

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
First Session — Fourteenth Legislature
38th Day

Tuesday, April 4, 1961.

The House met at 10:00 o'clock a.m.

On the Orders of the Day:

**MOTION RE COMMITTEE TO EXAMINE PROCEDURES IN PUBLIC ACCOUNTS
COMMITTEE**

Mr. Eldon A. Johnson (Kerrobart-Kindersley):

Mr. Speaker, this motion that appears on the Order Paper, I had intended to bring in through the avenue of the Public Accounts Committee of which I am presently a member and had been so in the previous Session. I have as a member, been concerned about the function and terms of reference of the Public Accounts Committee, and I've been very interested as a Member of the Legislature, in understanding this Committee and seeing that it should do its job as well as possible.

Now of course, I recognize the need of such a Committee in a government. I believe it is necessary of course, that there should be some committee which would study expenditures. Also, Mr. Speaker, I recognize the essential and valuable role of the Opposition in a parliamentary government as well as in a committee of this nature. There seems to be, however, some change or deviation from the intended role of the committee. Mr. Demers has indicated that its primary function is to determine whether or not appropriations have been expended as authorized by the Assembly, and of course, that is a necessary and valuable function. In my observation of the committee I haven't been aware of any expenditure that has not been properly made, nor has this matter been questioned. I shouldn't say it hasn't been questioned, but there has never been to my knowledge any item located which was not completely in order or not authorized, and this alone raises some question as to whether we are doing what we should be doing as well as possible.

In effect, the Public Accounts Committee has been not so much a committee on expenditures as a committee

April 4, 1961

which studies the operation of various departments. I don't in any way say that this is bad, in fact, many of us members have gained a great deal of useful knowledge from this aspect of it. However, I would just say this, that if the Public Accounts Committee, in effect, should make a study of the policies as well as the expenditures of departments, then our terms of reference should indicate that as such, and we should have wider terms of reference than we have been trying to follow under the chairman's ruling as of 1941.

In looking at this matter I find that other governments and other jurisdictions have quite different ways of handling this matter of the watch dog committee on expenditures, and it seemed to me that we should examine the ways in which other jurisdictions and other governments study their expenditures, and how they carry out their post-mortems. I am not convinced that we have necessarily the best way, though it may be, but I would like to see this matter examined.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if this motion is passed, I can see this happening — it would be of course, a committee set up of both sides of the House, and it would have as its terms of reference to evaluate the function and scope of the Public Accounts Committee. And of course, this group which should be rather small, would be empowered to call upon officials and people who have a greater knowledge than the average Member of this House, in order to complete their study. We would certainly get the advice of people who have had considerable knowledge in accounting or especially government accounting. This committee would be an inter-sessional committee, I would expect, because it's simply impossible for a committee to sit during the Session. According to my observations we are all thoroughly busy and the committee would likely sit in between the Sessions. I would suggest that a minimum accomplishment of the committee would be to lay out terms of reference that in effect could conform to our practice. I think Members who have been on the committee will agree that the practice of the committee has deviated considerably from the chairman's ruling of 1941. Now, it may be that we are doing exactly as we should be doing, however, in order to minimize dissention I think these things should be spelled out. Also, I think the committee would go beyond its minimum function and study other matters such as provincial accounting procedures; they may raise such things as the role of the provincial auditor. A question could be raised such as are we making the best use of an auditor, or should

we have a different type of an auditor. There are many questions and I'm not going to presume to anticipate what the committee will do. I would assume that they'd be responsible and open minded people who would investigate and report on the function and scope of the Public Accounts Committee.

I would hope that the Opposition will support this resolution, because I certainly recognize that they have an important role to play in parliamentary government, and I could quite well visualize that if this resolution was passed it would let them do their job more effectively than they may be able to do it at the present. I'm not criticizing them as such; I'm interested in letting them have the best mechanism in order to do the job that they are expected to do. I think we shouldn't be hampered by tradition, noticing the date of the chairman's ruling; its date is March 19, 1941. Twenty years have passed since that and I think that it is time that we reviewed what we are trying to do in this committee, and that should be one of the reasons why I feel this resolution should be supported, and I believe that it is time again to give this matter some further study.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I therefore move, seconded by Mr. Thurston:

“That this Assembly recommends to the consideration of the Government that a special committee be appointed to examine into and evaluate the function and scope of the Public Accounts Committee and to report thereon with recommendations to the Assembly at the next Session; the said special committee to be empowered to consult with the Provincial Auditor, officials of the Treasury Department, other department officials, and to gather information from other jurisdictions.”

Mr. W. Ross Thatcher (Leader of the Opposition):

Mr. Speaker, I think possibly that the hon. Member who moved this motion did so with a sincere desire to perhaps speed up the work of the House. And on the surface there may be some merit in this particular motion, but I will tell you quite frankly that the Opposition is afraid of it. We are afraid of it because we think that if this special committee is set up, with a Government majority as it must have, that ultimately it might mean some curtailing of the Public Accounts Committee.

April 4, 1961

I know that this year there were quite a number of Members of the Government side, who from time to time said that they felt that they were wasting time sitting on that committee; that they weren't getting too much chance in do questioning. I don't think that that is correct. We on the Opposition side feel that one of the most important jobs that the Opposition has is to go over these Public Accounts thoroughly and carefully. We think every expenditure should be scrutinized. We think that the mere fact that each of these departments know that when the Legislature meets they are going to have to justify those expenditures, should have a good effect on public spending. We in the Opposition think that we made a start this Session in going over those fairly thoroughly, and the next Session we hope to do the job more effectively.

Now, instead of setting up this committee, as the hon. Member suggests, I'd like to propose two or three other steps which in our opinion would be more effective in making the Public Accounts Committee function.

In the first place, some Houses I believe in England and elsewhere, have found it desirable to make a Member of the Opposition the Chairman of the committee. Some have done that on the estimates committee and others have done it on Public Accounts, and I think that's a good idea, I'd like to see a Member of the Opposition as chairman of the Public Accounts Committee.

Now in the second place, we didn't like, this year, the chairman — and I know he did it believing it was the rule — but repeatedly the chairman refused to permit us to make motions as we were going through the Public Accounts. I've sat on this committee in Ottawa and I can tell you that certainly was never the procedure down there. In reading Beauchesne I'm not convinced that it should be the procedure here, and next year we're going to protest very vigorously if that policy is followed, because if you can't propose motions as you go through Public Accounts, then a lot of the effectiveness is dispelled.

Now the third thing we'd suggest, if the Government really wants to make this committee more effective, is a little research help; give us some research help so that we can start digging all year. I repeat, I wished the hon. Minister of Mineral Resources were here today. The Civil Service is now over 7,000, surely we should be able to have at least two of them. Give us a research man we'll put him to work on Public Accounts

for part of the year, and I'll bet you when the account rolls around next year that we'll have some questions that will really be good questions.

For these reasons then, Mr. Speaker, because we are absolutely determined that this committee should not be curtailed in any way, because we feel that if this committee meets maybe the suggestion is going to be made that the numbers of the committee be cut down.

At one of the sub-committee meetings the other day one of the hon. Government Members said that they felt that there were too many Members of the committee, maybe we should cut it down to six or eight. Well I say again, the Opposition would be absolutely opposed to any policy in that manner, and therefore, we shall this morning, or when the vote comes, vote against this motion.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd (Provincial Treasurer):

Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to try to persuade the Leader of the Opposition to change his point of view. I do want to say that I think it is most regrettable and most unfortunate that he has taken that particular point of view.

I think the Member who moved the resolution in the Legislature, and who spoke on it in the Public Accounts Committee as several other Members from this side of the House, made it extremely plain that the resolution did not in any way anticipate any curtailing of the scope of the Public Accounts Committee. It has been made very clear by the Member who moved the resolution this morning and who spoke on it before that his only interest was in making it possible for the Public Accounts Committee to do the work more adequately and more expeditiously. But at no time was there any suggestion that the scope of the work should be curtailed, that the opportunity of Members of the Legislature to get information through the medium of the Public Accounts Committee should be in any way restricted whatsoever. The whole emphasis was on the other approach. Perhaps there are, if we were to sit down and study, better ways in which everybody could get a more satisfactory understanding of the process of government, and of the specific actions of the specific departments of government, if we wanted to study how it was done.

The Leader of the Opposition has suggested that we might make a Member of the Opposition the Chairman

April 4, 1961

of the committee. This is one of the points which was suggested as a possibility for study by one of the Members speaking in the Public Accounts Committee the other day. I was one who said at that time, Mr. Speaker, that I certainly welcomed the opportunity to have Members of the Opposition and representatives of Private Members on this side, sit down and take some time to study the form of Public Accounts, and to suggest after applying some reason and logic and study to do it, what they thought might be done in order to improve it. I still think that is true and I repeat that I think it is unfortunate that the Leader of the Opposition has construed the intention of the resolution as he has done this morning, but I certainly do not think that I'm going to take any more time of the Legislature in trying to persuade anybody to undertake the study. It is quite obvious I think, that this committee would be a success only if it had the support of the Opposition. And if they don't want it, well of course, I think there is no option but that we don't proceed with it.

Mr. Frank Meakes (Touchwood):

Mr. Speaker, as Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee and as a member of the committee for five years, I had looked forward to supporting this motion of my colleagues. I was very happy that this was brought into the House, and also, at the same time I feel very unhappy, and I still hope that the hon. Leader of the Opposition and the Members to your left, will take another thought on supporting it. Certainly I want to say at the beginning that in no way in my support of this motion am I thinking of curtailing any of the rights or the functions of it. Certainly I agree with the hon. Leader of the Opposition that there is always a necessity of scrutinizing the accounts. I agree that these expenditures must be scrutinized and this is a way in which the civil servants and the Minister in question always realize that there is the possibility of scrutinizing, and it makes them that much more careful.

But the reasons that I supported this motion — and before I go into that I would also like to deal for just one minute with what the Leader of the Opposition had said in regard to the chairman and his rulings on motions from time to time. Now this is one of the exact reasons why I was pleased that this motion was being brought in. I think that all Members of this House will agree that you Mr. Speaker, and chairmen of committees try to base their decision on two things,

on Beauduchesne and on the procedure of this House. And going back at least to 1931, and Mr. Demers, when he brought in his document, that I hold in my hand, the one that I'm sure the Members of the Opposition got a little tired of listening to, when he sat down and drew up this document they were too, basing this document on practice and procedure of the House. And I in my ruling in the committee, I feel, am forced to base my decision on these rules of procedure of this House which has been a practice for many years, unless a committee is set up and will look at the whole thing and possibly bring in and suggest other procedures.

Now as to the things that I think this committee could well look at, I agree with the mover I think the first thing they might look at is the function of the committee. What is the aim of the committee? How does the committee work both here and in other places? One thing the committee might look at might be on the size of the committee. Maybe it's too small and maybe it's too big and maybe it should be left as it is. I think they also could well look at the role of the auditor. And I mentioned in the committee the day that I spoke on the motion, on the final windup meeting, the role of our provincial auditor, which is incidentally as far as I can find out the exact same role for nine other provinces. In some places, Britain I believe and Ottawa, we have a different set up, we have two auditors, a pre-auditor and a post-auditor. I'm sure that the hon. Leader of the Opposition remembers the Auditor General and his reports. I think this is something that could be looked at.

Also, I agree with what the Leader of the Opposition said and hon. Provincial Treasurer, we could well look at who is to be the chairman. But again in the procedures of this House over many, many years, it has always been a Government Member. Then a committee such as this might look at the method of reporting — that is how much detail. I'm no chartered accountant but I'm sure that if we brought in every record of every cent spent by this Government in a year you would have a good-sized book.

I might say that I think we have as much detail as we had twenty-five years ago. You might ask yourselves in what form this should be brought in. Another thing we might look at is, and I think it's done in some places, is that they will pick on a special department each year. One year the committee will decide to look at a certain department, and this department is looked at very closely and in detail. All the officials

April 4, 1961

are brought in and minute questions are asked. The departments naturally don't know which one the committee is going to ask first so they are always on the bit and they must always be ready to answer all these questions.

Then we might look at what other provincial governments are doing. I know there is quite a difference, for instance, between Alberta and ourselves. As I said before, we can look at Ottawa and look at Great Britain. There is one thing I want to say, I quite agree with what the hon. Provincial Treasurer said, I for one am not interested in supporting this motion unless it has the unanimous agreement of all Members. Unless we have the Opposition interested in this motion certainly there is no use going ahead, because this is really, I think, one of the roles the Opposition should be most interested in.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that they will change their minds and support this motion, but if they don't I see no sense in us carrying it any further. We might as well ask the hon. Member from Kerrobert-Kindersley to withdraw it.

Mr. Eiling Kramer (The Battlefords):

Mr. Speaker, what I have to say on this is nothing much pro or con to the motion, it's simply in regard to something that the Leader of the Opposition said. I was certainly a bit startled when he said very pointedly this year we have made a very good start. On behalf of some of the hard working and hon. Members opposite that I've been associated with for the past nine years, I think that this is one of the most conceited and inflated statements that has ever been made in this House.

One thing that I think the hon. Member for Morse ought to realize, being on a ranch at least part of the time, is that there is one good thing about a cow — it doesn't blow its own horn. And I think I'm sure that the hon. Members opposite will not say anything about it, but as far as I'm concerned I have never seen the debate in this House, any year, drop to such a low level as it has under the leadership of the hon. Member for Morse. I have wanted to say this before and I have hesitated but after that very inflated statement this morning I thought it was time that somebody said something about this. I have enjoyed the proceedings of this House less this year than I have at any time during the nine years that I have had the privilege of sitting.

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! The hon. Member has already spoken in this debate.

Mr. Thatcher: — Well I . . . I was going to say that the one Member who made no contribution was the one that just spoke. He didn't even open his mouth the whole Session.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Danielson: — Mr. Speaker, may I say a word. I think that the hon. Member should have been called to order several minutes ago when he started to attack the Leader of the Opposition. This is not a personal matter; there is a principle involved. We don't mind that over here; we've got a good leader and we appreciate him.

Premier Douglas: — (interjection).

Mr. Danielson: — Don't you worry about the Opposition, they'll take care of themselves.

Premier Douglas: — I'm not worried about the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, but it's about time the Opposition started to worry about itself and its responsibilities to the democratic society.

