

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**First Session — Fifteenth Legislature**  
**27th Day**

**Friday, March 12, 1965**

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

**WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**Hon. Gordon B. Grant: (Minister of Highways)** — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I would like to introduce to the assembly, fifty-five grade eight students in the west gallery, from Massey School, and, of course, from the best constituency in Saskatchewan, Regina South. This group of students will be staying with us most of the afternoon. I am sure they will find it most interesting. I sincerely trust the members on both sides of the house will be on their good behavior to demonstrate how efficiently we run the business of government.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. J.E. Brockelbank: (Saskatoon City)** — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to announce to the members of the legislature, on behalf of the five Saskatoon members from Saskatoon city, that there are two groups of students in the east gallery — one from Henry Kelsey School and the other from Queen Elizabeth School, along with their teachers. I hope that their stay is pleasant and informative, and I know that we will all wish them a pleasant journey back to Saskatoon.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Grant:** — In my haste to put the members on their good behavior, I failed to mention that the group of students in the west gallery are under the direction of their principal, Mr. Walker, and their teacher, Mr. McKay.

While I am on my feet, I would also like to bring to the attention of the assembly a special group of sixty Regina students from various schools in the city. We extend a welcome to this group as well, and sincerely trust that their stay will be most enjoyable, and educational.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. A.E. Blakeney: (Regina West)** — Mr. Speaker, I first would like to add my welcome to the special interest group in the Speaker's Gallery, already expressed by the Hon. Mr. Grant, the member for Regina South, and then on your behalf, and on behalf of all members of the legislature, to extend a welcome to a group of forty-three grade eight students in the east gallery from Wascana School, led by their teacher, Mr. Plager. I know they have had some time about the buildings, and we are very pleased to see them in the house this afternoon. I am sure all hon. members would wish to express to them our welcome, and our hope that they enjoy this afternoon's proceedings.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mrs. Sally Merchant: (Saskatoon City)** — Mr. Speaker, the junior member for Saskatoon (Mr. Brockelbank), has already expressed, on behalf of the five members from Saskatoon, a welcome to the students from Saskatoon. I would like to draw to the attention of the house that the reason that I am in this house is because I get tired of members opposite speaking for me. On my own behalf, and on the behalf of this side of the house, I would like to welcome the students of Henry Kelsey and Queen Elizabeth, to this house.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**STATEMENT RE PRIVATE MEMBERS' RESOLUTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER**

**Mr. J.H. Brockelbank: (Acting Leader of the Opposition, Kelsey)** — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I would like to draw to the attention of the house the situation with regard

**March 12, 1965**

to the number of private members' resolutions on the order paper. There are seven resolutions on the order paper, all of which got the "stand" treatment yesterday, and some of these have been on for quite a long time. Resolution no. 4, moved by Mr. Hooker, has been classed as adjourned debate since February 19th; another one, moved by Mr. Pederson (Arm River) has been in the adjourned debate class since February 24th; another one, moved by Mr. Whelan (Regina north) has been under Mr. Gardiner's name since March 1st; and then there is another, March 8th, and a second one since March 8th, has been in the adjourned debate class. Now, I do hope that the Ministers will take into consideration the rights of private members on private member's day and not hold these up, so that they can be discussed, and I hope I will not have to make a complaint about it again.

**Hon. W. Ross Thatcher: (Premier)** — Mr. Speaker, of course, what the hon. member for Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank) continuously forgets is that the Socialists are no longer running the government of Saskatchewan. We move as rapidly as we can, and perhaps if my hon. friend from Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank) and others would not obstruct work in this house so much, we might be able to do it a little more rapidly. However, the government will take this matter into consideration and I hope that next Thursday we can get a good many of them off the order paper.

**Mr. Brockelbank: (Kelsey)** — Mr. Speaker, may I thank the hon. Premier for the entirely unnecessary lecture that he gave us . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — We are a little tired of you . . .

**Mr. Brockelbank: (Kelsey)** — I appreciate the statement he gave us that he would try to get something done with regard to these resolutions.

