

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Second Session — Fourteenth Legislature**  
**17th Day**

**Thursday, November 16, 1961**

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

On the Orders of the Day:

**QUESTION RE APPOINTMENT**

**Mr. W.J. Gardiner** (Melville): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, in light of an announcement which appeared in the press that Mr. Shoyama has accepted a position with the new leader of the New Democratic Party in Canada, would the government be prepared to say whether or not he has tendered his resignation, or whether the government is prepared to permit leave of absence?

**Premier Lloyd**: — Mr. Speaker, the government has not yet received a resignation from Mr. Shoyama.

**Mr. Gardiner**: — A supplementary question, Mr. Premier, if this is the case, is Mr. Shoyama at present working with the leader of the New Democratic Party, or is he at his job with the government?

**Premier Lloyd**: — He is still engaged as chairman of the Economic and Advisory Planning Board.

**Mr. Gardiner**: — I didn't ask if he was still engaged. I asked if he was working for the government or if he was working for the Premier. According to the newspaper report he has already taken over an office with the new leader of the Democratic Party in Canada.

**Premier Lloyd**: — Mr. Shoyama is working for the government and the Premier of the province.

**QUESTION RE VOCATIONAL SCHOOLS**

**Mr. Bernard Gallagher** (Yorkton): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Premier a question in view of a statement made by Premier Duff Roblin of Manitoba, that they are considering seven or eight vocational schools.

**November 16, 1961**

I would like to know if this government is considering any more vocational schools other than the ones announced?

**Premier Lloyd:** — The Minister of Education made an announcement in the legislature at an earlier date with regard to the plans of the government of Saskatchewan in this regard.

### **CONGRATULATIONS**

**Mr. Cliff H. Thurston** (Lumsden): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the members the fact that Marion Ganshorn, member of the Regina 4-H Grain Club was awarded the championship with her entry of wheat at the Toronto Royal in the 4-H competition. Also that Mr. Charlie Wong, a farmer of the Lumsden area won the championship on his entry, of eviscerated turkeys and I am sure that members of this House would want to join me in congratulating these people on their showing. Not only are they a credit to themselves in this district, but also to the province.

### **QUESTIONS RE TELEPHONE CHANGES**

**Mr. Gardiner** (Melville): — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Telephones, (Mr. C.C. Williams) as to whether or not the Department has given consideration to the request by the Chamber of Commerce and the city of Melville to have changes in long-distance service held over until changes are made in all other points in the province.

**Hon. Mr. Williams:** — Mr. Speaker, that has become a perennial. We propose to proceed with the original plan which was made up some five years ago.

**Mr. Foley** (Turtleford): — (Inaudible) . . .

**Hon. Mr. Williams:** — That is the custom, Mr. Speaker, and it is certainly quite possible. The matter will be investigated. I am sure the hon. member realizes that we have done a good deal of this kind of work in this constituency already, and we will certainly look into the matter.

## ADJOURNED DEBATES

The House resumed the debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Blakeney:

THAT Bill No. 3 — An act to amend The Education and Hospitalization Tax Act — be now read a second time.

**Mr. Speaker:** — In regard to the proposed amendment, or in regard to this motion for Second Reading of this bill, I have prepared a ruling in regard to it, but as has in the past been allowed by this House, and I think it is a good custom that some discussion in regard to these things be allowed, before I bring in the ruling I would be glad to hear from any members of the House with regard to their opinions of this amendment, and in regard to the admissibility, so that if it is desirable I may wish to revise my statement.

If there are any opinions with regard to this amendment as to its admissibility, I would like to have them at this time.

**Premier Lloyd:** — Mr. Speaker, it does seem that the amendment, because of the scope which it proposes, is hardly in order as an amendment to this particular Bill. We are discussing a Bill to provide for an increase in one particular field of taxation. This amendment suggests that the whole range of government expenditures be explored. It suggests that there are unnecessary expenditures being made, and suggests that this exploration be done in order to provide necessary revenues for the provision of needed services. One will have to consider the definition of needed services, which could include some things in the opinion of some people, and other things in the opinion of other people, that could introduce, it seems to me, a debate much wider than would be possible or permissible on an amendment to a specific bill.

**Mr. Speaker:** — The Order of the Day having been called for resumption of debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Blakeney: That Bill No. 3 — An Act to amend The Education and Hospitalization Tax Act — be now read the second time, I shall proceed to make the following statement:

### STATEMENT BY MR. SPEAKER

Just before the adjournment of the debate last evening, Mr. Gardiner moved the following amendment:

**November 16, 1961**

“That all the words after the word “That” be deleted and the following substituted therefore:

“This Assembly recommends to the Government that all possible economies in government expenditures be explored and that all unnecessary expenditures be dispensed with in order to provide necessary revenues for the provision of needed services.”