Mr. Speaker, no one will quarrel with two things which the Leader of the Opposition said. The first is the value of the Public Accounts Committee and the parliamentary form of government. That is the function of the committee and particularly the function of the Opposition, and every possible facility should be placed in the hands of that committee in order to do two things; one, to assure the public that there is a close and careful scrutiny of government expenditures, and secondly, to keep the Government itself on its toes at all times. This is the responsibility not only of the Opposition, but of all the Private Members in the House and all the members of the Public Accounts Committee. With that first point there is no quarrel. The second thing is that there should be no curtailment of the activity of the committee. I agree with that. As a matter of fact, there may be

April 4, 1961

some room for thinking that the committee's activities ought to be extended, not just kept where they are. As a matter of fact, the committee has itself been extending its activities. One of the problems the chairman has had, has been that from custom we have gradually broadened the scope of the committee beyond the actual terms of reference that were set out in the rules drafted by Mr. Demers twenty years ago and approved by the House. The committee bit by bit has been going beyond those rules, and the chairman is in the very awkward position of trying to adjudicate between what is laid down in the rulings and procedures established by the House and the practice which has grown up. Consequently, I think the Member for Kerrobert-Kindersley was doing a service when he brought up to the Public Accounts Committee, the other day, a motion similar to that which is now on the Order Paper. I was there when we discussed that motion and it was agreed at that time that since some of the Opposition Members hadn't known about the motion, that we ought not to proceed with it in the committee. I think a copy had been given to the Leader of the Opposition, but some of the other members of the committee hadn't seen the motion and so it was felt that it would be better to put it on the Order Paper here, and give everybody a chance to have a look at it, and this has been done.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that it is somewhat inconsistent for the Leader of the Opposition to stand up and make suggestions as to how the committee should be changed. Some of these suggestions are good ones. He suggested you might consider putting an Opposition Member as chairman. This is done in a number of jurisdictions. He suggested that the committee might have the power to make motions. This might also have merit. He suggested research. There might be some merit in having inter-sessional research done by the Public Accounts Committee. This is done in the British Public Accounts Committee where, between Sessions, they have a research staff at the beck and call of the committee, to carry on a certain amount of study and research. But, these are suggestions which the Government cannot implement. These are suggestions which ought to come from the committee. This is exactly what the Member from Kerrobert-Kindersley is suggesting. He suggests that there be an inter-sessional committee which would study proposals like this, bring them back to the House and if the House approves of them, then these changes would be made. If the House doesn't approve of them of course, then we would go on as we are. I can't understand the logic at all of saying that there are some things that

should be done to improve the capacity of the committee to do its work, and at the same time opposing the setting up of the committee, that could make recommendations along this line.

Surely the Leader of the Opposition doesn't suggest that the Government itself should change the terms of reference of the committee. This is not the Government's function. The Government has no power to do this. Only this Legislature can change the terms of the committee. Only this Legislature can decide whether it will be an Opposition Member or a Government Member who shall be chairman. Only this Legislature can change Mr. Demers' ruling set forth twenty years ago, and say that motions may be moved, or that we may broaden away from simply being a post-auditing committee, and deal with administration and accounts.

There are a number of important things that we ought to look at. This committee ought to have some knowledge of what is done in other jurisdictions in public accounts. I think we have a good Public Accounts Committee. I think they've done an excellent job throughout the year. But it's quite possible that there are practices in other jurisdictions that we could adopt, or we could modify, or we could incorporate into our method of handling public accounts. I don't ever think it costs anything to have a look at it and see if you can do better than you are doing.

I quite agree with what has been said by others. If the Opposition don't want to set up this committee, then it would be absurd of course to set it up. But I don't want, next year, the Leader of the Opposition, or anyone in the Opposition, to stand up and criticize either the chairman or the committee or its scope of investigation, after having turned down this motion, because the committee can only operate within its terms of reference. If they refuse to have a committee to investigate the terms of reference and to make recommendations regarding change in the terms of reference, then it must be that they're satisfied with the present terms of reference, and shouldn't complain about it. They shouldn't next year say they should be allowed to move motions, when the terms of reference say they can't.

Mr. Thatcher: — Where does it say that?

Premier Douglas: — If you look at the terms of reference as laid out by Mr. Demers, which was adopted by the House as the procedure

April 4, 1961

for the Public Accounts Committee, which has been followed for twenty years, these are exactly the terms of reference which are proposed here to be re-examined.

If the hon. Members don't want the committee, then it can only mean that they are satisfied with the terms of reference as they are, and the present scope and function of the committee as they are. I would certainly hope that this would not come to a vote. I hope the Member for Kerrobert-Kindersley will withdraw the motion, because, unless the Opposition are going to take part, and take part enthusiastically, there would be no value at all in having it. In the final analysis, the Public Accounts Committee is an opposition committee. It's the one place that the Opposition has the supreme function, although other Members should be equally interested in safeguarding expenditures. But it is the main function of the Opposition, and unless they felt that these terms of reference needed re-examination and revision, I would think there would be no value in setting up the committee.

Mr. L.P. Coderre (Gravelbourg):

Mr. Speaker, if I may in my simple way or as much as possible try and contribute something to this particular part of the debate.

Government Members: — We can't hear you.

Mr. Coderre: — It's a good thing you didn't hear the beginning. There's a few things that I'd like to inject in this particular part of the debate, Mr. Speaker, and one of them is, and if I may, I have to deviate slightly from the motion itself. On several occasions when committees have been formed to look into some matters of legislation or otherwise we've always found that the Government have been a little heavy on the committee and the Opposition represented much in the minority with the result that time and again when suggestions have been brought in by the committee or by the Opposition, the Government, whether there's reasons, whether it's political or otherwise, have not heeded the advice of the Opposition. One in mind, if I may, Mr. Speaker, is the committee on privileges.

We, as the Opposition believe, and I believe that it's been mentioned on several occasions in the House, that there are two sides to a story, and I believe that you have the side for and you should have the side against expressing their opinions.

Unfortunately, or fortunately, whichever the case may be, we are politicians, and whenever we get into discussions, it seems to me these political differences are injected into everything which has a tendency not to bring out the true facts. As I've said, Mr. Speaker, there's been a previous committee to investigate some privileges and I think I may refer to that in this Legislature.

Mr. Speaker: — I don't think that we can have a discussion of that committee at this time.

Mr. Coderre: — Well I'm not going to discuss the committee. I just wanted to bring out the results of it. The Opposition did not get out of this committee what we had anticipated and hoped.

The same applies with this resolution of forming a committee. There is a possibility that a committee will be formed, or it is the intention it would be formed with a predominance of the Members of the Government. I have noticed, since the Leader of the Opposition spoke on it rather guardedly in some respects, that since he has spoken, two Members of the Government have got up and have actually made a personal attack on the Leader of the Opposition, which immediately indicates again that there's a sort of a political opposition to anything we're trying to do.

I think that the stand that we have taken at the moment in regard to this motion has been one that, from previous experience, on previous committees, the Opposition has not had its equal share in deciding or definitely dividing the pros and cons. The Government has been a little top-heavy and consequently, we have to guard ourselves against repetitions of that sort.

I believe that the Public Accounts Committee, quite often, may have deviated from the true facts or the terms of reference. It's information that we're seeking, and quite often, Mr. Speaker, there's bound to be a tendency where we may go a little beyond the terms of reference. Oftentimes, I think the terms of the committee are a little too inclusive. How can we form a committee to get the Opposition point of view if it's not equally represented.

April 4, 1961

I just thought I'd leave these few thoughts in mind, because I think it is very important, that if anything is going to come out — something that's good, and as it has been mentioned in the House quite often, there are two sides to the story. If any committees have to be formed at any time which really deal with very important matters of the House, such as perusing the public accounts, then I say, give the Opposition an equal voice on these committees.

Mr. Speaker: — Is the hon. Member about to close the debate?

Mr. Danielson: — I can assure you I'm not going to say very much.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! The hon. Member has already been on his feet. Now whether it was on the point of order at the time, he did not state that he rose on a point of order. He has already spoken in regard to . . .

Mr. Danielson: — Pardon me, Mr. Speaker, I thought the Member who introduced the resolution had also closed the debate.

Mr. Speaker: — He has the privilege of closing the debate, the hon. Member who was on his feet may close the debate if he wishes to do so.

Mr. Danielson: — Is that what he's going to do now?

Mr. Speaker: — Well, that's what I have to find out.

Mr. Danielson: — Thanks.

Mr. Johnson: — Yes, Mr. Speaker, may I have this opportunity now then.

Mr. Speaker: — I may say Sir that there has been quite a bit said about withdrawing this motion. If it's the hon. Member's intention to withdraw the motion, he's not entitled to make a speech.

Mr. Johnson: — That is my intention, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — Well, it may be withdrawn, but you can't make a speech in withdrawing it.

Mr. Danielson: — I want to get the ruling again, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! The other Member has had the floor, whatever he wishes to do, if I may say so.

Premier Douglas: — I think the Member is right.

Mr. Speaker: — Are you rising on a point of order?

Mr. Danielson: — The question I want to ask you, Mr. Speaker, is this. If the motion to withdraw is now in order, then that ends the debate, doesn't it?

Mr. Speaker: — If the hon. Member wishes to withdraw the motion, the mover wishes to withdraw the motion, and the unanimous consent of the House is obtained, the motion will be withdrawn and the debate will be over, but I cannot foresee what will be the result of these things.

Mr. Danielson: — Well, I wanted to say a few words on this. As a matter of fact I think I will . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Danielson: — If I'm out of order, then I'm sitting down.

Premier Douglas: — He rose on a question of privilege. I think it was . . .

Mr. Speaker: — It could have been that way. When the hon. Member from Arm River didn't rise up and make a reply in regard to whether he was speaking on a point of order, or he didn't say so at the time — that would make his position clear. If the House is willing to accept that he spoke on a point of order I'd be very glad to have him speak at this time.

Mr. Danielson: — I am not speaking on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I'm just trying to take part in the debate, and so long as the motion has not received the unanimous consent of the House, I should think that I'm order. Is that correct?

Mr. Speaker: — Yes, that's right.

April 4, 1961

Mr. Danielson: — I've sat here for many years, and I haven't learned very much, but I'm trying to remember what took place before. But, I'm not going to say very much about this thing because I think that sufficient has been said and I have been listening to the Provincial Treasurer. He said that the statement of the Leader of the Opposition was not important and regrettable. Well, it might be to him, but he doesn't need to think that it's that same thing to Members on this side of the House. We have checked this thing over carefully. And, we have, and the Premier has even said so, we have one committee which is really an Opposition committee and that is the Public Accounts Committee. We want to guard very jealously the rights that we have under that committee, and I think any Government who has the best concern of the people at heart and the best concern of the problems of the people of this province, should be equally concerned about the rights and privileges of the Public Accounts Committee.

Premier Douglas: — And we are.

Mr. Danielson: — I haven't said anything else, but the Premier said this — that he didn't want anybody to come back next year and criticize him and he mentioned the chairman. He didn't suggest any such change. Well, I'm not responsible for what he says, but I think he's overstepping when he says that. At least I think so, and I am entitled to my opinion.

Now, I think that has been followed here for many, many years, and is a good system. We can state our opinions, we can ask the question and the Speaker is quite within his right to tell us whether that question is a proper one or not. We very seldom agree. I shouldn't criticize the chairman's ability, but the chairman who spoke before him, his rulings were very very inconsistent at times, extremely inconsistent at times, but nevertheless, we as the Opposition had to accept this.

Now, we think as an Opposition that we have certain privileges which have been established definitely, and we are willing to work under these rules and regulations, and we hope that the chairman of the committee from now on will be a little more consistent and liberal in his rulings and permit . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! It is not in order to criticize the fairness of chairmen of committees.

Mr. Danielson: — I'm not out of order in view of the fact that he has expressed himself in regard to his position as a chairman. I'm not criticizing him, but some of the ones we had years ago, and I say this without any fear of contradiction. I think the present chairman has done the best possible and he gets along very well with the committee, but that is the reason for our opposition; we are willing to work under the rules and regulations you have now.

Premier Douglas: — Good. That's all we want to know.

Mr. Danielson: — We think that we have a right under the parliamentary rules, in a committee of that kind, that if it is guaranteed to us that we are permitted to exercise that right, we will stick to the rules. That is the reason why we have certain things, and we don't know what is going to come under the recommendations of this committee. I have seen some of these recommendations before, and I have my doubts that we're going to be any better off when that committee has reported. I think in some positions we'll be worse off. That is my own opinion. Therefore, we feel that we are going to guard the rights that we have, extend them if possible, and I would comment to the chairman next year that he study parliamentary rules and learn as much about them as you have done in the last month or two, Mr. Speaker. I admire your rulings in many respects, and I think we have a good committee and we'll make use of it.

Mr. Johnson: — Mr. Speaker, I introduced this resolution with the hope . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I wish you would state at the first whether you intend to withdraw or do you intend to speak?

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, is he not allowed under the rules of the House to state why he's asking permission to withdraw it?

Mr. Speaker: — The rule is very clear, in withdrawing a motion.

Premier Douglas: — You can't make a speech on the motion.

Mr. Speaker: — You cannot make a speech.

Premier Douglas: — But I thought he would give his reasons for asking to withdraw.

Mr. Speaker: — I'm afraid that would be speaking.

April 4, 1961

Hon. Olaf A. Turnbull (Minister of Co-operation and Co-operative Development):

Mr. Speaker, I was in the Public Accounts Committee when this motion was introduced, and it was an interesting thing to watch the Members of the Opposition, because, in the first place they didn't have an opportunity apparently of studying this motion, even though it had been given, as I understood, to the hon. Leader of the Opposition sometime before.

The thing that impressed me there was that many Members of the Opposition were sincerely interested in this and they thought that there may be some value in it, and showed a willingness to take a look at it. I notice that some of these men are not now here — they're out of the Chamber.

I regret very much that we're now in this position. I think this could have been a useful thing. The hon. Member from Arm River is concerned about the recommendations the Committee might bring forth. It's my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that any recommendations would be subject to the approval of the House, which would be his safeguard. There would be a thorough discussion and debate on such recommendations, as they may be brought forth. So I think that it's a great disappointment that the Opposition has not seen fit to follow along some of the recommendations that their Leader has given himself.

He has voiced several suggestions where improvements might be made, and surely, the proper way to do this, is to move forward with the committee and bring forth such recommendations, and then we'll have a look at them. I think, speaking for myself, this is a great disappointment and I'm sure that many of the Members here are also disappointed.

Mr. Ross A. McCarthy (Cannington):

Mr. Speaker, it seems a very peculiar thing to me that the Government over there wants to make the Opposition responsible for this because after all I thought they were the Government. Under the British Parliament System, I understood, that if a Government wanted to make a change, they can make it. They have the power to do it. If they haven't got the intestinal fortitude to make some changes in their regulations, which the regulations should have, I don't see why they should try to blame the Opposition for not going along. It's a new deal to me, altogether.

