern way of living. From 1932 to 1954 there was an increase of 87 per cent in the total number of patients in mental institutions. The need for more services for these patients is realized by individuals and other welfare-minded organizations.

On previous occasions I have made mention of the two mental hospitals at Rosthern sponsored by the Mennonite Youth Organization and a third one is now being planned, sponsored jointly by several groups of Mennonite churches. This one will be built at Watrous. It is only fair that the Federal Government should assume its fair share of the financial burdens in enterprises of this nature, yet the Federal Government is willing to share only in that portion of hospitalization which relates to general hospitals.

So, Mr. Speaker, these are some of the reasons why I am going to support this motion, and to those reasons I would like to add the words of another Canadian, who, just a short time ago, thought likewise. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I would like to read the words of our present Prime Minister when he was in the Opposition. I am reading from the debates of the House of Commons during the 1957 Session:

March 15, 1960

“There is also the further disqualification of sanatoria and mental hospitals. Why is this? Why are these hospitals and institutions discriminated against? I say that the legislation in its present form is discriminatory in that it denies these institutions a right that should be theirs.”

Further on he says:

“I cannot see that this demand is unreasonable and I feel that reality demands acceptance of the principle contained in the amendment moved.”

Further on:

“But the goal that all of us had in mind will not be achieved until the two types of institutions to which I have made reference are included within the provisions of this legislation.

Having said that, I conclude my argument for I do not wish to cover ground already covered. We in the Opposition throughout the years have favoured this type of Legislation. All parts of the house are in support of it. I ask the Minister, before a vote is taken, once more to reconsider the matter to the end that, after a period of 38 years of promises periodically made and unkept, the legislation should be as complete as it is possible to make it and should cover all classes of medical institutions within our country instead of discriminating against two, thereby placing upon the provinces a greater load of responsibility than their financial position permits them to discharge.”

So, Mr. Speaker, because of the reasons I have stated before and because of the words of the Prime Minister himself, I will support the Motion.

Mr. J.W. Gardiner (Melville): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to say a few words on the motion that is before the Legislature, I would like to take a few moments to review some of the problems that might exist both in the field of mental health and also the care of patients suffering from tuberculosis.

Knowing the history of movements, in this province since its inception in 1905 up to the present time, I believe that all citizens of Saskatchewan realize that the people of our province have taken a very active part in trying, in some way, to alleviate the suffering that people who suffer from tuberculosis or from mental illness undergo. There have been many times in the past when persons have intimated that there were individuals who placed a stigma on people who had suffered from mental illness. Personally I don't think that this has been true down through the years in this province. I feel that since the beginning of public health treatment in this province that all governments have taken the attitude that mental health was the same as any other illness, and insofar as medical science made it possible, that it should be treated in much the same way as an individual should be treated who was suffering from a physical illness or any other type of illness that required medical care.

With regard to the question that is before us in this resolution, I feel, as the other speakers have stated here, that we should expect the Government, possibly not only because the promise was made at election time, but because we feel in our own hearts here in this Legislature and in this province, that the program of the Federal Government which exists with regard to health care at the present time should accept these two other problems in relation to public health and pay a contribution toward the care of patients suffering from mental disease and also from tuberculosis.

Probably one of the reasons that might be given for the fact the Federal Government possibly doesn't feel that this is correct is the fact that the Provincial Government in this province since 1944 has provided free care to all patients entering mental hospitals in this province, and due to that fact it has not been included as far as the cost of hospitalization plan in this province is concerned. And so we can state in the care of tuberculosis patients — here again tuberculosis patients are not covered under the provincial hospitalization plan and the expenditures do not come from that.

We realize today, in regard to tuberculosis care, the municipalities through taxation are paying the larger share of the cost of tuberculosis care, with the provincial government coming along with their grant up to the present of \$2 per patient day to assist in the care of those who are afflicted with tuberculosis. At the present time we have not accepted under our hospitalization plan, as such, the care of these two classes, and I am quite certain that if it is included under the hospitalization plan we will have to be prepared to accept that as a charge, the other half as a charge against the hospitalization plan that is operating in the province at the present. I think it is only right that we should pay a larger share of the cost, particularly in

March 15, 1960

the field of tuberculosis care where it has become a financial burden on the municipalities of this province.

In connection with mental care, of course, this program has been conducted through the revenues of the province for some years back almost to the beginning of the mental care program when the hospitals were first constructed at the expense of the taxpayers of the province. Today we have free mental care treatment in this province.

I would like to leave this thought: the members of this party have for some years now been pressing the Government of this province to initiate a program for the construction of small mental hospitals, and particularly my hon. friend the member for Humboldt (Mrs. M. Batten) and the member for Maple Creek (Mr. A.C. Cameron) have in every session since I have sat in this House, spoken on behalf of mental patients in this province and urged the Government to put into effect the program which they have decided to start in this present year, in the construction of the first small mental health centre in the city of Yorkton. I would like to say here, in the hearing of the member for Yorkton (Mr. F. Neibrandt) that I regret, of course, that that small hospital wasn't built in the town of Melville, which is going to be the next city in the province of Saskatchewan. I can assure him that I can appreciate the fact the program has started in our part of the province. At least care for the mentally ill will be provided in that part of the province where it hasn't been available to the people in the past.

I am quite certain that when we look at the cost of the operation, particularly of the tuberculosis sanatoria, where we can get an example of what has taken place during the last few years, when in 1944 the total per patient day cost in our sanatoria was approximately \$3, whereas in the last year for which we have records, it amounted to \$10.3 per patient in the tuberculosis sanatoria in this province. When we realize the increase in the provincial grant has only amounted to an increase of \$1 per day, we can see that the people generally, through taxation, have to carry the largest burden for the care of tuberculosis patients.

So, Mr. Speaker, I hope that if this program is undertaken by our Federal Government, every province as well will accept their fair share of the responsibility for the care of the tuberculosis patients, will accept their 50 per cent share so that the taxpayers, the property owners, will be relieved of the burdens they have to carry at the present time.

So, I think, on behalf of the party I represent in this House I can definitely state that we are wholeheartedly behind the mover and the seconder in promoting this resolution, and stating to the Government at Ottawa, not because it was an election promise, but because we feel it is a right that the patients suffering from mental diseases and tuberculosis should enjoy. We feel that this resolution should go forward to the Government of Canada with the full support of all parties in this House and all the people of the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I will support the motion.

Hon. C.M. Fines (Regina City): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a word or two. I want to make the position of the Government abundantly clear in view of the remarks that were just made.

On more than one occasion the Government of Saskatchewan has gone to Ottawa urging that these two diseases be included in the Hospitalization Act. Now, of course, if this were done, then automatically the Government of Saskatchewan is committed to pay its share. It means an end to the payments by the municipalities for the care of the tuberculosis patients.

May I say, too, that it is not a question of 50 per cent, but rather a question of 60 per cent, because that is the proportion of the hospital plan that is being paid by the province. The Federal Government is paying 40 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, I think all of us can agree with what has been said by the last speaker. We shouldn't be asking for this simply because it was a promise of the present Federal Government; we should be asking for it because we believe it is an integral part of any national hospitalization program. I am sorry that it was left out of the original Act which was brought in by the previous administration. I think if they had brought it in and made it an integral part of the Act, then of course we wouldn't have had to pass this Responsible today. But not having done this I think we should take steps now to get this corrected at the earliest possible date.

I just wanted to get up, Mr. Speaker, to say that the Government is prepared and has, on several occasions, made the recommendations to Ottawa that this be included in the plan and thereby the province would be paying its share and we would then relieve the municipalities from any further contribution to the Anti-tuberculosis League.

The question being put, it was agreed to unanimously.