#### **WELCOME TO GUEST FROM ARGENTINA**

**Hon. George Trapp: (Minister of Education)** — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to welcome a guest here from Argentina — Señora Martínez who is in the Speaker's Gallery. She is vice-president of the Teachers' Association in Argentina and is touring Canada as a guest of the teachers of Canada. I would like to welcome her to the house and to Saskatchewan. She is going to spend some time this afternoon visiting the Department of Education. I hope she will find her visit both enjoyable and profitable. Welcome to our friend from Argentina.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Trapp:** — I think the members would like you to stand at this time, so that they might see our visitor.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

#### **STATEMENT RE ARTICLE IN THE SASKATOON STAR PHOENIX**

**Hon. A.H. McDonald: (Minister of Agriculture)** — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to draw to the attention of the house, an article appearing in the Saskatoon Star Phoenix of March 10th, concerning an announcement that I made in the house that day, with respect to the sale of some parcels of grazing land in the province. The heading is as follows: Crown to auction Grazing Parcels.

Now, it is not the intention of the Department of Agriculture to auction any grazing land. I would like to point out that the body of this article is very factual, but whoever wrote the headline for it certainly did not read the article. As this has happened twice in about three days, I hope that they will ask those people responsible for writing the headlines, to read the story first. I want to congratulate the members of the press gallery who were responsible for the writing of the article. The article is excellent, but the headline has no relation to the article, and I hope they will speak to their counterparts in Saskatoon and see if we cannot get a headline to match the article.

#### **REPLY TO QUESTION RE RADIO BROADCASTING**

**Mr. J.C. McIsaac: (Wilkie)** — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to

make a comment or two in regard to a question raised by the hon. member from Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank) yesterday, with respect to radio broadcasting. The problem first arose when the broadcast of the remarks of the hon. lady member from Regina (Mrs. Cooper), and I believe, the member from Hanley (Mr. Walker) were interrupted for a period of fifteen to twenty minutes . . .

**Mr. R.A. Walker: (Hanley)** — Cut right off.

**Mr. McIsaac:** — Cut right off. That is right. The matter was brought to my attention at that time by some members opposite, and I checked with the CKCK Operations Manager at that time, as to how this had happened and why. The reply was that it was no fault of theirs. It was due to a work crew, I believe, a Saskatchewan Government Telephones or street crew, that accidentally cut off the lines carrying the broadcast. They would be willing to carry the remaining portion of the tape at some other time, or take a proportional cut in payment for the time we were off the air.

I checked again with the hon. member from Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank) and he advised that he wished that they put on the part of the broadcast that was cut off instead, rather than take a cut. So the agency, MacLaren's Agency, was advised of this by myself, and also that when they put over this portion that was cut off that they precede it by spot announcements, a day or two ahead, and then proceed to put on this portion.

I thought the matter was ended at that point. About ten days ago, I believe it was, the hon. member from Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank) brought the question up in the house again, and I immediately checked back through the agency again to find out why this had not been done. This time, I discovered the reason why the remaining portion of the broadcast had not been put over was because, somehow or other it had got lost, or the tape had been destroyed, I am not sure which, but it was unavailable. I then checked with the Clerk of the Assembly, and he advised me we could certainly have the legislative record for that particular day, and that could be used to put over the broadcast, but it was his opinion, and the opinion of one or two others, that this being a kind of a monotone type of thing, it might not be too satisfactory.

I, then spoke personally, directly outside the house, with the hon. lady member for Regina (Mrs. Cooper) and advised her of this and I also suggested that I could arrange for her to go down to the radio station and tape her own speech that she made in the Throne Speech debate. We would arrange for that, and also I asked her to check with the member from Hanley (Mr. Walker) who was not here that particular day . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — What do you mean "that day"?