Well, the gentleman who just spoke said that it'll be settled in the House. Well, sure, it'll be settled in the House, but they have the majority. If they're sincere, and they think there should be some change, why don't they as the Government bring it in, and not do as the Premier did a few minutes ago, say, "Well, if you fellows don't get along with this, we'll tell you about it next year, and we'll make you suffer for it."

After all, if I understand British parliamentary procedure, and I don't know much about it, I'll admit that, it's fundamental the Government lays down the policy. When they get in the position where they won't do anything without the Opposition taking some responsibility for it, I think they're slipping.

Mr. Johnson: — Mr. Speaker, I must make one sentence. I'm very disappointed that in view of the attitude of the Opposition I beg leave to withdraw this motion.

Mr. Speaker: — Is leave granted?

Hon. Members: — Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: — The motion is withdrawn.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Thibault regarding driver education:

Mr. Cliff H. Thurston (Lumsden):

Mr. Speaker, in rising to support this motion, I'm going to be very brief as many of the arguments that I would like to put forth, have already been placed before the House.

I think we can all agree that this resolution is very important, particularly when one views with alarm the increase of traffic fatalities not only in our own province, but right across Canada. I feel that this resolution, if it does nothing else but directs more attention to this problem, it will be well worthwhile.

I know that a few years ago, when polio was at its highest, many people, particularly parents, became alarmed. In fact some of them became frantic. They wouldn't let their children go to picture shows or swimming or join in any groups, for fear of this disease.

April 4, 1961

I'm not suggesting that they were responsible, but I feel that it had something to do with the improving of the salk vaccine, and certainly, the fear of this disease by the public generally, when the vaccine came onto the market, the parents took advantage and had their children vaccinated.

What does concern me, considering the alarm that was shown in this disease and other diseases, is that there are more people every year killed or maimed on our highways than by these diseases. The public generally goes merrily on its way and not giving it too much concern.

Now, turning to the motion itself, it asks the Provincial Government to give consideration to a further study and implementation to further driver training. I can agree with this, but I would just like very briefly to point out what the Government or its agencies are now doing in this regard.

I would like to turn to the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office. It's playing a leading role in this regard. I think that they in their business, they must be primarily interested in the keeping down of the accidents. In the first place, the Government Insurance Office is supporting the Highway Safety Council in their driver training program. This program was started in 1959, primarily by the support of the Government Insurance Office, by an annual maximum grant of \$100,000 taken from The Automobile Accident Insurance Act. This program is conducted by the Highway Safety Council, with the co-operation of the Department of Education. As I've said, it was started in 1959, and in the first year of operation, there were some 893 students enrolled in the program. In the current year, there are some 1,500 enrolled, and it's estimated that in the very near future, this will raise to 3,000.

Now, in this regard, in the schools, I want to agree with what the Member from Turtleford said the other day. I too had read the article in the Teachers' Bulletin, where the teachers were wondering just where this program was going to go. I don't think the Highway Safety Council envisages this as the program by the schools and by the teachers, for two reasons.

When you get into our high schools, teachers today, with the extra curricular work that they're endeavouring to carry on, have not got the time to spend

after school teaching young people to drive. Secondly, I suggest that there are many teachers who are not capable, and would have to train themselves to teach, and the Highway Safety Council is endeavouring to train people to work in conjunction with the schools. In the second place the Member suggested, particularly in rural areas, where boys and girls are transported to school by bus, that they didn't get sufficient time after school for them to take this training. There again, I agree with him, but I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this program is primarily for urban centres, larger towns and cities. I think that urban boys and girls need this training more than the rural. Now, I'm not suggesting for a moment that the rural boys and girls are smarter than their urban classmates, but I do say that on the farms, our boys and girls have advantages that the city children do not have. If you live in the city of Regina or a town, where are you going to try to teach the youngsters to drive an automobile, unless it's on the streets or on the highways? I, for one, wouldn't put anybody behind the wheel unless they either had a learner's license or operator's license, but out on the farm — I know my own son — I had him behind the wheel out in the middle of a stubble field at combining time, when he was twelve years of age. I couldn't see any great danger there because the closest automobile might be a mile from there. But, as I said, that by the time these youngsters on the farm come to the age of 16, many of them are pretty capable drivers, and then they just have to learn the fundamental safety rules.

Well, in that regard, I don't think it is the intention of the Highway Safety Council to impose anything on the schools. I think if it's going to be a success, it must be on a voluntary basis.

Now, statistics show that for the age group under 25 years of age, their accident rate is twice as high as any other age group. In this province, as I've said, we have just started this program of driver training in 1959, and they haven't had time to get an adequate set of statistics. But, in other provinces, where they have these statistics, those youngsters who have had driver training, their accident rate is reduced by half. I think that that is quite a percentage, if you take 1500 this year that are going through, and if you could reduce the accident rate by half, there are 750 drivers on the highway who are safer than if they didn't have that driver training course.

April 4, 1961

Now, that's the first step that the Government Insurance Office is supporting, and the second one they are supporting, as I said, is the Highway Safety Council. This Council, as I said, was set up some years ago with the blessing of the Provincial Government. The Government Insurance Office makes an annual grant of \$4,000 to the upkeep of this Council and in addition, the Government Insurance Office has offered to match dollar for dollar any other insurance company in the province, in this regard. I must report with regret that to date this has only cost the Government Insurance Office \$100. I would take it from that, Mr. Speaker, that other insurance companies may not see the benefit of this safety program.

Now another point that we have to encourage this program is by the discount on package policies. As I stated, all insurance companies doing business in this province, have an extra premium for anybody who has a youngster under the age of 25 who drives an automobile. Now to encourage the driver training program, if any young person comes purchasing their package policy and can show a certificate by a certified driver training program, they are given a reduction of 10% in their premium on that package policy.

Another point that the Government Insurance Office is giving a lot of stress to is the safety-lane test. Many hon. Members will know that the Highway Traffic Board has portable safety testing equipment that goes around the various parts of the province. I know that I have put my own car through it many times, and it gives you a check-up, whether your car is safe or not. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that no matter how capable a driver you may be, if there's a mechanical defect in your automobile or your vehicle, the chance or the danger of an accident is increased. The Government Insurance Office purchased this equipment for the Highway Traffic Board, and they maintain it, and this has cost the office in the neighborhood of \$5,000.

Another step that the Insurance Office is taking to try to cut down on accidents and make us as citizens become more accident-conscious, is the no-accident rating program, and as Members know, you get a better rate if you have three years of accident free driving, and if you get above that you go into your blue and your red licenses. I suggest that some of will never learn until we start having to pay, and I think this is a sound policy on the part of the office.

And finally, the Government Insurance Office, in their printed matter, they go in with the Highway Traffic Board, and when we purchase our license every year, we get the safety guide. That is divided in two parts. One is dealing with the insurance, and the other with the basic safety rules. I think this is very valuable. I talked to a young chap the other day that I know quite well and he had gone down to take his driver's test. He took his written test first and he got a very high mark, and I was complimenting him on it and he said, well, that for three nights he had studied this booklet, and he said that there was enough that he got out of it, that he could pass his examination. I think it's a good thing. I'm just wondering if statistics have been able to come up to show us how many of us really read that booklet when we get it. But I would suggest that each one of us do read it, particularly the part by the Highway Traffic Board dealing with safety and good driving practices. It would be well worth our while to sit down and spend a few minutes in reading it.

The other booklet put out by the Government Insurance Office is the "A,B,C's of Traffic Safety." I can well remember when this came on the market. I happened at that time to have the privilege of being on the Board of Directors of the Government Insurance Office, and I know in some cases, we were ridiculed for putting out this type of a booklet. It's exactly as it says, Mr. Speaker, — the A,B,C's, and it's written primarily for pre-school age children. And I suggest that we as parents try to teach our young people right from wrong. I suggest that if we teach other things, that we should teach them safety rules as soon as they are able to walk. I know my own little girl, when I took this book home and read it to her a couple of times, and with the pictures on it, before she could read, she knew the basic safety rules for children going to school. I think, Mr. Speaker, that this is well worthwhile to have for the younger people, and I know that if you have the traffic rules and safety rules in your mind when you're little, that when you become old enough to get behind the wheel, that much of that will stick with you and you will try to practise what you learned as a youngster.

Now I would just like to, before I sit down, have a word to say on the safety council. I have here the part one of the driver education training program of the Saskatchewan Highway Safety, dealing with its aims, objects, and policies. I'm certainly not going to take the time of the House this morning to go into

April 4, 1961

it, but they have some very high aims. One of their aims is to encourage in all communities a continuous education in safe driving, and through a specific program of driver education to teach the skills of driving, as well as to develop attitudes in all drivers to drive safely at all times. I think this is a very worthwhile objective. What they are attempting to do, is to train instructors that will go to these various schools and organizations asking for driver training programs. They will set up a set of rules and examinations for these teachers in these various schools.

And I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I think all Members of the House should get behind the Highway Safety Council. They're a group of very busy people, giving freely of their time and knowledge in trying to do something that will make our highways safe. And I think that any time that any Highway Safety Council comes into our various constituencies and wants some help, I think that we could be doing a good thing if we would at least get behind them and give them their support.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in closing I want to say that I don't think that there's any single program that can give us the success in this that we want, but there is one thing that I am convinced of and if we are going to try and teach our young people to be safe courteous drivers, we as adults, especially those of us who are parents, must set good examples ourselves. I know that there is no use of telling our children when they get behind the wheel to drive safely and be courteous, if, when we get behind the wheel ourselves, we just drive down the road with the attitude of "to heck with the other guy". And sometimes I know what the statistics say, that the age group 25 and younger, have more accidents. But sometimes I get a little vexed when I read that all the accidents are caused by young people. We had seven die over the week-end in this province, and I think that if you check the drivers you will find that they were not all young people driving.

I think it's very essential, because we try to have youngsters try to look up to us for other things, and I think, Mr. Speaker, that we should be sure that we set good examples for these young people to follow. If we practise these, Mr. Speaker, and encourage the driver training program, we'll be one step further in having more safe drivers on our highways. We can use our highways then for what they were built for, a safe place

to travel, for business or for pleasure.

Mr. Speaker, I will support the motion.

Mrs. Gladys Strum (Saskatoon City):

Mr. Speaker, I just want to add to what the previous speaker has said. I think this is a very useful thing, but I see two or three dangers in adding to the school program. I think we've got to begin to worry about protecting the school as a place where you go for instruction. I think we have gotten to the place where we have so many extra-curricular activities, that it's very difficult for teachers to carry on a good enough program and to get their students to take that program seriously.

I remember when I first went to Hope, in British Columbia, it was in the middle of the term, and they were going crazy for a teacher because all the young married teachers seemed to be home on other business, and if you were warm and breathing and could hold a book, you had to go and help out with the school. Now I had already gone to summer school and got a certificate to teach in British Columbia, but I hadn't intended to teach that year, and I was shocked when I went into the high school there, where I was to conduct classes in English, and at 9:00 in the morning these great big lunks were square dancing in the gymnasium. They couldn't write a proper English sentence; they couldn't do a decent problem in mathematics; they were just dullards having more fun in school than they could have anywhere else. And they were definitely a drag on the school and a curse to the classroom.

So while this is an excellent program, I think that the community and the school should jointly undertake to put this into effect, if they should decide it's a good program. And I should say that there are three aspects in this program; there's the mechanical aspect and I think there's the citizenship or the moral aspect of accepting your responsibility as an adult behind a high powered vehicle. And I'm all for tightening up on all of the driver regulations that have to do with drinking while you drive. I think that we have no excuse whatever, for taking one for the road and then getting out and letting alcohol and nature take its course. And then I think there's a place where the teacher can come in, and I think the curriculum could have in the senior mathematical classes studies that would advance mathematics and advance the understanding of the principle

April 4, 1961

behind this, because here you have a moving body and you have a problem of mass times velocity, that adds up to power. I think it would strengthen your mathematics course and it would give meaning to your driver's course.

You see, when you get to be my age and go back to school, you learn a lot of things that escaped you when you were a little younger. And when you take classes in education now, and the philosophy of education, you can see the difference between mere training and education. Horses can be trained and monkeys can be trained and dogs can be trained, but only humans can be trained to think and to see through problems of theory. And that, Mr. Speaker, is the difference between training and education. Education has to do with understanding the principle behind the training, and here I think you could take your mathematics classes and give them added meaning by working out these problems of mass and velocity and speed and the proper distance of at which to brake at certain speeds. I think that these students would welcome this opportunity to give sense and meaning to the problem under discussion.

Then when you come to the twenty-five year group there is one thing the hon. Member missed. I don't know whether this was his natural modesty or whether he had overlooked this, but the hon. Member for Humboldt will appreciate this, she and I are very happy to know that when they come to this twenty-five year group some insurance companies give a discount for the female of the species, because women have a better driving record and they get a better rate than the young males of that age. And I think that we need not apologize for that; I think it's perfectly natural that the female of the species is more sensitive to the needs of the young. After all, it's her responsibility to see that the young grow up. And I think that we should just recognize that women do have some sense and some judgment, and even insurance companies pay them off in better rates in some respects.

In closing I merely wish to say that I think this is a good program, but let's not mutilate the school hours any more. I'm glad that we've undertaken to take the laggards to task and make them work for a change. I'm all for it. But if we so disrupt the work-week that nobody takes it seriously because of all the activities outside the school room, then you have an impossible attitude to combat and you get a perfectly natural result in poor grades.

When I went back to university three or four years ago, I was shocked to have the Dean stand up the first morning and say, "I don't know who it'll be, but only one out of three in this room will be here next year, two of you are going to fail." That's a dreadful waste and it's a shocking thing to be able to predict. I think it's time we became very serious about the function of the school, because it costs so much. We're all appalled at the way we have to tax ourselves to support education. And as the Member said yesterday, the Member from Moosomin, the forecast is that this is going to be sharply increased as the increase in school population goes up.

I intend to support the resolution, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Arthur Thibault (Kinistino):

Mr. Speaker, in answer to some of the things that were said in connection with this resolution, first of all, to say that ladies have a better record, and I believe they have, if all the men take the attitude that I have, when I meet a lady on the road I get a little closer to the shoulder.

Mr. McDonald: — Whose shoulder?

Mr. Thibault: — That's up to you to figure out. I think when we brought the resolution in it was very broad and it was to stimulate interest in driver training, more than trying to say whether it should be brought into the schools or not.

I think the Department of Highways and the Highway Safety Council will use a lot of discretion in how to proceed with this program. And I don't think that we need to fear any disruption of our school program in regard to stimulation in driver training.