SECOND READINGS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate from Friday, March 11, on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Nollet.

Bill No. 44 – An Act respecting the Improvement of Family Farms

Mr. A.L.S. Brown (Bengough): — Mr. Speaker, I doubt if there is a great deal more I can add to the explanation that was given by the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Nollet) when he introduced this Bill, in his few well-chosen words. Not only were they brief but they were concise and very pointed. Possibly I should say, coming from some quarters, they might think they were 'barbed' remarks.

March 15, 1960

I do feel that possibly one or two of the points he made could be re-emphasized with some benefit to the House. I think the Minister outlined very clearly the purpose of this Act when he intimated that the purpose of this Act was a legislative attempt to improve the rural economy and raise the rural living standards of the people of this province, by undertaking to provide means by which improvements could be made to the farms, the homesteads, the farm itself and also the houses and buildings located thereon. And he was right when he said this was complementary to our rural electrification program and our grid road program. Both were oriented toward improving the economy and raising the rural living standards of the people of this province. To that might be added many of our other programs, with special reference, possibly, to the program outlined by the Minister of Telephones (Hon. Mr. Williams) when he intimated increased assistance and improvements to be undertaken to improve the rural telephone system in this province.

As we read the purpose of this Act, we can visualize that it will put into effect the program outlined by the Minister, but its scope is much farther reaching than that. In placing this Act before this Legislature, I think the Minister was absolutely right in outlining to us the proposed program that would be undertaken under this legislation. Too often in the Parliament of Canada and the legislatures in other provinces, we have seen legislation brought into the House, legislation which in itself was good, but because no program was enunciated under it, the legislation itself accumulated dust on the shelves of some back room. But he did outline to us the program he proposes to inaugurate this year under this particular legislation.

As he outlined the program he did intimate to us that he is taking into consideration the three main desires of the people who wish to participate in this program. What have been the difficulties in improving the living standards of the rural people of this province with particular reference to bringing water and sewer to the farm homes and other buildings on the farms? There have been three main difficulties; a lack of technical advice and a lack of technical knowledge; secondly, it has been the high cost of the materials which go into construction of this type of work; thirdly, as always, there has been an economic barrier in the lack of cash.

In the program that has been outlined to us he does envisage that these obstacles will be to a degree overcome, and I would like to suggest to this House, Mr. Speaker, that possibly the greatest of these services that will be provided will be not only in the technical end, but also by virtue of the fact that you have a program oriented toward providing these services, and I think you will see, as we have seen in our rural electrification program, that the people themselves will be coming in and giving themselves help through the program outlined by the Minister in presenting this Bill to this House.

In supporting this wholeheartedly, Mr. Speaker, may I suggest to you that I can visualize that, with the program that will be inaugurated under this Improvement of Family Farms Act, we will be able to see in the rural

areas of this province on the farms, the standard of living raised to the point where these people who are making a great contribution to our economy will enjoy a living standard equivalent to the majority living in our urban centre today.

With those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I can assure you that I wholeheartedly support second reading of this Bill.

Mr. Ross A. McCarthy (Cannington): Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a few words on this subject. I am very interested in it and I am sure we are all interested in providing the better things of life to our farm people. There have been a number of suggestions as to how this could be done and what would be done, but I think that basically the reason we haven't more water and sewerage and that sort of thing in the farm homes is because of lack of water. Water is at a premium in the dry areas and water is the main ingredient.

In the last 1920's when our economic position was very good, a great many farms in the southern part of Saskatchewan, at least, put in their water and sewer, but they found out that they were depending on water from the roofs of their houses and it wouldn't begin to do what they needed. These systems are there on the farms all over this province in disuse today. It wasn't the amount of money and it wasn't that they didn't want sewer and water, because they had the system but they didn't have the water.

Today that condition hasn't changed, Mr. Speaker. The main deterrent to this program is water. In a great many places in this province it is almost impossible to get water in sufficient quantities to guarantee that the system is going to work. I can take you to a great many farms down in my area where the original homesteader lost the farm because he drilled so many wells because he was so determined to have water, that he spent more money trying to get water than the farm was worth.

Then we come to more recent years when we got the dugouts, and they are a wonderful thing. But they still are not a sure supply of water. I can take you down to my district there, where we have more than normal rainfall; we have bluffs and ravines, which are ideal for catching run-off, and we do catch the run-off, but a great many of those dugouts have been dry for the last two years, and they are dry now. Some of those farmers are having great difficulty in getting water for their stock. So I think the thing isn't a case so much of money, and if it was, this \$300 wouldn't go very far, but the main thing is water.

The member for Bengough (Mr. A.L.S. Brown) compared it to electricity. There is no comparison between the two, because you can generate electricity, for instance, in Estevan, hook it on to a wire and take it anywhere. But if you have a set of farm buildings here that are three or four miles away from an assured water supply – (there may be more, there are lots that are more) it is going to be terribly expensive to put that in. We found out from experience that rainfall for the average home will not supply the average necessities of just washing, and that sort of thing. I have a system in my house, and there

March 15, 1960

are others on various farms which I am interested in, and almost invariably, even in these wet years, Mr. Speaker, we have had to draw water just to carry the ordinary washing, and that sort of thing – nothing to do with sewer.

If you had to Assembly sewer, I think you would have to add twice the amount of water. That is what people tell me who have had this experience; that it takes twice the amount of water for that one item; it takes as much for that as it would for all the other uses it is made of in the house. There is that difference when you compare it with power. It may be similar, but it is very dissimilar in a great many ways.

The member said the \$300 would relieve the economies to a degree. Well, I can assure him that it would be a very, very small degree, because in a great many cases, if there is water there, it is so deep and the expense of getting it up would be so great that the \$300 would be a very, very minor part of that installation. However, I am glad to see attempts being made at it, and I hope there are some districts that can take advantage of it. I think that the main thing we should be doing, in this attempt, is to ensure ourselves of a water supply. Of course, there is the other thing, too, that a great many houses are built in this country, some of them are still inhabited and they are perhaps 30 or 40 years old, so these would be hardly in shape to have a system such as this installed. A man living in a house which is 40 years old, and this thing is going by, would hardly want to go to the expense of \$2,000 or \$3,000 or whatever it might cost, and I think on the average it will be between \$2,000 and \$3,000, perhaps more in some cases. I think it is poor business, as a matter of fact, for him to install all this equipment in a house which is that old, and we do have lots of houses in that age.

Those are just a few remarks I wanted to make, Mr. Speaker, and I shall support the motion.

Mr. J.W. Gardiner (Melville): — Mr. Speaker, because of the request which was made yesterday to the Minister that the regulations under this Act be tabled before further discussion, I feel at this time that we should ask that the Bill be adjourned until such time as the regulation are placed before the members.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, all we're debating now is the principle of the Bill. The Minister has sent over the material which will be in the regulations, and this will be passed out to the members. You will have adequate opportunity to see these and discuss them when we are going into the details of the Bill. But all we are discussing now is the principle, and the principle is whether or not this particular type of program is such that we ought to proceed with it, and I do not see that the possession of the regulations would be necessary to carry on the discussion of the second reading of the Bill. We will certainly be glad to table...