I had not proposed this amendment to the House because at the time there was some doubt as to whether the amendment was in order. This doubt has been confirmed because on careful reading of the amendment I cannot find that it opposes the principle of the Bill, and according to Beauchesne, 4th Edition, Citation 393 (1) such amendments must oppose the principle of the Bill. Indeed, it is quite possible that the House could agree to the proposition contained in the amendment, and to the motion of second reading of the Bill. I therefore rule that while this amendment might be in order as a substantive motion, it is out of order as an amendment to the motion currently before the House.

The current debate will thus proceed on the motion which has been before us.

**Mr. J.W. Gardiner** (Melville): — Mr. Speaker, in continuing my address with the Bill, and with regard to the comments made by the Minister in presenting the Bill to this House I think that in presenting his remarks he did state that various tax fields and various methods of finding revenues to carry out the purposes of the medical insurance plan had been investigated, and it was found necessary to increase the education and hospital tax for this purpose; also to put on an added individual tax and to increase the income and corporation tax fields.

I am quite certain, Mr. Speaker, had the government taken the proper care in the investigation, they could have found sources of revenue other than those that have been suggested by the government, one of which includes the increase suggested by the government, one of which includes the increase in education and hospital tax. I am quite certain that in this House during the past number of years, there have been an untold number of ways given to the government in which they could have found the revenue in order to carryout any medical insurance plan which they might have considered putting into effect.

I have with me today one or two suggested ways in

which revenues could be found, rather than the increase in the education and hospital tax. One would include (of course the government has never agreed to a Court House in Melville, so that I couldn't say that would be one of the ways in which they could save money or not), but I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that in the last session of the legislature, indication was given by the then Provincial Treasurer, and before that session, that the government was considering economies in order to provide it for further funds and revenues in order to carry on necessary services, and also to make it possible in the future to possibly again balance the budget.

I am going to point out to the Provincial Treasurer that government has not been very successful in this way, in finding the revenues that could have been found in order to prevent the increase in taxation at this time.

I find in an answer to a return requested in this session, the Public Service Commission Report which indicates that the size of the public service in this province is continuing to increase from year to year in spite of statements made by the Provincial Treasurer, that economies are going to be made in government services in the provinces. Taking the total figure from August 31st, 1960 we find on that date there was 7,030 civil servants in the province. At the same date in 1961 7,067 — an increase of some 37 in the public service of the province during the year which the former Provincial Treasurer had stated he was going to try to bring about economies in government in this province.

We also have another example from a question that was put today, of the type of expenditures that are made by this government which are not necessary. When Mr. Shoyama feels himself that he would be dispensable for at least six months (that is one of the statements he has made in the press) and the government could allow him leave of absence for that period of time without, I would take it, in his own mind, any harm to the government service of the province, I am quite certain that his services could then be dispensed with for the rest of the time, which would mean a savings of at least \$10,000 to \$15,000 to the taxpayers of this province.

I am quite certain that many of the appointments which have been made — the higher paid appointments in this province which are not civil service appointments, but are appointments made by the Lieutenant Governor in Council, and have not the same protection under the Civil Service Act,

**November 16, 1961**

which regular civil servants have, that many of these individuals have, as is indicated in the position of Mr. Shoyama, been appointed for purely political reasons, and there is no need for the people of this province to be paying money out for salaries for individuals to carry on political work in this province.

So I think, Mr. Speaker, that in this one instance alone we have an example of unnecessary expenditures of taxpayers' money in this province. When you multiply it probably a hundredfold at the present time, then individuals that are receiving salaries of the type of Mr. Shoyama, you can find out just where some of the money could be saved by this government, in order to provide needed services such as we are considering in this House at the present time.

I have brought to the attention of the government before that I feel, and I think the people of the province feel, at the present time at least 10 per cent of the cost of administration could be cut off without any loss of efficiency as far as the public service of the province is concerned. Of course that alone would use up a lot of the monies we are finding it necessary to increase the education and hospital tax, to provide necessary services at the present time.

We could also, as has been suggested by previous speakers, not only save in that manner but all the auxiliary services would bring about a savings as well. Of course we find that in the last few years the government, because of the increases — the civil service have had to build many public buildings, not only in this city but in other centres, at great cost to the people of the province, in order to make available facilities for the increased public service in the province. Here again of course thousands, possibly millions of dollars could have been saved in order to provide the services which are being suggested at the present time.

I am quite certain the Premier and government as well could find, in every department of government at the present time, services that possibly could have been set aside for the present year in order to provide the medical insurance scheme without increased taxes. I make one reference to the department of the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Kuziak). I am one that is quite in favour, if we have lots of money to throw away, to spend a great deal of money in building recreational centres in this province, but I also feel that as far as the provisions of medical services, that is much more important than the spending of hundreds of thousands of dollars in order to build up new recreational centres in this province,

such as is taking place under the department of the Minister of Natural Resources at the present time.