That is all that I've got to say at this time, outside of that when we started to drive cars we started in shallow water and then got into the deep because we had the old model T Ford, the rough roads, and we grew up with the cars. But today, we take the youngsters right out in the middle and dump him right in the deep water and say "Swim boy, do the best you can." And that's the trouble that we're faced with today. If we started training a little earlier and if the youngsters knew traffic rules before they even get behind the wheel, it would go a long way toward making our roads a safer

April 4, 1961

place on which to drive.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I will support the resolution.

Mr. A.C. Cameron (Maple Creek):

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question if I may, I don't know where else to ask it, but I would like to ask who draws up the questions that are asked in these driver examinations? I'm thinking of one being impractical. I saw one the other day where we are attempting now to have all bus drivers take a physical check-up and a written examination. One question was brought to my attention, "When do you fill the bus with gas?" And the only answer acceptable was, "When the children are in the class room." Everything else was wrong, before you load up in the morning, before you put the bus away for the evening was wrong. The only right answer was, "When the children are in the class room." Now if that's the type of examinations we are getting for these bus drivers, something should be looked into.

Mr. Speaker: — Is this question posed to the Member who has just spoken?

Mr. Cameron: — Well to someone who could answer it because I didn't know where to raise it.

Mr. Dewhurst: — I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that question could be posed in estimates.

The question being put, it was agreed to.

INDIAN AFFAIRS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Johnson regarding Indian Affairs.

Mr. W.J. Berezowsky: — Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to take up too much time of the Legislature today, but first of all I would like to congratulate the hon. Member who moved the motion when he outlined the history of the native people of this province and this country. And I would just like to point out to this House that these people referred to as the Indians of North America and South America have

made a tremendous contribution to civilization in many ways. I would like to also point out that if we have underprivileged people in this part of the continent, the reason is the fact that the people here live under a severe climate, and in the continents of the world where the people are removed from the warmer parts, we find that they have similar problems of building up, say, a more progressive culture and civilization. And so we find that in Saskatchewan the people that were here as the aborigines or the first people were in the main nomads, and according to the various investigations that have been made, we find that the various tribes that we have here were not domiciled in any one part of the province but moved from one part to the other as the hon. Member has pointed out.

The thing we are dealing with is this: we have some 23,000 or more native people in the province of Saskatchewan, and it's very necessary that they become integrated into our society. And the purpose of this motion is to try to speed up the process. I can't help but refer to what is printed in the paper, in today's issue Tuesday, April 4th. It is said here that the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Ross Thatcher said Monday, he had been informed by Government Departments that some school board in Saskatchewan will not accept Indian students in that school. This is one of the problems that we have to face in this province. Now, I don't think — I don't know if this is true or not, I can't doubt the veracity of the hon. Leader of the Opposition that this could possibly be so. And the problem that we face in this province is to see that things of that nature do not happen. Now I could ask myself a question, — if they do, why do they happen? And immediately you get the response that actually this Government in this province hasn't got complete jurisdiction over the education, social welfare and over the public health of the native people. We all know, it doesn't have to be repeated, that these people are still considered as wards of the Federal Government, and until such time as we can have some kind of an arrangement or some kind of an agreement under which this Government will be able to assume the responsibility for services such as I've mentioned and for education, and until that time we cannot help but face situations such as the hon. Leader of the Opposition mentioned. In other words, Mr. Speaker, the way I see it, it's a problem which is two-fold; in one sense it's social and in the other sense it's economic. I think if we can solve the social problem

April 4, 1961

of the natives of this province and the economic problems of the natives of this province, then we will find that most of our difficulties will be removed.

Now, referring to the social problem insofar as it effects the native people, and which we would like to solve, we must remember that the native people who have resided in this continent since the glacial age, 10,000 or 20,000 years ago, have developed their own culture, and what we have tried to do in this country is to superimpose our own culture, our own civilization onto that of the natives. And that is of course very, very difficult. It's always very difficult it doesn't matter whether it's in Africa, whether it's in New Zealand or any other place or country, you'll find that that is a very difficult thing to do particularly if these people are on reserves or on, any tracts of land where they are isolated and living amongst themselves, it's next to impossible to solve that problem. And the only way you could solve that problem, the cultural or the social problem, is to try to get those people to mix, to move around the country and mix with other people and adopt a different attitude toward living. And it must be started in childhood. If we look at it more closely, we'll find today, that these same people in Saskatchewan and in Canada, when they find they're disappointed or they are mistreated or looked down upon, they retreat back to their reserves. And I've had a number of incidents where I've talked to these people, and they go back on their reserves because they feel that's the only place they have which they can call home. The idea I think is to try to get them to move more within our society and take jobs and mix with the rest of the population, and in that way we might get integration. But they cannot move away, Mr. Speaker, because of the economic situation. Today when a native leaves the reserve he's not prepared to take on a job such as an ordinary citizen would be able to get in the province of Saskatchewan.

I think that if you look at the records, and I think that the hon. Member who moved the motion pointed out, that only a few of them have the necessary educational qualifications, and I know that from experience. I know that only a few years ago there were very very few, if any, that left the northern reserves where I lived, and were able to go into the cities and into the towns and take on jobs that required, say the minimum of schooling which I consider is a public school education. Today it is somewhat better. Today we have some taking grade nine, grade ten, and of course we get more of them moving into the various areas. But it seems to me that economics is even more important than the other,

and we must do something about it. And until such a time as this Government or the governments of the provinces of Canada can make some arrangement with the Federal Government to be able to look after the social welfare of these people, to provide them with jobs, to look after their education, I think until that time, we will have considerable difficulty in getting the integration that we hope to see.

There has been much research made in different parts of Canada and Saskatchewan. I have here a report; I'm not going to refer to it very much; it was made when an investigation was made in Manitoba of social economic study; you see the same thing through all of it. And there is a theme through it all, unemployment, Mr. Speaker, and poverty, and to that I will add, as I have already said, the lack of education. I think that most of the anthropologists and most of the people that have studied the way of life and the difficulties that these native people, who are fine people and proud people, the only way that their problems can be solved is to see that we can give them these things, that is education, and see that they get employment and see if we can remove them from poverty.

Now, I do not wish to belittle what is being done by the Federal Government insofar as the reservations are concerned. I know they have programs of housing and they have other programs. But the thing that I ask myself is this: to be so far removed and with the perspective that the people in the Department of Indian Affairs have, are they looking far enough ahead? For example, you take a look at the housing, and as I said I'm not belittling what they are doing as far as housing is concerned, but it appears that they feel that a two room house is sufficient, whereas if we go into our ordinary communities, even on the fringe of settlement, we have a certain amount of poverty. No one would say that a two roomed house is sufficient, that people may live in such houses. The people are striving to see that they have modern homes. So when we see this kind of housing going on on the reserves, I can't help but wonder. If we set our eyes far enough ahead, is it enough just to build an ordinary little house, couldn't we encourage these people to put up better homes? Maybe again it's not possible because of the infants that they have, and the incomes, as it has been pointed, are very low. In Saskatchewan I believe it's somewhere around \$200 and some odd dollars per capita per year.

April 4, 1961

Now I'm quite proud of what this Government has done in the past. They've given the natives the vote and a certain amount of equal rights. They can now move around. But we have so much more that we can do, and we can't do it unless we can get the Dominion Government to agree to this request, and that is, that we enter into some kind of an arrangement where we can have integrated schools.

Now, Mr. Speaker, throughout most of the north we have that situation. If you do down to Montreal Lake you'll find that the so-called white children and the native children go to one school. And as a result, we are getting people that are growing up together and they are going out into the world and taking on jobs, and competing with one another, and one group is just as smart as the other. They are getting more or less an equal chance and they are getting the kind of thing we want to see. We find that in La Ronge, I'm sure the hon. Member from Athabasca will agree, that there is tremendous progress being made there, and we are getting that in Cumberland House. I have not heard in any of those places of the charges that were made yesterday by the hon. Leader of the Opposition. As a matter of fact this was a shock to me; I don't know where this could happen. Certainly it's not happening in the north. But if this is happening, then let's do the same thing in the rest of the province. Let's go down to Pelly for example — and I understand that they are making progress there now. Let's go down to these reserves at Pelly and different other places and let's get these integrated schools, let the children go all to the same school and let them grow up together. Let them grow up as Canadian citizens, and that is one thing that is going to help us solve this problem.

But we must not forget, that in many of these reserves — and I could refer to some of the reports here — the per capita acreage that these people hold of some of the poorest land in Saskatchewan, is as low as thirty-three acres, and therefore, we must recognize that it's not just a matter of education, it's a matter of seeing that these people get jobs and get employment. And when we go into the north and when you see the multiplying population, we must recognize that trapping and fishing are not sufficient. Again, it is necessary to see that we do something about getting employment for these people, and I think this Government can do quite a bit. I think we can. I think that we can help, first of all, as we have been doing the last year, in bringing a lot of these students in to train particularly in certain vocations,

whether it's for girls — hairdressing or nurses aids, or boys for welding, whatever it may be, we can prepare many of these students off the reserves, the native Indian people, so they will be able to take jobs in competition with the other people of the province of Saskatchewan and of Canada.

By doing those things, Mr. Speaker, I think we will solve this, if these children can go to school with our own children, if these young people can go ahead and train at vocational schools for higher education, if they can go out and mix and be regarded as first-class Canadians, not as second-class Canadians, then of course we will have, I'm quite sure, solved in the main the cultural and social problems that I have mentioned. They will be socially accepted. And I know what I'm talking of, because I know a number of Indian families who, because of education, because they have good jobs and a fair income, are accepted and no one ever thinks of them as being underprivileged natives off a reserve, yet originally they did come from reserves. So it isn't a matter of, say, difference in origin, or anything like that, it's a matter as I have said, of these rights which they should have and haven't yet.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think we should all be concerned, whether we are, say, members of municipal councils or Members of the Provincial Legislature, or members of Federal Government, we should all be concerned with seeing that these people are given every opportunity and that they may go forward one step more. We've done a great deal, as I have said. They now have just about equal rights, as a matter of fact they have equal rights, but they still haven't got that one right which other children have, and that is the opportunity to go to integrated schools to get the kind of education and opportunities that the rest of us have.

I therefore will support the motion, Mr. Speaker.

Mrs. Gladys Strum (Saskatoon City):

Mr. Speaker, I wish to support the previous speaker and the Member for Athabasca, for two reasons. I think this resolution is exceptionally well drawn, and I think it points out the weakness that has cursed our administration since the time the first Indian signed the first treaty.

I was in the Federal House when the Indian Act was up for revision, and I was amazed to find

April 4, 1961

that there are not only two or three treaties, there are dozens of treaties having dozens of different provisions, and there are many Indian tribes that have no treaties. So that you have here a very very difficult constitutional problem when you try to mete out justice to the native people.

Then the other thing that became very clear to me as we went on with the Indian Act and debated it clause by clause, was this: while these native people were undoubtedly citizens of Canada, they were not citizens of the provinces where they happened to live. They were wards, they were minors, they were children. And while the province could go from one reform to another, it did not touch these people because they were not citizens of the province where they happened to reside. And so, had I drafted this myself, I couldn't have expressed better my sentiments about what the difficulty is. It's the constitutional difficulty rooted in the treaties whereby the Indian agreed to go on the reserves and become dependent people.

And then later on I had the privilege of teaching at Uranium City, and there we have the county system. It's the only place in Saskatchewan where you have a full county system, and the Indian is completely integrated. I was principal of a nine room school there, and every month we had to make out two sheets of attendance; we had the Indian attendance roles which went to the Federal Government, and the Federal Government paid the local authority so much per day for every Indian child, and this was conditioned on attendance, which I think is only fair. This seemed to me to be the most sensible thing, and to me, the only way that you can get at this thing, to give to the local authority the money which is the responsibility of the Federal Government, and then to say to this local authority, you see that these people get the same instruction that every other child in this community has a right to, because these are Canadians and they have the same rights as any other Canadian.

You know I have here in my hand the charter of the United Nations, which I intended to use on a different debate this morning, which didn't come off. But it's just as applicable to this particular thing.

To me this is awfully important. "We reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women." And underline this, gentlemen in this House,

of men and women, and of nations large and small. And it goes on to say that in the first paragraph of the United Nations charter, that the dignity of the human being is the corner stone. And yet we have robbed our own people of dignity because we have said you are still not grown up, and you are still not able to take advantage of the things that white men take as a matter of right and a matter of course.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that no young person in the world today can be self-respecting, unless he can be self-supporting, and this implies independence, and this implies competence. And this means that you must have a field of employment, you must have a skill for which society is willing to pay. And you can't have that, Mr. Speaker, unless you have the same chance at the first level, the chance in the schools, the chance in the community. You must be able to hold up your head with everyone else and command respect, and not be the last man hired because there's no one else. And that's just about what the position of the native is today. If there's nobody else, and you can't get anybody else, and there's a native then you would give him a job. Well that's not good enough in today's world.

We talk about trying to give leadership to the colored nations, and I think we have a record there that could give leadership, but if they ask us what have you done to your native people, then we must hide our heads in shame. We have not equipped them to live in today's world even in this province. And, Mr. Speaker, I see this resolution as the first step toward remedying that defect. If we could negotiate with the Government of Canada the financial arrangement which will permit the province to make services enjoyed by all the people of Saskatchewan available to Indians, and to undertake such specialized educational and developmental and economic programs as would be required by reason of the special needs and problems of Indian communities, if we were to do that, then we would open the door to full participation and full citizenship, and we could have then cleared the way so that we could go to the United Nations and say, we have no blot on our constitution, we have upheld the dignity of the human person, the dignity and worth of the human person in the equal rights of men and women, of all degrees of citizenship in our province and in our country, because the Indian still feels the same as any person feels, when robbed of dignity.

April 4, 1961

When we say to this person you are not as good as someone else because of a defect that he cannot remedy, you place him in an impossible position. You see, if a person is ignorant he can be educated, if he is wrong he can be corrected, but if you are going to put the stigma on the basis of skin color, Mr. Speaker, there isn't a thing he can do about it. If you are going to put it on the basis of origin, that is the most unjust, unscientific and antiquated basis for judgment. And so we must bring this thing up to our standards of decency, our standards of citizenship that we know are right, and because it is the right thing to do and the moral thing to do, and the just thing to do, let's proceed as fast as possible to put this resolution into effect.

Mr. Allan R. Guy (Athabasca):

Mr. Speaker, I would like first of all to commend the Member from Kindersley for bringing in this motion concerning our Indian friends, particularly in view of the fact that he has no Indians in his constituency. Also, I'd like to pass on the same regards to the Member from Cumberland.