Mr. McDonald: — Mr. Speaker, might I say a word on that point. I will admit that it is the principle that is now before the House, but the Bill is so vague that I, for one, am unable to make a decision as to whether this principle is sound or not sound, until such time as the regulations are made available to us, and I for the life of me could not see how any member could make a decision even on the principle, with the meagre framework that exists in the Bill. Firstly, I would like very much to have a look at the regulations, or a draft of the regulations. The Minister of Municipal Affairs has been good enough to give us a copy of the regulations under Bill No. 55, I think it is, and we would appreciate very much have the same material made available to us with respect to Bill No. 44, before we proceed.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, on a point raised, I can provide members with copies of the policy statement that has gone out, which at the moment embodies pretty well anything of importance at this stage, in connection with regulations. All of this is set out in the statement which I will have very shortly for the hon. member. I am sorry that I didn't get it in time when I was coming over, but I can give you that now. But insofar as regulations are concerned in connection with this legislation, in the first instance it will be covered by a policy statement, first of all. Regulations may come afterwards, Mr. Speaker, but I think it a bit premature to suggest that we have regulations drafted for this kind of legislation before the Legislature has even approved the principle, and as soon as regulations are decided upon, I can furnish all hon. members with copies as quickly as possible.

Mr. McDonald: — I have no desire to make a debate out of this, but there is just one other point I would like to make, Mr. Speaker. As the hon. member for Cannington pointed out, there are areas in Saskatchewan where, to locate water especially from wells,

March 15, 1960

is most difficult, if not impossible. Our experience with the dugout in dry years has not been too good in some areas. Therefore, we are concerned at the moment as to whether this program could be brought into affect throughout all of Saskatchewan, and that is one point I would like to be clear on. That is one issue I would like to be clear on before I decide one way or the other, even as to the principle of the Bill. If we know the position that we are in, as to whether all areas of Saskatchewan are going to have this service, no matter how difficult it is to store water, or to locate water from wells, then I think we will be in a position to decide. But at the moment I find it difficult to make that decision, just from reading the Bill. There is nothing in the Bill that guarantees to me, or to anyone else, that this service is going to be made available in those areas where water is most difficult to locate or to store.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I have no desire to be contentious in this matter, but I would point out there are scores of Bills that come before the House, and some of them very lengthy, in which not even in Committee of the Whole are the regulations produced, let alone on second reading. My own feeling is that the question is not whether it can be given to every corner of the province, but whether or not we should start, because no one things within the first year it can be taken to every corner of the province.

If the hon. members feel they want time to peruse the policy statement, I have no objection to adjournment, although I personally feel it is quite unnecessary.

The question being put, it was agreed to adjourn the debate until Wednesday, March 16, 1960.

(Debate adjourned)

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 71 – An Act to amend The Power Corporation Act.

Hon. Russell Brown (Minister of Travel & Information): — Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 71 is just three or four proposed amendments. One of the amendments is in connection with the matter which was being discussed by the Minister of Municipal Affairs. I believe it was yesterday, in connection with the natural gas incinerator program which has been entered into with a number of the municipalities in the province. We are providing an amendment to cover that program.

We are also including an amendment this year, giving the Corporation authority to undertake some pilot projects with respect to communication systems in isolated areas. There are some areas in the province which do not have telephone service, and we believe that it may be possible for the Corporation to do something in that regard by joint use of our power lines, or by providing some sort of a power line carrier system, and we require authority to conduct this sort of experiment.

Other than that, the only other amendment of any moment is one, if you'll pardon the expression, Mr. Speaker, to increase the borrowing power of the Corporation from \$200 million to \$275 million. With that brief explanation, I would move second reading of the Bill.

The question being put, it was agreed to, and the Bill referred to a Committee of the Whole at the next sitting.

Bill No. 72 – An Act to amend The Power Corporation Superannuation Act.

Hon. Russell Brown (Minister of Travel & Information): Mr. Speaker, this Bill is designed to amend The Power Corporation Superannuation Act, and there are really no new principles involved. As a matter of fact, all we want to do is make some amendments to bring the Act into line with the other superannuation acts which affect the Telephones and Public Service. They are very minor amendments, and I would therefore suggest they be considered in Committee of the Whole.

With those few words I move second reading of Bill No. 72.

The question being put, it was agreed to, and the Bill referred to a Committee of the Whole at the next sitting.

Bill No. 73 – An Act to amend The Telephone Department Act.

Hon. C.C. Williams (Minister of Labour): — Mr. Speaker, as you know, we have 962 rural telephone companies in the province. Quite a number of them have efficient boards of directors, good equipment, their plants are in good shape, and they give their subscribers excellent telephone service. On the other hand, there are some, mostly in the drought areas, where the plants are run down, poles are rotten, the equipment bad, and as a result their subscribers get very poor service.

This Bill will enable the Saskatchewan Government Telephones to render to companies operating telephone systems under The Rural Telephone Act, advisory, supervisory and technical and other assistance, respecting the construction, extension, rehabilitation, reorganization, maintenance, repairs, management and operation of rural companies. The money appropriated by the Legislature will be obtained from the Provincial Treasury, and the grants made for the purposes just outlined will be approved by Lieutenant Governor in Council.

With that explanation I move second reading of Bill No. 73.

Mr. J. W. Gardiner (Melville): — Mr. Speaker, the other day the Minister did give a resume of what might be the regulations in this regard, and I think here again, on the basis of the statement that he made at that time, that we should have before us the regulations before we consent to Second Reading of the Bill that has been presented, largely for the same reason as was stated here with regard to the other Bill. From the statement made the other day, this isn't going to be a very far-reaching Bill with regard to rural telephone companies. I feel for that reason, Mr. Speaker, that we should ask for an adjournment of the Bill, and ask for a written copy of the regulations that were given the other day by the Minister, so as to have some idea as to the scope of the Bill, and how beneficial it might be when the regulation is put into effect.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I am afraid we cannot agree to an adjournment of this debate. We are now trying to introduce surely an entirely new procedure in carrying on the business of the House. There will be estimates up providing for this sum of money, and at that time the Minister will tell the House the formula upon which this money will be spent, and the hon. members will have every opportunity to get all the details.

It is not customary every time we bring in legislation, that regulations must be introduced and passed around to the members at the same time. Members will ask about this, but the most proper place will be in Committee of Supply when the estimates are before the House. All that is in this legislation is whether or not this Legislature agrees to the principle that

assistance shall be given from the Provincial Treasury to help rural telephone companies. The details as to how much, and on what basis, is something for this House to determine in Committee of Supply when dealing with estimates, and for that reason I do not think, unless there is some better reason, that we should agree to an adjournment.

Mrs. Mary J. Batten (Humboldt): — Mr. Speaker, I think there is a better reason, and it has to do with these regulations. This is the fact that, in the last year particularly this year and partly last year, we have been flooded with Acts which say very little. They are merely permissive legislation. They give the Minister or the Lieutenant Governor in Council all sorts of powers, without giving any indication in the Bill itself, as to how those powers are going to be used. If they are going to be used for the good of certain portions of our society, certainly we are in favour of the principle of extending money or extending aid. On the other hand, if they are simply for the purpose of taking over these various associations, or controlling them, we might not be in favour of them.

It is very simple to say that the principle is to give aid, but that principle is tied with a lot of strings, and we must know what those strings are. I agree with the hon. Premier; certainly it is asking a lot to ask to have draft regulations tabled; it should not be necessary for second readings, except because of the way these Bills are being drawn up by this Government. If the Bills themselves gave any indication as to how this aid was going to be administered, and to whom it was going to be administered, then it would make sense. In this way, it is almost impossible.

There are rural telephone companies that certainly need help. In fact, I don't know of very many that don't need help, but many of them need help merely to exist and to provide the services they are providing today. There are farms in this province where the assessment for telephones is higher than the actual land tax. Now, when things have come to that stage, surely those people need help and they need it unconditionally, not only on condition that they join a larger system, or something of that nature. Without a draft of the regulations, we simply do not know what the Government has in mind. The Minister, on second reading doesn't outline it, and many of these Bills only make sense when they are read, together with newspaper clippings, where speeches have been made by Government officials, in connection with the policies that are going to be administered.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Vote against it then, if you don't like it.

