

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
First Session — Fifteenth Legislature
21st Day

Thursday, March 4, 1965

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mrs. Sally Merchant: (Saskatoon City) — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the day are proceeded with I would like to draw the attention of the house to the fact that we have visitors from Saskatoon, from Mayfair School, grade seven with their teachers, Mr. Knight and Mr. Taylor and I would like to welcome them to this house and wish them a happy day and an educational one.

Hon. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. H. Link: (Saskatoon City) — The four members of the legislature sitting on this side of the house would like to join with the previous speaker and extend a very warm welcome to the students and their teachers, from Mayfair School in Saskatoon. We trust that their visit will be enjoyable, informative and we wish them a safe journey home.

Hon. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. A.E. Blakeney: (Regina West) — Mr. Speaker, before orders of the day I would like to draw to your attention and to the attention of the house, two groups of students in the east gallery, both from the Regina West constituency, one group from Benson School, consisting of about 30 students from grade six with their teachers, Mrs. Bruce, and another group from Athabasca School, consisting of about fifty-two students with their teachers, Mr. McDonald. May I say that the group from Athabasca includes a grand-daughter of my colleague, the lady member from Regina West (Mrs. Cooper). I know that all of us will wish to welcome the students and to express the hope that their visit with us today will be interesting and informative and I am particularly glad that they are going to be here on a day when they will be able to witness a ceremony which highlights one of the ancient traditions of our parliamentary system.

Hon. Members: — Hear! Hear!

ANNOUNCEMENT RE MISQUOTATION ON SPEECH

Mr. W.A. Robbins: (Saskatoon City) — Mr. Speaker, before Orders of the day are called, I would like to draw the attention of this assembly to a misquotation on my speech in the budget debate the other day, as reported in the press, and also some misinformation.

It states that I said, and I quote,

I deducted \$5,000,000 surplus from last year and I said the real reduction in taxes was \$7,000,000.

This is not what I said, I did say;

The increase in medical care and hospitalization tax of \$5,000,000 taken from \$12,000,000, quoted by the Provincial Treasurer, did constitute a net reduction of \$7,000,000 in total.

The other thing I would like to draw to your attention and the attention of this assembly is that the report states that I am an employee of Federated Co-operatives. This is not true and has not been true for nine and one-third years. If it were true, I would hope that they would send me the back cheques shortly.

**PRESENTATION BY MR. MACNUTT OF ARBORFIELD OF SPEAKER'S CHAIR BELONGING TO HIS
FATHER, THE HON. THOMAS MACNUTT, FORMER SPEAKER**

Mr. A.R. Ponto: (Sergeant-At-Arms) — Mr. Speaker, before the orders

March 4, 1965

of the day, I would like to advise you that Mr. Thomas Russell MacNutt of Arborfield, Saskatchewan, is in attendance at the bar of the house and is desirous of making a presentation to the assembly.

Mr. Speaker: — Shall the hon. stranger be heard?

Hon. Members: — Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: — Let the hon. stranger be heard.

Hon. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Thomas Russell MacNutt: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the assembly for allowing me the privilege of performing this duty this afternoon. I would like to also congratulate you, Sir, on being elected to your high position in this legislature. I know that you will discharge your duties faithfully. May I also congratulate all the members of this legislature on being elected to represent the people of this province. I am confident that your deliberations will be fruitful.

While presenting this historic chair to the people of Saskatchewan this afternoon, I would like to reminisce for just a few moments and take you back to 1905, when this province came into being. I can assure you that I will be brief, because I know that you have work to do, and I am not going to take up too much of your time. The population of Saskatchewan at that time was 257,000 and a great deal of the province was wilderness, our fine cities of Regina, Saskatoon, Moose Jaw, Prince Albert, were little more than good sized towns. Roads consisted of dirt roads and prairie trails, and in many places were non-existent.

Railroads were still pushing through branch lines into the sparsely settled areas. Immigrants were streaming in from Great Britain, central Europe and many other countries, lured by the free land, of course. Very few had any money, but they had hope and they were willing to bet \$10 against 160 acres of land that they could live on and improve a quarter section a year. Many of them won their bet and expanded, while some gave up and moved on. To cope with the great problems of the day, the people of Saskatchewan elected a legislature of 25, 16 liberals and 9 Provincial Rights Party. The hon. A.E. Forget was appointed Lieutenant Governor. Hon. Walter Scott was our first Premier. With him in the cabinet he had such men as W.R. Motherwell, a farmer from Abernethy, who was most active in farm organizations. Jim Calder J.H. Lamont, Sir Fredrick Haultain, who had been Premier of the North-West Territories, led the Provincial Rights Party and was Leader of the Opposition. Many other outstanding men sat on both sides of the house. To those men we owe much. They had a tremendous job to do and very little to do it with, as money was not too plentiful.

Roads had to be built, mostly by farmers in their spare time, and their equipment consisted of wheel scrapers and slushers, a far cry from the machinery that we have today. School Districts had to be set up, and schools built. Rural Municipalities had to be formed and their responsibilities allotted. Their job was well done and they laid the solid foundation for a great province, which we today are enjoying.

I would like to pay tribute to these men who sat in this legislature at that time, who carried such a tremendous load, and to the sturdy pioneers who came here with an axe, an ox team, and a walking plow, and carved out homes for themselves and opened up our country. Today, we are enjoying the fruits of their labors.

My father, who farmed at Saltcoats, was one of these elected to the first legislature and represented the constituency of Saltcoats, which, by the way, he represented in the North-West Territories legislature, and which is now represented by our present Speaker (Mr. Snedker).

Hon. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. MacNutt: — I might say at this moment that the present Speaker is the third Speaker from the constituency of Saltcoats, if we go back to the North-West Territories. Hon. Mr. W. Eakin, was the second last Speaker of the North-West Territories, my father was the first Speaker, of Saskatchewan, and now our present Speaker, Mr. Snedker.

At the first session of the new legislature, my father was elected

Speaker of the house, and continued in that office until 1908, when he resigned the seat and successfully contested the Saltcoats seat in the federal action of that year. That constituency is now the federal constituency of Melville.

In those days when the Speaker had completed his term of office, he was presented with his chair, and a new one was obtained for his successor. After 1908 my father received his chair, and after his death in 1927, as the only surviving son, it came into my possession. We, as a family, value it very highly, but as time goes on, the sentimental value will gradually diminish, as it is the first Speaker's chair of the province, we feel that it has some historic value, and its rightful place is in the keeping of the representatives of this province.

Now, Sir, while this is like parting with an old friend, I take great pride, on behalf of my family and myself, in presenting this first Speaker's chair to the people of this province, with the hope that it has some historic value.

Hon. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. A.H. McDonald: (Minister of Agriculture) — Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all hon. members will agree with me when I say that it is indeed a great pleasure of this assembly to accept the gift that has been so generously offered to us. I think that we would like to express our thanks to the MacNutt family, to Russ, his father, and the other members of the family, for the contribution which they have made to the political life and general welfare of the province of Saskatchewan.

Some hon. members may not be aware of the fact that Russ MacNutt, himself, sat as a member of this house for four years, from 1952 to 1956, and many of us are aware of his contribution that he has made to the assembly during that time, and unfortunately there are few of us who have any personal knowledge of the contribution of his father to this assembly, and to our country. However, I am sure that his contributions were similar to that of his son's and as I said a moment ago, that it has played a part in the development of Saskatchewan and Canada.

We feel very honored that the MacNutt family have offered this chair to the government of the day, and I presume it will rest in our Library, where generations yet unborn, will have the opportunity of seeing it, and it being the first Speaker's chair, I think it has a special part to play among those articles that we preserve in the Library here in the assembly, so we do thank you, not only for the contribution which you have made, but for the gift that you have made to all the people of Saskatchewan here today and, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by my friend the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey)

That this assembly do accept the gift of the chair, belonging to the former Speaker of this assembly, presented this day by Mr. Thomas Russell MacNutt of Arborfield, and that the warm thanks of this assembly be conveyed by Mr. Speaker to the donor.

Hon. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. J.H. Brockelbank: (Kelsey) — Mr. Speaker, I take a great deal of pleasure in seconding the motion made by the hon. Minister of Agriculture, (Mr. McDonald), and I want to say to Mr. MacNutt a very sincere thank you for this gift which he has presented to the province of Saskatchewan today, and also a word of appreciation for the contribution of his family, his father, and himself to our province.

The hon. Thomas MacNutt was grown up and in the militia, ninety-nine years ago now. Ninety-nine years ago, 1875, he came to the west and worked for three years on a special survey and then took up farming in the Saltcoats area, he was really one of the pioneers of this province.

Mr. Russell MacNutt who has made the presentation today is one of my constituents, I have had the pleasure of being in his home in Arborfield, and I think I sat in this chair on one occasion. I know that Mr. MacNutt during several past years has always been a supporter of the opposition, and I hope he will continue in that habit.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

March 4, 1965

Mr. Speaker: — I note that the motion says “to request the Speaker to convey the warm thanks of this assembly to the donor”, and I do now very sincerely, convey the thanks of this assembly to Mr. MacNutt and to his family for this very fine gift, they have presented to the province of Saskatchewan and which I am sure will be honored and revered by all the people of our province for generations to come. Thank you very much, Mr. MacNutt.

Hon. Members: — Hear! Hear!

ANNOUNCEMENT OF NEW SCHEDULE OF RATES IN AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE:

Hon. A.H. McDonald: (Minister of Agriculture) — Some older members of the house, Mr. Speaker, will be aware of the fact that The Automobile Accident Insurance Act, or what is commonly known as A.A.I.A. is a special fund and a special program that is administered by the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office. This is a special fund, and the only revenues that go into this fund are the premiums that are paid for the compulsory end of the Automobile Accident Insurance Plan together with the interest from these premiums as they are invested. Of course, this fund varies in its total amount from year to year according to the accident rate and the cost of repairing human bodies and automobiles during that particular license year.

I want to make it abundantly clear that there is no money from the Automobile Accident Insurance Act, which gets into the general funds of the Government Insurance Office, or no monies from this fund that find their way into the Provincial Treasury, and if the amount of money that is held in reserve in the Automobile Accident Insurance Act fund is depleted in any year, I think it makes good sense to increase Automobile Accident Insurance Premiums so that this fund may be replenished. By the same token, if there are surpluses in the fund over and above what the Board of Directors and the management of the Automobile Accident Insurance Act feel are necessary then there should be reductions in premium rates.

When the present administration took office last May 22nd, the fund stood at \$2,000,000 and it is the desire of the new Board of Directors to maintain this fund at, or as close, to \$2,000,000 as is possible. Therefore, this year we have found it necessary to increase the rates for automobile accident insurance. The over-all increase will amount to about eight per cent. The increase on private automobiles will amount to about five per cent and I will be sending to my colleagues across the house, a copy of the rates for each division of insurance later this day.

I want to make it abundantly clear that the drivers and the automobile owners are the people who have it in their hands to control automobile insurance rates. This statement has been made in this house on many previous occasions but I doubt if the people of Saskatchewan yet realize that they have it in their hands whether rates will be higher or lower next year. But it is our sincere hope that the driving habits of our people will improve so that the rates may be decreased in the future, rather than increased.

Perhaps I should tell you that in the last licensed year, the Automobile Accident Insurance Act lost about \$700,000. It is our hope that the new rates are at such a level that we will have no loss next year but a small profit, in order to bring the reserves up from about \$1,900,000 to \$2,000,000 at the end of the next license year. We have had some rather devastating experiences with some sections of our automobile drivers, and perhaps I should tell the house at this moment that automobile dealers' licenses are going to be increased by fifteen per cent, and the reason for this is that the experience of the Insurance Office, on accident rates under this type of plates is such that it warrants a fifteen per cent increase. Taxi license rates will be increased by twenty-five per cent; C&D truck licenses by ten per cent; A&E truck licenses by ten per cent; and on the other hand Public Service Vehicles, the experience has been such that we will be reducing the rates by ten per cent. Because many drivers of automobiles in the province are not owners of automobiles, and many of the accidents that have happened yearly are caused by people who do not own automobiles, and the only contribution they make to this fund is through their drivers license, we will be increasing the rate for drivers' license, a white license, from \$2 to \$3: for a blue license from \$10 to \$15 and a red license from \$25 to \$30. In other words, the Government Insurance Office feel that we should be putting the penalty on those people as much as possible, who are causing the accidents in Saskatchewan.

With those few words, Mr. Speaker, I hope that every citizen in Saskatchewan will realize that they are the people who set insurance rates

not this house, we have to set them according to our accidents and the cost of repairing human bodies and automobiles and I sincerely hope that the experience will be such that a year from now we will be able to again decrease these rates. This will depend on the driving habits of the people Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

RESOLUTION RE RAIL LINE ABANDONMENT:

The assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Leith (Elrose)

Mr. C. G. Willis: (Melfort-Tisdale) moved the following amendment thereto;

That this assembly welcomes the interest of the government of Saskatchewan in the problems of rail line abandonment and endorses in principle the statement of the government of Saskatchewan with respect to federal Bill C120, but recommends that provisions be made in this bill to provide fair and reasonable compensation to any municipality which suffers damage by abandonment of a branch line; and further this assembly urges the government to convene as soon as possible another conference of representatives of the governments of Alberta, Manitoba and Saskatchewan to further consider the overall problem concerning transportation rationalization and the effects of the new technology upon the industry and to prepare a joint presentation to the federal government and further that this house strongly urges the government of Canada to permit no abandonment of rail lines that are essential to the communities they serve and to assure that this objective is obtained, this house further urges that the power of the Branch Rationalization Authority be broadened to include mandatory public representations.

He said: Mr. Speaker, you may recall that last Thursday, February 8th, I spoke briefly on the motion, of the member for Elrose, (Mr. Leith) re rail line abandonment. In the time allotted me, I reviewed some background on the development of rail service in Saskatchewan. I also expressed the concern of the people of Saskatchewan and of the former CCF government with the proposed abandonment plans of the railways as they affect our province. At that time I proposed to put forward an amendment, a broadening amendment to the motion on the order paper, but as time then did not permit, I, therefore, move the above amendment, seconded by the junior member for Moose Jaw. (Mr. Snyder)

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak briefly to the motion. The first part of the motion, Mr. Speaker, commends the government upon meeting with various groups for discussion and agrees in principle with the policy statement tabled in this legislature earlier. The second part urges that fair and reasonable compensation be made to any municipality which suffers damage by abandonment of a branch line.

May I emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that railway lines should not be abandonment results in greater social and economic costs than costs to the railroads. This is what the motion means and I think what the policy statement says. This we agree with, and we trust that the federal government will go along with this recommendation and change Bill C-120 to make the bill more specific in this regard.

It seems to me too, Mr. Speaker, that there should be further concern as to the effect upon farmers and communities after abandonment applications are granted. The greatest direct increased costs resulting from abandonment will be borne by farmers, whose market centres are farther removed from them. Grain hauling costs and other farm costs will increase but unfortunately, in my opinion, at least direct compensation for such increased costs cannot be made by payments to farmers affected.

You can't pay a farmer, who after abandonment, has to haul grain say ten miles where he hauled five miles previously, and at the same time, not pay a farmer who has always hauled grain ten or twenty or more miles. This overall question of cost to farmers in getting their produce to market is one affecting all farmers, more or less, Mr. Speaker, and should perhaps be considered as such aside from rail line abandonment.

March 4, 1965

Perhaps a policy embodying some degree of equity could be worked out in the future so that all farmers are compensated for the distance they are from market. This is something the government might take a look at sometime in the future. In regard to the rail abandonment question, farmers increased direct costs should be considered and considered carefully along with other social costs before an application for abandonment is granted, and we would agree with the original motion that there should be mandatory public hearings at which all groups or individuals affected by abandonment, would have an opportunity to present their cases.

Indirect costs to farmers could be kept to a minimum or even eliminated by making provision to pay municipalities for increased road costs, etc, which are occasioned by changed road patterns in the area. Such payments to municipalities will tend to keep municipal taxes from rising, and will indirectly benefit farmers and other taxpayers. This much can be done and should be done, and such compensation to municipalities should be urged upon the federal government.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the amendment asks that this government call a conference of the three prairie governments and other interested organizations to discuss the overall problem concerning transportation, rationalization, etc.

I mentioned previously, when I spoke in the house, the success of the December, 1962, conference, called by the previous government. The conference requested moratoriums on abandonment, until the federal government finalized and abandoned such a policy. The direct result of that conference was that there have been no abandonments of rail lines in this province or in the west in the last two years.

An emergency existed, Mr. Speaker, in 1962, a similar emergency exists now in 1965. It is certainly important that bill C-120 be amended in the interests of the people of the west, who are greatly affected by proposed abandonment plans of the railways. Alberta and Manitoba have similar interests with those of Saskatchewan in a good rail rationalization program.

In 1962, the three provinces took united action for the benefit of their citizens. In 1965, joint recommendations from the united west would undoubtedly have similar beneficial results. The challenge facing the government, Mr. Speaker, is to convene such a conference thereby showing the same concern for the people of Saskatchewan as was shown by the former CCF government two years ago.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge all members to vote unanimously for the amendment and the motion as amended.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — The question before the house is on the motion of the hon. member for Elrose, (Mr. Leith) seconded by the member for Shaunavon, (Mr. Larochelle)

That this house strongly urges the Government of Canada to permit no abandonment of rail lines that are essential to the communities they serve, and to assure that this objective is obtained, this house further urges that the power of the Branch Rationalization Authority be broadened to include mandatory public representation

To which an amendment has been moved by the member from Melfort-Tisdale, (Mr. Willis) seconded by the member from Moose Jaw, (Mr. G.T. Snyder) as follows;

That the following words be inserted before the first word of the motion . . .

Hon. A.H. McDonald: (Minister of Agriculture) — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you were going to rule on the admissibility of this amendment, whether its an order or not.

Mr. Speaker: — Well, I was going to read it to the house first.

Mr. McDonald: (Minister of Agriculture) — Fine.

Mr. Speaker: — In connection thereto and in consultation with the clerk, and in order to bring this amendment into correct parliamentary form on the advice of the clerk, I inserted the word ‘that’ before the word ‘this’ in the amendment. So therefore, it would, if this is agreeable to the mover ad seconder, read as follows;

That the following words be inserted before the first word of the motion.

That this assembly welcomes the interest of the Government of Saskatchewan in the problems of rail line abandonment and endorses in principle the statement of the Government of Saskatchewan with respect to federal Bill C-120, but recommends that provisions be made in the Bill to provide fair and reasonable compensation to any municipality which suffers damage by abandonment of a branch line; and further this assembly urges the government to convene as soon as possible another conference of representatives of the governments of Alberta, Manitoba, and Saskatchewan to further consider the overall problem concerning transportation, rationalization and the effects of the new technology upon the industry and to prepare a joint presentation to the federal government and further

And the ‘further’ goes to state the words of the original motion.

Now I must say that I haven’t before seen an amendment, that was submitted in such a way as to have words inserted prior to the original motion. It’s usually done the other way, but the fact of the matter is that’s how this particular amendment has been submitted and I hope that all the members understand the nature thereof. Or would you like me to read it again?

Well, that’s the question before the house, now was somebody going to rise on a point of order?

Mr. McDonald: (Moosomin) — Mr. Speaker, I just wonder if the amendment that has been moved by the hon. member, is in order. I’m not too familiar I must admit, with this method of amending motion and I’m not too familiar with the form or the content of the amendment and just what it will do to the resolution that is now before the house. I would like the opportunity of acquainting myself whether the amendment is in order or not, and I don’t know what position you find yourself in, Mr. Speaker, but I certainly would like the opportunity to peruse this for awhile before you ruled on it, if this can be done without interfering with the debate that is now before the house. I have no idea whether you want to give your ruling now or whether you would like to wait until later this day.

Mr. G.T. Snyder: (Moose Jaw) — Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words in connection with the resolution that is before us and I hope that you will see fit to allow . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! Is the member speaking now on a point of order or is he speaking to the motion?

Mr. Snyder: — No, I’m speaking to the motion, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — Speaking on the motion, well, the amendment isn’t before the house . . .

An Hon. Member: — We’d like him to withhold his decision.