Now, we do not always agree on many things, but I believe that the Member from Cumberland and myself do quite often agree on the problems of our Indian people. Now I don't profess to be nearly as eloquent as the last speaker we heard on this motion, but I would like to point out a few things concerning it as we go along.

After sixteen years of socialism and more abundant policies of this Government have certainly not been passed on to the Saskatchewan Indian. I was pleased to see that all the talk in the last while about apartheid and so on has finally pricked the conscience of the people on the side opposite, and that this pricking along with the repeated urging from this side of the House finally brought a murmur from the Government and the further hope that they are now going to carry out some of the promises that they have repeatedly made from the hustings.

We are all concerned about the problems which face our Indian people, and we admit that past policies have not always been desirable or successful in alleviating these problems. But I feel that the Member from Kindersley was unkind and unfair the other day when he stated that the churches were only interested in saving souls from the clutches of other churches. Now at a time

when no other organization showed any concern about the Indian people, I think we do realize that the churches were doing something. First all, they Christianized the Indians. They started schools for them. They saw that they had food and clothing, and they did administer to them when they were sick. In fact, at the time when the white man was too busy settling the western prairies, it was the Church and only the Church that did a great deal to show the Indian that they must go along and accept the treaties as they were being made out for them. I think that if you were to look through the lists of the treaties that were drawn up between Her Majesty Queen Victoria and the Indians of British North America, you will find throughout the signatures of ministers and priests that have had a great deal to do with that phase of our history. So I was very sorry that the Member from Kindersley had such a lack of regard to the contributions made by the churches at that time.

I was also disappointed with the statement made, that all Japan's handicrafts are rubbish, especially at a time when we are looking toward Japan as a major purchaser of our surplus wheat.

Now I've stated for some time that the affairs of our Indians would appear to be better served if they had closer communication with the government controlling these affairs. And one possibility that comes to mind, of course, that would improve the communication would be if the province had complete administration of Indian affairs, and that is what, I believe, this resolution is asking for. At the present time there is no doubt some disagreement among the provinces, among the Indian people of the Indian Affairs Department and the Indians themselves, concerning the feasibility of such a move. But I think that the time has come when such a move should at least be given some consideration.

Now, I'm glad though that this motion includes a protective clause that a request must be made by the province, and also, that a majority of the treaty Indians must be received. Now it is very important that the treaty Indians themselves must be in favour of such a move. We have done too much in the past of telling them what would be best for them and what should be done, instead of asking them what they want. And this protective clause must be in there in order to protect the wishes of these people.

Now the motion goes on to request the Government of Saskatchewan to give consideration to negotiating with

April 4, 1961

the Government of Canada the financial arrangements which will permit the province to carry out its own education development or economic program for Indian communities. Now since the Federal and Provincial negotiations are being carried on at present in regard to the building of schools, the building of hospitals and the building of roads across the reserves, I am not quite sure how this section of the resolution should be interpreted. I'm afraid that I cannot agree with the lady Member from Saskatoon, that this was drafted in the best terms, since it does not show clearly the intent of the resolution in this regard. Now, if the motion means that the province should have complete administrative control, but the Federal Government should accept the financial responsibility, well then I cannot agree with it. I don't believe that any government should be able to spend unlimited sums of money without having some responsibility for the raising of such money, and particularly this Government who sits across from us who have the record of spending money like soldiers on a spree. If this is the intent of this motion, I would not blame the Federal Government if they give no recognition to the resolution. If, however, this motion when asking for complete administrative control, also accepts the main responsibility for financing the programs which have been suggested, with the aid of federal grants as the Federal Government sees fit, then that would be a different situation. And since this intent is not clear, I am afraid that this resolution will lose most of its effect. The Federal Government will not accept a resolution whereby they are going to give over full control if they'll accept the responsibility of financing the program, and if it's the other way, well then I think there will be some concern among the provinces as to where the money will come for this added responsibility. There is no doubt that before this resolution can be acted upon the Government of Canada will have to give considerable thought to the terms of the Indian Act, the Indian treaties, and the Constitution, to see how they will be effected. So it would appear that the hope for early action is remote. And since we feel that it is extremely urgent that the problems of the Indian should receive continuous attention, I would like to move an amendment to the resolution. This is seconded by Mr. Barrie, "that the following words be added to the resolution:

But until such time as this legislation and these negotiations can be completed, that the Provincial Government make a greater effort, within their jurisdiction, to provide equal services to these Indian communities."

Mr. Speaker: — It would appear to me that we have a repetition here of the old story of federal and provincial responsibility. However, in the original motion, it does mention, that you are urging the Government to enact legislation which will make it possible for the province to assume complete administration of Indian Affairs. The assumption by the province of complete administration of Indian Affairs is part of the original resolution, and the resolution itself also requests the Government of Saskatchewan to give consideration to negotiating with the Government of Canada. The Provincial Government, I do believe, is already involved in the resolution, and I think it would be quite in order to admit this amendment in regard to that resolution. I would so rule.

Mr. J.R. Barrie (Pelly):

Mr. Speaker, in connection with the Indian problem, and it is a great problem we have in the province, I would like to suggest that in different parts of the province, the problem is somewhat varied. What applies in the northern part of the province, such as in the Constituency represented by the Member for Cumberland, and the Member for Athabasca, the conditions are somewhat different to what they are in the southern and central part of the province, in connection with Indian Reserves. Insofar as the motion is concerned, I believe there is some merit in the matter of having the administration of the affairs of our Indian people brought closer in touch with them. I know this is one of the complaints they have. The main administration is centred in Ottawa, two thousand miles away. Indians feel that this distance, that the communications between them, such as has been mentioned by the Member for Athabasca, is one of their problems. On the other hand this is a matter that deals with constitutional rights of these people — the treaty rights of these people. I doubt if the Federal Government can, even if they chose, hand these particular responsibilities on to the province. This is something our Indian friends guard very jealously, and they feel that insofar as their treaties are concerned there has been in some cases and some instances certain deviations from the original treaties. They are disappointed in that particular regard, and they are always suspicious of every move made by Federal, Provincial or Municipal authorities that deters from the advantages they have under their treaties.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I hate to interrupt in this manner, but if we are to follow the ruling that a Member speaking to an amendment will again have the opportunity to speak in

April 4, 1961

the debate after the amendment is carried or lost, it makes it very difficult to enforce that ruling if the Member does not stick quite closely to the amendment when he is speaking to the amendment. You have to, I realize, discuss both in making comparisons and so on, but if the Member will endeavour to stick as close to the amendment as possible, then it will leave me free to allow the Member to speak again in the debate later on, if he so wishes.

Mr. Barrie: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will deal with the amendment. Now, insofar as the amendment is concerned, I will try to keep very close to it, I would say that the Provincial Government has had an opportunity in the past of doing considerable to assist Indian populations. I submit, Mr. Speaker, they have not done so, because they have on many instances deprived the Indian of certain trapping and hunting rights that they have had over the years. This particularly applies to those Indians who live in my Constituency. Formerly the Indians had rights on Crown Land, such as the Duck Mountain forest Reserve, and the Porcupine Forest Reserve, to go in and trap and hunt. But, in the last fifteen or sixteen years there have been certain trapping areas set-up and handed out to white people, and white trappers. The Indians, in fact, have practically been eliminated from having any particular area or district to trap in. These were the hunting grounds and the trapping areas that were used, and part of the maintenance of these people in using this particular area for many, many generations. These have been eliminated by actions of the Provincial Government.

Another matter in this connection is one I have a certain responsibility for, probably more so than many of the Members in the House. We have given the Indians the right to buy liquor, the same as other people. I was one of the people who recommended that, suggested it and supported it, feeling it would be something which would possibly eliminate one of the greatest problems our Indian population have. I regret very much today to say my mind in that particular regard has changed. We find one of the greatest problems that exist today, in connection with the Indian population, is the problem they have with the consumption of alcohol. Insofar as enforcement of the law and this particular matter of supplying liquor and the conduct of the Indians following use of liquor, is something that is the responsibility of the Provincial Government. I know many communities within the province, particularly the town of Kamsack in my Constituency, have a very serious problem, and it

is costing the people of these particular communities a very sizeable sum in trying to enforce law and order. Even with added numbers on the police force, they still have a problem and they don't know what to do. This is something I think should be looked at again, in view of what has happened since these people were handed the privilege of purchasing liquor the same as you or I, or anyone else.

Then, there is another matter, Mr. Speaker, that strikes me in connection with this amendment. That is, of course it has something to do with the resolution too, the responsibility of the Metis people in the province has been a provincial one over the years. While the Indians have social, cultural and economic problems, the Metis people also have the same problems. I just wonder, in view of the results that have been obtained by the province in handling the Metis problem, whether they shouldn't concentrate our efforts in that particular responsibility first, before they try to take over the Indian problem in addition to the one they already have.

My experience and my knowledge of the Metis problem in the province is one which I don't think the Government, or we people in the province, can be too proud of. I think possibly if we could solve that first, particularly the economic problems of the Metis, then we would be in a position to go forward and say we were prepared to take over the Indian problems, and have some success with it.

So, I say that insofar as the amendment to the resolution is concerned, I think the province, the provincial authorities, could do much now, even without the main point brought out in the resolution, to alleviate some of the problems that are existent in connection with our native population, not only the Indians but also with our Metis people. I, Mr. Speaker, will support the amendment.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I would like to bring a small matter to the attention of the Assembly in regard to this amendment. It is very necessary that these resolutions, when finally passed, are completely in order. It would appear that in this amendment that has been added to this resolution is a complete clause but there is no verb, "and up until such time as this legislation and these negotiations can be completed, that the Provincial Government make a greater effort within their jurisdiction to provide equal

April 4, 1961

services to these Indian communities.” I think it would make better sense if it were worded “but until such time as this legislation and these negotiations can be completed, urges the Provincial Government to make a greater effort within their jurisdiction to provide equal services to these Indian communities.” With my authority as Speaker, I think it is in order that I make that change at this time.

It doesn't change the resolution in any way, but I think it will make better sense if the resolution is passed.

Hon. A.G. Kuziak (Minister of Natural Resources):

Mr. Speaker, I wasn't intending to take part in this debate but since the Opposition always, I don't know why — not matter what resolution is presented by any of the Members of this side of the House, they always have to bring politics in. I believe that this resolution, as it stands, certainly shows that the Provincial Government is prepared to co-operate with the Federal Government in the program of integrating the Indians, not only in the south part, but also in northern Saskatchewan. I am going to say something, particularly in connection with the Indians and the Metis people of northern Saskatchewan and some of the things that this Government has already done in the past for the Indians of the north.

Mr. Klein: — Are you going to confine him to the resolution or to the amendment.

Mr. Speaker: — I would think that the hon. Member would endeavour to discuss the amendment as much as possible. I do realize that you sometimes must compare the two, but I would ask you to . . .

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — Mr. Speaker, I haven't got the amendment before me, but it looks as if their aim is to make sure that the Provincial Government is prepared to go along with the Federal Government to make its rightful contribution, and then again to participate prior to the time that the agreement is made. I want to argue that we are today already participating and have been participating in the past in aiding the Indian situation in northern Saskatchewan.

The arguments that were used by the Opposition and the arguments that were used by the hon. Member for Pelly was that we have not done anything in the past in

aiding the Indians of Saskatchewan, and I would like just to point out some of the things that we have done, particularly in northern Saskatchewan. One of the things is the building of the roads into the north to make access to the Indian villages of northern Saskatchewan, and I'll only take one example — the building of the road — from Buffalo Narrows to La Loche. Certainly we are not building that road and spending thousands of dollars to develop any particular resource there, but bringing access to the Indian village. A good portion of the people residing at La Loche are Indian people. Therefore, we are directly spending thousands of dollars to aid Indians who are actually the responsibility of the Federal Government. We are planning another road, for example into Jans Lake, off the Hansen Lake road to the Deschambault and the Pelican Narrows area. In the Pelican Narrows area, I believe, 95% of the natives residing there are Treaty Indians, and there, over the past few years, we have contributed considerably to the building of fish filleting plants in order to aid these people of that particular area. Throughout the whole of the north we have too, spent money on establishing power plants, co-operative power.

The hon. Member for Pelly was critical that we have placed certain restrictions in the way of fishing, trapping and hunting for the Indians of Saskatchewan, and, of course, those of the north. I've got to agree here, that sure we have brought about certain conservation policies to make sure that their fishing, trapping and hunting would actually increase over a term of years. I would like to say something about some of the protection that we have given the natives of the north of Saskatchewan, the Indians and the Metis for example in fishing, where we have set quotas on the lakes. We have set the number of fishermen that are carrying on the commercial fishing operation of northern Saskatchewan, and we are protecting this area for the Indians and the Metis of the north. Instead of doing probably similar to Alberta, where in an area very similar to ours, they have 300 or 400 white fishermen from Edmonton or Calgary, and they actually take the fish out and tell the natives of the area to go catch jack rabbits in the bush. Therefore, my point is, that this Government has done a lot in improving the standard of living of the Indian people of Saskatchewan, and the way the resolution is worded here — we have co-operated with the Federal Government in past. We will co-operate with the Federal Government in the future.

April 4, 1961

Hon. Mr. Lloyd (Provincial Treasurer):

Mr. Speaker, I am only going to add a word or two to what has been said in regard to the amendment. I am not rising to oppose the amendment, as I think, as the Minister of Natural Resources has already pointed out, it is in effect Government policy. There would be no reason on the part of the Government to reject the suggestion.

I do want to add however, that the amendment is capable of very wide interpretation. I would hope that members of the Legislature would not expect us to carry it to its fullest implications. It says, that the Provincial Government make a greater effort to provide equal services to these Indian communities. Now, the problem would be, of course, that if we were going to immediately embark on a program of this kind, having in mind that the Federal Government does have certain responsibilities, and perhaps might be relieved of those as the province moved in, this conceivably could put us in a less favourable position when you get down to specific negotiations.

We have had some experience with this over the years, in entering into arrangements with the Federal Government when the arrangement starts as from where the program is at that particular moment, and the program in one province is sometimes much further advanced than in another province. The province which has gone ahead has in effect been penalized because of certain chances that have been taken. I would hope that the Legislature wouldn't interpret this then, in the widest possible sense.

As I say it has been Government policy, as the Minister of Natural Resources has just outlined with regard to the number of the services. I could make some comment with regard to what the Provincial Government has attempted to do by way of getting more co-ordinated and co-operative effort in the field of education. This has been touched on previously, probably all we need now is to remind ourselves that there has been, for many years, this attempt to get joint action developed. And we have been meeting in recent years, with considerable success, and we hope it will continue.