Mrs. Batten: — I don't intend to vote as stupidly as some members in this House do. I would like to know what I am voting on. I'm not going to vote against or for it, just because the Government either says I should or shouldn't. I want to vote because it makes sense, and because it is good for this province. I don't know until I have some

March 15, 1960

indication of what policy is going to be utilized, and what the regulations are going to be, and I think the request of the hon. member for Melville (Mr. Gardiner) is not only expedient but necessary, when the Bill is as vague as it is.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I simply say that we cannot be asked to table regulations which are not passed until the legislation is in existence. There are no regulations to table, and any questions which members want regarding the details of this as to how it will be applied, can be secured in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. Speaker: — I want to inform the hon. members that all the information necessary will be available in Committee of the Whole. The point of order is well taken. The regulations cannot be drawn until the Bill is approved by second reading and passed by the Legislature.

Mr. McDonald: — Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to speak on a point of order; I'm going to speak on the second reading of this Bill. If this legislation is going to be broad enough to cover the rural telephone companies that I have in mind, then there is nobody in this House that is going to give more welcome or greater support to the Bill than I am. I don't think anyone realizes the financial predicament that many of our rural telephone companies find themselves in at the moment. In reading some of the daily newspapers statements with respect to the Bill, I am led to believe that it is not going to give service to many of the rural telephone companies which I have in mind. However, the principle of the Bill is sound, in that the Government has finally recognized that they have some responsibility for the rural telephone system of this province. In the past, the Government has been prepared to handle that portion of the telephone system of the province from which great profits could be made, but they have not been prepared to share any of the financial responsibility for bringing telephone services to the vast majority of people who live in the rural areas in the province of Saskatchewan. So far as the principle of the Bill is concerned, I am in complete agreement with it, to extend government responsibility to rural telephone companies, but I sincerely hope that, when we get into Committee of the Whole, that some of the statements I have read in the newspapers will be proven incorrect, and that we are not again trying to bring about one large company, where several small companies exist today.

Many of the rural telephones that have been installed in this province have only maintained their services through tremendous efforts on behalf of local people, tremendous financial contributions — a lot of work for which people have never been paid. There are other areas in the province that have never had any service, so I hope that the Government, in its wisdom, will see fit to give benefits to the smaller rural telephone companies. But that is a matter, I presume, which we will have to discuss when the Bill goes into Committee, but I do hope that is the intention of the Bill.

Mr. Speaker: — I wish to inform the Assembly the hon. Minister is about to close the debate, and anyone wishing to speak may do so now.

Mr. Gardiner: — Mr. Speaker, before the hon. Minister closes the debate, I would like to say a few words on The Telephone Department Act. Having some interest in telephones, and being secretary of a Rural Telephone Company, I have some knowledge of the problems that exist in many of our rural areas. It started back in 1911 when many of the lines in this province were constructed, and it is coming to the point now that even where great care is taken, and good service given to the people, most of these lines which were built in the original telephone systems in this province, require reconstruction. There are some who may point out that the cost today of rural telephones is because of the inefficiency of the people who are operating them. This is entirely false; most of the groups who are operating the rural telephone systems in this province have done a marvellous job, under the conditions which they have worked during the past 40 years, in providing service to the people of this province.

I would hope that under the terms of this Act, not only a few companies would be able to benefit immediately, but all rural telephone companies in the province would immediately be in the position of benefiting under all the terms of the Act which are being presented to the Legislature at the present time. Under the information which I have at my disposal now, I feel this is not going to be the case, and that there can be only a small portion of the companies in the province that will receive the major part of the assistance which is being offered by the Government under this legislation. In fact, I am surprised at the amount which has been budgeted for this particular Act, because under the regulations, as I understand it, there will be very little paid under this Act in this present year. However, if there were a uniform system of grants provided to all the rural telephone companies in this province, it would give great assistance to our rural telephone people. I hope when the regulations are brought in, that the Minister will see fit to give an equal contribution to all telephone companies, on the basis of whether they are a big company or a small company, so that all rural telephone subscribers will have an equal opportunity to benefit under the terms of the Act which we are going to pass.

I can say here that I am in full support of any measure which will give assistance to the rural telephone companies, but I do believe that all hope when the Minister brings down the regulations, that he will have had a change of heart and will place all rural people in this province on an equal footing, and provide a suitable grant to all rural telephone companies under the Act.

March 15, 1960

Hon. C.C. Williams (Closing): — Mr. Speaker, I think some of the members opposite, in effect, have been breaking into an open door. Certainly we want to assist the rural telephone companies as much as we think proper, and to a sufficient amount of money which we feel is required. It is over 50 years ago that many of these companies were formed, and as I said a few moments ago, from the peak of 1,100 back some eight or 10 years ago, amalgamations have resulted in there being only 960 companies in existence at the present time. I can assure this House that we have no intention of taking over all the rural systems, as indicated by one of the members opposite a few moments ago. Neither do we want to get into any one bit system. There is no suggestion along those lines at all. A few days ago we did mention in Committee something to the effect that a unit of 400 telephones was the approximate correct number that one maintenance man would look after, but that does not mean that everyone of those companies must be amalgamated. Certainly we encourage amalgamations, but we have no intention of forcing a situation on any of the companies which they do not want.

It is quite correct, and I think you agree, Mr. Speaker, that this is not the proper place to be talking about the regulations, especially in view of the fact that they have not yet been drawn up. Perhaps I was wrong the other day in mentioning some of the things we had planned on doing. It has given some of my friends opposite a little ammunition today to shoot across here, and in some respects, beat the gun. They may have missed their target, at that.

That is all I intend to say on this, Mr. Speaker. I can assure this House that we have the welfare of the rural telephone companies at heart – every company will be eligible for the things which we propose to do.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Yes, every company will be eligible.

The question being put, it was agreed to, and the Bill referred to a Committee of the Whole at the next sitting.

Bill No. 61 – An Act respecting Retailers

Mr. L.P. Coderre (Gravelbourg): —Mr. Speaker, when I sat down yesterday, I had hoped to try and follow the precedent that had been somewhat established by the Attorney General, in the fact that he presented a Bill for second reading, and had hoped that it would die on the Order Paper, hoping that the people concerned would have a greater opportunity to look at it, and be able to deal with it a little better.

When I got up and tried to deal with this Bill No. 61 – an Act Respecting the Retailers, I felt that insufficient information had been sent out to the people and merchants of Saskatchewan in that respect. So I took it upon myself to phone several merchants whom I knew, and had met through the retail channels and otherwise, and asked them what their opinion was. In all cases, they thought that the Bill generally was a good thing, in that it would curtail or handle the trading stamps. But then when I further told them they would have to pay a license, and that it would curtail other gimmicks, or gimmicks in the trade, they wanted to know more about it. So I proceeded to answer my questions as best as I could.

You will find that in many towns, or communities in the province, they are trying to promote the people to come into these various communities. Many of you have heard on the radio the last few years of these ‘Wampum’ days, trying to promote business within the communities. In dealing with the Bill, it says it is particularly to curtail this gimmick selling. I think there is nothing wrong with a gimmick – trying to get the people or the traffic to get into your business. In the Bill itself, it does not tell us what is going to be stopped, and we leave it entirely to the discretion of a board to deal with it. The second reading of this Bill came up most unexpectedly; I was not fully aware of the House regulations. I was under the impression this was private members’ day, and it would not come up so soon.

From what I can gather, any time that you license anyone, the term or meaning of a license means that it is a restriction. You are not free to develop your business as you would like to develop it, the way you should, to better your business relationship with your customers; try and get the traffic through the doors, and to give better service. Volume means better business, and better business means lower prices. Licensing is a restriction. It has a privilege that is being granted. After 1900 and some years – probably longer, of being in business, the socialists in Saskatchewan decide that they should grant us the privilege of being in business.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — It’s not that long; it just seems that long to you.