Mr. Snyder: — If you wish to withhold your ruling on the validity of the . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Go ahead.

March 4, 1965

Mr. Snyder: — Very good, Mr. Speaker. I want to say just a few words in connection with the resolution that is before us and I think first of all, I should like to congratulate the hon. member for Elrose, (Mr. Leith) for bringing this very important matter to the attention of the house. I hope that all members will see fit to support it. I believe it is timely for us to present a united front at this time, in view of the recent events and the very vital nature of the problem that we are confronted with.

The matter of rail line abandonment, Mr. Speaker, and transportation rationalization generally is a matter that has been in the forefront in recent years. Following the report of the McPherson Royal Commission, in 1961, the railways stepped up their abandonment policy, using the existing law to apply for the abandonment of a number of branch lines.

On September 16th, 1964, legislation was introduced into the House of Commons in Ottawa following very closely the recommendations of the McPherson Royal Commission. It is a piece of legislation that is become known rather commonly as Bill C-120, an act described as An Act to amend the Railway Act, the Transport Act, the Canadian National Railway Act, and to repeal the Canadian National, Canadian Pacific Act.

This new legislation, Mr. Speaker, would set up a branch rationalization authority, a three member body, which would be appointed by the federal government. This is a body which would accept application from the railways to abandon individual lines. The statement of alleged losses based on railway figures would have to accompany each application.

Now, this legislation, unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, seems to assume that the only way to rationalize our transportation problems is to abandon some of its parts. This three member branch rationalization authority, which is appointed by the federal government, acts only, Mr. Speaker, as an intermediary between the railways and the Board of Transport Commissioners. It has the authority to recommend but it has no statutory power to act. This authority refers information submitted by the railways along with their own recommendations, to the Board of Transport Commissioners, which is then charged with the responsibility of making a decision as to whether this rail line should be abandoned or not.

This decision is made solely on the basis of the economics of the operation, according to the operating figures submitted by the railways in connection with the branch lines involved. Should the Board of Transport Commissioners decide that the line is uneconomic and should be abandoned then the ball is thrown back to the branch rationalization authority which is then charged with the responsibility of deciding the date upon which abandonment will take place.

Statutory limitations provide a minimum of thirty days and a maximum of five years. In the meantime, provision is made for the payment of a subsidy to the railways to the maximum of \$13,000,000 a year to compensate them for their alleged losses.

Mr. Speaker, Bill C-120 provides in no way that the profit enjoyed on a lucrative line be applied against the losses which are shown on another line which is operating at a deficit. The Saskatchewan Farmers Union in a submission which they made not too long ago, indicate that this principle is very hard to justify in the case of the privately owned C.P.R. They state further that in the case of the publicly owned C.N.R. which is already owned by the people of Canada, that this is not only a principle which is hard to justify, but they suggest it is absolutely absurd. Under these circumstances, Mr. Speaker, profits are private and sacred, while losses are public and social.

Mr. Speaker Bill C-120 does not take into consideration in any way the social implications to communities which are so affected. It takes into consideration in no way, the resultant strangulation of business concerns which have been the life blood of the communities which are affected. It ignores, also, the additional burden of cost to the western Canadian farmer, who will be obliged to move his grain greater distances at increased cost and inconvenience. In addition to this, it fails to recognize the increased cost to the municipality for the maintenance of roads which will be used a good deal more heavily if such abandonment takes place.

I think it's worthy of note, in passing, Mr. Speaker, that those lines upon which abandonment applications have been received and lines which have already been abandoned, are largely grain moving lines.

Mr. Speaker, the original resolution that was placed before the

house was somewhat narrow in its application and for this reason the amendment to the resolution was moved, and I had wished, Mr. Speaker, to comment or briefly on a broader aspect of the general problem and I want to out for a few minutes in connection with the rapid changes in the technology of transportation and the effect it has had on the labor force in recent years.

This is a matter, Mr. Speaker, in which I have rather profound interest as an active railroader for about twenty-two years. I think perhaps those who have not had this direct association with the business of railroading may find it somewhat difficult to understand the interest and the fascination that railroading holds for those who have been connected directly it. I think most people will agree that children for generations, have been captivated and fascinated by trains and engines, but for some of us, this interest and fascination is not restricted to the very young.

Since World War II, Mr. Speaker, I think most members recognize that there has been a new technology emerge in the business of railroading. We've seen steam power replaced by diesel power with three, four and five units coupled together, operated by a single engine crew from the leading unit. Trains of up to two miles in length are no longer uncommon.

Productivity per worker has risen at an unprecedented rate and at the same time many trades and crafts in the industry have either been reduced sharply or have disappeared altogether. I can give as examples, flier makers, boiler washers, machinists, wipers, steam fitters, and other classes of laborers and general crafts. In recent years, Mr. Speaker, the movement of trains has also undergone a rather startling transformation. Again, I can use the Moose Jaw terminal as an example of this.

The single dispatcher in the Moose Jaw terminal in charge of a control panel, throws electrically operated switches which arrange for the meeting and the passing of trains over two entire subdivisions from Swift Current to Moose Jaw and from Moose Jaw to Broadview. This new innovation is referred to as Centralized Traffic Control and it has had the effect, Mr. Speaker, of eliminating the operators at the intermediate points. This innovation will presently be in effect from coast to coast, on the C.P.R. main line. In addition to this, new accounting and bookkeeping methods have been introduced over the years and the compiling of payrolls by computer methods has also resulted in the centralizing of this service at a point outside of the province.

These new techniques, Mr. Speaker, in conjunction with the other innovations that I have mentioned have resulted in a drastic reduction of employees, both in the operating and the non-operating crafts. Again, I turn to the Moose Jaw as an example. In 1950, there were approximately twenty-two hundred employees in that general area. By June 1964, a matter of fourteen years later, the number had been reducing to 790.

Mr. Speaker, the point that I'm endeavoring to make, perhaps not too well, is that the number of workers in the railroad industry has been declining sharply, while productivity for worker has been rising at an unprecedented rate. I think it's pertinent at this time, Mr. Speaker, to turn your attention to an article by the chairman and chief executive officer of the Canadian Pacific Railway in which he had this to say;

Business conditions in Canada during 1964 were buoyant. This permitted the Canadian Pacific to produce the largest volume of transportation service in its history. All segments of the companies worldwide transportation, communication, and resource activity benefited. The Canadian Pacific is highly diversified but it is seldom that economic activity in almost all of the company's markets is strongly upwards. This was the case in 1964.

Mr. Speaker, this diversification to which the gentleman makes reference includes Canadian Pacific Airlines, Smith Transport, Telecommunications, Merchandising Service, Canadian Pacific Steamships, hotels, and a number of other activities that I think members know well.

I think all of this indicates, Mr. Speaker, that this particular railroad, our privately owned C.P.R. has enjoyed an era of unprecedented prosperity. I think the following figures will speak for themselves. Jack McArthur, the financial editor of the Toronto Daily Star, in a recent article points to the net profit figure of the Canadian Pacific railway for the year

March 4, 1965

1964, at \$40,100,000, in 1964 were \$2.56 a share. This compares to a profit the previous year of \$32,400,000, for a \$2.02 a share.

Mr. Speaker, in spite of all this, in spite of the profit figure which has been shown in recent years, we can expect, as time goes on, new innovations may be introduced. I think I should say just a few words this afternoon, in connection with the proposed run-through arrangement that was attempted by the Canadian National railways only a few short months ago. I think members especially in the northern areas of the province, around Melville and Biggar, are more aware of this perhaps than other members in the house. This attempt, Mr. Speaker, by the Canadian National railway, to run trains over two entire sub-divisions instead of one, was initiated without consideration for employees and it ignored also the protest of the communities which were affected. It was called off only after a stoppage of work by employees. But had this plan been effective and had it been allowed to come into effect, Mr. Speaker, it would have resulted in the travelling of two sub-divisions instead of one. It would have eliminated the former turn-a-round point of Wainwright, Alberta, and crews would have run from the terminal of Edmonton directly to Biggar. Of course, this created a number of real problems in connection with workers who had previously established their homes at that intermediate point. It would have made it necessary for these employees to seek quick sales for their homes at bargain prices and it would have resulted in a good deal of hardship on the communities which were also affected.

There was no provision made in any way, Mr. Speaker, for the company to compensate either the community or the employees for their losses. Just a rule of thumb Mr. Speaker, indicates that in the areas where this innovation has been accepted, it has meant general reduction of about twenty-five per cent in operating crews

I don't intend to belabor this issue this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, because time doesn't permit, but I wanted to mention this only to cite this as another example of where Bill-C-120 should be broadened to take into consideration these kind of new innovations which the railroad is entering upon. Bill C-120, Mr. Speaker, also takes into account the adjustment of passenger train services. Once again, unfortunately, it's totally inadequate in this respect. The members are probably aware of the apparent intention of the Canadian Pacific Railway to discontinue the transcontinental service on trains No. 7 and 8, the Dominion, later this year. This is the very persistent rumor. Now, if this is done, Mr. Speaker it's estimated fairly reliably, I believe, that it would affect about fifteen employees in the sleeping car department, about one hundred and eighty in the dining car department, about one hundred and twenty mailmen, one hundred and twenty train crew employees as well as fifty to sixty men in engine service. It would affect also, a large number of supply and maintenance men and also employees who are under contract for the delivery of mail at intermediate points.

In spite of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that the largest revenue-producing part of the service has been mail and express over the years, and this has become recognized rather thoroughly, the local mail car on train 7 and 8 between Regina and Calgary was removed three months ago. According to a recent bulletin, the head end of trains 7 and 8, the mail and the express, is to be removed on the 24th of June. When this happens, Mr. Speaker, I believe there will be very little doubt but what the company will be able to prove that this operation is no longer economic after the portion which is most productive and profitable has been removed from the train.

Bill C-120 gives the railways increased freedom to adjust passenger service and provides for another subsidy in the event that they are obliged to continue the operation. The subsidy begins at \$65,000,000 the first year, and graduates down to zero at the end of the fifth year. I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, that it's not necessary for me to impress upon this house the importance of maintaining this passenger service, especially after the kind of a winter that we have just passed through, when for many days the only safe and reliable form of transportation has been by rail. I know that all members recognize the importance of this transcontinental service to the travelling public and to the communities which it serves.

Mr. Speaker: — If I might interrupt the member from Moose Jaw, (Mr. Snyder) for just a moment. I'm afraid that I do so in the interests of freedom of speech because I think in all fairness he should know to what subject he is speaking and that can't very well be done until I make a ruling on the motion.

Now, I find thee subject matter of the amendment, that is its content in order, and although the method of inserting it prior to the main

motion may seem unusual, I also find after consulting the articles, that that is in order. The amendment, therefore, is in order. I find on reading the motion and the amendment that the subject matter of both seem very similar. It would be so hard to distinguish between them in debate, and I therefore, rule that the debate continues on the motion and the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Snyder: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I was just in the process of concluding my remarks at this time. I just want to say in conclusion that Bill C-120 instead of offering encouragement for increased efficiency and the bringing about of more reasonable settlement of problems which existed, in effect, makes it convenient for the railroads to withdraw services and in the meantime the carriers are compensated for the operating deficit which is incurred by them.

I think then, Mr. Speaker, that the mere fact that it was deemed advisable eighty years ago to subsidize the building of our privately owned C.P.R. and also to subsidize the operation of our over-capitalized publicly owned railroad for the past fifty years, suggests that these expenditures were made for the purpose of providing certain services for Canadian people. However, in view of technological changes which are affecting our whole economy, including the transportation industry, I think it seems reasonable that we have now reached the point where the federal government is going to have to take a fresh look at the whole transportation problem if they are to properly discharge their responsibility to Canadian people as a whole.

The wholesale abandonment of branch lines and of auxiliary services, Mr. Speaker, or eternal subsidies, is obviously not the answer. The co-ordination of existing facilities in relation to other forms of transportation, is due for consideration by the federal government if proper benefits are to be realized from the investments which the Canadian public has already made in our two railway systems.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, then that we in this house should make it clear that we as a body hold the view that any group which is to decide the fate of rail lines and auxiliary services should be charged with the responsibility of proposing alternative solutions with an eye to effecting economy measures in the examination of the whole broad spectrum with due regard for the immediate and the long term social and economic effects of such a plan.

I will be most pleased, Mr. Speaker, to support both the resolution and the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. W.S. Howes: (Kerrobert-Kindersley) — Mr. Speaker, in rising to say a few words on this resolution and the amendment before us, I do not intend to speak at too great a length. But this does not mean that I do not feel this is a serious problem. To me, the question of railroad abandonment is one of the most serious matters faced by rural citizens of this province and I think the people of the constituency I have the honor to represent are faced with perhaps as serious or more serious situation than any other area of this province or dominion. In my constituency, the C.N.R. proposes to abandon 142 miles of railroad. If you calculate this out on a percentage basis, it equals 7.3 per cent of the proposed abandonment in Saskatchewan and 3.7 per cent of the total proposed for the dominion.

My constituency is only a small part of this province, but I certainly think we have been singled out for far more than our share. The effect of this abandonment as has been pointed out previously, is extremely serious. In my constituency, on a ten year average basis, the elevators on the proposed abandonment handle almost 7,000,000 bushels of grain per year and there are fifty elevators involved on this proposed abandonment with a capacity in total of 4,000,000 bushels.

If these lines are taken out, the municipalities will lose assessments totalling \$748,000. Now, I don't have before me the over-all increased cost to the farmer, or to the municipalities involved, but I am of the opinion, and I think research will bear it out, that this cost will be far greater than any savings the railroads claim they will make and I for one am not prepared to accept the argument that they are losing money on these branch lines.

The railroad accounting procedures are complicated. A person will

March 4, 1965

have to spend a very long period of time to analyze these procedures. I feel the charges that have been placed against these branch lines for off-line costs are far too high. I feel that these off-line costs that they claim deserve very close study as do other portions of their submissions.

Now, if the railroads are losing money on these branch lines, I feel they could look close to home before they start on the individual farmer. The railroads have always been big enough to look after themselves, but I do feel that the ordinary person needs protection from these people. I feel that they should give consideration to the co-ordination of railroad lines as between companies, for example, Saskatoon west, the C.P. and C.N. lines run for a distance of 120 miles and in no place are they over six miles apart. Surely some rationalization could take place with benefits to the over-all system.

The other day, I looked up the CNR executive structure and it is very interesting. I noted according to the annual report, that the CNR had eighteen vice-presidents, four associate vice-presidents and one deputy vice-president. I thought one or two would be enough. It would seem possibly that a top heavy executive exists. Possibly this should be considered in railroad costs.

Another matter, and especially one that railroads should consider I think, is some of their related activities. If my memory serves me correctly and I believe it does, in the 1962 report made to the House of Commons Committee on Railroads, Donald Cordon stated that for the year 1962, the railroad lost \$175,000 in the operation of the Bessborough. Now I have been in the Bessborough many times, I've stayed there and I feel probably most of this house have, and I think they must have made a determined effort to lose that much money.

Mr. Speaker, many claim that the related activities the railroad should not be taken into account in assessing the question of branch line abandonment. However, I feel that some consideration should be given to the assets held by these companies, assets that were received for the building of these particular lines, mineral rights etc. But I do think there is a great deal of validity in their argument.

I had, Sir, the opportunity to attend the railway retention meeting held in this city on November 22nd, 1963, and I also had the privilege of acting as vice-chairman on the resolutions committee at that meeting I enjoyed this very much and I want to take this opportunity to express my thanks to the previous government, my sincere appreciation for the reception held on the evening of November 21st. The reception and meeting according to the Public Accounts cost \$293 and some odd cents. I'm at loss to understand how so much could have been provided for that amount, but as I have said, the reception was quite enjoyable. I think that perhaps the greatest value of the meeting held was evidence of the fact that the local railway retention committees of the province are extremely interested in this subject. They feel and feel strongly they require assistance and help. I believe that if Bill C-120 was amended to provide mandatory public hearings in all cases, that this would be of considerable help to the local committees. I also feel, as has been verified by what happened at the public hearings held in connection with the Reston-Wolseley abandonment, that local committees must have some assistance.

The railroad companies appeared at the hearing I mentioned with the battery of high-powered lawyers and with all due respects to the legal profession I feel that if one side is represented by legal counsel, then the other side should be represented by legal counsel. And I feel that the counsel representing the Railway Retention Committee should be well versed on the subject before them. Possibly consideration should be given by the Railway Retention Committees as a group in co-operation with the provincial government to have this type of legal counsel available.

Now there's a great deal more I could say on this subject, since it affects us quite extensively in our area, but I think I have just about exhausted the time allotted to me. So therefore, Sir, I will support the original motion, insofar as the amendment is concerned, I would like to withhold my decision on that at this time.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. S.K. Asbell: (Bengough) — Mr. Speaker, in entering this debate on rail line rationalization authority, I do so with a feeling of closeness for within our constituency and within our borders of the south country, lie two railroads

that are now up for suggested abandonment, namely from Willowbunch to Ceylon and Weyburn and another adjacent community is the Killdeer, Rockglen area. As you know, people in that area live in isolation and rail lines to them in their agriculture welfare, Sir, are most essential.

I deal particularly with the authority in the agricultural field. We know that 1940 miles have been applied for in the province of Saskatchewan for abandonment, a total of over 3,797 miles in the area of western Canada. Sir, this indeed would create an uneconomic situation for our farmers, and by maps and estimations, some of the authorities believe that the grain handling points should be confined to no less than areas that can handle a 1,000,000 bushels in one town and this again would create a hardship beyond control of the small area farmers. This would add to his cost and to his total welfare. It is essential at least that ten cents a bushel would be added to the trucking costs of the small farmers, and today with the cost in the battle of world markets, a 10¢ extra cost to the farmer would create a situation that he himself could not be asked to subsidize.

The problem here is, Mr. Speaker, that the rail line rationalization authority should be given, as the speaker previous has suggested, the power of compulsory hearing, so as the communities could present their case to the public of Canada. Particularly the small communities who would suffer losses by the closure of towns and elevators. These towns would be forced to close, and there would be no such thing as a local community. They would be affected and they would disappear in the entirety.

I must compliment the government of Saskatchewan in February of this year, for compiling the policy statement to the government of Canada on Bill C-120. This is done by the authorized committee of the executive council, Sir, and projects the complete thinking of the entire people of Saskatchewan. It deals with the rail rationalization and the abandonment of uneconomic branch lines. It deals with the Crow's Nest Path, and the associated rates; it deals with unjust discrimination and undue preference; it deals with the bridge subsidy which hides various subsidies under the title of bridge subsidies; it deals with the cost and procedures of the railways and it deals with maximum rate control.

Sir, this document is prepared by the committee under the chairmanship of the Hon. Gordon B. Grant, our Minister of Highways, is one to be well commended

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Asbell: — It presents faithfully, thoroughly and effectively our cause, our plea for the western farmer, for the people of Saskatchewan and for the people of Western Canada to defer this Bill C-20. This Bill C-120 gives not the power to rationalization authority but it is divorced of same by the Board of Railway Commissioners, who have full authority by a mere whisper as suggested, that the railway is losing money and therefore it is allowable for complete abandonment. This, Sir, is most unfair, there's only one side to the question, the Board of Transport Commissioners and in this particular area is not only judge, but jury also.

Sir, I would say that the people of Western Canada and those of Saskatchewan, particularly must impress upon the government of Canada, to withhold this Bill C-120. It should be said again that the particular problem of rural Saskatchewan, as quoted by our Premier in Saskatoon, on November 17th, 1964, that the wholesale abandonment of branch lines in Western Canada would be definitely unthinkable. The authorization granted particularly now to the Board of Railroad Commissioners, gives them the privilege of singular railroad abandonment without rationalization to the welfare of a complete area of Saskatchewan and of Western Canada.

Therefore, it is only just and fair, that we ask that Bill C-120 be void for the minute, or if this rationalization authority be given more powers to deal with the implications that have been involved with this situation as presented to them and not forced upon us without relative presentation to the cause of the people.

Sir, at this time, I move to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

RESOLUTION — POWER RATES FOR CERTAIN SKATING AND CURLING RINKS:

The assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed resolution, moved

March 4, 1965

by Mr. Hooker:

That this assembly requests the Saskatchewan Power Corporation to consider reducing the rates of electrical power for skating and curling rinks, which are community owned and operated.