This is true in regard to some fields of health as well. Speaking at an earlier occasion, it was pointed out in this Legislature that the Provincial Government is

negotiating with the Federal Government with regard to such developments as bringing power to reservations, and bringing grid road systems into the various reservations as well.

Briefly, all I want to say in regard to the amendment, is that it is in effect Government policy, and I can see no reason why we should reject the amendment, or attempt to reject it. I would simply ask, however, that we have to be at least reasonable in our interpretation, as to the extent that the Provincial Government can be expected to take over services for which the Federal Government does have constitutional and financial responsibility at this particular time.

I would like to make only one comment on the remarks of the Member from Pelly in which he suggested that it might be better for us to first of all solve the problem of the Metis, and then proceed to solve the problem of the Indian. I suggest, that one of the problems is that there has been too much of this trying to departmentalize people. It is impossible to solve the problem of the Metis, so long as the problem of the Indian is in general not solved along with it. The only way this problem is going to be attacked is if we solve the problem of the Metis, of the Indian, and of the white man as well. Let's not leave him out of the picture because a lot of our work has to be done with the white people.

Mr. Frank Meakes (Touchwood):

Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time just to answer one remark that was made by the hon. Member for Pelly on which the Provincial Treasurer just remarked too, and this was the provincial record in solving the Metis problem. I understood him to say, that until this Government had solved this problem we should not go ahead and try to solve the Indian problem. I agree with what the Provincial Treasurer has said. Really the Indian problem and the Metis problem are very closely related. I think that this Government to quite an extent has solved the Metis problem. I realize not completely, but they certainly have gone a long way towards better conditions for these people. I am now thinking in terms of the Metis people of my own community of Lestock.

I want to say at the beginning that it was not only the Government — it was the Government with the assistance and the co-operation of the local parish priest and the different junior priests in the Lestock area, and with a good many citizens of the community. I can

April 4, 1961

well remember, Mr. Speaker, when we had our (what we used to call) little Chicago — four and one-half miles from Lestock — where there were about twenty-five families living on the road allowance, where these children weren't going to school. I can remember an Indian telling me how he had been the best man at a wedding in little Chicago and he said "I was the only one of the four that could sign my name, or sign the wedding certificate." Neither the bridegroom, nor the bride, nor the bridesmaid — none of them could sign their name. At this time these people lived in absolute hovels, and through the work of this Government and of men like Father Blanchard, who worked with us for a while and Father Reilly, Father MacGrath, and Father Kines and Father Furkola, I think we have gone a long way in improving the conditions of the Metis people within that area.

I could not allow the remark if the hon. Member to go by without challenging it. I am ready to admit that we haven't solved all of the problems, but that little co-operative farm on the edge of Lestock, where really it is only a housing project has done a lot of good. From that little farm, those families have moved on to it, their children have been able to get their education in Lestock. Here we have some integration with the Indian problem too. I know that often when I walk down the streets of the city of Regina I see quite a number of these same Lestock Metis people, who have been educated and are now self-supported in this city because of the policies of this Government and of the assistance of the people I have already mentioned.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I rise mainly for the purpose of saying something with reference to the remarks of the Member for Pelly in connection with liquor for Indians. I agree with him that this has created a problem, and more of a problem in some areas than in others. I am not prepared to agree with him that we made a mistake in doing it. I think all of the Members of the Legislature were unanimous in the decision to give to the Indians the same rights to purchase liquor as are enjoyed by other citizens of the province.

I think some of us approached this problem with some misgivings, and we recognized there would be problems, and there have been. We have been keeping very careful watch on the situation in some districts where there was considerable difficulty at first. This seems to be levelling off. In other districts, it is more pronounced, and we're having to keep a very close watch on the situation.

I rose purely for the purpose of asking both the Members of the Legislature and the people of the province to have a good deal of patience in respect of this matter. You can't have people who have been treated as second-class citizens, who have been denied the right to get liquor, except from bootleggers, who have been treated more or less as children, as wards of the Government of Canada, and give them rights and expect them not to abuse those rights. We are all Canadians and we must accept responsibility for what Canada does as a whole. After all, many white people who have had these rights for as long as we can remember, abuse them. You can't expect people who are suddenly given a new power and a new responsibility to accept it with the same degree of understanding and maturity as we would exercise ourselves.

As a matter of fact, in many of the areas, I have been surprised by the degree of maturity which they have shown. Members will be glad to know that the executive of the Saskatchewan Federation of Indians, have gone from reserve to reserve. I saw the schedule. I haven't the figures before me at the moment, but if my memory serves me right, I think it was either nineteen or twenty meetings which they held in various parts of the province, where they spent an entire day. They called in all the Indians of the district, and put before the Indians themselves the complaints which they had received from the police, from the liquor licensing commission, and from various authorities. They said: "Now here is a right which has been given to you by the Legislature of Saskatchewan, and if you abuse this, it is inevitable that it will be taken away, or it will be modified." They tell me that they were most gratified at the response which they received. Many of the Indians, said, "We've got to handle this thing more carefully; we've got to discipline our own people." The report I get from the liquor licensing commission, who in turn get their report from the hotel keepers, would indicate that in a great many places the situation has improved. There are still some trouble spots that we're having to watch very carefully, but I think the situation has improved considerably.

It may be that we will come to a place where some modification will be necessary. I think the problem of the conduct of these people in the beverage rooms and in the beer parlours is improving and will eventually take care of itself. I think the real problem we'll have will be the sale of liquor for off-premises consumption. As hon. Members know, a number of the bands have

April 4, 1961

already taken a referendum and have asked the Government of Canada to pass the necessary order-in-council, allowing liquor to come onto the reserve. Where that is done they will be in exactly the same position as white people to buy their beer or liquor and take it to their homes. They will have the right to consume it, and they will not be allowed, any more than anyone else, to consume it any place else, except in their homes, or in a hotel room, or in a motel.

The problem will rise, and the problem this Legislature will have to face in the future is, that of the reservations in which they do not have a referendum, and do not pass a resolution asking that liquor be consumed on the reserve. We may have to consider that for those people there will be no sale for off-premises consumption, because there is little value in them being able to buy liquor if there is no place they can consume it. Most of them can't afford to go down and hire a hotel room just so they can drink their liquor there. This would raise an administrative problem. You might have three or four bands purchasing in one community, and some bands would have the right to consume on the reservation, and others wouldn't. You might have to give them some identity card or something of this sort. It may be necessary for the Legislature sometime in the future to deal with this problem, but I rose for the purpose of saying that I hope that the mere fact that there have been some difficulties will not lead us to the hasty judgment that this was a mistake. I don't think it is ever a mistake to give people the same rights as other citizens. Maybe we gave it to them too fast, and maybe we should have given it to them in stages, but I don't think it was a mistake to do it. I think that what we must do is watch the situation closely, deal pretty stringently with those who break the law, and carry on an educational program among the Indians themselves through the Saskatchewan Federation of Indians who I think have risen very well to this occasion.

The other thing we must do I think, is for the people of the province generally to have a good deal of patience, recognizing that if we have some embarrassment and if we have some problems, part of them are our own making. You can't treat people the way these people have been treated for two or three generations and then expect them over night to suddenly assume all the responsibilities and display all the maturity of other citizens.

I may want to say something about the motion later, but I think that is all I want to say about the amendment.

Mr. Speaker: — I want to apologize to the Assembly for making a slight error a few minutes ago, and I would certainly like to apologize to the Member for Pelly. I failed to note that he was seconder of this motion when I spoke to him about not speaking to both the resolution and the amendment at the same time. The seconder of the amendment does have the privilege of speaking to both the amendment and the motion at the same time, although he is thereby not able again to take part in the debate. Owing to the fact that I did check up the Member for Pelly in regard to that, I felt it would be only right in this instance, if he did wish to take part in the debate later on that we grant him that privilege. I am sorry I made that mistake for saying that he could not speak on the motion and the amendment at the same time.

The Assembly recessed at 12:30 p.m.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I was just making a few comments when you rose for the adjournment, and I just want to finish what I had to say.

I had already made some mention of the liquor problem as it affects the Indians. I want to just make a comment regarding the proposed amendment.

I have no objection to the amendment, except that I think it tends to indicate that we haven't fully caught the purport of the main motion which it seeks to amend. I think Members have to stop for a moment and consider very seriously, this whole question of the Indian. This is a question which has perturbed Canadians for generations. As Members know there have been royal commissions and there have been parliamentary committees looking at this question, and submissions have been made to such parliamentary commissions by this Government and by previous Governments. So far we haven't yet found a solution to the problem of the Indian. To merely suggest, as this amendment does, that the Provincial Government make a greater effort within their jurisdiction to provide equal services to these Indian communities seems to me to be the question. There are places where this can be done, and should be done, and I think one has to recognize the position of the Indian. They entered into a treaty

April 4, 1961

with the Federal Government. They were put on land which is virtually another country. This is land onto which the Provincial Government can't go, and on which the municipalities can't go. It is exempted from taxation, which means that the Federal Government under the constitution has assumed responsibility for their health, their welfare, and their educational services.

This hasn't worked too well. It is easy, of course, to have hind-sight and to blame the people who laid out the Indian policies fifty or more years ago. But the fact remains that at that time the Indians were thought of as being a dying race. It was a matter of looking after them during the period when they would gradually banish away. Since that time they have built up immunity against the white man's diseases. Their rate of population growth is now faster than the white population, and the Indian, let's be thankful, is here, and he is going to continue to be an important segment of the Canadian population. This means that we must now adopt a whole new policy. The reserves on which they were put are not capable of sustaining a growing population. Not only that, but isolated as they are there is very little chance of their being integrated into the community. What is even more serious is, I think, that in spite of very considerable expenditures by the Government of Canada, they have had to duplicate on the reserves services which are available all around.

I have spent a good deal of time on these reserves at different times in my life. Many of these reserves could be better developed than they are. Working around these reserves are our Ag. Reps. for instance, working in the rest of the community. They could help these people on the reserves, but they have no jurisdiction to go there, and there is no arrangement by which they could go on and help these people make better use of the reserve.

We have a duplication in school services, except for a few places in the north where we have integrated educational programs. We have duplication of health services. We have duplications of hospital facilities except again, in one or two places where we have entered into arrangements with the Government of Canada and have jointly built hospitals that both the Indians and the white people use.

The solution as set out in the motion seems to me is the ultimate solution which we must find. I don't know how soon we'll come to it, and I don't know whether the Government of Canada will accept the idea. I think

almost everyone who has studied this question, recognizes that the only way you (a) improve the lot of the Indian and (b) integrate the Indian into the Canadian community, is gradually to make available to the Indian the same services that are available to the rest of the people of the community on the same basis. This will mean eventually accepting the responsibilities of other citizens including the paying of taxes, and getting other services which are available. I say, gradually, because some of them will not want to leave the reserves. Some will want to continue the way they are. This is not the kind of thing you can force on people. It is undoubtedly true that as roads are built, and as schools and hospitals are required, that they ought to be getting the benefit of roads, the benefit of power, and be able to send their children to the same schools, and get the same social welfare benefits, the same health services as are available to other people in the community. If they do this, of course, they will also have to accept the same responsibility of paying taxes as other people do, and get the same type of training, to be available for employment, and the same employment opportunities.

The municipalities and the Provincial Government can't do this. They can't be asked on the one hand to exempt them from taxation, and on the other hand provide them with all these services. Under the constitution and under the treaties into which the Federal Government entered, they are responsible for providing these. I am not saying that they haven't done their best to provide them, but it is very difficult to supply services in little pockets, and also continue this program of segregation.

The resolution, to my mind sets out what is probably the ultimate solution. It is that the Government of Canada enter into arrangements with the provinces to get the provinces to supply these services, or the municipalities to supply these services, and pay for it. The Federal Government could over a period of twenty-five years, or some set period of time, pay for these services with a declining amount each year. At the end of a given period of time, twenty-five or fifty years, they would be completely relieved of the responsibility. The idea would be that in the meantime these people would have been integrated into the community and would have become self-supporting, and able to take their place as part of the Canadian society. This would seem to be the solution.

Therefore, while I am prepared to vote for the amendment, I don't think anyone should lose sight

April 4, 1961

of the fact that it doesn't meet the real problem. The real problem is that provincial and municipal governments must sit down with the Government of Canada around the negotiating table and work out a completely new approach to this problem. We have to keep in mind that we have a responsibility as Canadians to look after these people. We have to keep in mind that it must be assistance that will not only help them to keep body and soul together, and train them to be self-supporting citizens, but will also give them equal status in the community so that they can retain their sense of dignity and feel that they belong as part of the Canadian family.

I merely wanted to say those few words so that no one would think that in supporting the amendment, I for one, was losing sight of the major purpose of the motion, which is a long term program. I am convinced the Canadian people eventually, must adopt it if we are ever going to solve the problem on a humanitarian basis.

Mr. A.H. McDonald (Moosomin):

I think the remarks of the Premier will be well taken by most Members in the House, but I doubt that the Premier has taken the meaning out of the amendment that was actually meant by the mover and seconder and the Members on this side of the House.

The Premier has stated that in order to bring about the conditions that are suggested in the motion, this would probably take a good deal of time, and when the Premier read the amendment, he neglected to read the first two lines. "But until such time as this Legislation and these negotiations can be completed," and, of course, this is the main theme in the amendment in that we recognize that it is going to take considerable time to work out a solution to the problem as suggested in the main motion, and that until such time as this co-operation between Provincial and Federal Governments can be brought about to better the lot of the Indian and the Metis, we are asking the Provincial Government to do more than they have in the past. Now, some criticism has been levelled at the Opposition, and the statement has been made that we have said the Government are doing nothing. I don't think that statement was ever made, and if it was, I don't think the person who made it meant that we believe the Provincial Government have done nothing.

Certainly Provincial Governments down through the years have been endeavouring to help out with this problem, but the fact that they have carried out certain

programs, in our opinion, doesn't mean that they have done everything that is within their constitutional power or within their financial resources. We believe that there is more that can be done, and realizing that it is going to take years, in my opinion, to work out a solution that is acceptable to both our National Government and to all Provincial Governments in Canada, then we believe that Provincial Governments ought to give further consideration to extending provincial services to the Indian, and I might add to the Metis as well.