Mr. Coderre: — In any event, Mr. Speaker, I find that the merchants as a whole are not aware of other restrictions or implications this Bill has, and my personal point of view is, and the point of view of about 187 merchants whom I have contacted so far who are not completely aware of the implications, and I feel that, under the circumstances, unless I know what the complete implications or regulations governing the Bill are, it is giving too much power to the Government. I have mentioned time and time again that what we need is a Bill of Rights to protect the people from the Government. Now it is a question of what are we going to do? The merchants are coming under this, the agricultural machinery, the farm petroleum. Who is next, Mr. Speaker? Are we going to have to have a license before we become eligible to sit in the House? Are we going to have to have a license before we can go to see who is in the bush in the backyard, or something? I don’t know

what is going to happen.

Under the circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I cannot possibly support a Bill, regardless of what the main intention is, that it is so broad in scope that it does not give a specific reason of what it is up to, without possibly infringing upon the rights of the people,. I cannot at this moment, Mr. Speaker, support this Bill.

Mr. J.R. Barrie (Pelly): — Mr. Speaker, having had a few years' experience in the retail business in this province, I find that most of the small retail merchants and retail sales outlets have plenty of restriction as it is, and in many cases, license and fees for licenses, returns, and so on. In many cases it has become pretty nearly unbearable. I would like to add a little to what the member for Gravelbourg (Mr. Coderre) has just said.

Up until now or in recent years, it was considered a man could start a small retail establishment, or a small store, and it wasn't a privilege he was granted by a Government or anyone else. It was a right he had as a free individual in this country. This particular Bill, I understand from the remarks of the Attorney General, is to control at the present time, trading stamps and the use of them. I would quite agree that possibly these are not a desirable item in the business world, in this province particularly, but at the same time, why, if it is just to control trading stamps, couldn't some regulation or Bill be brought in that would be more specific?

What I take exception to, Mr. Speaker, is the wide powers that are vested under this Bill in the Minister in Charge, and the Executive Council. With the powers that would be granted them in this Bill, I would say that possibly the small merchants, and the retailers generally in this province, should be concerned, because with legislation of this kind on the Statue Books, there is nothing that could stop them from taking very drastic action in control of retail business in the province, to the benefit of some other group of groups in the province. I am not saying this is the intention of the Bill at the moment, but the powers that would be vested in the Government and the Minister under this Bill, the control is something that I do not think is at all necessary. I am quite certain, while the Retail Merchants' Association have proposed this Bill, and are backing it, their members are only a very small percentage of the people engaged in the retail trade in Saskatchewan. I am also certain that amongst the members of the Retail Merchants' Association, in this province, there are many, if not a majority of those members, who would take exception to the wide powers this Bill gives. I think this matter, because I am quite certain it will not meet with real favour with the retail trade generally in this province, and as a result, Mr. Speaker, I cannot support this Bill.

Mr. D. T. McFarlane (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley): — Mr. Speaker, I want to be very brief in my remarks on this Bill, but I do want to point up what conditions might happen, not only to the retailers in the constituency which I represent, but also to the retailers all over this province, if this Bill goes into effect. I was very interested in the remarks made last night by the hon. Attorney General, when he tried to tell us that he had received quite a large endorsation for the actions he was taking. On checking by telephone and other means, with some of my constituents since last night, I do not see any indication of the mass demand for this type of Bill which he indicated last night. What they do want is to get away from some of the restrictions placed on them over a period of 16 years by this Government, and if you go into any of the retail stores in this province, or the implement agencies of this province, the first thing they will tell you is that they have had to increase their establishment to find room to hang up all the licenses that have been forced upon them, in order to deal in this province under this Government.

Another thing they are vitally concerned with is the fee as stated by the hon. Attorney General. He indicated to us that the fees may stay around \$5 or \$10. Well, I think if he were to go out into the country today, and visit some of the agricultural dealers, and some of the implement dealers, the first thing he would be condemned for would be that this Government increased the license fee last year from \$5 to \$25. I think he would have that brought up to him the minute he walked into some of these stores.

Another thing which will affect people especially in my own constituency would be a case that we have at the present time in the town of Indian Head, one of the largest trading centres in that area, and I might say, an aggressive trading centre. For the last two years they have had what they call 'Wampum Days' and have had a terrific influx of farmers and shoppers, not only from the town of Indian Head, but from all the towns around. The stores that are sponsoring the 'Wampum' deals share in the increase in trade; also the stores who are not involved in that type of promotion also realize an extension in trade. If you care to go into the town of Indian Head, I believe it is on the Wednesday, you would see the town jammed from one end to the other, and I think this has been a very considerable factor in increasing trade in that town. By increasing the trade in the town, it has let these merchants, through the volume of trade compete with firms in some of the larger centres, perhaps not too far from Indian Head. It has also helped in keeping business that may leave that area for the city within that trading area. By doing that it has helped the taxpayers pay their taxes; it has helped the businessmen to stay in business. That is one thing I wanted to mention here this afternoon.

The other thing I was concerned about is that if there is complaint against the businessman or retailer under this Act, then he is guilty until he is proven innocent. According to British justice, the person is innocent until he is proven guilty, and I think under this Act we have a complete

March 15, 1960

reversal of British justice, as we know it.

I would suggest to the hon. Attorney General, if he wanted to get rid of trading stamps in this province, by all means bring in a Bill dealing strictly with trading stamps, but to try and force the retail merchants of Saskatchewan into a position through unfair competition, or perhaps from spite, that they could have their businesses closed, I don't think that is the type of law that the retail merchants want, and I don't think it is the type of law that we freedom-loving people want in this province, either. I suggest that this Government has gone too far, as has been stated by my colleagues. This is only one more instance of a complete socialization of all the businesses within the province, and I would suggest if this matter is allowed to go on for another year or longer, goodness only knows what we may end up with in this province.

So, Mr. Speaker, because of the fact that there is no protection in this Act for the retailers themselves at the present time, I cannot see myself in favour of supporting this Bill.

Mr. L. N. Nicholson (Nipawin): — Mr. Speaker, might I just touch on a couple of clauses of this Bill for just a few moments. I believe much as the other members that have spoken, that it is very far out-reaching; reaching out beyond the necessity of controlling the trading stamp issue. Clause No. 11, to me is a restrictive clause as far as the small business people are concerned in the towns throughout the province. It says here:

“Every license retailer shall notify the Provincial Secretary in writing of any change of address for service; any change of address in his place of business, any change in partners in the case of a partnership.”

Mr. Speaker, I know when I went into business, I went in on one basis only, and that was the determination to be in business for myself. Now, I don't want any legislation to be passed that will prevent a young person in western Canada, or in the province of Saskatchewan, if he has the desire and the determination to enter into business, to be able to do so.

One other point that I think is touchy in this regard is Clause 15, which actually I think will stop a man from entering into a business, for the simple reason (I'll read Clause 15, just to give you an idea of my point):

“No municipality or officer thereof shall issue a license to any person authorizing him to carry on a business of retailer in a place of business, unless he first produces existing license issued under the Act, in respect of that place.”

In other words, if a person wanted to go into business, he wouldn't be on safe grounds to go and purchase property in which he intended to establish that business, unless he had first received a license, and I don't know why he would want a license unless he knew the property would be available. I personally, would like to see this Bill go back and specify the penalty for illegal action, as far as trading stamps and gimmicks of all kinds are concerned, but I would very much like to see the Bill left open enough so that people will have the right to enter a business, if they have the nerve to go, the same as we have throughout this province for many years. I don't like the Bill as it stands at this time, Mr. Speaker.