Mr. F.A. Dewhurst: (Wadena) — Mr. Speaker, I can assure the hon. members opposite that I am not going to take much time in speaking on this resolution at this time, but I must speak in order to put it back on the floor for the debate.

The motion that I am speaking on, is the one moved by Mr. Hooker. I have no quarrel at all with that motion. I believe that in areas like that they are not profit organizations and can do with any consideration that the Power Corporation is able to give in the way of rate reductions. I intend, Mr. Speaker, without taking a lot of time, to move an amendment to this motion so you will know that while I may stray slightly away from what is here, my amendment will cover it when it's sent to you.

I agree in addition to this, there are other areas which need the same consideration, such as community halls, and I could list a host of other things. When we go briefly over the history of the Power Corporation, we find that that it used to be known the Power Commission. From a deficit of some years ago, rates have been reduced constantly throughout the years and the organization has grown from a small organization to a large organization in this province. Over the last number of years, enough wires have been added to the mileage of the system that if they were all put end to end, they would reach round the earth almost three times at the equator. This was necessary in order to give service to the different areas of the province. Considerable expense for additional generating power and additional construction for line mileage has been incurred. When we go over the financial statements summary for the past twelve or fifteen years, we see as an example in 1951, the total profit from the corporation was \$412,000 in that year. Money had to be borrowed, a large amount of money in order to make the necessary expansion, but after setting up the necessary sinking funds to take care of the debentures when they came due, the profits from the corporation have grown year after year. A year ago, the total net profit was \$5,500,000, a \$2,000,000 rate reduction was put into effect last year and according to the Budget Speech, (we don't have the financial statements tabled yet) it's estimated this year to be about \$4,800,000 and that was after the rate reduction last year. The budget also forecasts approximately \$6,400,000 profit for next year.

So I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the same trend is continuing now that did before and shows that it isn't necessary, at the present time, to have the additional heavy capital costs we had a few years ago. I think further rate reduction could and should be made at this time. So I am going to move, seconded by Mr. Brockelbank, the member for Kelsey, that the motion be amended by adding to the, motion the following words;

and further, in view of the projected higher profits of the corporation, to also consider a general reduction in electrical rates.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — The motion before the house is on the motion by the member from Notukeu-Willowbunch, (Mr. Hooker)

That this assembly requests the Saskatchewan Power Corporation to consider reducing rates of electrical power for skating and curling rimes, which are community owned and operated.

To which an amendment has been moved by the member from Wadena, (Mr. Dewhurst) seconded by the member for Kelsey, (Mr. Brockelbank) that the motion be amended by adding to the motion the following words;

and further, in view of the projected higher profits of the corporation to also consider a general reduction in electrical rates.

Now I find the amendment in order. However this is distinguishable from

the motion, more so than the other one was. I rule the debate continues on the amendment.

Hon. A.H. McDonald: (Minister of Agriculture) — Mr. Speaker, as I understand your ruling, the debate now amendment solely, and the amendment states as follows;

and further in view of the projected higher profits of the corporation to also consider a general reduction in electrical rates.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to this house that it might be better to get some higher profits before any general reduction in rates is considered. The Saskatchewan Power Corporation at the moment owes large sums of money and it seems to me that a program of a general reduction of this indebtedness ought to take place before a general reduction in rates takes place. The amendment points to projected higher rates; the amendment doesn't say that there are sufficient revenues on hand to decrease the indebtedness that would justify a lowering of rates at the moment. I can assure you that the desire and the wish of this government is that rates will be generally reduced, as more efficiency is brought about within the Power Corporation. But for this house to make recommendations to lowering power rates because there's a projection for higher profits, I think the house would be very unwise and for that reason, Mr. Speaker, I cannot support the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J.H. Brockelbank: (Kelsey) — Mr. Speaker . . .

Hon. D.G. Steuart: (Minister of Health) — Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Brockelbank: (Kelsey) — Oh, go ahead, it is your turn, but if you don't want it, I will take it.

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker, speaking to the amendment, I think the effect of this amendment, if it is carried, would be to nullify the very thing that the original motion requested the Power Corporation to do. I think it would be within realm of possibility for the Corporation to consider giving relief to rinks, community skating rinks, at this time, but if the amendment carries and this is attached, I think this will have the effect of squashing the whole thing. I think members opposite realize this and this is the purpose behind this amendment.

As the Minister of Agriculture, (Mr. McDonald) pointed out, the profits of the Power Corporation are not such that we could in conscience and in a sound business-like way recommend a general rate reduction. I can assure the members opposite that with the new management and the new approach of the Power Corporation that this will come about in time, in the not too distant future. But without a doubt, it seems that the intention of this amendment is to throw up a smoke screen and make it impossible to consider what I think was a reasonable request in the first place, and for this reason, Mr. Speaker, I intend to oppose the amendment, not from the idea that when the Power Corporation raises its profits, and we intend to see that the Power Corporation does raise its profits. Rate reductions will be aimed not only to householders, not only to bring relief to householders, to domestic users, but also to bring relief to industrial users, and what's more important, we are convinced that the Power Corporation can be, should have been in the past and will be in the future, a far greater instrument for bringing about the industrialization of Saskatchewan. One of the things that is impeded industrial development in this province has been high power rates. And the only way we can lower power rates and do it in a business-like way, is to bring a better business-like approach to the corporation.

This we intend to do; this we're doing already.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — . . . was of a very minor nature, a very minor nature, but a very major nature to those people who are trying to keep these community efforts going all over this province, especially in rural Saskatchewan. The intent was to give them some relief, give them some small help; it could make the difference between them keeping them going and seeing them close down.

I'm afraid that this amendment, if it passes, will have just the

March 4, 1965

opposite effect. I'm sure that the members opposite recognized this and realized when they brought in the amendment. If they want to see some help brought to the rural communities, in this very small way, some better amenities brought to the small communities, give them a chance to do something. They've done it all over this province, but they've had to do it on their own. We're now suggesting on this side of the house, in the original motion, that they be given some encouragement and some help.

If the members opposite felt as strongly about this as we do, and as strongly as they claim, they would have just risen in their place and supported this. When the time comes and the profits of the Power Corporation come up to a reasonable level, as they will do in the future, we would have had no objections, in fact we wouldn't have to wait for them to rise in their places and suggest a reduction in rates, we'll be miles ahead of them.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I must, while I am in favor of rate reductions by the Power Corporation, and have always been, I must rise in my place at this time and oppose this amendment because I don't think that's the aim of the amendment. I think it is just to put up a smoke screen and make it more difficult for us to try to recommend here, some way of bringing some help to our rural communities.

Mr. W.G. Davies: (Moose Jaw) — Will the hon. member permit a question? Does the hon. member, Mr. Speaker, object to a consideration of lowering the rates?

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker, we don't need the opposition to tell us when to consider lowering rates. That's one of the first objectives we had when we took over the Power Corporation, to bring about lower rates just as rapidly as possible. First we have to put the house in order before we can bring a business-like administration to the Power Corporation. Then we will be in a position to lower rates and I can assure hon. members on both sides of the house, this will be our goal.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: (Kelsey) — Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words in regard to this amendment which is before the house. I'm absolutely amazed at the Minister of Agriculture, (Mr. McDonald) and the Minister of Public Health, (Mr. Steuart) in getting up in this house and saying, in view of the announcement of the government that they project the profits for 1965 to be up to \$6,400,000 for the Power Corporation rather than \$4,800,000 which will probably be for 1964, to get up and say, "this is no time to consider the general reduction in electrical rates".

I think it is a very fitting time for a rate reduction. A general reduction amounting to two or three million dollars could very well be made and still not . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: (Kelsey) — . . . interfere with the Corporation continuing to be successful and to be solvent. As well, there could be something done, if the government needed it, for what is mentioned in the motion itself. Its a clear indication, I think that the government in operating the corporation is not interested in the little consumer of electricity and what he has to pay for it, his lights and his power, and what they cost him on the farms, but they are only interested in apparently being able to give bargain rates to the big business in the province of Saskatchewan.

This is what it sounds like, Mr. Speaker, in listening to what they have been saying just now. They have said those words, they won't be able to get away from them, and so I hope that this house will seriously consider passing this amendment and that in the next year or so, the Power Corporation will be able to announce a reduction in rates that will apply to all of the users of power in the province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: (Milestone) — Mr. Speaker, I would like to

say a few words on this. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would just like to make a comment on the hon. Member for Kelsey, (Mr. Brockelbank) first of all. Mr. Speaker, he is expecting us to do in nine months what they have failed to do in the past year. Our major objective, Mr. Speaker, in the field of Saskatchewan Power is to put our house in order, to put it on a business-like basis, so that we can immediately return the benefits to the people of Saskatchewan.

I also want to point out that we at this time are concerned with another matter, and that this matter is a matter which we feel is very, very important for rural Saskatchewan, and for many of the small communities . . .

Mr. E. Kramer: (Battlefords) — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order the hon. Member is misleading the house . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! The hon. Member has the right to be heard in silence.

Mr. MacDonald: (Milestone) — Mr. Speaker, the member for the Battlefords, if he will be patient, will have an opportunity to speak as well.

Hon. D.T. MacFarlane: (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley) — He doesn't know any better.

Mr. MacDonald: (Milestone) — I just want to point out that the government is attempting to improve the condition of rural communities in Saskatchewan. The biggest single capital investment is most times a community-owned rink. In this community-owned rink, very often the biggest proportion of costs are power, in some cases as high as fifty per cent of that cost. We would like to give an opportunity for these people to bring down the costs of this community rinks and to give them an opportunity as well . . .

Mr. A.N. Nicholson: (Saskatoon) — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I understand . . .

Mr. MacDonald: (Milestone) — The hon. Member can sit down, he'll get an opportunity in one moment . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Nicholson: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order . . .

Mr. Speaker: — State the point of order.

Mr. Nicholson: — I understood that your ruling was that the debate would be on the amendment at this stage. It appeared to me that the member speaking is discussing the motion, rather than the amendment.

Mr. Speaker: — Yes I ruled that the debate would continue on the amendment and I think that's going through all the authorities. I think the amendment takes in a pretty wide field, if it is a general reduction in electrical rates, that would be a reduction in any kind of electrical rates there are in the province, and it also says,

in view of the projected higher profits of the Power Corporation

I think that would encourage anything in regard to the profits and the financial affairs of the Power Corporation.

Mr. MacDonald: (Milestone) — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I hope that satisfies the member for Saskatoon, (Mr. Nicholson) and perhaps he can get up and talk about community halls, or something else. Mr. Speaker, the point of this whole problem is this — that many of the community-owned rinks in the province of Saskatchewan have an unbearable burden . . .

Mr. Brockelbank: (Kelsey) — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, you ruled that the debate was on the amendment and the motion specifically mentions community

March 4, 1965

rinks. Now that certainly precludes them from being debated under the amendment, if the ruling is, and I heard you give it, that the debate is on the amendment. You can certainly discuss any other power rates but the ones you can't discuss on the amendment are in regard to the community rinks.

Mr. MacDonald: (Milestone) — Now can we get back to the motion?

Mr. Steuart: — If the amendment passes, they are talking about the general reduction in rates — general reduction in rates — this covers everything, if the hon. member wishes to speak on how this will affect community rinks, I think he has the right to speak on that. Their amendment covers everything.

Mr. Brockelbank: — I didn't . . .

Mr. Steuart: — Well, you didn't listen to what he was doing, you jumped up . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Well of course, this is the problem that arises when we decide to follow the regulations and discuss the amendment to a motion. You don't have this arise if you discuss the motion and the amendment, and then is a good possibility, perhaps we might have been better to do it the other way or we may spend more time debating points of orders than we will be debating the motion.

This is the amendment;

and further in view of the projected higher profits of the Power Corporation to also consider general reduction in electrical rates

Well, if there was a general reduction in electrical rates that would be a reduction in anything that was hooked on to the Power Corporation. I think you could just discuss any kind of an outlet the Power Corporation has got, if they have one in a rink, or a parliament building or a store, or anything else, but I do agree that the emphasis should be on the amendment, but you can't deny that rinks are attached and a general reduction in electrical rates would also apply to them. You can make out just as good a case in applying it to something else. Now, how are you going to distinguish between this?

Mr. MacDonald: (Milestone) — Mr. Speaker, I will sit down and put the question to the house, I only wanted to point out one other point, that once again this government is sincerely interested in the reduction of power rates, and as soon as it becomes feasible we will look into this, and I can assure the hon. members opposite, in the years ahead, that the record of the new government will not take a back seat to the former government when it comes to the reduction of power rates.

I will not support the amendment.

Hon. A.C. Cameron: (Minister of Mineral Resources) — Mr. Speaker, I have one or two observations I would like to make on this amendment. The amendment, of course, deals with general reduction in rates. If you gave a general reduction in rates, you would also give a reduction in rates to curling rinks and community halls, so that it becomes a factor in the general reduction.

If you are giving an overall one per cent reduction on rates, it amounts to a considerable sum of money in the matter of the Power Corporation's operations. If you are giving a ten or fifteen per cent reduction on a smaller area of operations, such as curling rinks, it hasn't the effect on the operations of the Power Corporation, because in total dollars and cents it is perhaps negligible, or certainly not nearly as great. By giving a general reduction across the board, you may be limiting these curling rinks and skating rink reductions to a one per cent reduction — whereas treating them as a separate entity, you could grant them probably fifteen or twenty per cent reduction in price. This is the point that you are trying to avoid, you are trying to avoid the opportunity of the Power Corporation to give a substantial reduction in rates to community rinks and curling rinks. Because this is in an area of sports and relaxation, and I am going to oppose the amendment. I think everyone that has a sincere desire to assist these curling

rinks and these skating rinks, in some tangible form would oppose this amendment, because it would defeat the purpose of the main motion to give a substantial reduction to curling rinks and skating rinks.

Mr. C.G. Willis: (Melfort-Tisdale) — Mr. Speaker, I point out that members are not reading the amendment correctly. They are taking it as though we are saying the one and not the other — one only. The amendment as I heard it was that further to the lowered rate for skating and curling rinks, we would do the other. Now doing the one doesn't rule out the other. This amendment simply says that we would do both. I can't understand the argument put forth by the Minister of Mineral Resources, (Mr. Cameron) who certainly has misunderstood the amendment.

Amendment was negated on the following recorded division;

YEAS — 25

Messieurs

Brockelbank (Kelsey)	Whelan	Wooff
Cooper, Mrs.	Nicholson	Snyder
Wood	Kramer	Broten
Nollet	Dewhurst	Larson
Walker	Berezowsky	Robbins
Blakeney	Michayluk	Brockelbank (Saskatoon)
Davies	Smishek	Pepper
Thibault	Link	
Willis	Baker	

NAYS — 29

Messieurs

Howes	MacDougall	Bjarnason
McFarlane	Gardiner	Romuld
Boldt	Coderre	Weatherald
Cameron	McIsaac	Larochelle
McDonald (Moosomin)	Trapp	Asbell
Steuart	Cuelenaere	Hooker
Heald	MacDonald (Milestone)	Radloff
Guy	Gallagher	Coupland
Merchant (Mrs.)	Breker	Pederson
Loken	Leith	

Mr. Thomas M. Weatherald: (Cannington) — Mr. Speaker, I believe that if it is any consolation to the members opposite, the member for Notukeu-Willowbunch (Mr. Hooker) the past afternoon when he introduced this motion adequately gave excellent evidence that this rate reduction will be of benefit to practically all of the people of Saskatchewan.

As a rural person, I am convinced that there is hardly a person in this province, in the city or rural parts, who will not benefit. Indeed if we do not use the skating or curling rink ourselves, then some other member of the family does, or at least grandchildren or children.

I think, at the same time, while it was being very well put the number of people which will benefit, I feel, somewhat, that there are one or two other points which have been overlooked. We have a tremendous number of people in rural Saskatchewan today who live beside very small hamlets and, indeed, these hamlets are becoming smaller as the larger towns grow. These people find it increasingly difficult to support their community rink, be it curling or skating, without running a deficit, or at least without increasing funds to the point where it is very onerous on some of the people who live there.

Now, I suppose there is the possibility of these rinks closing, but I think this is very undesirable, because anyone who has a small boy or small children who like to use the rink, it is very difficult for them drive twenty-five or thirty miles to make much use of it and to play on local hockey teams. I think, Mr. Speaker, it is to the great benefit that we give assistance to these small community operated rinks in these hamlets and this is who will benefit to the greatest extent if we give them a rate

March 4, 1965

reduction.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Weatherald: — This, Mr. Speaker, will have the benefits of reducing the operating costs so that they can continue this so that the children who live there will have the opportunity to use these facilities. I also find, Mr. Speaker, that many of our towns and villages are attempting to put in artificial ice in their curling clubs. This is very desirable, but at the same time, they find that while the capital costs are exceptionally high and are very onerous, although they can raise the capital funds for the construction of these buildings, they find the operating costs to be very high for the number of people utilizing them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if we are able to reduce the rates and, therefore reduce the operating costs, I think it will provide great incentive to many of our towns in Saskatchewan to install artificial ice and to build artificial curling rinks, and so, again many of our rural residents will have the recreation which lasts for approximately six months a year in this province.

As I mentioned at the beginning I do not find that I can say there is practically anyone in this province who won't benefit from this reduction in rates and as the member for Maple Creek, (Mr. Cameron) previously mentioned we will, if we particularly select this group here, we will reduce the rate of power substantially, so that at least this group of people will have substantial benefit.

In brief, Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that this is a step in the right direction to improving the social life of many rural people and I hope and I am convinced that this government will continue to take steps in that direction to give rural people the assistance which is so badly needed.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. D.W. Michayluk: (Redberry) — I, too, would like to associate myself with a number of hon. members that have taken part in this debate on both sides of the house. I, for one, would be the last one to vote against this resolution. Many of our communities in the province of Saskatchewan have curling rinks and skating rinks, which provide recreational facilities to our young growing boys and girls and to our young people. These also serve as centres for physical development and I want to suggest to the government, that although I am not aware of the current rates charged to these curling and skating rinks, but I would suggest to the minister in charge of the Power Corporation and to the government, that if they are contemplating rate reductions to these community enterprises, that they be made worthwhile.

A great deal has been said in regards to the profits of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation early in the term of this present government what more that the profits of the Power Corporation were insufficient. This is merely a matter in form of a suggestion to the minister and to the government. I certainly agree with this resolution, I know it is going to help small communities that own these facilities as a community projects, but I would also request that is the Saskatchewan Power Corporation is granting relief in form of reduced rates, that you make these reduction worthwhile.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. L.P. Coderre: (Minister of Labour) — I would just like to say a few words on this motion. I think it is one that certainly augurs well for the youth of our country and of our province. We have always concerned ourselves very greatly with the physical fitness of our youth, and to see that they are properly occupied.

I see in this motion the lowering of the rates, making it possible for many of our rural rinks, skating and curling rinks, to extend the season and this is important particularly to us here in Saskatchewan where we are affected by the Chinooks, which have an effect on our ice. This will definitely encourage them to enter into the artificial rink set-ups, and for this reason alone; Mr. Speaker, it is well worthwhile going for this resolution.

Everyone in this house will note that from time to time, the governments of the provinces have seen fit to give assistance in forms of regional park. Still when it comes to the winter, with the longer winters we have, sometimes no effort has been made in that respect. I certainly go

with this motion because at this particular time, as I say, this will definitely promote physical fitness in our youth. I would like to repeat that a matter of a few years time, the greater part of our population will be young people. Let us keep them fit. This is for the best of the people of the country.

Mr. MacDonald: (Milestone) — Mr. Speaker, I want to rise and say a few words on this motion. I don't want to prolong the debate, but I have some interesting figures and statistics that I would like to make known to this house.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I think that everyone will recognize in rural Saskatchewan today the community rink is the heart of the community. It is here that people gather to play, to visit and to meet one another. It is here that the children spend a great portion of their time and it is here that they grown and develop into maturity. It is here that people work and co-operate with one another, it is the best example of community spirit. The community rink of rural Saskatchewan is without question, the heart of the community, but, Mr. Speaker, of even greater importance is the fact that the skating rink is the habitat of the children. They are constructed, operated and maintained for their benefit. It might be interesting to note that in my own community over ninety per cent of the children of Wilcox actively use the rink and possess skating tickets.