I can agree with the Premier when he says that this is a problem that has been with Canada since the white man took over the jurisdiction of the country. And, I am not one of those who is going to blame our forefathers for the predicament in which we find ourselves. Perhaps if we had been handling the affairs of our country at that time, we would have made the same mistakes. But it seems to me that we have now progressed to a point where we can no longer tolerate having small countries within the Dominion of Canada, and after all, an Indian Reserve, in my opinion, is a country unto itself. I personally think that it is time that we looked beyond that particular situation. But, I want to make it abundantly clear that any move that is made by Provincial and Federal Governments to solve this problem should be a full consultation, and with the full support of the Indians concerned.

No doubt, there are Indians on reservations who will live there the rest of their lives. That is where they want to live. But, I don't think it is good for the Indian or good for us to have future generations brought up and maintained in control of reserves. I think it is time that these people were given equal status with the rest of us, and I agree with the Premier that if you're going to give them equal status with the rest of the Canadians, then there are certain responsibilities which they must accept, and of course, this extending of liquor privileges to them has been a problem.

I was one of the people who sat on that commission, and one of the people who thought that the extension of liquor rights for the Indian was the right move, but it has created tremendous problems. I don't think because it has created those problems that we should now take that privilege away from the Indian. I don't think so. I doubt if the Indian's behavior is any worse than the behavior of some of the white men in the past in regard

April 4, 1961

to the abuses of liquor. What the answer to the problem is, I don't know. I am one of those who believe that we must continue to experiment with this problem; endeavour to make changes from time to time so that the Indian can be fully integrated, and he will never be fully integrated unless he has the exact same privileges, including the use of alcoholic beverages, that we have. I sincerely hope that this whole problem of settling this Indian and Metis question will not become a political issue. I hope that all the Members in the House will support the amendment, and that when the amendment is given the support of the House, that the motion can be given our whole-hearted support, because it seems to me that it is going to tax the ability of all provincial governments and our Federal Government to come up with the proper answer to bring about complete and full integration of the Indian into our population.

The question being put on the amendment, it was agreed to.

The question being put on the motion as amended, it was agreed to.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Erb:

That Bill No. 69 — An Act respecting Mentally Disordered persons — be now read the second time.

Mr. J.W. Gardiner (Melville):

Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to take any time in discussion of the Bill that is before us. On perusing the Bill, I find that most of the changes that might be necessary could be made on third reading. I think largely the purpose of the Bill has been actually a revision of the existing Statutes, as has been mentioned by the Minister, and I think possibly any of the changes that could be made, in the Act as it has been presented to us, could be discussed quite fully and with proper effect on third reading.

The question being put, it was agreed to.

....

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Kuziak:

That Bill No. 72 — An Act to amend The Northern Administration Act — be now read the second time.

Mr. Allan R. Guy (Athabasca):

Mr. Speaker, I was sorry the other day when this Bill came up for second reading that so little explanation was given by the Minister of Mineral Resources who was presenting it in place of the Minister of Natural Resources. From the explanation which was given it is difficult to see just exactly what principles were involved in this amendment to this Act.

Now, it would appear that there are two principles involved. This first is the principle of compulsory hospital insurance premiums, and since this legislation has already been passed by this Government, we must accept the principle. Prior to 1959 the residents administered by the Northern Administration Act participated in the hospital plan on a voluntary basis. However, after 1959 it became compulsory. Now, since that time the Government has had some trouble in collecting this tax and in fact last year, I believe, only 64.5% of the tax was actually collected. So it is a problem, and I sympathize with the Government when they would like to see it improved.

By this Bill they are saying that by making the residents subject to court action, that this will cure the situation. Now, I do not disagree with the theory that the people of northern Saskatchewan should be treated the same as those in the South. But, I am very doubtful that this approach of using force, is the correct approach at this time. Because if a person cannot afford to pay his tax, it is not likely that he can afford to pay his fine, with the result that if he doesn't pay his fine when taken into the courts, he will be subject to a term in jail. While he is there he cannot work, so his family now must be taken care of by social aid. So the taxpayers are going to pay for it in either case — for his stay in prison and also for the social aid which will have to be administered. If this prison term should overlap, say over the period of trapping and fishing, that social aid could continue for six months or more. Now, this would soon eat up the \$18,000 which I believe is involved as far as the collecting of this tax is concerned.

Now, I would like to quote from page 152 of the Annual Report of the D.N.R. — 1960, and it says:

April 4, 1961

“In some sections, collections have been difficult due partially to unfamiliarity with the program, and also because of the average low personal income.”

From this, it doesn't appear that there is a wilful neglect in paying this tax, but rather a lack of understanding and ability to pay. In view of this, I feel that hauling them into the law courts and seizing their personal belongings, as could be done if this Bill is passed, is not the answer at this time. Rather, instead of coercion, perhaps a little sympathy and understanding with an attempt made to explain the benefits of this plan would meet with more success. It might mean a few less actual dollars in the Treasury, but I think the good will and the confidence which would be gained would be worth far more.

Now, the second principle of this Bill, is who should be responsible for the collecting of this hospital premium. If this Bill passes the responsibility would be placed squarely on the employer, the fur buyer, or the storekeeper, who hires and handles the products of the individual who has not paid his tax. Now, this is a principle that I cannot agree with. The principle of making a private company or individual in private business responsible for collecting the hospital tax is unfair, unsound, and the worst example of bureaucracy that this Government has ever devised. It appears that the buyer would have to deduct the payment from what he owed the trapper for his fur, and it would be similar to a garnishee being placed on an employer or fur buyer in this case with the result that this tax would be collected first, notwithstanding what the trapper may owe the storekeeper or fur buyer on a previous account of this year, or probably going back over other years.

You are probably aware that the people who fish and trap and hunt have a different system of financing that we have. Almost without exception they go to a storekeeper and they get the advance for the particular period that they are going to be out on the trapline. In many cases this includes a flying bill which is substantial. The storekeeper will pay the flying bill on behalf of the airways firms with the result that the storekeeper becomes substantially involved in this trapper going to his trapline, and therefore is very interested as such in what the return of the trapper will be.

Now, we are asking, that when this trapper brings in his fur, that this storekeeper must, or be subject to court action, deduct the premium which in most cases is \$48.00 because there are families involved, before he receives anything on his account. Now, if the fur take is small and does not cover the tax and the advances that the storekeeper has made, he is faced with the problem of extending more credit in order to allow the trapper back out onto the trapline in the hope that he will recover his debt at some future date. Of course, if he refused to extend this credit, he loses a customer plus all the accounts that he owed to him.

Now, the fur buyer can't win under this sort of situation. Even though the trapper may have enough to cover the advance and the premium, because we all know that if the buyer deducts this premium of \$48.00 or whatever it is, regardless how well he tries to explain that this is the action of the Provincial Government, the fur buyer will be the man that is blamed, and because of that he will lose his customers.

Now, this could also encourage these buyers to flout the law in order to keep the customer and the account, figuring perhaps, that the \$25.00 fine involved would be the lesser of two evils. The idea of having buyers submit a list of customers is also unfeasible, for trappers shop around when they bring in their furs. They go to this store; they go to that store; they sell their fur where they get the best return, and it is not necessarily the same store from which they have had their advance. They will sell their fur and then they will go and pay the storekeeper what they owe him on their account. From this, trappers could be possibly on two or three lists, and in some cases could conceivably pay this tax two or three times, if they do not understand too well what is involved.

Summing up I would like to ask, why should individual fur buyers be forced to jeopardize their business to be the goat of this Government to collect a tax that is levied by this Government? Why should trappers face the added hardship of getting advances from a storekeeper, because the storekeeper doesn't wish to take the risk of having a poor return and being stuck with the account? Also, this is a dangerous precedent, having the Government force private businesses into doing their dirty work. If it were successful in the north it could well become a law that was followed throughout the

April 4, 1961

province. If they want this tax collected, I would suggest that they have enough Government employees going throughout the north who should be responsible for collecting this tax. In fact this could be a good job for the northern co-op manager - advisers to help justify their existence.

It would appear that should this Government wish to eradicate all private business and businessmen in the northern part of our province, that this Bill, if passed, will go a long way to doing this, with the result that the trapper and fisherman will have no alternative but to fall into the hands of the Government co-operatives. I hope that this is not the motive behind this Bill. Since there are serious principles involved, and I doubt that they will be ironed out in Committee of the Whole, I cannot support the second reading of this Bill.

Mrs. Mary Batten (Humboldt):

Mr. Speaker, I just want to add a few words to what the hon. Member has said. We were told a few years ago when it was first made known to us that there was going to be an attempt to collect hospitalization tax in the northern areas, that this would be a slow process and that these people would be taught that they have to pay for this service. We went along with the Act, somewhat unwillingly, but we realized that the cost of hospitalization was becoming very burdensome, and we could understand that people who were in a financial position to pay this tax, should carry part of the load.

I would doubt very seriously whether the financial position of these people has improved so much during the past few years that they are now willing to assume this burden, and apparently the administration feels that teeth should be put into the attempts to collect. As the hon. Member who has just spoken has pointed out, in many cases fining these people is just going to be an additional burden on the Government itself. They're going to put money in one pocket, and then have to pay out three times that amount out of the other pocket in order to support the families of these people while they are in prison. This certainly does not seem to be sound economics or good sense. The report of the Government itself shows that the delinquent accounts are not the result of malice or lack of desire to pay; they are simply the result of lack of money, or lack of knowledge. Now, that is no defence when the charge is laid against them, and I don't think that this is a fair thing at this point.

Certainly before I vote in favour of it, I would want to have some indication that people are deliberately evading payment, while they have the means with which to make this payment. But, as the hon. Member from Athabasca pointed out, there is a move vicious principle involved, and this is the principle of making the fur buyer or the fish buyer liable for the collection of this tax. This is a matter of taking a private individual doing business with these people, and saying to him, "You are going to extract tax from these people." Certainly this is not going to make him very popular. This isn't going to ease the relations between him and his customers. This is, in effect, I think, going to do this; it is going to make it impossible for these people to handle the shipments of fish, or fur on the basis of — I'll take this now, I'll sell it and I'll pay you later — because nobody is going to allow these merchants to owe them any money. The minute the merchant owes the producer, the trapper, or the fisherman any money, that money is going to be liable to be collected by the Government on arrears of tax. This is simply interfering in the way business is done out there, this is going to tie the hands of the merchants in dealing with their customers, and I don't see why this burden should be put on at all.

Surely, there are officers of the Northern Administration in the northland who know these people, who can explain it to them, who don't have to do business with them in other fashions. They can explain that this tax has to be paid, and that this tax is for their own protection. This has been done in other parts of the country. You will remember, Mr. Speaker, when this tax first came into effect, quite a few people didn't pay. Later on they found out that if they went to the hospital they should have paid their tax, and there is very little difficulty, except in cases of extreme need, in the collection of hospital accounts today in the southern part of the province. I think eventually this will be true in the north. I don't think it is necessary to scare these people into this type of thing. I think the Government found out itself how unpopular this type of tax was. When people evaded payment and charges had to be laid, the Government was very, very loathe to lay those charges. In fact the inspectors usually told the municipal authority that that was their responsibility and they had to lay those charges against the individual, and the municipalities in turn found that this was not a very popular move and instead of doing that they simply paid the taxes, and then collected from these people.

April 4, 1961

There are actually very few charges laid for the evasion of this tax. I see no reason for this extension, and this great need suddenly to put this pressure on these people. We have done a lot of talking, not only this Session, but other Sessions, about second-rate citizens, and sometimes I wonder who they are, because the treaty Indians themselves aren't going to suffer from this, because they are looked after by the Federal Government — their health needs are looked after, but the Metis, who have absolutely no aid from the Federal Government, aren't the responsibility of the Federal Government, but are, Mr. Speaker, our responsibility. They are in the same financial position as the Indians. In fact, in many cases they are in a worse financial position than the Indians, and they are going to be forced to pay this tax. If there is any money coming to them from their merchants, or from fish that they have caught, or fur that they have sold, they are going to find that the \$48.00 is going to be deducted from that amount, before they get one cent of it for groceries, or whatever else they may need.

This is unfair; it is unfair to the merchants, I don't think it is kind or generous to these people who live in the northland, and certainly I will not support this Bill.

Mr. W.J. Berezowsky (Cumberland):

Mr. Speaker, I didn't have a chance to look at this Bill until a moment ago, and I do recognize that when people owe any kind of taxes, that the taxing authority has the right to put on this seizure and obtain the tax monies, or they can sue a person and obtain the tax that the Government or the municipality is entitled to through action in the courts. But, by placing responsibility on say a private individual to collect the tax for the Government or any other corporation, is something that is more or less a precedent.

I can understand, for example, when you have a mining company, where they have a plan and they deduct wages for the purpose of paying hospitalization and a medical plan. But, if they were to go to a storekeeper and say, "Now, you buy any fur and fish, you must collect this tax" — is really, as I say, a precedent.

Another thing bothers me when looking at subsection 6 - 74D. It says every fur buyer and every fish buyer shall upon request give information as to what a person owes him. I can assure the hon. Members that there

are very, very few storekeepers to be found anywhere across the northern part of Saskatchewan, in the Northern Administration District, who owe money to the trapper or to the fisherman. It is usually the reverse. The trapper or the fisherman owes money to the storekeeper, whether it is the co-operative store, or whether it is a private store, and probably the same thing pertains to the fish dealers, although I don't know too much about it.

I would prefer it if the Minister in charge would hold up this Bill, and let's take a second look at it. I have to apologize but I didn't get a chance to study it before, but when I look at it now, I really am concerned about what could happen. I don't think that the purposes or the intent here could be carried out. I don't think it will succeed at all in getting any more taxes. I will agree with the hon. Member from Humboldt, and say this: The Government, and that includes the whole Government here, the Opposition, every one of us that sits in this House, will be looked upon as just another white man's means of making it tough for under-privileged people. This is all I will say at this moment. There may be an explanation so far as this Bill is concerned, that might make me change my mind somewhat, but I can't support it.

Mr. F.A. Dewhurst (Wadena):

Mr. Speaker, I have only one short comment to make, and that was on that statement of the Member for Athabasca. He pointed out that this Bill would make it impossible for the independent merchant, the fish dealer and so on, to carry on; that it would drive people away from his store. I was amazed to hear the statement that he made to the effect that in order to justify the existence of the co-op managers in the north, they should be made responsible for it. I think this shows his true intent of what he thinks of the co-ops of the northern people - -

Mr. Guy: — Not co-op manager, but co-op management advisers.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, there are two or three points that I would just like to deal with briefly. The first has to do with the suggestion of both the Member for Athabasca and the Member for Humboldt, that there is little value in hauling these people into court, if all you end up with is the

April 4, 1961

expense of keeping them in jail, and looking after their families. I think we recognize that. We've had the power all along to take these people into court who didn't pay. That is not the purpose of this legislation. What have we tried to do throughout the years in the northern part of the province? For instance we have instructed the staff that people who don't pay fall in two categories. Those who can't pay are the responsibility of the municipality to pay on their behalf. If a person doesn't pay, under the Municipal Act that has been in effect ever since the province was formed, the municipality is responsible for their hospital and doctor bills. In many cases what the municipality does if they are sure the person can't pay, is that they pay the premium, and then they try to recover it, in some way or other, or if they can't, they just chalk it up to their social aid costs and take the point of view that this is less than what they would have to pay if they had to pay the whole hospital bill.