As well, I happen to find it necessary to travel the road east of Regina, and last night was the first time I have had the opportunity of driving on it since they opened all these lanes. I think a lot of the people of this province will have to be Philadelphia lawyers to find out how to get over the road without getting lost. Then at least for the next few months — and it is not going to be a saving and danger to the drivers of the province, but it is going to be an increase in the dangerous driving on that particular road for sometime, until everybody is able to work out all the turns and ways they are supposed to use to get off and on that particular highway.

We have been told this is going to be needed in 20 years — they are looking ahead 20 years. Well, surely to goodness, if they are looking ahead 20 years it would not have done any harm to have withheld these expenditures until such time as the money was available for these expenditures, and use that at this time for the provision of what this government tells us in the legislature today is definitely a needed service in the way of prepaid medical insurance.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — Progress is always hard for some people to take!

**Mr. Gardiner:** — Well, it might be progress, but I am quite sure this road is going to be worn out in 20 years, and if the traffic isn't going to be available to use it, we'll probably have to rebuild it before the 20 years are up. So in the meantime it is a waste of expenditure and monies of the people of Saskatchewan. There are much more necessary services, as has been indicated by the government, that the money could have been expended on in this present year.

I think for that reason, Mr. Speaker, that any hon. member in this House at this time, in voting on a measure to increase taxes must take these matters into account. I know that the Premier and the Provincial Treasurer, the Minister of Health also, will say again that we are being irresponsible because of the fact that on second reading we supported the medical care plan, and now we are not prepared to vote increased taxes. But I am going to say to him and the other speakers that there is no mention in this Bill of prepaid medical services, so that any one that can stand up and state that these increased taxes are for this purpose, are quite wrong because there is no statement in this Act that states these monies are going to pay for the cost of a medical insurance plan. It is only statements by the Ministers of the government offices that we

have to accept, in order to understand that these monies will go for that purpose.

So I say for the ministers to contend that by voting against tax increases we are voting against prepaid medical services is one of the most ridiculous statements that could possibly be made, because there is nothing to prevent this Government from taking any of the revenues that they have at present and making use of those revenues for the purpose of providing prepaid medical services for the people of this province — absolutely nothing that can prevent them from using any of the revenue in the general revenues of the province for this purpose.

I say that, in voting against the Education and Hospitalization Tax there is only one thing that members are voting against, and that is strictly an increase in taxes at the present time. They are not voting on any other issue, when they cast their vote either for or against the increase in the education and hospital tax. That is strictly what they are voting against — an increase in the tax burden for the people of this province. I think at the present time that all members of this legislature are in a position of responsibility, to see to it that further burdens are not placed on the taxpayers of this province, in a year of very difficult circumstances economically, particularly in the rural areas of our province.

So, Mr. Speaker, with that I think I have made it plain that I am prepared at this time to vote against the act to provide increases in education and hospitalisation taxes.

The question being put, if was agreed to on the following recorded division:

**YEAS — 31**

Lloyd		Meakes
Dewhurst	Thurston	Thiessen
Williams	Erb	Stevens
McIntosh	Nicholson	Kluzak
Blakeney	Turnbull	Dahlman
Brockelbank	Stone	Michayluk
Walker	Whelan	Semchuk
Nollet	Berezowsky	Perkins
Kuziak	Kramer	Peterson
Cooper (Mrs.)	Johnson	Brotten
Strum (Mrs.)		
Davies		

## NAYS — 14

Thatcher	Gardiner	Horsman
Batten (Mrs.)	Foley	Coderre
Barrie	Guy	MacDougall
Danielson	Boldt	Gallagher
Cameron	Klein	

The Assembly then resolved itself into a Commission of the Whole.

## SECOND READING

Bill No. 5 — An Act respecting Allowances to Members of the Legislative Assembly, and to Certain Other Persons, for the Second Session of 1961.

**Premier Lloyd:** — This is, of course, the Bill which determines the indemnity for members of the legislature during this session. It also establishes some rates of remuneration for certain officials who attend the legislature. The Bill was drawn and introduced earlier, when it was felt there was some possibility of a session much shorter than the present one, and I may say that I have intention tomorrow in committee of introducing House amendments which would double the amounts as referred to in the Bill. It is a little difficult to know just what basis should be used to arrive at this particular figures. I have gone back over the other special sessions insofar as they may form a precedent, and in the special session of 1955, the legislature sat for 17 days and the indemnity at that time was \$400. On the other hand, in 1952 the session was \$225.

Obviously the same principle was not applied to arriving at the indemnities of these two. The figure which I have referred to, Mr. Speaker, I understand is generally acceptable, but there may be and probably will be some difference of opinion with regard to it.

I would suggest that the figure itself could be discussed when we have a bit more time in Commission of the Whole tomorrow, and I would at this time move second reading of this Bill.

(Agreed)

The House then adjourned at 10:00 o'clock p.m.