I checked the time spent by my own son, a boy of ten years of age, and in one week, he averaged from twelve to sixteen hours in the community rink. We only have to realize that perhaps one of the greatest problems in Canada, and in the twentieth century is the problem of juvenile delinquency. I am convinced that young people of 1965 are as fine, or finer than any period of history. The trouble often lies in the adults, who fail to give them the time, opportunity, resources, or guidance in the use of their free time. An active boy is a good boy.

Any young person who has an interest in any worthwhile endeavor has neither the time nor the desire to get in trouble. No activity dominates a boy's interest to the same extent as does sport. Skating and hockey are the number one national pastimes, and any opportunity to expand this opportunity for children is certainly worthwhile.

Mr. Speaker, I have in my possession a survey of the Saskatchewan amateur rink association, and, Mr. Speaker, out of 400 rinks canvassed, they have over 300 replies, and there were some very interesting statistics brought out and I would like to mention them to the house.

Number one: nine out of ten community rinks in the province go in the red in each year of operation. Number two; the costs of power represents anywhere from twenty-five to fifty-five per cent of the total operating costs. Number three: and I think this is the significance one, is the fact that the cost per kilowatt changes from place to place, and is much higher in a smaller community, even though operating costs are normally the same for every rink in the province, regardless of the size of the community on the same size of rink. The charges vary from three and one-half per cent sixty kilowatts to two and one-half for the next ninety, to one and one-half for the next 150, in the larger centres, to a straight nine cents per kilowatt in many of the small centres. Here are eight or nine examples — the town of Wilkie, 2.8¢; the town of North Battleford, 3¢; the town of Sedley, 4¢; the town of Glentworth, 6.4¢; the town of Consul, 7¢; the town . of Glenside, 8¢; the village of Lebret 8¢.

To give the house an idea of the amount many communities spend, or pay for power, each year, I have power bills here from the community skating rink in Weyburn, just for power and gas. In the month of November, the cost was \$681.45; for the month of December in 1964, the costs of power were \$750.91; for the city of Estevan, who run their artificial plant with electricity, rather than with gas, their bill runs over \$1,000 per month. In my own constituency here are bills from the community rink of Milestone, for both skating and curling rinks, for both power and gas. Take the month of February in 1964, for gas — \$120.47, for skating rink power — \$96.65; for the curling rink power — \$39.42, for a total of \$256.54 in a small rural community of around 500 people.

The fourth major concern, Mr. Speaker, is the demand rate charged by the S.P.C. in both winter and summer. This is particularly onerous in the summer months when power charges are not based on consumption, but consumption plus the demand.

March 4, 1965

In rural Saskatchewan, the community rink is often the biggest capital investment of these communities. Years of work, saving and effort have gone into these rinks, yet, Mr. Speaker, they remain idle all summer long in many communities because of the demand rates. A good illustration is in the city of North Battleford, they opened the community rink for a one hour function last summer, used six dollars worth of consumption, and the total power bill was \$46.

I want to make two specific recommendations to the house at this time, and I would like to draw them to the attention of the minister in charge. One: that a standard per kilowatt rate be charged right across the province, regardless of the size of the community. I would also suggest that this initial rate not exceed 3¢ for the first basic kilowatt charge. Two: that the demand rate on all community owned rinks be removed, and that consumption be the criterion for charge.

I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that the loss of revenue to S.P.C. cannot balance the advantages offered. When dealing with the growth and development of a young boy, or girl's character, we cannot estimate the advantage in dollars and cents.

I urge every member of this assembly to give this resolution their unanimous support.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. E. Kramer: (Battlefords) — Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words on this resolution. Certainly, I welcome the suggestion that these community efforts be subsidized. I think that this is certainly timely, and I might say further that I am somewhat surprised that all of the people apparently on the other side of the house are going to give this support, or it may surprise me if they do give it support, because we saw evidence only a year ago of a completely different attitude regarding the subsidization of winter sports.

I want to say this, that in this province, this prairie province of Saskatchewan, we have a tremendously long winter, and besides the necessity of providing winter activity and as the hon. member from Milestone, (Mr. MacDonald) and others have said, provide good healthy activities for our young people, we have to make life and living more attractive for all the people of Saskatchewan and especially young people.

Therefore, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that while this may be fine, it is a good start, there are other areas that I believe that we should be taking a good look at too, and possibly the time is now. I would like to explore this. There are a couple of more items I would like to check on in order to further explore and build my arguments, therefore, Sir, at this time, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

SECOND READINGS:

Mr. I.H. MacDougall: (Souris-Estevan) moved second reading of Bill No. 29 — An Act to provide for Certain Exceptions to The Lord's Day Act (Canada)

He said: Mr. Speaker, in rising to move second reading of this bill, I want to point out to members of this assembly that this bill is simply permissive legislation. It will allow a municipality, meaning cities, towns, municipalities, and so on, to pass by-laws to allow Sunday sports.

Now as it is pointed out in the bill, the hours of these sporting activities will be set by law, and sporting contests which include football, hockey, baseball, bowling, stock car racing, motor cycle racing a contest of this nature will be allowed between the hours of 1:30 and 6:00 in the afternoon. Other sporting events such as horse racing, dog racing, boxing, wrestling and alike will not be permitted under the terms of this bill. As I see it, many towns and cities have already had plebiscites concerning Sunday sports and the major cities of Regina and Saskatoon, have endorsed Sunday sport in their plebiscite.

It might be noted here that most provinces in Canada have permissive legislation such as this, and cities like Montreal, Toronto, Winnipeg, Vancouver and I suspect many other smaller centres in Ontario and Quebec are already allowing Sunday sport on a commercial basis. There may be some people who will argue that this is a first step towards the wide open Sunday, and of

course as most other members will agree with me, I oppose a wide open Sunday and I think the majority of the people of Saskatchewan oppose a wide open Sunday. If the legislation passes this house, I do not think that it will lead to wide open Sunday.

There are a great many people who work in the afternoons and who would enjoy a relaxing Sunday afternoon sport. Sunday sport is of course taking place at the present time and the only difference is, in this province, that they can't charge people to see these sporting events. However, anyone and everyone who has gone to a baseball game or a hockey game, realizes that collections are taken, silver collections are taken at the gate to help defray the cost of these participating clubs and organizations.

In most centres, attendants work on a voluntary basis to permit the particular sport involved, therefore there would be very little difference in the amount of extra work done should this bill come into effect. Sports organizations across the province have indicated for many years that they want to see legislation passed allowing them to charge for Sunday sports. I feel that this would be a great boost to sports in Saskatchewan.

It makes little difference whether a person sits at home on Sunday and turns on his television set to watch a Sunday baseball game, which, in effect, he is paying for one way or another. The southern part of the province where we live, we pick up five or six television stations and one can sit down at approximately 1:00 on a Sunday afternoon and watch a baseball game and then later on he'll watch a football game, and a little later on he may even watch a golf game or a game of bowling and so I fail to see where this makes any difference whether you go out in the fresh air and can pay to see the same type of sport.

Mr. Speaker, there are those who by the very nature of their religious beliefs oppose Sunday sports in any form, therefore, we propose a free vote on this bill so that members can vote as their conscience dictates. I feel that because of the nature of this legislation, because it is permissive legislation, that most members of this house will feel free to vote for this bill and I certainly urge them to do so.

There are many pros and cons to this, and I feel that if we are worried about our young people, we must find something for them to keep them busy. If they can attend a sporting event of their choice then I feel they should be permitted to do so.

Again sports clubs of any kind find it very difficult to finance without funds. They find it difficult to operate and it is because of this reason that this bill is being brought in at this time and personally, I feel that I would far sooner watch a football game here in Regina on a Sunday afternoon, when the sun is out, rather than drive all the way in on a cold evening to sit and shiver; and I think that many people in this city feel the same way.

Now if the people of a community do not wish Sunday sports, they do not have to have it, However, if the majority of the people in any community decide that they do, their councils can then pass appropriate legislation and appropriate by-laws and I feel that they should be given the freedom to do so. The plebiscites that were taken in the past in the city of Regina and Saskatoon, showed that there were fifty-seven per cent of the people that voted, voted in favor of Sunday sports, Saskatoon, fifty-five per cent, North Battleford sixty-two per cent and the only other one that I have record of in Saskatchewan, Canora voted fifty-eight per cent in favor, therefore, Mr. Speaker, with these few brief explanations, I move second reading of this bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mrs. Marjorie Cooper: (Regina West) — Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak in opposition to the principle contained in this bill and I think in doing so, I'm expressing the opinion of a very large number of citizens in my constituency and in the whole of Regina and throughout the province in the many jurisdiction that will be affected. Now. Mr. Speaker, I am very well aware of the many inconsistencies in the Lord's Day Act as it now exists and I know full well that it is honored very often more in the breach than in the observance. There are many things that you can and cannot do legally on Sunday, that I can't defend by logic and I don't intend to try to do so. But, I feel, Mr. Speaker, this bill, the amendment that is suggest here, adds nothing to the logic of the situation. For instance, why does the bill exclude horse racing, and dog racing and boxing and wrestling? How are they different from other commercial

sports? These other sports have their fans too, and I expect they also have a good deal of problems in raising enough money to support these, just as much problems as there are with hockey and football.

But, Mr. Speaker, while there are many inconsistencies in the Lord's Day Act, one thing the Lord's Day Act has done, is to prevent commercial activities on Sundays except for certain essential services. It kept at least this much at a minimum. Now, Mr. Speaker, if you are to allow certain commercial sports on Sunday, what possible reason is there then to close the theatres? Since the advent of television, the movies have had a very difficult time financially also, and I suspect, Mr. Speaker, that there are just as many people who would enjoy a movie on a Sunday afternoon as football or hockey, and certainly one thing does lead to another and this, Mr. Speaker, is the thin edge of the wedge, another step in the direction of a completely open Sunday, and I just don't think the member from Souris-Estevan, (Mr. McDougall) can deny this. Now I don't think that a completely open Sunday is a good thing for either the physical health or the spiritual health of our people. I have always felt, Mr. Speaker, that Sunday was a different day, a day set apart, a day that differs and should differ from the other six days of the week.

It's not only, in my opinion, a day for religious observance, a day when you can go to church and Sunday school, but to me, Sunday has always had a special significance as family day. It's the one day in the week, Mr. Speaker, when father and mother and the children can be home together. It's a day to strengthen family ties and to do things together as a family, and it's a day without the rush and bustle and the many activities that fill the other days. The more you allow commercial activities to intrude on our Sundays, then the more people become involved with Sunday as just another working day, and of course it means more policemen on duty, more traffic officers, more transportation workers, and if you go further into the field of the theatre, and I certainly don't see how you can allow commercial sports on Sunday without the theatre then you have projectionists and cashiers and ushers and so it goes and we lose our special significance of Sunday.

Now I realize often, Mr. Speaker, as mentioned by the member from Souris-Estevan, (Mr. MacDougall) that this is just permissive legislation and that the local municipalities will decide in the long, long run if this is passed, but, Mr. Speaker, whatever action is taken by the community, certainly affects all areas in the province, I don't think there's any doubt about that. I think that before any such action is taken, there should be at least further consultations with urban municipal associations. Now I'm speaking of the plebiscites that the hon. member from Souris Estevan (Mr. MacDougall) mentioned. I'm aware of the plebiscite in Regina and in Saskatoon and other places. These plebiscites did pass as mentioned by the hon. member, with not a very large majority, about 3,000 in Regina and an even smaller majority in Saskatoon, and I noticed at the time of the vote in Saskatoon the then Mayor, Mr. Buckwold said this:

The results of the Sunday sports plebiscite was not conclusive enough to warrant the city asking for legislation to legalize Sunday commercialized sports . . . Mayor Buckwold said on Thursday.

Now as far as Regina is concerned, I know that there was some criticism at that time, that the ballot was not clear. I have a paper, the Leader Post of Saturday, November 2nd, and they say this:

In the Regina plebiscite the expression Commercial Sports has been omitted, despite the fact that the opinion of holding sport activities with paid admission on Sunday, is the only matter about which information is being sought. The results therefore can only be inconclusive. The plebiscite question to be placed before the Regina voters reads;

Are you in favor of amateur and professional sports on Sunday, in Regina, between the hours of 1:30 and 6:30 p.m?

There is an unfortunate obscurity in the wording because no distinction is being made between amateur and professional sports, and no references have been made to the only real point of issue, namely the holding 'of spectator sports activities with paid admission, that is commercialized sports. It cannot be too strongly emphasized that all amateur sports without paid admission are already fully legal and are not the question in the present vote.

It is unfortunate that the plebiscite makes it, necessary for many to appear to be voting against amateur sports in order to protect a cherished observance from being exploited for further economic gain.

Mr. Speaker, I think that there was unquestionably some validity to this claim that the ballot was not clear. For instance, amateur sports, which are the training grounds for our young athletes has an even harder time to finance and attract crowds, than professional sport has, so that if the Sunday afternoons are to be taken up with paid professional sport, then the lot of the amateur sports might even be harder than it is today. Now if a person was in favor of amateur sports on Sunday afternoon, but opposed to paid professional sports, how could they possibly mark the ballot that I quoted to you, so I say there was, I believe, some validity to the argument that this ballot did not necessarily reflect the true opinions in the city of Regina.

I don't want to speak too long on this, I don't want to prolong it, but, Mr. Speaker, because I feel that commercialized Sunday sports will lead to an open Sunday and because I feel this is not in the best interest of our people, I urge the members to vote against this bill on second reading.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. S.K. Asbell: (Bengough) — Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the private member's bill for Sunday sports. As a matter of fact, I come from a rural community and am not too much involved in the city sports of type, but however, we certainly look upon the free activity of our volition as such. We in the country have, of course, limited activities as to where to go for our recreation, therefore, we have to indulge in our type of recreation, namely the community gathering of baseball, softball, and the like. I might add in all due respect to the opinions of the lady member from Regina, (Mrs. Cooper) this is still a free vote and this is one permissive local legislation, and any community who feel avidly about the situation can vote for or against the permissive type and voluntary type as proposed in this bill.

It would seem, Mr. Speaker, that the question of morality is possibly posed here as to the question of the passing of a dollar bill to see your favorite sport. I might say political gatherings have been indulged by the other side of the house as well as this side of the house, on the Lord's Day without reservation.

Now again, the family. Many families are separated during the week by activities of the man and possibly the lady of the house having to earn a living, and true enough the religious aspect of one's life must be adhered to and there's time allocated, I hope for this. If the family feels free to enjoy an activity of sport, to go as a family, this freedom results with this permissive legislation. If that family felt free to do anything else of course, at this time, it's their own just due that they do.

So I feel in this age of democracy and freedom, that this permissive legislation should be allowed to be put before the people and they the people decide for themselves.

I support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: (Milestone) — I only want to say a word on this, and I am very vitally concerned about this matter because in the past, I have had a great deal of interest in athletics and particularly with young people. I have spent a great portion of my life in coaching athletes. I am very, very, concerned about the condition of amateur sport in the province of Saskatchewan.

Just have a look for a moment at rural Saskatchewan. Fifteen years ago, every community in this province had a sports day, every community in this province had a ball team, and you could go through the month of July and August and travel from sports day to sports day from rural community to rural community. You could find the people of rural Saskatchewan finding their entertainment at home. They were enjoying it. Their young people were participating in good clean athletic sports. I well remember on more than one occasion, I spent the entire months of July and August playing ball myself, and going from community to community and taking part in sports days. Today, this is no longer possible. There is too much competition for athletics

March 4, 1965

We have the television, we have the car, we have all the other various forms of amusements today and it is very, very difficult to get a boy to continue his work or his interest in sport after the age of fifteen or sixteen. I would suggest that this is one opportunity which may revive interest in athletics in rural Saskatchewan today.

I would like to point out that in most fields of sport endeavor, there is no restriction on Sunday. The only restriction is in the group competitive sport, which nine times out of ten involves our young people. Father can pick up the golf clubs in the morning and go golfing. He can spend all day. The older brother can pick up the car and go to the beach and spend the day water skiing, but when it comes to the endeavor of a group sport or a competitive sport, which may involve as many as fifteen or twenty boys of any age, from fifteen to twenty, there is a restriction.

Now the lady member for Regina, (Mrs. Cooper) has brought up a very good point, the problem of professional sport. But I would also point out that there is only one professional organization in the province of Saskatchewan, and that is the Regina Roughriders. There is no professional hockey team; there are no professional ball teams; there is the odd community that do bring up a ball team of college students and pay them enough for their expenses, but I would hardly call this professional ball. The only people involved are actually the Regina Roughriders, but there are thousands of communities in Saskatchewan, thousands of small ball teams, thousands of small hockey teams, which in reality need resources to continue to operate, to provide good clean worthwhile entertainment for the people of Saskatchewan.

I would also like to point out that the biggest problem today in sports, is the growing costs of competition. For example, the Estevan Bruins or the Moose Jaw Canucks, we've all heard the problem that they have had in hockey this winter. These are not professional athletes. These are young junior hockey players, and these communities are trying to hold their hockey teams together, to provide good, clean entertainment. The difficulties of their financial position is unbearable. Unless something is done in the field of sports, there may be further limitations and further reduction in this type of interests. Once again, I can tell you this, in all sincerity, that a boy that is active, a boy that is interested in athletics, if he's interested in hockey, in baseball, in football, this boy is a good boy. I would say that on many occasions, if we can continue the interest of this boy beyond the age of fifteen and sixteen, that the spiritual and religious value that this boy can obtain from athletics could go far to balance the amount of time he might lose on Sunday in playing these sports. I would also point out that even the professional Regina Roughriders provide entertainment for thousands of people in this province. There is no single institution or organization that has captured the imagination of the Saskatchewan people to the extent of the Regina Roughriders. These people have become a byword in the schools, in the classrooms, on the rinks, on the ball fields, in the homes, in the living rooms, of every citizen in southern Saskatchewan and perhaps all of Saskatchewan. If these people are that vitally interested in this endeavor, we must keep them operating, I think that this in itself, does provide an opportunity to help retain the professional Regina Roughriders. I would also like to point out that the member for Bengough, (Mr. Asbell) brought up a very good point. There are many fathers that today leave their home at 9:00 in the morning, Sunday or 6:00, pick up their golf bag and never go to church and never take their family to church. If you can provide an entertainment or a recreation that will hold the family together, that the family can go to together, this in reality can do a great deal for the home and for the family.

And really, even though I know that the lady member, (Mrs. Cooper) for Regina West has a very good point, and is sincere and conscientious in her objection, and has a good valid argument, I would urge the members of the house to consider the other aspects of this problem. This is the kind of a thing where we need a balance scale. There are two sides to the question and we have to try and analyse which side of the balance scale has the most weight.

I would suggest that for the good of rural Saskatchewan, for the good of the young people of Saskatchewan, and for the good of the retention and the development of sports in this province, that this is not a bad piece of legislation, and I would certainly support it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. W.G. Davies: (Moose Jaw) — I would like to, first of all, Mr. Speaker, congratulate the

speaker, the member from Milestone, (Mr. MacDonald) for ably presenting the view point of those that are Sunday-sport supporters. I think that he has presented these views as I have heard them presented quite frequently, and I am getting them now, in some correspondence. I must say that I have some sympathy for his point of view. I must also say, Mr. Speaker, I'm getting representations on the other side of the coin and perhaps he is as well; and maybe other members of this house are as well.

I'm not wholly convinced that Sunday sports would do all the things that the member from Milestone, (Mr. MacDonald) has suggested that they might do. I rather think the problem is much deeper than would be solved simply by the recreation or a Sunday sport position. However, I didn't rise at this time, Mr. Speaker, to do much more than to ask the member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. MacDougall) whether he had considered in his bill, the inclusion of the principle that there might be a local referendum before there would be a decision by by-law. Because it seems to me that this question is one on which there is enough feeling in many communities that the decision would be better based if the citizens were given the opportunity to make this decision by plebiscite or referendum. I don't think subject to the correction of the member, that this bill does include that principle.