The Northern Administration District does exactly the same thing. If a person can't pay because his income is too low, the Northern Administration pays the premium, because if they don't pay the Northern Administration gets stuck with the hospital bill. In the long run they are better to pay the premium on their behalf. That is what they do. This will be continued. We have no intention of hauling people into court who have such a low income that they can't pay. But there isn't any doubt on examination that there are those who could pay, who by investigation have sold a considerable amount of fur, or fish, and who have spent the money some other way without meeting their obligations.

It is not possible to run all over the country finding them. A lot of these people are semi-nomadic, and it is not easy to find them. This brings us to the second principle. The principle that has been objected to is, that we are asking independent merchants to collect the taxes. Let me remind Members, that this is exactly what we do with any other municipality. The Northern Administration Area is a large municipality. What it is doing now is that for the people who don't pay their tax, the Northern Administration Area pays it on their behalf, just like a municipality in the south. When a municipality in the south pays a person's tax, they try to recover it. They have the right to recover it on the grain elevator list, and they can post the person's name in the grain elevator. When the person

delivers their grain after certain exemptions (and exemptions can be provided here under the regulations), this is taken out of the money to which they are entitled from the grain elevator. No one has ever objected to the fact that the municipalities throughout the years have used the grain elevators as a means of collecting taxes to which the municipality is entitled. That is all we're suggesting here. The Northern Administration District would be acting exactly like a municipality. There aren't any grain elevators in which they can post a list, but they can go to the people who are doing business. If a person has a certain amount of money coming to him (allowing for any exemptions that we want to put in the regulations), we feel that part of this money should be collected. We might not be able to collect all of it. We might have to do it on some percentage basis. But we could collect at least part of it from those persons who have money coming from the sale of fish and fur.

I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that I think all of us have to take a pretty serious look at the situation with respect to the north. In terms of those people who have low incomes, there can be no argument at all that Northern Administration should pay their hospital premium, and if they can't collect it then they should carry that as part of their social aid costs just as any other municipality does. But if no serious attempt is made to collect the tax from those who are able to pay, then it is clearly apparent that those who have been paying will discontinue paying. This is the experience if one takes the trouble to study the figures. Year after year a few less people who have been able to pay in the past are paying now, because they find that other people don't pay. The Northern Administration pays their hospital tax, and therefore, they wonder why they should pay the tax. Their neighbour isn't paying it, and their neighbour sold just as much fur as they did, and sold just as much fish as they did. The number who pay is going to steadily decline. I don't think there is a worse thing you can do for people than to develop the idea that you can evade your legitimate responsibility. At some time we must make a clear cut demarcation between those who can't pay and those who can pay. For those who can't pay, I can assure the House that certainly no attempt will be made to extract money from them that they badly need for the care of themselves and their families. But for those who can pay, I think the Northern Administration must have the same type of machinery, and the same powers available to them which a municipality has, namely that when they pay the tax on some person's behalf, and they are satisfied that that person has an income which is sufficient to enable them to pay the tax, they should have some means to

April 4, 1961

recover that tax. If we don't we will face the time, in only a matter of years, when practically no people in the Northern Administration Area will pay their tax.

Mrs. Batten: — Will the hon. Member permit a question, Mr. Speaker? Is it not true, Mr. Premier, that it is no defence that you haven't got the ability to pay — it is no defence to a charge under this proposed Act, nor under the present Act.

Premier Douglas: — That is perfectly true, Mr. Speaker, but the fact is that we have never to my knowledge, laid a charge against any person who is unable to pay. It is a strict rule to the people who administer the legislation . . .

Mrs. Batten: — You have to my knowledge.

Premier Douglas: — . . . that if a person cannot pay, then no charge will be laid. They are double checked by the field man and the municipal secretary. When it comes in and they recommend laying a charge, our people in turn go back and double check. I said in this House when we brought in the Hospital Services Plan, and the successive Ministers have repeated this, that we do not want, and we will not knowingly take legal action against a person because they can't pay. But, we have a responsibility to take action against the people who can pay, because if we don't then the people who do pay conscientiously, feel that they are carrying an unfair share of the burden.

Mr. Ross A. McCarthy (Cannington):

Mr. Speaker, I just want to pass a few remarks in connection with what the previous speaker just said. The tremendous difference between the elevator list and the system you are setting up is that the elevator people are employees of a company, and when there are three elevators in town there are three lists set up. But, here you're going to penalize an individual who is in business privately. There is no comparison between these two systems of collection, because it doesn't matter where the chap goes, he is going to pay this to an elevator, and the elevator hasn't advanced him money of their own. That is another difference. The individual storekeeper who advances these people money, when he has

to take this \$48.00 from them, as he does have to according to this Act, will find that his customer can simply go down to the next village or settlement and start a whole new account. You can't compare the system of collecting through the elevator list with the system you have in this Bill. There is no comparison at all.

Mr. A.C. Cameron (Maple Creek):

Mr. Speaker, there are one or two comments that should be made in connection with the Bill. We realize that the Northern Administration Area is responsible for the collection of this tax, the same as any other legally constituted form of Government in the southern part of the province. The Premier says that the R.M.s have the responsibility for collecting farmers' taxes and, therefore, they put a seizure against farmers at the elevator. That is true, but they are acting under powers given to them as a local government. Under the local government, as set up in the Municipal Act, taxes are the first charges against that land — taxes come before everything else, and then the Thresherman's Lien. Therefore, they are taking and placing their hold on the grain that is grown on that particular quarter of land that is in arrears of taxes. But, there is a difference. The municipalities haven't the right to go to a merchant, or to the stockyards and say, "Now this man owes \$100 of arrears of taxes, therefore, when he delivers you some cattle, you must remit to us the amount of his taxes," and or when he goes to a feed mill and takes some of his feed grain to the feed mill, or when he goes to the produce market and delivers his garden produce — potatoes and other vegetables. They don't carry it to that extreme because, of course, the Act doesn't call for it, and it would entirely impractical if it did.

What the Government is attempting to do, is take every agent, every private business man in the north and make of him a Government tax collector by legislation. That is exactly what they are doing, and say to him that legislation that is passed today make you a tax collector of the Government. He is not in the employ of the Government. He gets no commission as a result of it, but they say, "You must be a tax collector for the Province of Saskatchewan, therefore, you must submit all the names of the customers that do business with you, and every time that they come in to sell you

April 4, 1961

something, you must deduct from them the hospital tax.” It doesn’t say, “after your account has been settled” or if the fellow is dealing at the other merchant — so the condition that I see that you are getting into, is making the individual operator who purchases the fish or the fur, to register as a tax collector, and to be bound to collect this tax from these people who bring their goods to him, and to give a list of each and every one of his customers.

Now his customers today may be someone else’s customers tomorrow. They deal with the various fur traders and stores in the north. How can each individual storekeeper say John Jones is my customer, while the other fellow may be listing the same fellow as his customer? Both fellows feel that as a tax collector for the province, he is under a penalty if he doesn’t collect the tax, then of course he is responsible for neglect of duty in not doing so. It is a whole new concept. It is invading the realm of private enterprise, and private initiative.

To try to say that it is similar to the actions under the Municipal Act is trying to, I think, leave a completely wrong and false impression to the House. You are dealing with individuals, you are not dealing as a local government taking responsibility for the collection of taxes which is in the first charge of the land on which that grain was sown. To do that so you would have to go to and take the first charge on the water on which the fish was caught, or on the particular bush or forest from which the fur was secured, if you are going to follow through that principle.

I think it is very, very dangerous to say to any group of men, “We’re appointed you as tax collectors, and you have no choice to the matter — this is what you must do and these are the penalties assessed.” You put them in a straight jacket and say, “From here on this is what you must do.” It is a severe step. It is infringing on the rights of an individual citizen to go about freely in his business. This is coming right in and saying to him, “Here is the complete yoke — now you must do this, you must be a tax collector, and we hold, not your customer responsible, but in the event that you don’t collect from him, we put the onus on you, and you are held responsible for that man’s hospitalization tax.”

For that reason, because of the drastic sweeping nature of the Bill, and what it will do to every private storekeeper and fur trade in the north, I cannot support a Bill of that nature.

Mr. Speaker: — The hon. Minister is about to close the debate.

Hon. A.G. Kuziak (Minister of Natural Resources):

Mr. Speaker, I should probably go back and give you a bit of the history of our collections in the north over the past three years, and some of the difficulties we have had in collecting payments that we have made on behalf of the people of the north. You are pretty well all aware the Department of Natural Resources pays hospitalization tax for people of the north, and then, of course, tries its best to collect it from those for whom we have paid the hospitalization tax.

I would like to give you some figures. Back in 1959, we paid the taxes on behalf of the people, to the tune of \$47,300, and were able to collect some \$14,900 back. In 1960 we paid out \$53,500 and collected \$24,700. It was improved and maybe people were getting used to it. But at the same time, these people were pointing out there is so and so, he is able to pay the hospitalization tax just as well as I am, but he has refused to pay it, and you wouldn't do anything about it.

The figures for 1961 show that we paid out \$74,000 and we collected only \$12,500. In other words it is dropping; some that are actually able to pay have not paid, and those who have willingly paid are pointing to the fact that they have willingly paid, but there is so and so, who could have paid it just as easily as we have, but has refused to do it.

Now, the fact that the Northern Administration District or DNR has paid, on behalf of these people the — Saskatchewan Hospitalization Administration Act, therefore, could not collect these taxes by bringing them into court. For example they have still another way of collecting it, and that is by notifying the employer, they can make a demand on the employer for whom the employee is working, and hasn't paid the hospitalization tax and collect it. In other words because we have paid it, the hospitalization branch could not take action, because actually the hospitalization has already been paid by the Department of Natural Resources. Therefore,

April 4, 1961

we have to put the very same kind of section that the Saskatchewan Hospitalization Act has, within the Northern Administration Act, to put some teeth, and to be able to collect these amounts.

I know, I have heard extreme criticism made by the Opposition, and yet they have admitted that very, very few charges have been laid against people in the south, certainly even fewer will be laid in the north. Unless we are definitely sure that someone is able to pay in the north, and evading payment, only then will a charge be laid against some person.

Now the other sections in the Act, and again may I say that all these sections are exactly the same as the section under the Saskatchewan Hospitalization Act here in the south, all that they are doing is adding that instead of making a demand on the employer in the north, you can make a demand on the fish buyer, or the fur buyer. Although some say that it is not similar to what is done in the south, I say it is exactly the same.

I have heard the same kind of arguments a number of years ago when the Tax Enforcement Act was brought about by the previous Government, wherein they legislated that the municipalities have the power to put up a list of people owing taxes or hospitalization tax to the municipality in the elevators, and the elevator agents complained just as bitterly that it was an infringement against their rights and so on. People finally got used to it, and it has worked out very well, and I say that the same thing will happen in the north. I have had the opportunity of being in the north when, for example the fishing operation is on, and the fisherman makes \$80, \$90, \$100, and even \$125 a day, and they keep that up for a week, for ten days, and probably within ten days he has made \$1200 or \$1300, but you can't force him to pay the hospitalization bill. But, if you served notice under subsection (1) on the fish dealer, or I may say for example the Co-operative Fisheries Limited, they are operating in actually half of the province, so when some Member of the Opposition mentioned that this would interfere with private enterprise and, therefore, legislate so that the co-ops should be doing it, half of this the co-ops would be doing, because we would serve notice on Co-operative Fisheries Limited when the fish is coming in, to collect on our behalf. It is being done now in the south; certainly it can be in the north.

But, there is a special section that we inserted in this Bill, and that is subsection (11) of (2) wherein we state that even if the fur dealer or for example the fish dealer makes out a cheque, as I know elevator companies do in the south, in say the joint names of the fish producer and say the administrator of the D.N.R. that the administrator still has the power if he sees fit and believes that this is going to put severe hardships upon this particular family that needs that money immediately, that he has the power to turn even all the money back. If for example a cheque for \$100 came in, the administrator could only take \$10.00 of this today, and say “here is \$90.00 — I realize you need it, but at the next sale I will be collecting another \$10.00”

I believe that in a year or two this Act will be taken just as well as the Hospitalization Act is being taken today in the south, or the Tax Enforcement Act of the rural municipalities use in the southern portion of the province.

Mr. Klein: — Is it permissible to ask a question at this time?

Mr. Speaker: — Of the speaker who has just sat down? Yes, if it is on the principle of the Bill.

Mr. Klein: — In the event that two dealers list the same person as their customer, and neither one collects the tax, who do you hold responsible?

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — Whoever bought the product. If neither of them bought, neither one of them would be responsible. If they both bought, they would both be responsible.

Mr. Klein: — You would prosecute them both then?

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — I don't know what we would do; we would have to see the case.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

The question being put, it was agreed to on the following recorded division, and the Bill referred to a Committee of the Whole at the next sitting:

April 4, 1961

Yeas

Messieurs

Douglas	Dewhurst	Brockelbank
Lloyd	Nollet	Kuziak
Cooper (Mrs.)	Strum (Mrs.)	Davies
Willis	Brown	Thurston
Erb	Turnbull	Stone
Whelan	Thibault	Kramer
Johnson	Meakes	Thiessen
Snyder	Stevens	Kluzak
Michayluk	Semchuk	Perkins
Peterson	Broten	

— 29

Nays

Messieurs

Thatcher	Batten (Mrs.)	McCarthy
Barrie	McDonald	Danielson
Cameron	McFarlane	Gardiner
Foley	Guy	Boldt
Klein	Horsman	Coderre
MacDougall	Snedker	Gallagher
Berezowksy		

— 19

HOUSE BUSINESS

Mr. Thatcher (Leader of the Opposition):

Mr. Speaker, might I ask the Premier what the business of the House will be tomorrow?

Premier Douglas: — I would like to deal with the second readings, which we didn't get to today, and anything that is in Committee of the Whole. There may be some items that are now in Committee of the Whole. Then we will go to supply. I think the Minister wants to take Industry and Information, and finish Highways, Executive Council, and follow on from there.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:32 o'clock p.m.