Mrs. Mary J. Batten (Humboldt): — Mr. Speaker, I, too, do not feel that I can support the Bill, although the purpose which the hon. Attorney General gave (or at least one of the purposes that he gave for it – he gave so many and I don't have a transcript of what he said), was that the Government would, at its discretion, merely use this to prevent the use of green stamps. Surely this is a case of overdoing the so-called remedy. The Attorney General is quite well aware of this, that there is a very simple method of looking after this green stamp menace that seems to obsess the Attorney General. As a matter of fact, I think he has said on several occasions that he has controlled it very well, and if he has, it is certainly unnecessary to have more control. I think what he is going to succeed in doing is setting up a type of dictatorship, where he is going to the public itself, and competitors to act as informers to him, because he doesn't want to police it. He doesn't want to hire people to go out and police this Act. I think I understood him to say that, and that is a correct interpretation of what he said. Yet, Mr. Speaker, the Act in itself is so indefinite, and so vague that it simply gives the Attorney General all the discretion in the world to cancel licenses to allow people to have retail stores, or not to have retail stores, as the Attorney General, in his discretion, may see fit.

Now, learned and wise as the Attorney General is, I submit there is no man that is either that wise or that learned, or should have that type of power to control the businesses of hundreds and hundreds of people in this province, and the means of livelihood of hundreds of families, simply at his own discretion. I know the Attorney General is going to say that you always have the right of appeal. The right of appeal for what? Where he has complete discretion; where he can make whatever regulation he wishes to control his discretion as little as he sees fit, certainly the court to which you appeal

March 15, 1960

has to work within the framework of those regulations, and as long as the Attorney General or Provincial Secretary has not exceeded his authority within that wide framework that he himself is going to give himself the superior court can do nothing about changing his decision. Therefore, that is simply a very poor excuse, and will not help the petitioner very much.

I see too that there is an advisory board being set up. Amazingly enough, the hon. Attorney General could not even answer the question as to how many retailers in the province of Saskatchewan belong to the Retail Merchants' Association, who are going to name a representative to this board. He simply doesn't know. He doesn't know how representatives these people are. For all he knows, they might represent 5 per cent of the people on whom they are going to sit in judgment. He is going to have a representatives of the municipality, chosen, I presume, by himself, and he is going to have his own representatives, who is going to be the Chairman of the Committee, and these are the people who are going to advise him (and of course, Mr. Speaker, he doesn't have to take their advice). I have been in the process of advising him for years, and any advice that he has taken, he has distorted so badly that I wished he hadn't taken it.

No matter how you play this particular theme, it is certainly not going to work for the greater prosperity of this province. I say this in all sincerity, Mr. Speaker, whether there is any truth in it or not; the fact is this, that people who are holding a license, particularly under this Government and its regulations, this Government who, in the person of the hon. Provincial Treasurer, and even the Premier, I believe, have stated that if you hold a license, you have a privilege. I think they have held in various debates that the two are almost synonymous. By obtaining a license you are thereby proving that you are operating under a privilege given to you by the generosity of this Government; that you no longer have any innate right to do certain things. This applies to the Highway Traffic Board, and they say to us that because we want to travel, because we want to have a license to travel, the mere fact that they give us the license, we have the privilege. We no longer have the right, but we have the privilege that could be taken away at will by the Government, because the Government has given it to us.

This is the reasoning that we have listened to for years from this Government, and once again they are not going to give these people the privilege of making a livelihood as retailers. If this wasn't so sad, and so dangerous, Mr. Speaker, — so terrifying, it would be rather funny, because these are the people who say that if you want to sell pencils at a street corner, you have to obtain a license from them, but if you want to work in somebody's mouth, and put in dentures, these people say, "Oh, it's a violation of freedom to license. You must be able to do it without any license." What type of consistency is this? Where the health of our public is affected, you don't need a license; where you are merely operating as a middle-man between the factory or the producer and the customer, and the customer can buy or not buy as he sees fit, you have to be licensed, and your license is apt to be picked up, because the Attorney General says you have violated one of his regulations.

Not only that, but it can be picked up because you refuse to answer some question; almost any question that he might see fit to ask you. He might ask you to give him an affidavit swearing to certain facts, and if you refused, disliked to do it, and say you won't do it, that is sufficient reason for him to pick up your license. This is going to be the most thorough policing of an industry, or an occupation that has ever been done, and for what purpose? What gross injustice have these people perpetrated on the people of Saskatchewan, to make them liable to this type of policing, this type of dictatorship? Frankly, I haven't seen anything.

Surely the Attorney General has not been such a terrible failure as an administrator of justice that he cannot rely on the laws as they exist today, and on the police and the various other officers in his Department, to see to it that those laws are carried out, without jeopardizing the livelihood of hundreds of people. Amazingly enough, I don't think he knows how many hundreds. I don't think the Attorney General today could get up and tell us how many people; how many families are going to be affected by this legislation.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Every family in Saskatchewan will be affected by this legislation.

Mrs. Batten: — How many retailers are there in this province? How many retailers have been guilty of misrepresentation or fraud? This is utter nonsense.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — It certainly is.

Mrs. Batten: — The Attorney General might think it very funny. Surely he can, and anybody else can, when they have the powers that this Government has, say, "I have a very good purpose in mind", and then proceed to do the most evil things. I submit this is evil, because even today people are terrified; people in our local governments are terrified to become candidates of political parties against this Government for fear they are not going to get good treatment. That's true. People who operate liquor outlets are terrified of this Government, and if they have any loyalties other than to this Government, they are careful to hide them.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — That's not true, no.

Mrs. Batten: — It is true, and everybody in every town in this province knows it's true.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Bunk!

Mr. McFarlane: — You just had the truth hit properly.

March 15, 1960

Hon. T.C. Douglas (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, the member for Humboldt (Mrs. Batten) has an amazing capacity for seeing ‘bogeymen under the bed’ and frightens herself with every piece of legislation that comes up and purports to speak for all of the people of the province with great assurance. As a matter of fact, of course, she doesn’t represent the point of view of a great many of the people of the province and particularly the people most directly affected.

Mr. McCarthy: — Neither do you.

Premier Douglas: — Let me say, first of all, that the Government does not want wide and extensive powers over the retail trade. There are only two reasons basically why you usually impose a license. The first is for revenue purposes, and certainly there is no intention of using this as a method of securing revenue; the second reason why you impose licences is where it is necessary to restrict a certain service or operation to persons who have certain qualifications. That’s true of professions and certain skilled operations, and that doesn’t apply in this particular case. Therefore, normally, certainly there can be no place for licensing retail merchants, and with that I agree completely. But we have faced a situation which none of the speakers who have taken part on the other side have discussed at all, or have faced up to it, and that is that there has been a growing menace, first of all in the United States, then in central Canada, now moving into western Canada, of a very powerful group handling what are commonly called ‘trading stamps’. This has wreaked havoc on the business operations of thousands of small businessmen in the United States and in eastern Canada. From the standpoint of the small businessman who, when he finds big supermarkets handling trading stamps, either has to get into the trading stamp business or go out of business, and often he can’t keep pace, and so he is pushed out. It has been a bad thing for the small merchants.