Mr. W.A. Robbins: (Saskatoon) — Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a word or two with respect to this particular proposal in support of the hon. lady member from Regina, (Mrs. Cooper). Like the hon. member from Milestone, (Mr. MacDonald) I am very much interested in sports and always have been all my life. I have been very active with boys in boys work, I was even foolish enough up to very few years ago to go out on Sunday afternoons and play rugby with sixteen and seventeen and eighteen year old boys. I found however, that each year that I got older and they got bigger and stronger, the hazard became greater, and finally I thought wisdom the better part of valor and withdrew from that particular scene.

However, I am a very ardent tennis player and I like badminton and I don't think I take a bigoted view in relation to this sort of thing at all. I enjoy playing these games on Sunday, but I think some of the arguments put by the hon. member for Souris-Estevan, (Mr. MacDougall) and also by the hon. member for Milestone, (Mr. MacDonald) are somewhat fallacious. For example, the plebiscites that were held, and I think I quote the figures correctly with respect to those given by the member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. MacDougall). He said Regina was fifty-seven in favor; Saskatoon was fifty-five per cent; North Battleford was sixty-two per cent; and Canora fifty-eight per cent. However, I think it's also fair to say that a very small percentage of these persons voted, and this does not give a very concise picture with regard to the whole scene.

I also think it's rather naive to suggest that if we have stock car racing and motor cycle racing, and hockey and football on a commercial basis, where charges may be made for these sports, that we will soon have a good deal of pressure in terms of horse racing and dog racing and boxing and wrestling, and you will see Sunday becoming more and more an open Sunday.

Now, as I said before, I am not opposed to amateur sport on Sunday. I think this is good, if we get participation of people, but I think what we are talking about here is the fact that we're talking about commercial sport where the vast majority of the people, the only exercise they get is what the member for Bengough (Mr. Asbell) mentioned, in handing out the dollar bill to get through the gate and although it's true they would enjoy fresh air, etc. there is no real participation by the vast majority of these people.

I think also the hon. member for Milestone, (Mr. MacDonald) pointed out there were financial difficulties for organizations like the Estevan Bruins, and this is certainly true. I think this is a clear indication that these are semi-professional sports. These costs are rising all the time because pay scales are involved with regard to these people and there are a very limited proportion of the total number of people in any community participating in these sports. I therefore, take the same stand as the hon. lady member for Regina West, (Mrs. Cooper) and oppose the bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. E.I. Wood: (Swift Current) — Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise to say a few words in regard to this bill. I am quite sure that all members of the house are in favor of amateur sport. I feel that this is one of the best things that we have for our young people today, to keep them out of various kinds of difficulties and trouble. I think that members of the house are possibly equally

March 4, 1965

agreed that we don't want a commercialized Sunday. It seems as though this bill which we have before us is trying to tread a pretty fine line between these two.

The hon. member for Bengough, (Mr. Asbell) mentioned some things that we now have, political meetings and such, and if we have these, why shouldn't we have others? Well, this is practically what I'm afraid of in this bill. If we have these things, why should we not have others? If we have the things which are allowed in this bill what is to prevent us from going all the way into a wide open Sunday? This is something that is a little like a camel's nose into the tent. Once it comes in, it's going to be very difficult to shut the door on other things as well.

The hon. member for Milestone, (Mr. MacDonald) I thought made some good points in regard to the amateur sport in Saskatchewan. We all know that we have had some very good baseball teams and such in the small areas in Saskatchewan, in the small centres. We still have a good many of these teams. We still have a lot of amateur sport. He also pointed out that it is competition that is hurting these, competition with other things. I think if we open up the cities, not only the larger cities but the smaller cities throughout the province, to professional sport on Sunday afternoon, we're really going to hit a pretty hard blow to the amateur sport which is in the surrounding communities.

You say that this bill is open, it's an entirely permissive bill, permissive legislation, that the municipalities will be able to accept or reject. They may accept, but the surrounding communities have no voice whatsoever in what Regina says about it. And their young people are going to be drawn irresistibly to professional sport in the city of Regina, to the detriment of their own amateur sport at home. I think that you will find this throughout the province, that it won't be because of the small communities, the small communities will have no voice in the matter. It will be decided by the larger communities in the province as to what is to be done in regard to Sunday sport. I think the overall picture will not be of any assistance to the amateur sport of the province of which we feel we do need. I thought I would like to bring these points out, Mr. Speaker, in regard to this bill which is before us.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: (Milestone) — Mr. Speaker, I think at this time and I don't want to prolong this because this, at least speak too often . . .

Hon. A.C. Cameron: (Minister of Mineral Resources) — You can't speak . . .

Mr. MacDonald: (Milestone) — Oh, I can't.

Mrs. Sally Merchant: (Saskatoon) — Mr. Speaker, I, as a city representative, would like to put a word in here, but I do feel in this particular area, both our city councils and we here in this house at the moment are doing a little bit of pussyfooting on this particular issue because when the member for Regina mentioned that Mayor Buckwold, in the face of a referendum that had indicated that a majority of the people of the city of Saskatoon were in favor of Sunday sport, when he said what he said, "that this was not a sufficient majority to ask the provincial government for permissive legislation", this was to me an indication of pussyfooting, and I can't think of any other word to describe it. In an area, where I think legislators at all levels of government, whether it's in city councils or whether it's here in the legislature, know in fact, I think, that most people really want Sunday sports.

Now, there have been a variety of reasons advanced here. Some of them have been, I think, very good reasons. Some of them have perhaps, been reasons that are reaching pretty far down. I'm inclined to agree with the member for Moose Jaw, (Mr. Davies) that there should be, coupled with this legislation, a binding clause carrying an obligation on the part of municipal councils for a referendum in that matter, which would give the communities control over their own affairs. I think my position here is not one in which I want to engage in a philosophical discussion of what Sunday is. My own feeling has often been that the law as it exists at the moment is something that discriminates against a great number of people. Because those people over the course of years who were able to pay club dues, who were able to buy the equipment, tennis, badminton, whatever it may be, golf clubs skis, water skis, have the car to get to it, the boat to pull it, all these kind of things have contributed to people being able to engage in sports like this and fill their Sundays, and on the other hand, the law discriminates against not only the young people, as the member for Milestone, (Mr.

MacDonald) has suggested, but I think, very often, against older people. There are in the city of Saskatoon, I know, a great number of quite elderly people who very much enjoy the kinds of sporting events to which they could go under changed legislation.

This is a group that I think is discriminated against if there is no sport on Sunday.

The Assembly recessed at 5:30 p.m. until 7:30 p.m.

Mrs. Cooper: — I wonder if I might ask you a question, Sir, so I won't interrupt the lady member? This bill that we have been discussing is introduced by a private member. Does this not have to go, in this case, to law amendments and representations be heard before it comes back into the house? I just want to be clear on that point.

Mr. Speaker: — I'm not clear on it myself. Just wait a minute. No, when the bill gets second reading, I'm informed, and I think this is correct, when the bill gets second reading and I ask when shall this bill be considered in committee, then if it's to be referred to the law amendments or some other committee, whoever wishes that to be done, that's when that motion should be made. Otherwise, it will go to committee of the whole.

Mrs. Cooper: — That motion can be made then, at a later time.

Mr. Speaker: — Well, it wouldn't be in order to make it now.

Mrs. Merchant: — Mr. Speaker, when we recessed for the dinner hour, I had been, I hope, making my stand clear in connection with the proposed bill to allow Sunday sports. I must say, I agree with the position taken by members and I think it is a very good idea, that this bill on which people are entitled to vote in a personal way. From my own point of view, it is a delight to be able to express your own personal opinion, although I feel that in this connection I speak a little bit for the city of Saskatoon, because I feel that the city has expressed an opinion in favor of this.

Now, I know that there has been reference made here to the fact that the referendum that was held in the city of Saskatoon, because there was a low proportion of the possible voters actually casting votes, that this perhaps was not a true referendum. I know also, that the member who advanced it to prove his own case in opposition to the bill in question. But the fact is that I think most of us will recognize that when there is a low proportion of voters out, you will find that the greatest number of voters who are in fact casting their ballot are those who are opposed. So I think perhaps his argument against using referendum in the cities of Saskatoon and Regina, perhaps speaks for my case rather than for his, because those people in opposition probably all have voted in referendum like this, whereas people who are in favor of Sunday sport notoriously are not those who get out and cast their votes.

So that while we had in the city of Saskatoon, somewhere in the vicinity of fifty-five per cent in favor, it is not a true picture. I think, on the basis of voting patterns in these connections, you would find that had all those people in favor voted in the same proportion as those against, you would find even more voting with it.

But I don't intend to go into all this sort of thing. I had said as we broke at the dinner hour, that I didn't want to get involved in a discussion of the moralities of Sunday sport. From my own point of view, I think I take somewhat of a delight in the sight of empty streets on Sunday. Because this is something that we in Canada perhaps have that makes us a little bit different to our neighbors to the south. But I don't believe that as an individual I can afford to intrude my own feeling into a debate like this. I feel it is the wishes of the people that we're dealing with here and I think they have demonstrated over and over again, in many ways, that they themselves want Sunday sports.

To deal a little bit in moralities, I am one who has always felt that if a thing is good to do on Tuesday, it's equally good to do on Sunday. This sort of thing perhaps is something that we shouldn't be discussing here. But the thing that I would like to say is that there is very often criticism of governments at whatever level for moving too quickly for people.

March 4, 1965

I think we've had examples of this in the province of Saskatchewan where legislation has gone ahead of the wishes of the people. But I think you can probably level the same kind of criticism against governments at what ever level who choose to lag too far behind the wishes of the people. I think if we refuse to do something about this, we are guilty of just this. Lagging too far behind the wishes of people.

We are inclined sometimes to be guided by those groups who make their wishes known. Very often it is the heads of groups of people within society and sometimes one wonders in terms of the ways in which the members of those groups act and indicate their opinion, if sometimes the voice that speaks from the top is in fact voicing the opinion of the people for whom they purport to speak. So I think we can't be guided too greatly in decisions here by shall I say, the voice of pressure groups as such. \

But the thing I do feel is important, is that the member for Regina, (Mrs. Cooper) spoke in terms of this being just, I don't know whether she used the word enabling or permissive legislation. Her choice of the word 'just' permissive legislation struck me because I feel that permissive legislation is at root of a great many of the problems that we have in the province of Saskatchewan. I think we have taken unto ourselves at a provincial level, or provincial government has taken unto itself, very many of the areas in which local government should be concerned. I feel that basic to my argument in favor of Sunday sports, is the thought that this is some thing that rightfully belongs within the jurisdiction of municipal governments. As I said earlier, I am very much in favor and would be almost tempted to move an amendment to the bill as it stands to insist that there be an obligatory clause obliging a referendum in the cities or in the towns or wherever the legislation was contemplated, to insure that it was by local option.

But it seems to me that my argument in favor of the bill rests on two things. One, the fact that this is a matter of local concern, and secondly, I feel, and this is probably even more important, though I can't think that there is, in my mind, anything more important than local control, but this is a law that seems to me contributes to a kind of hypocrisy in which governments engage. Because this is a law that is virtually impossible of enforcement. Over and over again, in every community in this province, the law is broken and we put our police force in a position where they must wink at the breaking of a law. It seems to me that legislative bodies make a mistake when they insist upon perpetuating a law that has over and over again, been proven a bad law in that it cannot be enforced.

So for a variety of reasons, these two, main amongst them, Mr. Speaker, I would like to indicate, if I have not already done so, that I am very much in favor of the motion by the member for Souris-Estevan, (Mr. MacDougall) and would be, as I say, almost tempted to move an amendment though I think perhaps this was the member for Regina's, (Mrs. Cooper) thought in rising. I think there will be further opportunities to look at this bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. T.M. Weatherald: (Cannington) — Mr. Speaker, in speaking to this bill, I would first like to say that I would be very much in favor of what the member for Moose Jaw, (Mr. Davies) suggested that a local option vote be taken previous to allowing or disallowing of Sunday sports.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that I can say justly and without being condemned as being conceited, I feel that I can say that probably I have participated in sports as much as any member in this assembly, particularly in baseball. I have found that I would be somewhat remiss in my duties if I did not say, as a young person, that young people in general want to be able to partake in Sunday sports.

I think there is a point which should be differentiated here and has been differentiated in the bill, in regard to what is commercial sport and what is participant sport. I think race tracks and theatres, although they wouldn't be classified as sport, fall into a commercial operation whereas our amateur teams in baseball and in hockey fall into participant sports, which I think it's in the best interest of everyone that the maximum number of people partake.

I think at the same time, Mr. Speaker, that we cannot overlook, regardless of what we do with this bill, that Sunday sports are here to stay. I had the privilege last year of attending a number of baseball tournaments on Sundays and on a number of occasions there was over 5,000

people there. I think that this itself indicates that the public in general want them.

At the same time, I respect the member from Regina, the lady member from Regina, (Mrs .Cooper) who suggested that Sunday should be kept for families but at the same time, I find that there are many, many other things that young people can do today and I don't think whether Sunday sported are allowed or not, is going to have a great influence on whether families are together on Sundays or not.

I'm also sure that everyone is aware that the younger people have cars, they have a million other things they can do if they don't play baseball or they don't play hockey and I think that in a lot of cases they would be better off, if they were participating in sports than they would be probably doing a lot of other things that they do.

I would also suggest that in many of our smaller towns and indeed in the cities, Mr. Speaker, that we have a number of younger teams who play hockey in the evenings, particularly in hockey they are forced to go out on cold nights and play hockey because they can't charge admission for their hockey games on Sunday. They need these funds to be able to operate, and if we allow them, for three or four hours on Sunday afternoons, to take a small admission, this often means that the younger boys that play hockey or baseball, can get a little funds to help the team operate.

So, Mr. Speaker, I've come to the conclusion, speaking as a younger person, and particularly in my area of the province that I would definitely have to support a move to Sunday sports. I think it's something that we have. I think it's something that's popular and whether we support it or not, I am convinced that it's here to stay.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J.A. Pepper: (Weyburn) — I would like to draw to the attention of the hon. members that I think we are overlooking the ones that are actually participating in these sports. There are still yet, Mr. Speaker, quite a number of our young people who because of their spiritual and religious beliefs and teachings, are opposed to Sunday sports in general. If we allow this bill to pass, we would be giving the municipalities the authority to pass bylaw to allow Sunday sports in the afternoons.

Mr. Speaker, there are still a lot of rural areas that have their church services in the afternoon, and this will continue because of the minister having as high as three services a day and they cannot change it. If a young person is sports minded, he or she is going to have to make a decision, which can be very difficult for them. If they go to church, they can not participate in the sport and they would not have the opportunity to take part in it. By passing this bill, we are making it more difficult for them.

Again, Mr. Speaker, there are those young athletes who are going to school in our cities, studying hard for their educations, providing good entertainment for the public through the week; and by the municipalities having the power to pass this bylaw, they would be expected to participate during Sunday as well, not because of their desire, but because perhaps the executive or their organizations want them to, so they, the executive, can make greater financial gains.

I think, Mr. Speaker, we are the ones who should be making this ruling or act of legislature and not passing the buck, as the saying is, on to our municipalities. Their decision would certainly not be uniform across the province, and would do nothing but cause chaos.

There is a difference, Mr. Speaker, in participating in sport on Sunday from your own desire, and that of being more or less forced into it because of a bill being passed in the legislature, opening the way for provisions to be made by municipalities inducing our youth to participate.

Mr. Speaker, in principle alone, I cannot support the motion or the bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. D. Boldt: (Minister of Social Welfare) — Mr. Speaker I had not intended to take part in this debate but seeing that so many members have risen, I feel that the majority of the members are quite concerned about this bill.

March 4, 1965

I certainly will oppose the bill. I don't profess to be an authority on the good book, nor do I profess to be any better than anyone in the chamber or outside, but I think we will agree that throughout biblical history, nations have fallen because they do not listen to the voice of the good book. I'm sure this is a step in the direction where we are heading for. This is the responsibility of the senior government, not the local government. If we give permission to local governments we are going to have the same situation as the time question creates where in one area it is permitted, the other area it is not permitted, and there is going to be conflict. I think the government should take the responsibility upon itself and tell the people whether we will have legalized sport or not. It certainly would interfere with the Sunday worship even if the time says 1:30. People will refrain from going to church because the pastor might speak past the 12:00 o'clock mark.

Another thing that I don't approve of is, you are going to introduce forced labor, people will have to work on Sunday, who otherwise would not. Your ball clubs and hockey clubs, will engage people that must serve at the cafeterias and at the gates. You are going to have forced labor on Sunday. Whether this is the proper phrasing of the word or not, I am not sure.

Another thing that concerns me, I think you are depriving the poor of attending sport and I don't like to be waging war on the poor. In many areas now, these people have sports on Sunday and I don't oppose sports on Sunday as such, but where you have a local team, its more or less of a friendship game, all people can attend and the majority of people will attend. But once you move into the professional type or the legalized sport where everybody will be charged at the gate, you're depriving the people that can't afford it, the large families.

Then another thing that bothers me, the name of the bill the Lord's Day Act when you're going to introduce sport and theatre shows, I think we should change the name of this act, and call it the Sunday Act or something else. It just doesn't appeal to me.

I certainly think that this is a step in the wrong direction. I would hope that all members would take a very serious view of this and I would hope that you would vote against this bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. W.J. Berezowsky: (Cumberland) — Mr. Speaker, it isn't very often I agree with the hon. member from Rosthern, (Mr. Boldt) but I think on this occasion I do. I don't agree because of the good book. I do agree because I think that we have some responsibility to build a moral society and we do recognize ourselves as a Christian society, and so we have set aside one day, which we try and respect as a day of rest and by respecting this one day, we have built, I think, a good society. It seems to me that the passing of a bill such as has been presented to us, will take away too much from the young people and from future generations. It won't make any difference to me. I'm still going to respect Sunday and I am still going to spend my time on Sunday as I have learned to spend it.

I'm not too certain, Sir, whether we are speaking for all the people of this province, or the majority of the people of this province. I have heard no demand from the area that I represent for the opening of Sunday for commercial sport, for a part of the day or a full day, and unless I were more certain that the society that I have in my constituency would want such legislation, I cannot go along with the bill.

I think the hon. member from Milestone, (Mr. MacDonald) who is a young man, has tried to point out to us that by having commercial sports this would help with the amateur sport activities in our society. Well, I think that those of us who have had sons and daughters, and look back and see the fine children that we have had, we can say that they benefitted quite a bit from amateur sports. They haven't had commercial sports, which I might mention a little later on, but they get sport activities in schools. Today you have unit boards, as you know providing annual sports days. The young people too, are busy during the winter with curling and hockey, and in the summertime it is softball and baseball. Sometimes on a Sunday, they accompany us to our parks and into the recreation areas and so we are very happy as parents, to have those children with us on that one day. It may be after a Sunday service, in the afternoon, and I think that that half a day that we are able to get them out into God's country, the north country, is good for their morality, probably a lot better than commercial sports.

Now, what do commercial sports do to society?

Well, they do a lot of things that are not what the hon. member from Milestone, (Mr. MacDonald) and maybe two or three of the other younger people said they would do. First of all, it has been pointed out by the hon. member from Rosthern, (Mr. Boldt) there is an admission charge, you can't get in unless you pay, but with admissions there is also a lot of gambling that goes on. I know, I visited, Sir, in Manitoba only recently, last summer, and I found people moving in crowds to attend Sunday sports. We find all kinds of gambling going on. Let's not be afraid to say that when you have commercial sports in your country, you are going to have the kind of thing that is happening in the United States, or in Quebec, or in other provinces or states in this American continent of ours, where not only is there gambling but there are much worse things than that going on.

If that is what we want in our province of Saskatchewan, then, of course, we would support such a [text unavailable] but looking to the future, I don't think we want that. I think we want sports; I think we want our young people to have recreation; I don't think we want our young people to crowd on Sundays to watch games which are commercialized. We want participation in amateur games, and amateur sports, of course, let us give young and old all the necessary encouragement. I think the government can find ways, it can provide money for auditoriums, for gymnasiums and assist organizations out in the country, in the rural areas, in the city areas, to obtain, say, equipment. This is what we should have. but why have sports every day of the week? We now have five or six days, must we use Sunday too?