Secondly, trading stamps, from the point of the consumer, it has been demonstrated to us by the data which has been collected, and which I have every reason to believe is accurate, trading stamps and gimmicks of that nature, have increased the cost of consumer goods anywhere from two to four per cent, and there is no way to control it. Once you get books out and people with trading stamps, they get a catalogue and find if they buy so many packages of cornflakes, and so much of something else, they get a pair of roller skates. One of the youngsters wants roller skates, and somebody else wants a doll, and you’re into the maelstrom. You have a certain number of stamps, and you have to keep on buying if you are going to get anything on the equity you already have. This becomes a very vicious method of merchandising, and this has caused so much discord and discontent in those parts of Canada where it has been practiced that, for several years now, various groups interested from the standpoint of the retail merchant and the consumer, have made representations to the Government, asking us to give them our support in stopping the use of trading stamps. It’s all right for the member for Humboldt to say, “Well, you don’t represent many people”, but the Retail Merchants

Association — I don't know what their membership is, but I think it is about 5 per cent, and I think it is safe to say that they are the only group in the province who represent organized retail merchants. They have a full-time office and a full-time staff, and they must have a very large membership. They present an annual brief to the Government; they bring their staff down here and they have for years been placing before us the serious nature of the trading stamp menace.

The co-operatives, and there can be no question there as to who they represent, as they represent thousands and thousands of consumers of this province, have made strong representations, year after year, with reference to stopping the trade stamp threat.

The consumer group, representing particularly women's organizations all over the province and all over this country, have asked that action be taken with reference to trading stamps.

The Attorney General has prosecuted wherever he thought he had a chance for a conviction, where people were violating the provisions in the criminal code relating to trading stamps. So far we have had a fair measure of success. As far as we were concerned, we were quite prepared to leave it at that. The groups that I have mentioned, however, have felt that the chances of succeeding in curbing this menace by means of the criminal code were so decidedly limited. I will leave it to the lawyers to iron out the details, but as it was given to me as a layman, while they were able to stop the trading stamps in Ontario, as long as the premium to be given to the customer was obtained from someone else, they were illegal, but when the premium was given on the premises, from which the goods were purchased, they were no longer in violation of the criminal code. Because of this, they are now flourishing again, because they are able to change their technique so as to evade the provisions of the Criminal Code, which are most specific, as the Attorney General pointed out yesterday. It is for this reason that we have been asked, not this year alone, but year after year, by the Retail Merchants, by the Co-operatives, and by the Consumers' organizations, to bring in licensing legislation. I, for one, have always resisted this provision.

It has been pointed out to us that the only place where this problem has been coped with successfully has been in the province of Alberta, and I was therefore rather surprised to see that the hon. member, one of the Social Credit members, opposing this legislation, because if he will take the trouble to look at the Alberta legislation, the Licensing Trades and Business Act, 1942, and look at the regulations under that Act, . . .

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Just take a look at the size of the fee!

March 15, 1960

Premier Douglas: — . . . and see a fee there of \$100, you will see legislation there which is much more stringent, but legislation which, I may say, the retail merchants asked for in Alberta, and legislation which they support, and have asked the Alberta Government to keep on the Statute Books. I have never wanted to get into the Alberta legislation, to my way of thinking, it is much too stringent, but the fact is that Alberta is the one place where they have been able to cope with it successfully. It is not a matter, then, of saying that a certain trading stamp company fail afoul of the Criminal Code, but if it is indulging in this kind of a trade, even though it has altered the methods and techniques, if it is indulging in this kind of a gimmick, then you have the authority to cancel its license, and in this way you can stop this very serious cancer in your business community.

Therefore, we decided we would agree to these repeated requests for licensing legislation. I notice that some members here today, and also I noticed the Leader of the Liberal Party saying, “Well, if you really want to stop trading stamps, all you have to do is say ‘trading stamps’ instead of having this very wide policy, and of course anyone who is familiar with drafting legislation knows very well that when a matter is provided in federal legislation in the Criminal Code, you cannot pass provincial legislation on that, either. We couldn’t bring in specific trading stamp legislation. It would be ultra vires.

Mr. Nicholson: — Would the hon. Premier permit a question? I don’t know where, in all of this Bill, that you could find anything pertaining to those things, and with reference to Alberta, I think the hon. Attorney General has a clause of their Act which actually names trading stamps.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — No, it doesn’t.

Premier Douglas: — It may in the regulations, but not in the Act.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — It was passed 1937, before they even thought of trading stamps.

Premier Douglas: — But the Act was not passed with the idea of dealing with trading stamps. It was passed, first of all, in 1937 and was then consolidated in 1942.

Mr. Nicholson: — It’s on a sheet of paper which we have here.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — That’s regulations.

Premier Douglas: — That’s right. That was in the regulations, but the Act was passed long before the question of trading stamps came up. It was passed in Alberta for a totally different purpose, but it has been very effective in dealing with trading stamps, but it wasn’t passed

for the purpose of dealing with trading stamps.

The point I am making, Mr. Speaker, is that I would agree if it weren't for the fact that it is federal legislation, that the Act is specifically the same, that the cancellation could only be for trading stamps, if you can get a broad enough definition of trading stamps. But provincial legislation cannot deal with something which is already provided for in federal legislation. Therefore, we have to follow legislation on the broad general lines contained in the Alberta legislation, which is the only legislation so far which has been reasonably successful in coping with this problem.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — The Minister in Alberta has the power to deal with it for any reason.

Premier Douglas: — Yes, the powers in Alberta are general powers, and the Minister may suspend anything which he thinks is not in the public interest, or he may refuse to grant a license. That is why, in the Speech from the Throne, we said: "In view of the widespread interest in preventing questionable retail sales practises, legislation will be submitted to regulate such activity in the event that the Criminal Code proves ineffective." If the Criminal Code is effective in preventing trading stamp sales, and this type of gimmick that comes under this general classification, this legislation may not need to be proclaimed. This Government has a bounding duty, and I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this Legislature has a bounding duty, to give some protection to the small merchants, to the co-operatives and to the consumers of this province, against the menace of this trading stamp.

Mr. Nicholson: — We all agree to that.

Premier Douglas: — I think that, instead of crying so much about the terrible things that the Government might do to the retail merchants, I think you ought to consider what some of these trading stamp monopolies might do to the retail merchants. The recent report brought down by the Price Spreads Commission, headed by Dr. Andrew Stewart, pointed out that a good deal of the increased cost of food in the past few years is inexplicable and inexcusable. He points out that the farmers' prices have actually gone down, the wages are the lowest paid in the food-processing industries of any other industry, and that a large part of the increase in the cost of food in the stores, is due to gimmicks and other types of promotion, and that this needs to be investigated, and that some of this needs to be stopped.

What we are asking is, that if the Criminal Code is not able to stop this type of practice, that we have the necessary power to be used only if we have to use it, to protect the public of this province, and to protect particularly the small merchants who could be, overnight, exposed to a type of competition which they are totally unprepared and ill equipped to meet. I say to the gentleman opposite, who have said they are going to speak against the vote on this legislation, that they will have to accept the responsibility

March 15, 1960

for voting against it, because if legislation of some sort isn't passed, and if these companies are able to get around the Criminal Code, and trading stamps start like a prairie fire through this province, as it has gone through other parts of Canada, and gets away from us, it will be too late to do it, by the time another Legislature has convened.

Therefore, I say that I don't like arbitrary and widespread power vested in governments; even though I am a member of that Government, I still don't like arbitrary powers vested in the Government. But this is a case where we have to decide whether we can trust ourselves better than we can trust a gigantic trading stamp monopoly from the United States, who is liable to come in here and spread all over the province. As far as I am concerned, I am prepared to put the trust in the hands of the Government, whatever government may be here — responsible to the people here, and subject to the appeal — to the Courts. Mr. Speaker, I believe this legislation, if it becomes necessary to proclaim it, will provide a measure of protection which, otherwise, the consumers and the retail merchants of this province wouldn't have, and therefore I shall support the Bill.

Mr. Nicholson: — May I ask a question of the hon. Premier? Do you mean that if we vote against this Bill, we are voting against protecting the public against trading stamps?