Let's leave Sunday where it is until there are different people in this legislature that may not think as we do, and not live in the kind of society that we live in. At the moment we are living in a good society. Let's keep that society good, Sir.

There is another thing to remember. As time goes on we find that people find more and more leisure time on their hands. We used to work six days a week, and twelve hours or more a day as laborers. Farmers, of course, worked much longer than that. Today, you are getting to the point that people are saying forty hours work is too long, and so they have all kinds of opportunities on week-days to go down to commercial arenas and enjoy themselves, and that again is a good argument why we should give no consideration at all, to this bill. Surely, there is plenty of time for people to spend their time as I say on commercial sports during the week, instead of on Sunday.

I don't know if I have added very much, there has been quite a bit said on both sides of the argument, but to me, as I say, as a man who has raised a family, and I know something about the benefits of amateur sports and how much amateur sports we have now, both in the schools and in the community, I don't see any necessity of expanding that area, and at the same time endangering our society.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. I.C. Nollet: (Cut Knife) — Mr. Speaker, I agree in part with what the hon. member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) said, and, of course, the hon. member for Cumberland, (Mr. Berezowsky) too, and other hon. members in connection with this matter.

I have two principal objections to the bill; one is that there is no provisions made for a plebiscite, and the other one is that sports are not defined into the two categories specifically, commercial sports and amateur sports. If this was a bill that would encourage amateur sports as part of a physical training program. I would be highly in favor of it. I don't think there is any harm at all for young people, as a matter of fact, we should encourage young people to participate actively in sports whether it is on Sunday after services or any other time. The objection I have to this bill, principally, Mr. Speaker, is that I am of the opinion that this bill hasn't been inspired so much because of a desire on the part of the people to have more young people participate in good healthy sports of all kinds, but I rather think it is the commercial type of sports mind that has occasioned the bringing of this bill into this legislature.

I am very opposed to this, Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult to argue on a valid basis that commercial sports do in fact encourage amateur sports. The records prove this is not true. We will take, for example, degeneration of the sport of wrestling, as a result of its commercialization. We can look to commercialization of baseball in the United States and it certainly hasn't added anything to amateur sports and to the, (much as I love football) to the commercialization of football. One of my chief objections to some of these kinds of sports is that they are becoming too commercialized. When a team can offer as much as \$400,000 for a young man graduating from university to have him on their football squad, Mr. Speaker, this is not

sports anymore, in the sense of sports, this becomes purely commercial. They swap players back and forth for huge sums of money as though they were mere chattels, and it has been proven definitely that our good players from the amateur ranks that go into these commercial fields of sport, are very nearly bonded slaves to commercial organizations.

I appreciate the fact that the Saskatchewan Roughriders in this sense are not entirely a commercial sport organization, we say this is a community activity, but nevertheless, we can't help but classify them as a commercial sport as long as they are part and parcel of the commercial football organization, or baseball organization as it has been organized on the North American continent.

I am told, Mr. Speaker that there is no such thing in the state of New Zealand, as a professional sport. The sports there are all amateur sports. This is the way I would like to see it — sports are sports, and sports are designed primarily for wide participation, and I can't for the life of me see how a commercial football game in Regina on a Sunday will encourage young people to participate in sport on that particular day. I just can't see it. We would have a whole lot of young people that ought to be out playing, sitting on their backsides, watching a game, perhaps they do get some inspiration from it, but we find a lot of oldsters sitting there cheering away, watching the gladiators battle one another, feeding their ego and imagining "What could I have done if I was young and vigorous again, as in my day".

Well, this is an outlet, I suppose, but not proper on Sunday, I don't think. May I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that Sunday has been taken over too much by commercialism of all kinds. As a matter of fact, we are beset with commercialism — in our home on Christmas Day too, and we are compelled to look at all kinds of trash, violence of all description, crime of all description, extreme degrading views on sex, and this occurs on Sunday, I think this is about enough, Mr. Speaker, without introducing commercial sports on Sunday.

I don't take any holier-than-thou attitude at all. I like to have Sunday as a time when I can meditate on my own spiritual views, and then I would like to engage in some good healthy recreation together with, yes, my grandchildren and all the rest of them, on that particular day. I think we should keep Sunday free from commercialism more than anything else and if this bill clearly defined that it was the intention to encourage amateur sports on Sunday, I would be all for it, but as long as it is designed the way it is, the very least I think would be the right to a plebiscite, because people do have varying views on this subject, as had been demonstrated in this legislature.

I think before any local council should pass such a by-law, it ought to be submitted to a plebiscite at least. So for these reasons, briefly outlined, Mr. Speaker, I will oppose the legislation as it is presently introduced.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. H. Broten: (Watrous) — Mr. Speaker, as I rise, I would be remiss, the way I feel about this, if I didn't say a word. Mr. Speaker, the lady member for Regina West, (Mrs. Cooper) did say my sentiments in this very clearly and did a very good job I thought. I would like to put this matter of Sunday sports in an area that I would call a sensitive area, an area where we should probably be very careful when we move in it, and have a lot of signs that people do want it without any doubt at all. I would like to think that this could be an area something like some of our democratic rights, some changes in constitution, etc, that probably we should have or demand, more than a simple majority. Probably two-thirds in my mind.

I think, Sir, that commercial sports, once it gets into the commercial field we have pressures put on by reason of the money involved, the hullabaloo that naturally follows this type of thing, and you get it out of the ordinary hands so easily, that this average person is no longer in control of the whole area, as he would be under normal circumstances.

I think the true picture can be obscured so easily when it gets into the commercial field by reason of the fact, that we get so interested in our business commercially that we just go out to sell it regardless of what we have to sell, or how it affects people as a whole. I think that we have got to remember too, that all signs point to at the present time, more than it ever has before in my life, that we are going to have shorter work

weeks; we are going to have more leisure time for sports other than Sunday. My boy plays ball on Sunday, but I don't think I would like to see Sunday commercialized as we have seen it across the line and many places. We value the fortitude both morally and spiritually within our nation: and I think this is built up through a respect for our Sundays and all that is involved.

Yes, I think that we should be cautious. We should make sure that we have a very strong sentiment for this type of thing, and I think here is the place for the decision to be made, rather than in the municipalities because of the importance of uniformity, pressures on one community that lead to pressure on another community and it snow balls which is a reaction that we can't stop, even if one wanted to.

Therefore, I vote against the principle of the bill.

Mr. L.M. Larson: (Pelly) — Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to participate to any extent in this debate. I find, however, that there are some points that I must, in conscience, voice my opinion on. There are three specific areas that I want to spend a few minutes on. The hon. member from Cut Knife, (Mr. Nollet) to some extent said what I had wanted to say, so I will not repeat or bore the house with it.

First of all, on this basis of local decision, I think this is the wrong place to put the onus, I think this is wrong to have the decision made there. We are going to have, as has been pointed out, a hodgepodge of different regulations from the different areas. This, to me, is not the proper approach. If we are to deal with it at all in this legislature, then we say it shall be all over the province or it shall be not at all. I take objection and exception to allowing this to be left as a local option.

My second point of objection is the fact that this is essentially opening a door to commercialism. Now where do we stop? Commercial sports, baseball, football, hockey, and so on, and where do we stop? I have already had a couple of phone calls from people that are already interested in expanding this, taking it into other fields. So here I say we are merely opening the door, that is going to be very difficult, very hard to keep from going probably further than the intent of this bill at the moment, anticipates. We may also expect that we will have beer parlours wanting to stay open on Sunday, and I think this is opening a door in the wrong direction.

Now my third point, I have to agree with the hon. member from Rosthern, (Mr. Boldt) that although I am not particularly a religious man, it does go against my grain that we are going to move in this direction. I think that this is putting a materialistic approach on the whole concept of our moral fibre. I would remind members, and many of you have read probably as much of the Bible as I have, that it says, "Remember the Sabbath, keep it holy". These are pretty important factors in this so-called Christian society. Factors that we can't overlook or ignore. I would certainly not feel right within myself, if I were to promote, were to go along with a concept that is going to try to destroy or detract from this moral concept. I think that this is very important, and I think that this is the major objection that I have to this particular piece of legislation at this time.

I think that if we were pressured from groups of religious denominations and others that this is essentially important and that they could prove to us that we are not detracting from our Christian and our moral principles, then probably we could, to some extent, look at, maybe eventually justify doing this. But the church that I belong to doesn't believe that this is the direction we want our present Christian society to go into. It can point out very clearly and very distinctly, the effects that this type of approach has had on other societies and other peoples, and I think that we cannot ignore this. My own conscience dictates that I cannot ignore this, so I say, Mr. Speaker, that we are not moving in the right direction, and I will, therefore, have to oppose the proposed legislation.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. R.H. Wooff: (Turtleford) — Mr. Speaker, this is one of the very difficult questions. I find myself very much in sympathy with a great deal that has been said regarding to this bill and I find myself wholeheartedly in sympathy with our gracious member for Regina West, (Mrs. Cooper).

This is one of the fields in which democracy finds itself in a difficult position. You may say to me, "I can only conduct my business on certain days of the week", I may not like it, but I will accept the decision

of the majority, but I find it very difficult when I come into other areas because I am not prepared to accept the will of the majority insofar as my conscience is concerned, and I do not want to impose my will upon my fellowman, by law and by force.

The will of the majority which rules in so many areas of our present day democratic life, to me doesn't apply in the same sense in this particular case, so I find myself in a much more difficult position. But I do agree that once we begin to let down moral and spiritual bars that we are opening the gates to the very kind of moral breakdown that has taken every empire and every nation to its doom. I invite you to read the history of old empires where this kind of thing, along with the elements that are always associated with it, are what have broken down the moral fibre of all the nations before us.

You do put pressures on young people and you do put pressures on parents, and when my hon. friend from Milestone, (Mr. MacDonald) begins to talk about the spiritual fibre in commercial sport, talking about the Roughrider and national hockey and so on, some of the things I read about what goes on behind the scenes, the conduct and the language and so on, I have grave doubts about the spiritual uplift in these fields. I do agree with him that the sports field properly supervised is a wonderful place. I do doubt in my value in my own mind of taking our Sundays for this kind of activity. I don't see why we have to conduct our business all week long and then rob our Sundays for recreation in the form of organized sport.

However, there is one other thing that disturbs me about the bill, Mr. Speaker, I notice that this is only half a measure, this angle of the proposed legislation. I had noticed until this evening — the hon. lady member for Saskatoon, (Mrs. Merchant) was talking about the difficulty the police were finding themselves in continually, because they had to wink at a great deal of disregard for the Lord's Day Act. May I suggest this bill is going to do nothing for them, because it is only opening up sport from 1:30 p.m. until 6:00 p.m. and you are going to have just as much trouble in that area from 6:00 o'clock on during the long summer evenings as you have had during the rest of the day, and I would remind you, that there are still many areas, where afternoon services are conducted. This is going to be just as difficult a situation for the police as it has been in the past. I, for one, cannot accept this part of the bill.

As I said a little while ago, I don't want to impose my beliefs and ideas upon my fellowmen in the religious and spiritual areas of their lives, but we have decisions to make and as the bill is at the present time Mr. Speaker, I cannot support it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. A. Guy: (Athabasca) — I hadn't particularly anticipated taking part in this debate, but I feel that in regard to some of the remarks that have been made that perhaps I should.

Now, I am like the member from Cumberland, (Mr. Berezowsky) I come from a constituency where there has been no particular pressure put upon me in regard to Sunday sport, for or against. But at the same time I come from an area and I know the member from Cumberland, (Mr. Berezowsky) has similar areas, where Sunday is the most important day of the week as far as business goes, and it is due entirely to sport, and that is the sport of fishing.

All the argument that have come from members on both sides of the house in regard to Sunday sport increasing the amount of employment needed, people having to work etc, can be applied to sport fishing. This sport does that perhaps more than any other sport that we could participate in. There are more people forced to work on Sunday up in my constituency in the cafes, and in the filleting plants and in the out-fitting camp, than there are on any other day in the week, and it is done under the name of sport — sport fishing. Now, if it is all right to have to employ people for that sport, why isn't it all right to have to employ them for the sport of baseball, softball or football or any of these other sports that we mention in this bill?

What is the difference between participating in the sport of fishing or participating in or watching the sport of football or baseball? In order to fish, you have to pay for it. All we are saying is perhaps the major sport, either amateur or professional, should be in a position where they can charge for admittance and so on.

Now, we mention amateur sport. Some of the members opposite feel that if this was confined to amateur sport they would go along with it. I would say that this is logical reasoning, but at the same time in this day and age, even amateur sports costs a great deal of money and personally I would rather know that my boy was participating in a sport, where the facilities were adequate, where the equipment that he was going to use was adequate, than to have him in some back lot where he could break his neck or his arm, or his leg, with no supervision, or no equipment. I would far sooner see him in an organized league, amateur or professional, yet to have these organized sports, you have got to have the money to pay for them.

Unfortunately, and I am probably as much to blame as any other member on either side of the house, who have children. We do not and we are not prepared to pay our share of providing the equipment and the facilities for our boys and girls to get out and participate. That is one of the reasons, the basic reason I contend that we must be able to charge for sport activities such as baseball and softball, so that the people who come to watch these games can contribute. As I say, we as parents, sometimes fail in being prepared to provide the necessary funds to see that our children do have the facilities and the equipment and so on, in order to make their game safe.

Another point that I would like to raise is that we are not asking for anything that isn't being done at the present time. People are participating in sport, both professional and amateur, and I do agree with the members that have spoken in favor of a referendum. I think that it is only right that any given community should have the opportunity to decide for themselves whether they want to have either amateur or professional sports taking place in their community on Sunday.

As far as saying that this is a question of religion, I can't altogether agree with it. I don't believe religion enters into it at all. If the only reason you are not going to go to church is because you can go to a football game or conversely you go to church because there isn't any football game, well then, I don't think you are a particularly good adherent to your church anyway. I think that this is strictly a matter of conscience. If you believe in going to church on Sunday, you're going to go to church whether there's a football game, a baseball game, or whatever there is. If you don't want to go to church on Sunday, you're not going to go whether there's a football game, or you go to play golf, or you go fishing or any thing else. It's strictly a matter of conscience. You have to decide that for yourself. I don't think we should place ourselves in the position of legislating to help somebody to follow his conscience. If he can't follow it, his own volition, certainly we shouldn't accept the responsibility of trying to make a better person out of him.

So I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I can wholeheartedly support this bill, because as I say it's for something which we are already doing. I think that we're going to provide better facilities and I'd far sooner have my boy out on the football field playing football, or playing baseball or playing hockey, in facilities where he is being supervised, where the equipment is there, than to have him out somewhere in the back alley or on the back street where I don't know where he is or what he is doing. So I'm pleased to give wholehearted support to this bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. W.E. Smishek: (Regina East) — I rise and take part in this debate with some mixed feeling, I want to say that I have had representations made to me both for the idea and against the idea. It is not an easy decision to make. I am, however, concerned about the extension of commercialism. I'm wondering whether this really is not the thin edge of the wedge. Where might this lead us into? Will the extension of Sunday sport in the commercial field lead us into the next step of opening of other shops and other businesses on Sunday? We have seen that, particularly across the border a few years ago, this has become the case. First of all, they started with sport, then they followed where many other enterprises started to open up and today, Sunday is just like any other day, whereas, at least in this province, we still do reserve Sunday both for purposes of family unit, to be together, as well as for worship.

I think that in the world we are living in where we are subjected to more pressures from work, from commercialism, from the speed of technology, that this is important for man to have a day set aside where he can rest and do some thinking. However, there is no question that there are a lot of people who do favor the idea, then there are those that are against it. A suggestion has been made that there should be referendums in each city or each town or each municipality. There are dangers in a referendum because people who have pecuniary interests will put on campaigns in the way that they will try to sway the vote. So there are some dangers with having referendums. The group that has the most money to sponsor the largest campaign in support of the idea, has chances of winning the election.

I do think, Mr. Speaker, that this legislature would be well advised to have this referred to the law amendments committee, where we can receive some representations from people who are interested in this and then we will be able to make a better decision as to how people really feel. I'm sure that many would appear before the law amendments committee and present their views, organizations, individuals, and in this way, we would get a better opinion of how to make a better judgment.

As I said, I have mixed feelings, I know that members in this house, from both sides of the house have mixed feelings about it, because this is somewhat of a thorny problem caused by pressures from their constituents.

Mr. G.G. Leith: (Elrose) — Well, Mr. Speaker, I didn't intend to take part in this debate at all but I find that I'm forced to because after hearing so much I haven't heard what I wanted to hear in the debate. I haven't heard an expression of my own particular opinion about it, so I will proceed with your permission to give it to you.

Years ago, farmers could be fined for threshing on Sunday and this used to happen once in a while. If a complaint was made by a neighbor and a man was out combining his crop, the police could come along and give him a summons and he would have to appear in court and could be fined. We don't do this anymore, Mr. Speaker, and I think that it's a good thing.

I take the position that it's very difficult, in fact it's impossible to legislate any kind of morality, and if we're talking about morality in the case of this act, I say again, that this legislature can't pass a law and expect the people of Saskatchewan to observe it as far as their personal conduct on Sunday is concerned.

Many nations of the world now allow Sunday sports. Sunday sports are going on in Canada. They are going on in Saskatchewan. People are paying for them. But they are illegal. I think that we should make this legal from the hours of 1:00 to 6:00 and I say to members of the legislature that if a referendum or a vote was allowed in each particular case, there would still be three checks against any abuse of this six hours or five hours.

The first check would be that the local municipality would have to vote on it. They would have to decide on it themselves. The second check would be that if there was a plebiscite to precede this to give a clear indication to the officials of the municipality, that they wanted Sunday sport, and the third and most important check would be the conscience of the person himself, the person who is going to go or going to stay away from it.

I take the position that we can't as an assembly or we shouldn't at least, try and legislate this kind of conscience into people. I know that I'm not particularly enthused about professional sport. I couldn't care if football was played or not. I sometimes watch the hockey on Saturday night but still I will defend another person's right to watch it whenever and wherever they wish.

We could go back for several generations in this country. We have always been a moral society as far as observing Sunday, but in the last generation or so, we have observed Sunday in the breach. People play golf. I know that many members of this legislature play golf on the morning and this is fine. It's a participant sport. Many people play cards on Sunday. Many people will drive and pay money to get into a park to swim. Many people watch television. These are the things that we can't legislate against. I feel as a matter of conscience that we should allow the bill to have the second reading and then work on it in committee.

I say again, that there are still three checks, first, if it were amended or if a plebiscite were added to it, this would be the first; the officials of the municipality would have the second check. and the third and most important check would be each person would be able to decide whether he could or whether he wished to take himself and his family to see this

sport or stay away from it. I think I will support the bill, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. M. Breker: (Humboldt) — Mr. Speaker, I believe there are three types of sport. Let's take hockey for instance. There's the professional type. Let's use Saskatchewan for instance. We have only one professional sport here in Saskatchewan and that's football. I couldn't care less if the Roughriders played on Sunday or week days.

Secondly, we have the commercial type of sport. We had the Humboldt Indians hockey club in our area for years and thank God, they're gone. I don't think these gentlemen or these players lent a thing to our youth, and I believe our children were neglected as a result of that type of sport.

Now, the third type of sport, is amateur hockey and here you have community participation. Mr. Speaker, we in the Humboldt constituency have been doing for years what the member from Souris-Estevan (Mr. MacDougall) is only now trying to legislate. We have ball tournaments, junior, senior, pee wees from June until the end of September.

You cannot legislate morality or faith. If a child isn't taught respect of the Sabbath, a mere absence or mere presence of legislation, won't remedy this situation. I say to members of this house, vote as your conscience dictates. But as for myself, I will vote for the motion in principle.

Mr. A.E. Blakeney: (Regina West) — Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words under two broad headings. The one is along the following lines. I read the bill and I was intrigued by it solely in its legal aspects. I had doubts, without doing any substantial amount of work on it, whether or not it is within the province of this legislature to pass an act which purportedly modifies the federal Lord's Day Act. I don't want to labor this point but I would like at some stage in the proceedings, an expression of opinion, either from the Attorney General or from the Legislative Council. I think the appropriate source of an opinion on this subject is the Attorney General.

However, that's really not the major point I wanted to raise. I think, whether or not the bill is entirely constitutional, it would serve as a basis for action in Saskatchewan, even if it turned out to be not constitutional, and that is perhaps all we need to do as a Legislature.

I wanted to say that I view the fact that the bill was introduced into the house, with a bit of sadness, because it indicates to me that the Sunday which we have known is passing. I hope that I don't speak in any holier-than-thou tone when I say that when I go down to the United States, as I do from time to time, and see a completely wide open Sunday, with the stores open on Sunday and generally almost all commercial activities being carried on on Sunday, I view this with some distaste, not any moral distaste but I would think that I would not want to live in that particular community because it seems to be a very fractured community. The people work. There is never anyone day when any substantial number of the family are not working and therefore can be together.

I therefore, view this development with some concern. Not only that, but it seems to me to be self-defeating because the principal attraction of Sunday sport is that it is a day that many people will have off from work. If the idea of Sunday sports becomes generalized, at all, if it goes from Sunday sport to Sunday theatres, to Sunday beer parlors, to Sunday commercial establishments, the advantage of Sunday sport will pass because so many people will in fact be working that the particular attraction of Sunday sport will have vanished.

I view also, with some misgivings, the fact that undoubtedly some additional employees will be put under pressure to work on Sunday when they might not wish, from a moral point of view, to work on Sunday. I might hasten to add, that I would not think that I ought to oppose this bill on the grounds that it would restrain anyone from attending a sport function on Sunday. I doubt very much whether it's the province of legislatures to impose moral restraints on people. I leave that up to their own conscience. The only reason why I might be tempted to vote against it is because people might be under pressure to work on Sunday, when they did not wish to do so.

However, I recognize that there are good and valid arguments against many of the ones that I have raised, and I think that many of them were marshalled and put very well by the member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald), and other have raised them.

I view this as an issue on which people feel pretty strongly. At least the opponents of Sunday sports view it with some strength. I find no pattern among the people who are for it and against it — no pattern along political lines or along broad philosophic lines. There are some correlations between particular religious persuasions and points of view on this, but my point is that the question has no party political content. Whether we view as federal or provincial or municipal, I don't see any particular correlation here. When this is so, and when there is therefore no position which a recognized political movement can fairly represent on this, because their supporters will not be uniformly of the same view on it at all, I think it's particularly a question which lends itself to a decision by plebiscite. Accordingly, while I don't normally approve of plebiscites in deciding issues, certainly if they are complicated issues and certainly if the issues are part of the general philosophy of a political party. Where we find an issue which is relatively clear cut and which is completely free from any party lines, so far as I can detect it, I think it lends itself very well to the plebiscite approach.

I have indicated some of my own personal misgivings about the trend but I have to admit, with the member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. MacDougall) that this particular bill is not going to lead to a wide open Sunday. It is one relatively small step towards that, and I cannot lay at the door of this bill, the bringing about of a condition such as I view with some dismay when I go to the United States. Furthermore, I am conscious that many of the people that I represent and I believe a majority of the people I represent, would want me to support the general principle of this bill. I think however, that for the reasons which I have given, we ought as a legislature to attack this problem with some caution and allow every person who feels that they ought to have an opportunity to be heard, to be heard. I think here of possibly using the facilities of law amendments committee or some other appropriate facility to allow people to have an opportunity to have their say. And then I think we ought to provide in the bill that there would be a plebiscite for all the reasons mentioned by many of the members. Having said that, having expressed the view that we ought to try to see that people who might want to make representations have an opportunity so to do, and that we ought to provide in the bill for a plebiscite, having said that, I would support the bill on second reading and await what might come out of the committee before taking a final position of it. I think it is a bill which the majority of my constituents would want me at least to approve in principle so that the house might consider it more fully in committee. I would therefore be supporting the bill in general with the hope that the changes which I have suggested might be achieved in committee.

Hon. G.B. Grant: (Minister of Highways) — Mr. Speaker, it seems that this evening is an evening for confessions or baring of the souls, and this issue reminds me somewhat of the Moose Jaw highway No. 2, there seems to be a certain area of confusion and difference of opinion . . .

Mr. Walker: (Hanley) — Not no. 2

Mr. Grant: — . . . I'm glad to find that the former Minister of Agriculture the hon. member for Cut Knife, (Mr. Nollet) has time to meditate on Sunday and I'm sure he didn't have time when he was Minister of Agriculture, but this is not a reason why I would decide one way or the other because right now I do not have time to meditate on Sundays nor take in Sunday sports or any thing else. I'm breaking the Sabbath by working for the department.

It's a most difficult matter to decide but I doubt whether I can add too many new arguments pro or con. I think there have been some very good arguments placed before us this evening. I feel personally that I was elected to represent my constituents, I assume, because of the vote taken a year ago, have expressed their feeling. Granted it was not too strong one way or the other, somewhat like the Moose Jaw highway. One of the hon. members expressed concern that he didn't want to impose his opinion or at least impose his decision on the people. By not supporting the bill, that is exactly what we would be doing; we'd be imposing our decision on the people so they would have no choice. I concur with the hon. member from Prince Albert, (Mr. Steuart) that this is a matter of each individuals conscience and each individual should determine his feelings and cast his vote on it.

I cannot support the bill in its present form, but I support it in principle at this stage and I would be prepared to support it with a plebiscite amendment attached to it.

Mr. Martin P. Pederson: (Arm River) — Mr. Speaker, I had had no intention of joining in this debate this evening but I want to say at the outset that I believe that I have been privileged to witness one of the most thoughtful and certainly most thought-provoking debates that I have ever witnessed in this house.

The question before the house, in dealing with this particular act, seems to me to revolve around the question of whether we are, if you will, flouting religious customs of the past or present, in supporting this bill. I agree with what was said by several members in that the conscience of the individual must set the pattern that he follows. Certainly not legislation. And I together with the member from Regina, (Mr. Blakeney) who spoke a while ago, feel some sadness that the Sunday as those of us who profess to some feelings that are very deep insofar as religion is concerned, very sad to see those days, as it were, passing away. But I do agree with what has been said by many members, that in some aspects of our life those days have in fact already passed away. We are prepared to accept in our society, perhaps not in the field of sport, but in many areas, the principle that people are compelled through one form or another, to work on Sunday. I don't think there is a soul in this house who has not driven his car on a Sunday, at some time or another, pulled up to a service station and bought a tank of gas, and driven to a restaurant and had a meal and so on. We expect that service and we would be appalled if our community was one that had none of these facilities available.

The extension to the field of sport is something that in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, has been going on for some time. I find in the city of Saskatoon, that if you wish you can golf, you can play ball, you can bowl, you can play tennis, badminton, any one of a dozen type of sports that you care to mention.

I'm not necessarily saying that this is a good thing, I am stating that as the laws now exist, these things are possible and are practised, and with the suggestion that have been made regarding some amendments, which I hope would be placed before the house at the time when it goes to committee of the whole. I see no reason why the members could not advance this bill to the committee so that there would be an opportunity to find out if the fears that some members have been expressing cannot be eliminated through some changes in the wording of the act itself. I am of the opinion that we should give this bill an opportunity to move further ahead and I am prepared, as the Hon. Minister of Highway, (Mr. Grant) stated, to support it on principle so that it can be moved ahead, and to reserve the right to decide at that stage when I've had a chance to look at amendments that might be proposed, whether I would support it in any further stages beyond that.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. D.G. MacLennan: (Last Mountain) — Mr. Speaker, I think this issue is a very personal one to all people concerned, both to the members of this legislature and to their constituents. We all have our own personal religious and moral beliefs and on this matter and as individuals, I do not think we can presume to inflict our own personal ideas on the people that we were elected to represent.

I have heard a number of very valid arguments presented tonight and some that I think were not so valid. One of the arguments I've heard was that we should have Sunday sports to further and to maintain amateur athletic teams. In the province of Saskatchewan we've had very successful amateur athletic teams; we've watched them; some of us have participated in them and yet we did not have Sunday sports. I think personally amateur athletics teams right across this province can grow without having Sunday sports and I don't think that that is a valid argument.

I do listen with a great deal of thought to the suggestions presented by the member for Regina South (Mr. Grant) the member for Regina West, (Mr. Blakeney) and the member for Arm River, (Mr. Pederson) and I personally feel that I cannot support the bill in its present form.

I would like to see, however, the bill progress into committee of the whole, I would, I think support the bill, if a free referendum or plebiscite was assured to the people of the province on this matter, and again on this particular topic I do not agree with the member for Regina East, (Mr. Smishek) when he expressed his fears of a referendum. He very sincerely stated his feeling that there were bound to be some interests that might be financially involved in Sunday sports. These people might represent a great financial complex or something along that line and consequently put up a lot of money to present their case to the people. Well,

I do not believe the amount of money spent in elections or on referendums or plebiscites such as this would affect the outcome because I'm certain there are highly organized and well financed pressure groups against this bill. There could be some come forward in favor of it. So I do not agree that money and the campaign that could be waged for or against in a referendum would affect the outcome of such a vote.

But I do believe that I personally would like to see this bill go to the law amendments committee. I represent a rural constituency in this province, a number of the larger towns in my constituency do not engage in Sunday athletics on the amateur level, some towns do so, however. I would like to welcome further representation from my constituency on this bill, from both those that are in favor and those that are opposed. I would now support the idea that this be referred to the law amendments committee. If it is not, I would go along with seeing this bill progress into the next stage.

That, Mr. Speaker, is my feeling and I think the feelings of the people that I represent in the best way that I can assess them at the moment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. J.M. Cuelenaere: (Minister of Natural Resources) — Mr. Speaker, I was just going to add a few words to what has been said, I had no intentions of speaking on the matter, but I'm some what surprised that the hon. member for Regina West (Mr. Blakeney) had questioned the possible constitutional validity of the act. I think it's quite clear that the Lord's Day Act permits this type of legislation by the provincial authorities. Section six which governs games and performances where admission is charged clearly states that it is not lawful for any person on the Lord's Day, except as provided in any provincial act or law or hereafter enforced, to engage in any public games and so on. Now, Mr. Speaker, it's under that exception that acts such as this have been introduced in other provinces, they have been introduced in Ontario, it's been introduced in Manitoba and British Columbia and I think that this act is exactly along the same line.

Now, apart from that I certainly take the same view as the hon. member for Regina West. I'm going to support this bill on second reading in order that it may progress into the committee stage, and at that time, we will have a full opportunity of discussing possible amendments to make it more acceptable by providing a plebiscite or a local plebiscite. I just wanted to make that observation and I don't think I can add anything else. Much has been said for and against the basic principle of the bill.

I am going to support it on second reading in order that it may progress to the committee stage.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. A.M. Nicholson: (Saskatoon) — Mr. Speaker, I had planned on asking earlier that the debate be adjourned, but a great many members have spoken and I agree, this has been one of the most interesting debates that I've heard since coming to the legislature. But in view of the fact that a number of members are unhappy with the bill as it is, and wish to have some changes made, I would beg leave to adjourn the debate because I think there are some other members who still would like to say something, because when we give it second reading, we are agreeing in principle and I would beg leave, Mr. Speaker, to adjourn the debate at this point.

Hon. A.H. McDonald: (Minister of Agriculture) — Mr. Speaker, might I say a word on the move to adjourn the debate. It is not possible to change the content of this bill in its present stage in the house. But the content of the bill can be changed if we advance it into committee of the whole and I would give the assurance as Deputy Premier of this house, that when the committee sits or if this bill proceeds to committee of the whole, house amendments will be prepared and brought forward that I think will meet much of the criticism that the bill has received at this stage. I would like to see the house advance to that stage where we can make the amendments that so many people have referred to and perhaps the amendments that the member for Saskatoon has in mind can be brought in, changes can be made at that time, but they cannot be made at this time.

I would very much like to see the bill move on to the committee stage. I object to the . . .

Mrs. Cooper: — May I ask the hon. member a question? Would you be prepared as the Deputy Premier to say you'll be willing to have this go to the law amendments committee so that outside people could come in and we could have their expression of opinion. I'd like to know that.

Mr. A.H. McDonald: (Moosomin) — No, personally I would not. I've been a member in this house for some eighteen years, and I don't think there's been a year yet when the pros and cons and sometime both cases have had representation to groups that I have been with in support or opposing this type of legislation, and I think we've advanced to the stage where we as members must accept the responsibility and vote for or against as our conscience guides us. One reason I didn't take part in the debate, I have no desire to try to influence anyone in this house. Some members stated earlier on that they wouldn't vote for the bill because of its present form, but I think this is the wrong attitude. Its present form, means little during second readings. Second reading is pure and simple principle; the content of the bill must be discussed in committee of the whole. I think all members ought to be in the position now to take a stand when the bill is in committee and to bring in whatever house amendments they feel are necessary in order to implement law in this province that will meet the needs and the wishes of the majority of our people.

Mr. Wood: — Mr. Speaker, I need hardly to point out to you that adjournment motions are not debatable.

Mr. Speaker: — Yes, I realize it's out of order. The question before the house is the request of the member for Saskatoon that the debate be adjourned. Has the hon. member leave to adjourn the debate?

The question being put on the adjournment motion, it was negatived on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 24
Messieurs

Brockelbank (Kelsey)	Whelan	Snyder
Cooper(Mrs.)	Nicholson	Broten
Wood	Kramer	Larson
Nollet	Dewhurst	Robbins
Walker	Berezowsky	Brockelbank (Saskatoon)
Blakeney	Michayluk	Pepper
Davies	Smishek	
Thibault	Link	
Willis	Wooff	

NAYS — 30
Messieurs

Howes	MacDougall	Bjarnason
McFarlane	Coderre	Romuld
Boldt	McIsaac	Weatherald
Cameron	Trapp	MacLennan
McDonald (Moosomin)	Grant	Larochelle
Steuart	Cuelenaere	Asbell
Heald	MacDonald (Milestone)	Hooker
Guy	Gallagher	Radloff
Merchant (Mrs.)	Breker	Coupland
Loken	Leith	Pederson

The motion is lost and the debate continues on the motion for second reading.

Mr. Nicholson: — Mr. Speaker, I must thank the hon. members for flattering me by wishing to hear me for a long while this evening . . .

March 4, 1965

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Nicholson: — It's a long while since I had the opposition so unanimous in wishing my very melodious voice. I did want to say before that I think the government was to be commended for bringing this measure in and suggesting a free vote.

As members on both sides have indicated, we are discussing a very sensitive area. There are people in the province who feel very strongly on both sides. When the plebiscites were being taken, there were those who were looking forward to more dollars available if the legislation could be changed. It's true that for a long, long time people have on the prairies had Sunday activities, and it's along while since action was taken to my knowledge that did interfere with the citizens who wanted to participate in amateur sports. Like the member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) and some of the other members I too, have had an active career in athletics over a longer period than most members here. As a matter of fact, it was my first year in the west, where they didn't seem to have anything to do on Sunday that resulted in my eventually finding myself a Minister of the United Church. My first work was with a threshing outfit. The threshing machine did stop on Sunday but poker playing was the order of the day for most of the men on the threshing outfit, and it seemed then that there should be more leadership provided in the community to have helpful recreation and I soon found myself as a school teacher some twenty miles from the nearest rink or the nearest church or the nearest community. A country school teacher was expected to provide some leadership in the activities to try to have the young people take an active part in athletic activities on a year-round basis, and it was somewhat disturbing to find even more than forty years ago, the place of the dollar bill in the effect on athletic activities in Saskatchewan. I was quite a good ball player in those days and found myself a member of a semi-professional ball team. It did seem that this wasn't the ideal way to develop athletics in a small community. You had a great many people who weren't quite as good players as some of the American imports but had they been involved everyone would have had more fun. I think we've had a fair measure of success over the years in having people who were prepared to play ball on Sunday without asking their neighbors to pay a dollar or fifty cents or seventy-five cents to come to watch them. I think that this is one of the problems that we do have to give consideration to.

Is this, as we celebrate the Saskatchewan's Diamond Jubilee and as we prepare for Canada's centennial, is this to be one of our main moves in the year 1965? Do we in Saskatchewan want to import from the United States, from Montana, the practice of having commercial Sunday sports?

For my part I cannot support this move and I think that members on both sides who haven't spoken would like to have a chance to consult with their constituents. I'm sure that a number of my constituents would like to have Sunday sports. I would like to have a weekend to get the views of some of the people but this didn't seem to meet with the approval of those who are opposite and in the meantime we do have to consider whether it is in the best interests when this legislature is divided as closely as it is divided apparently, and I'm very glad that the Minister of Social Welfare, (Mr. Boldt) and I are on the same side of this particular issue.

An Hon. Member: — You could be wrong.

Mr. Nicholson: — Well, I don't think it proves to his friends that he must be wrong because he and I happen to be on the same side of this particular issue. I'm not sure that there are a great many people in the province who voted for candidates opposite would like to have the chance to come before a committee of the legislature. They would have a chance to tell us over the weekend whether the Bill 29, should be passed in spite of the fact, that there are members on both sides of the house who would like to move in this general direction, but they cannot support the legislation as it is presently drafted.

I was hoping that the house leader, The Minister of Health, (Mr. Steuart) and the Deputy Leader, would have said without any reservations, that before this legislation becomes law of Saskatchewan, they would like to provide ample opportunity to people in Saskatchewan, in the cities, in the towns and in the villages, who have strong views one way or the other to present their views. I'm sure that on reflection that this would serve the best interests of the greatest number. The children who are going to be remembering 1965, would like to have something more than Bill 29 as one of the outstanding bills passed in this legislature this session.

The Minister of Highways, (Mr. Grant) and the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Cuelenaere) have indicated that they can't support the bill in its present stage, that they would like to make some changes.

They would like a majority of the members of this house, to give second reading to this bill, which says that they do approve of this measure in principle, then after having said they approve it in principle to try to wiggle out after we've gone into committee. The members on this side of the house have not moved that this bill be not now read a second time, but that it be referred. Certainly we were hoping that there would be no objection to my motion to adjourn the debate, to give members of the Progressive Conservative party, and the Liberal party and our party, to consult their constituents, their friends in the province who have very strong views about this particular type of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that as far as I know, this was not outlined as part of the plan that elected the members opposite to the government. If this was one of the planks in the platform. I didn't read it and I think to try to force a decision tonight on the 4th day of March after a very, very brief period, of debating the strength and the weaknesses of the measure with one cabinet minister speaking out quite fearlessly in opposition and two other cabinet ministers having some serious reservations. This is not the way to build a strong Saskatchewan as we celebrate sixty years and move on into the future. I realize that there are differences of opinion in different parts of the province and I think members on both side s of the house have spoken with restrain, have spoken objectively. I think those who are for the measure and those who are against do want to have legislation which they believe will be in the best interests of all the people in Saskatchewan. But I'm sure we all have respect for others. Some of us spent our childhood days where very high priority was given to honor the Sabbath day. As a matter of fact, my teaching in Sunday School was if you couldn't get through without working on Sunday, you should give up your job. My first Sunday in Saskatchewan more than forty years ago posed a real problem to me. I was working on a threshing outfit and part of my job was to haul a tank of water on Sunday so that the steam engine would get cleaned out. I debated, should I refuse to do this job or should I haul water? I reasoned that if I didn't haul the tank of water, someone else would, and I hauled the tank of water and when I inquired about how far the nearest church was, it was much too far. There are a great many who were brought up in an environment where one's parents, one's elders do give high priority.

I realize we're living in a changing world and people do play golf and they go fishing and they do a great variety of other things, but here is a principle that is offensive to a great many. The idea of introducing commercial sports to make millionaires out of a few people because they can close down some of our country churches, they can embarrass some parents as their children must decide whether they will go with the crowd to watch the circus or whether they will go with their parents to worship where their parents and grandparents have gone.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think its a great pity that this is a piece of legislation that in the views of the government opposite has to be forced to a final conclusion tonight and I'm sure that some of the members opposite who felt so strongly, at 9:20 tonight will have some second thoughts when their constituents have a chance to ask them, "well why was this so urgent?" "Why could it not wait until Monday or Tuesday or sometime next week? So, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank again, the hon. members opposite for being so anxious to hear these remarks from me and as I intimated before, while I had made up my mind, I would like to have had a chance to consult the people who vote for me or against me in Saskatoon, to tell me over the phone this weekend as the lady member for Saskatoon, did last week, in connection with the budget. So I'm sorry that I will be unable to support Bill 29.