Premier Douglas: — I'm saying. . .

Mr. Nicholson: — It is my interpretation. . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! The hon. member may not answer his own question. . .

Mr. Nicholson: — I ask if that is right.

Premier Douglas: — I'm saying that I know of no other way by which we can provide that protection, and I haven't heard anybody opposite suggest any other way by which we could protect them.

Hon. Mr. Fines: —The way they do it in Alberta.

Premier Douglas: — Alberta has found it effective, and after having it now over 20 years, there has certainly been no suggestion that it has been used dictatorially, or arbitrarily.

Mr. Danielson: — They're not socialistic.

Hon. Mr. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, it is quite true what the hon. member for Humboldt (Mrs. Batten) has said. There may be licenses that carry with them the privileges, but licenses of this kind, licenses such as are associated

with the provisions of The Farm implement Act, are considered to be licenses in the public interest, to regulate certain aspects of business in the public interest. There are innumerable examples of it. Livestock Dealers' Licenses is another one, but the reason I am on my feet, Mr. Speaker, and I hope you will not rule me out of order, is that several members opposite have mentioned, or rather have compared this legislation to The Farm Implement Act, and expressed opinions against The Farm Implement Act. I would again like to bring to your attention that the provision for licensing implement dealers has been in The Farm Implement Act since 1949. This entire Act was reviewed by a Special Select Committee of the Legislature, who reported back to this House, and supported by the farm organizations. No change was recommended in 1958, the Act was opened again, and not a single member of the House expressed any criticism of the licensing of the Implement Dealers, and they voted unanimously in this House for this legislation. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to your attention that the representations made by the hon. members are at variance with their actions in this House.

Mr. McCarthy: — He's dreaming!

The question being put, it was agreed to on a recorded division, 32 to 15.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact there has been some expression of opinion to the effect that this does not represent the wishes of the people of Saskatchewan, I would therefore move that this Bill be referred to the Special Select Committee on Law Amendments and Delegated Powers.

The question being put, it was agreed to.

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 66 – An act to Amend The School Act

Hon. W.S. Lloyd (Minister of Education): — Mr. Speaker, most of the changes proposed in this Bill can, I think, best be discussed in Committees. There are, however, two changes which I should draw to the attention of the Assembly at this time. One is one which, in conformity with changes already proposed for municipal acts, increases the allowances which members of school boards may provide for themselves. The maximum per diem previously was \$10 and is changed to \$15, and the number of days previously was 50 and has been changed to 65.

The second change has to do, or results because of the interest which there is in some areas of the province, in developing and operating junior highway schools; that is, an organization of grades VII, VII and XI. To begin with, it is clear, I think, that if there is to be such kind of an organization,

March 15, 1960

it is limited to districts in which there is a fairly large enrolment. Otherwise, it would be impossible to have this kind of division.

Secondly, there is no problem in those districts in which all of the grades, for all of the community, come under the jurisdiction of one school board. There are two other kinds of organizations prevalent, however, in which the arrangement is not so simple. If, for example, there is a secondary school district and a public school district in a community, the jurisdiction of the secondary school district is for grades from IX to XII, and of the elementary districts for grades from I to VIII. The proposed junior high school organization cuts across those lines. In this case, the Bill would provide that the elementary school district could make an agreement with the secondary school district, to provide the educational facilities for those students of VII and VIII, which would ordinarily be under its administration – that is, the administration of the elementary school district and consequently make the organization of the junior high school organization possible.

The second type of community is one in which there is a secondary school district, a public school district, and also a separate school district. The Bill provides that the Board of Trustees of these various groups may agree between themselves to have a junior high school organization. Most of the boards concerned with elementary education might agree that the secondary school district would continue the high school program, or the secondary school district might agree with either the public school district, or the separate school district, to carry it on just for the youngsters with which either one of them were responsible. If, however, the arrangement is just between the two districts to affect the youngsters for which only one of the public or separate school districts is concerned, then the third district must agree to it, before it could come into effect.

With that explanation, and with my previous comment in mind that the other amendments can best be discussed in Committee, Mr. Speaker, I would move second reading of this Bill.

The question being put, it was agreed to, and the Bill referred to a Committee of the Whole at the next sitting.

Bill No. 67 – An Act to amend The Secondary Education Act.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, this is an Act to amend The Secondary Education Act, and it provides substantially the same amendments for those schools as has been provided in the Act which I just discussed. I would move second reading of this Bill.

The question being put, it was agreed to, and the Bill referred to a Committee of the Whole at the next sitting.

Bill No. 69 – An Act to amend The Larger School Unit Act

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — This is a Bill to amend The Larger School Unit Act. It has in it the amendments with regard to the allowances which the trustees may provide for themselves, similar to the one previously discussed. It also provides for the change in grants which I have discussed, in earlier remarks in the Chamber, in connection with the budget debate. Briefly, the change is that the allowances which are established, and on which grants are based, are increased by \$500 each in the case of each of the classrooms.

With this, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading

The question being put, it was agreed to, and the Bill referred to a Committee of the Whole at the next sitting.

Bill No. 70 – An Act respecting Government Contributory Life Insurance for Certain Teachers

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, this is, of course, an entirely new Act, and as it indicates, is one to provide life insurance on a group basis for the teachers of the province. As I mentioned previously, the Bill will come into effect, provided a resolution favouring it is passed at the Annual Meeting of the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation Council, which will be held at Easter time of this year. Basically, if the Bill becomes law, it provides that all of our teachers will be included in a plan of group life insurance. The Government, in this instance, is taking the part of the employer and has agreed to pay the premium costs for the first \$2,000. The remaining premium costs will be paid by the teachers themselves, and will be on a basis related to the salary which they receive. The costs will be recovered by means of a salary deduction by the trustees, and by means of a comparable reduction in grant from the Department of Education.

The main purpose of the Bill is, of course, simply this, to further improve the profession of teaching in Saskatchewan, and consequently to improve our ability to attract into the teaching profession, and to retain the best possible type of persons. The Bill to date has been received with considerable enthusiasm by a large number of teachers in the province who have discussed it. Teachers in the province have been discussing group life insurance, to my knowledge, for the last 25 years, and this is going to be I'm sure, a further satisfactory step toward improving those conditions of work which make possible the recruitment and the retention of better persons in our schools.

I would therefore move second reading.

Mr. Loptson (Saltcoats): — Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Minister, what will be the cost to the Treasury for the \$2,000? That's what you are going to share on, isn't it — the first \$2,000? What is the estimated cost that the Government will assume?

Mr. Speaker: — I will put the motion, and the hon. Minister can answer when he closes the debate.

Mr. Loptson: — That is just a question I was asking him.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, the cost as far as can be interpreted at this point is 41 cents per 1,000 per month.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Roughly \$5 per year.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — Roughly 41 cents per month, or approximately \$5 per year per \$1,000 coverage. A portion of this goes, of course, to the Company, and the unused portion remains in the fund or is returned to the party responsible.

Mr. Loptson: — And your limit is \$2,000, is it, which the Government will. . .

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — I think I made clear in my remarks that the Government was paying the premium on the first \$2,000 and the teachers will pay in relationship to their salary.

Mr. Loptson: — That means that the Government is paying all the premium on the first \$2,000 at the rate of \$5 per 1,000, is that correct? About \$10 for each policy?

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — Yes, that is correct.

Mr. Loptson: — I suggest you might include some of the workers — both union and other workers. . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — I am supposed to be closing the debate, Mr. Speaker. . .

The question being put, it was agreed to, and the Bill referred to a Committee of the Whole at the next sitting.

On motion of the Hon. Mr. Douglas (Weyburn) the Assembly then adjourned at 9:43 o'clock p.m.