Hon. A.C. Cameron: (Minister of Mineral Resources) — Mr. Speaker, I want to make a comment or two on the remarks of the member from Saskatoon, (Mr. Nicholson). I was surprised with the manner in which this bill was discussed tonight, in a forthright dignified manner.

I'm disappointed that the member from Saskatoon should bring up a plea to adjourn the debate, when this debate has been going on since 4:40 this afternoon. I would venture to say that over seventy-five per cent of the members in this house have spoken on it. He's one of the last ones.

If it was a matter of a bill being introduced and one or two of the early speakers asked the adjournment, there may have been reason for it,

but the members have all expressed their opinions, pro and con, and he's one of the last ones, and he asks the house to accommodate him. This bill has been on the table for some days. Telephones are not a foreign thing in this legislature. He had ample time to phone his constituents. He prefers to say that the government is attempting to force this through. I would point out to him, this is not a government bill. Yet he wanted the government members, the cabinet, the leader of the house, and the Deputy Premier to give their assurances that something additional would be done. They're not speaking and giving assurances on behalf of this bill because it isn't a government bill. The leader may commit the government to what it's going to do in giving assurance, but this is a private member's bill and the member has been a member of this house and of the House of Commons long enough to know that.

There's other things that he said. The government is forcing this thing through and the people will want to know that, and they're forcing it through in order that they can wiggle out of their commitments later on. It was generally understood by everyone up until he rose that the idea was to advance the bill through second reading in order that if it was felt necessary, amendments could be brought in, in Committee of the Whole. It was generally understood the type of amendment that would be brought in, an amendment probably providing for a plebiscite. There was some suggestion to be sent to the law amendments committee. I think the lady member for Regina West, (Mrs. Cooper) rose and asked the Deputy Premier if he would give his commitment that this would be done. The Deputy Premier is not in a position to give this commitment that it will be sent to the law amendments committee as that is the decision of the house tonight. Not the Deputy Premier or the Premier, or anyone else. That is the decision which this house will make on a motion as to whether or not it goes to the law amendments committee. I just wanted to make those few distinctions.

I'm surprised that the member should say that those people who support this bill are supporting it for an ulterior motive, that somehow they have been gotten next to by these commercial promoters, these people who want to make a million dollars in order, as he said that a few people may make a million dollars. Now, I think this member has done more to discredit the attitude that has been carried on in this debate than anyone who has spoken. To put it down to level of imputing motives. We understand this is a matter that touches the hearts of a lot of people. I was certainly impressed and uplifted by the manner in which the bill has been dealt with in debate.

For myself, I think it could matter little, whether the bill passed or whether it was defeated, as far as my personal convictions are concerned. I know where I live we have Sunday sports, someone says this is a bill to permit Sunday sports, it isn't a bill to permit Sunday sports. Sunday sports are legal now, everybody may have Sunday sports, the only change in principle here is that this bill gives the right to charge admission; it is not introducing Sunday sports, and this bill if it is defeated will not deny Sunday sports. We have Sunday sports but what is happening in so many areas throughout my seat, which is a great ball country, we have all our ball tournaments on Sunday. We have in many instances, the great rodeos of the south-west on Sundays, they're sports too, how did the people get around it? They don't charge admission, because it is illegal, but they sell you a program for \$1 and you have to buy a program to get in. It is perfectly legal to purchase a program. They are having their commercial sports on Sunday, only they are doing it in an under-handed legal fashion. Law enforcement officers have to turn their eye the other way so as not to see it. This is the only change in principle, to say it is a step to opening up of beer parlors on Sunday, is nonsense. Everyone knows that regulations of liquor comes under the Liquor Licensing Commission, a particular act, not this act at all. Everyone knows that the opening of theatres comes under another act, and to say that this is putting your foot in the door, of opening up other commercial activities on Sunday, of course, is not in accordance with the facts.

The principal thing in this bill as I see it, is not Sunday sports it is that you may permit them to charge for Sunday sports. I think the bill should be moved along; I think it should go into committee; from thereon amendments can be discussed and I propose to support this on second reading in order that the house may get it into committee and get on with the bill.

Mr. F.K. Radloff: (Nipawin) — Mr. Speaker, and members of the legislature, it really doesn't make too much difference to us old fat fellows what turn this bill takes. We do our fishing and we play our golf and we curl, but we might as well get down to the crux of the matter and that is the responsibility

we have to our young people.

Now, it is no longer the rule of the day when the young people of the day have wood to cut, or like the member for Saskatoon (Mr. Nicholson) water to haul, or cows to milk, but our young people have to have something to do and if we are going to keep our young people out of the restaurants and out of the cars, roaring up and down the road. We must make it possible for these young people to have good healthy sport. In order for our young people to appreciate the responsibility that they have, we must make it legal for them to be properly financed. I think it is time for members on both sides of this house to get together to make it possible for our young people to have the opportunity to organize their sports properly, and to make it legal for them to have the financial possibilities to carry on their sports in the proper manner.

I certainly am going to support the motion and the second reading of this bill and let us get it into discussion where we can make the amendments to this bill and make it the kind of a bill that the people of this province want.

Mr. H.E. Coupland: (Meadow Lake) — Mr. Speaker, I hadn't planned on saying anything on this bill, but I certainly can't agree with my seat mate here, the member from Nipawin (Mr. Radloff). I might as well say here and now that I am opposed to Sunday sport. To say that we have to have Sunday sport in order to keep our children occupied, I don't think is right, as I can recall when I was a young fellow and taking part in Sunday sports, ball games and so on, and how mad I used to get at my parents, when they said, "Hal, you can't go this morning, you have to go to Sunday school, or church". I was probably a little mad at the time, but as you grow a little older, you realize that your parents knew more than we did when we were children.

The opening of Sunday sports as far as I am concerned is somewhat as someone already said, of the opening wedge to more activity on Sunday. I think Sunday is a day that we should stay at home and rest, or sure, we go fishing or we go to the lake, but when it gets commercialized, I just don't think that people take the same interest in home life.

Therefore, I can't support the motion myself.

Mr. J.E. Brockelbank: (Saskatoon) — Mr. Speaker, I would agree with quite a few members who have spoken to this point in the debate., that this is a matter that will require careful consideration and in a way I don't feel that I, standing alone here, am fully qualified to judge all the merits of the bill, or the discussion that could still come forward from other areas without having some more opinions from other areas.

It seems to be that everyone says, "I didn't intend to take part in this debate" and they immediately begin to take part in it. I suppose that is all right, but some of the people that have taken part in the debate have brought forward some points that I just can't agree with. One of the points that particularly bothered me was the one about commercial sport, in effect, leading to greater participation in the area of amateur sports. I think that is not exactly true; I think that is a fallacy. Another thing that has come to my attention by the lady member from Regina West, (Mrs. Cooper) was the matter of balloting done in the city of Regina and in the city of Saskatoon, and in other areas. She said that the ballot was inconclusive. A lot of people have been basing their arguments on the fact that these ballots weighed slightly in favor of commercial sport.

I want to make it understood that I am able to distinguish between Sunday sport and commercial Sunday sport, I think I realize what the bill is about. As it has been drawn up, it appears to me that the bill has been drafted so hastily, with so little consideration, that they have left out the matter of a plebiscite, and it seems strange that they would overlook the matter of a plebiscite. It should have been incorporated in the bill at the beginning.

With regard to the coming of commercial sport on Sunday and allowing local options, plebiscites on this particular matter will cause a considerable amount of pressure between one section of the province and another section of the province, if one section does vote in favor of commercial sport on Sunday, and the other section had taken no action up to that point, a lot of pressure can be brought to bear on the second area to vote in favor of Sunday sport as a means of defending themselves against the first area.

I think that this is just something like trading stamps, I believe that trading stamps, once they are established in any area, people have to accept them as a matter of defence, they have to buy the products that give you trading stamps, and eventually what you get is some company selling little bits of paper which costs you two per cent more on your groceries. That is what trading stamps are once they are established in a community. This is the same kind of pressure that would be brought on by a bill that would allow local options for commercial sport on Sunday.

Some people have talked about imposing of wills on someone else, suggesting that if you vote against this bill, you are, in effect, imposing your will on someone, because you are not allowing that person to make his individual choice. Well, it is quite clear in the bill here, that the following are excluded. No by-law shall authorize the following; horse races, horse race meetings, dog racing, boxing contests, or exhibitions of wrestling, judo, or other like exhibitions or contests on the Lord's Day. I would suggest to the people who drafted this bill, that they are imposing their will on the people because they are not allowing them to watch commercial judo on Sunday and I would suggest that this is an imposition on the people that this bill will affect. I have a responsibility to the people who elected me, and I recognize my responsibility as being this, that we should be interested in hearing more discussion on this particular matter.

Mr. R.A. Walker: (Hanley) — I can truthfully say that . . .

Hon. L. Coderre: (Minister of Public Works) — Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Walker: — I'm sorry, that is all right.

Mr. Coderre: — The humorous expressions given here this afternoon and evening, Mr. Speaker, definitely indicate that there is a need for this bill to get into Committee of the Whole, as soon as possible, because I believe there are only three or four people who have not spoken thus far and I am sure that the means of expressing the opinions, making the, necessary changes required in the bill, can certainly be handled much easier in committee. At that particular time, I am sure that greater opportunities will be had, between the time it gets into committee and now, for every member of this house to contact their constituents or people, or the proponents of this bill.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that I would be remiss if I didn't mention the two persons in this house who have expressed themselves in an honest, sincere way, in opposing the bill. They did so with honesty and sincerity and I think that all members of this house should respect their opinions. We found from then on, Mr. Speaker, that everyone else was sort of tip-toeing through the tulips. It just gives the impression that you are picking the petals from a daisy, "I will, I won't", "I will, I won't" — that sort of attitude has developed all the way through.

You know when you get my age, Mr. Speaker, participation in sports seems to be a thing of the past, I have been very, very active in all types of sports . . .

Mr. Brockelbank: (Kelsey) — Grandpa.

Mr. Coderre: — . . . and there comes a time when you like to watch and observe good sports. We have some in our junior athletics, that is true, but do you know, Mr. Speaker, that there has been more football amongst our young people in the province, since the Roughriders have been in the picture, than ever at any time in the past. You know it is a great pleasure to watch the Shaws, in football and in baseball, to see the Erfells, the Danes, and the McLeods. These are better class of sports, Mr. Speaker, a little more finesse in that type of game than you would see in the normal amateur type of game. In order to bring this to the public you must have ways and means to pay for this type of sport, it can't be done in an amateur sort of way, so consequently I certainly am going to support this bill. We have it on T.V. we have it everywhere else on film, we would like to have it right at home, and see our home-grown professionals play, and this is the only way you can support sports by paying for it.

It has been mentioned that communities have had regular sports days on Sunday for a number of years. To many areas of this province, it seems to be the only time that you can have sports, even though they are of the amateur nature, they still have to provide money to be given to the top team of the day, and this, again strengthens my opinion that we should go ahead with this bill and I certainly support it wholeheartedly. I think the

most important thing now for every member of this house is to get this bill in committee, where you can deal with it clause by clause, add clauses if you wish, and take some out. This is the only place where it can be dealt with most effectively now. Once that bill is in Committee of the Whole, I am sure that every member of this house will have the opportunity to express themselves precisely in the area they wish, the sections they are concerned with, will be dealt with effectively.

I will support the bill.

Mr. Walker: — I rise rather reluctantly to participate in this debate, I hadn't intended to, and I must say that my views of the matter have changed a good deal since the debate commenced.

I want to say first of all that I think that the purpose of a legislative debate is not only that we should argue among ourselves, and resolve among ourselves differences of opinion and come to conclusions and resolve questions by resolution, but the purpose of a debate in this legislature is also for the purpose of stimulating public opinions, for the purpose of giving some leadership to the various points of view in the province to give public opinion a chance to express itself, and to mobilize itself and to bring its representations to bear on the members of the house.

If, indeed, it were otherwise, Mr. Speaker, there would be no urgency about the proceedings of this house being widespread by press, radio etc., there would be no urgency about having a press gallery at all; we could just as well meet in camera, if we are not to recognize the inter-play of forces between the legislature and public opinion. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I regret very much that the decision has been taken, that the government has unanimously come to the conclusion that this bill must be resolved, if necessary, by steam-roller, today. I think that there have been controversial questions, there have been contentious matters, some have been much less contentious, and much less controversial than this, but we have allowed them to stand over for a day, or for a week, or even longer, to give public opinion a chance to express itself.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Walker: — That is the course which I would recommend to the government at this time. There is plenty of time, Mr. Speaker, the proceedings of this province, the work of this province is not of such urgency that it has to be finished up and swept under a carpet, the very same day that the discussion is initiated.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Walker: — No, I can recall, Mr. Speaker, a very important matter raised earlier in this session that affected the livelihood of some 65,000 farmers, was adjourned day after day, after day, by members on the other side, by forcing their will upon the house.

I am concerned about the quality of this bill. I must say that I presume that this bill was drawn by the same professional advisors, technicians, who have done such good work for this assembly in the past. This bill has some very serious and obvious shortcomings. Perhaps I should be more charitable and attribute the shortcomings to the instructions given to the draftsmen by the mover of the bill.

The bill hardly got before this house when it was acknowledged on all sides that it had one very serious and one very grave omission, and that is provision for the holding of a plebiscite or a referendum in a municipality before a by-law was passed. This is a very serious and significant part of the whole problem, of the whole question, and I am surprised that it was only the second or third person to participate in the debate, who suggested it, and everybody else has since concurred in it. I suggest that perhaps, we are ill-advised in having private members bills, if they can't be the subject of a little more consultation, and a little more consideration before they are framed and before they are placed on the order paper. Because Mr. Speaker, say what they will, if we endorse the principle of this bill, the principle of the bill is that the municipal council shall decide what shall be done in the municipal area, that is the principle of the bill, and it isn't good enough for any member of the house to give us assurance that, in committee, they would like to tack on some extra provision, which I suggest will go into a great many lines, probably as many lines as there are in the bill now.

March 4, 1965

Because if you are going to provide for a plebiscite, you have to provide, well you can't have a plebiscite without having a Returning Officer, you can't have a plebiscite without defining the eligibility of voters to vote on this question, you can't have a plebiscite without prescribing whether or not it will be deemed to be carried by a fifty per cent vote plus one, or by a two-thirds majority or whatever. There are a great many principles, Mr. Speaker, which hon. members have just facilely assumed could be stuck into the bill in committee, which are quite at variance with the principles contained in the thing that is before this house.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think that not only to be trying to ram this through in one day, but trying to ram it through under the guise of something which they say is going to be changed, and something which they say is going to be incorporated in it, the wording and the contents of which we have no means of knowing at this time, is I suggest an example of contempt for this legislature, and I say that advisedly.

I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I didn't feel so keenly about this matter until we saw the bitterness that occurred on the other side of the house on the question of whether or not we should be allowed an adjournment. But when we saw that determination, the sand and grit that they put into this, then, Mr. Speaker, I feel quite strongly that this bill is a bad bill and it ought to be sent back. It ought to be withdrawn and redrafted and resubmitted.

Now on the general principles of Sunday sports and Sunday observance, I want to make it perfectly clear that my initial response to any broadening or widening of the freedom accorded to the citizen as to what he shall do on Sunday or any other day, finds favor with me. I am in favor of according people as much liberty and opportunity as possible in the conduct of their ordinary day to day affairs, and I don't believe in statutory enforcement of such moral principles as a general proposition. I believe that most people are quite capable and competent to deciding for themselves the question of what they shall do on Sunday and I believe, Mr. Speaker, that most of my constituents feel the same way about it, as I do. I'm satisfied they do, and I would like to be able to support a proper bill to accord a proper degree of widening of the latitude which the citizens of Hanley constituency might enjoy. But what has been presented to us, Mr. Speaker? Some say that this bill may lead to the opening of the cocktail lounges, the race tracks, hunting on Sunday, and this is pooh-poohed by members on the other side of the house.

Well, Mr. Speaker, what does the bill say, it says and I refer to clause three . . .

Mr. Guy: — Point of order, Mr. Speaker, he knows better than to refer to definite clauses, he has been in the house long enough that he should know better.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Walker: — Mr. Speaker, this bill is aimed at permitting those people who wish to engage in any public game, contest, or sport, the freedom to operate on Sunday. Now, Mr. Speaker, the question of the constitutionality of this has been raised. Public game, contest, or sport, that is the principle that is before us. Whether that kind of activity shall be permitted by by-law on the Sabbath. If that isn't the principle of the bill, Mr. Speaker, then it has no principle, because that is the principle of the bill contained in those three words.

Mr. Guy: — Vote against it . . .

Mr. Walker: — So, Mr. Speaker, the question of whether or not it is constitutional has been raised, and the hon. member for Shellbrook, (Mr. Cuelenaere) referred to the section six of the Lord's Day Act, and I suggest that the house might look, members might look at page two of the notes, section six —

That it is not lawful for any person on the Lord's Day, except as provided in any provincial act or law, now or hereafter enforced, to engage in any public game or contest for gain, or for any prize or reward.

Nothing about “sport” in that, Mr. Speaker, nothing at all, and so this bill proposes to extend privileges on Sabbath to “sports”.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it isn’t the same as the Lord’s Day Act. It goes further. I just question whether or not the court would say that the Lord’s Day Act authorizes provincial legislation to deal with sport on the Sabbath. Certainly the Lord’s Day Act deals with a public game and with a contest, but it makes no reference to sport. And what is this area? I would have thought, Mr. Speaker, that the mover of the bill would have given some consideration to making sure that his bill fell on all fours with the wording of the Lord’s Day Act so that there would be no question about its constitutionality. I should have thought that he would have imported from the Lord’s Day Act, the very words into his bill so that there would be no question about it.

No, Mr. Speaker, this extended meaning being given to this bill, “sport” does it include the beverage rooms? I don’t know. Some hon. members laugh. Well, Mr. Speaker, as you well know, when the court is confronted with a problem or interpreting a word in the English language, a word found in a statute, they rely upon the decided cases, the authorities. And then they go back to the dictionary and the official dictionary in this country is the Oxford English Dictionary. Here we find the word “sport” hasn’t got just the insignificant meaning that my hon. friends over there seem to think it has. It goes on here for a whole page. These are the things that are being authorized by this bill, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Willis: — What are they?

Mr. Walker: — Well, “pleasant pastime” . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Walker: — I’m sure that there are some members on both sides of the house who think that that means sitting in the pub. And I don’t think that a court would be able to say that perhaps that might not be included within the intentions of the legislature in adopting the word “sport”, because the court will look at the dictionary and they will assume that the legislature knew what the dictionary meaning of the word was. Whether we do or not, Mr. Speaker, it will be assumed that the legislature knew what the dictionary meaning of the word “sport” is.

“Pleasant pastime” “Amusement” “Diversion” “A pastime afforded while the endeavor to take or kill wild animals” “Game”.

Mr. Guy: — Fish.

Mr. Walker: — Or fish.

Mr. Berezowsky: — Hunting on Sunday.

Mr. Walker: — So that the dictionary meaning of this word that is proposed by the mover of this bill, includes hunting on Sunday, your honor. “Participation in games or exercises.” Now, that I think was expected. I think we expected it to mean that. Especially those pursued in the open air.

The second meaning: “a matter affording entertainment”. Well, I suppose that includes movies. I don’t see why not.

Mr. MacDougall: — Spelled out, if you read it.

Mr. Walker: — That’s right. “An occupation or proceeding of the nature of a pastime or diversion.” Now, that’s what the word “sport” means. And then, of course, section six exempts certain kinds of sport. But I don’t see movies. I don’t see hunting. I don’t see sitting in the beer parlor or the cocktail lounge excluded, anywhere in this act.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

The Assembly adjourned at 10:00 o’clock p.m.