**Mr. McIsaac:** — I asked her to let me know what her wishes were in this regard, when she contacted the member from Hanley (Mr. Walker). I have not heard from her since and I did not hear until yesterday that this matter had not been resolved satisfactorily, but I just want to advise the member and all members that we have done everything, I thought, humanly possible to correct the situation, and I certainly regret the inconvenience caused, but I do not feel that I am responsible for it.

**Mr. Brockelbank: (Kelsey)** — Mr. Speaker, could I ask a question, please, of the hon. member, and I wish to thank him for bringing this story to us of the incident. Would it not be possible to get a tape from one of the other radio stations that broadcast?

**Mr. McIsaac:** — Perhaps this is possible, but I asked the director of the agency, if this were not possible, and he said no.

**Mr. McDonald: (Moosomin)** — Mr. Speaker, may I point out that if the line was cut, they could not have a tape, because as I understand it, it goes over the telephone from here to the station and is taped there. If it was cut between here and the station responsible for . . .

**Mr. Walker:** — The other station carried it all.

**Mr. McDonald: (Moosomin)** — No. It was carried by tape at a later broadcast. There would not be any tape if the line was cut between here and the recording station.

**Mr. Walker:** — How did the other station carry it?

**Mr. Brockelbank: (Kelsey)** — Mr. Speaker, there was no complaint about the debate not being carried that afternoon. This was CKCK the night broadcast, so that the lines must have been all right from here to CJME. They got it broadcast, but CKCK did not get it apparently.

**Mr. McIsaac:** — I am open to any suggestions which you wish to make, but I would prefer that it not be brought up again and we will do whatever you wish to clarify it.

**Mr. E. Kramer: (The Battlefords)** — I would suggest that the whips discuss this further.

Agreed.

### ADJOURNED DEBATES

The assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Thatcher for second reading of Bill no. 30, An Act to provide for the Appointment of Legislative Secretaries to Members of the Executive Council

**Mr. A.M. Nicholson: (Saskatoon City)** — Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank hon. members for permitting me to adjourn this debate the other evening. I had an opportunity to read the transcript of the remarks of the Premier, when the bill was given second reading. On page 137, the Premier is reported as follows:

I am informed that this system, the parliamentary system, originated in the British parliament, that it has been used in other parts of the continent, and above all, it has worked very satisfactorily for a long period.

There was an interruption, “You’re kidding”, and the Premier said:

Well, it is our contention that this system would work the same way here in Regina.

The member for Regina West made a very telling speech the other day. He felt it was unfortunate that this legislation should be before the Saskatchewan legislature at this particular time. I note that on the 23rd of November, the question of involvement of at least one parliamentary secretary was the subject of debate in the House of Commons. Mr. Douglas, the member for Burnaby-Coquitlam, had some questions to ask the Minister of Justice, regarding one Mr. Lucien Rivard and Mr. Emile Groleau, who, he understood, were being held in the Bordeaux prison. The United States was seeking to have them extradited to face a charge of dope smuggling and Mr. Neilson from the Yukon, also asked about the same problem.

The Minister of Justice was introducing his estimates that day. He said that he would have something to say about this question later. After making his statement, Mr. Neilson went on to ask a very pertinent question about some topics which were not discussed. As hon. members know, the Chief Justice of Quebec, has been reviewing this question since November. I realize the Premier had made a commitment that legislative secretaries would be appointed this session, but I submit, with due respect, Mr. Speaker, that this might be reconsidered, and that we should wait until the report of the Dorion Commission is completed.

I think it is significant, Mr. Speaker, that not one Minister of the cabinet has risen . . . Oh, yes, I did not rise the other day until the Premier was trying to close the debate. At that time, not one member of the cabinet had risen in his place to say that “I am exhausted with the work that I have to do”. I am not suggesting that members of the Saskatchewan cabinet do not have heavy duties. But they accepted these posts knowing that they would have to discharge their duties. I doubt if there is anyone sitting in the front benches but the Deputy-Premier, (Mr. McDonald) who is likely to rise and say that “I must have some help”.

I read in the papers that the Deputy-Premier (Mr. McDonald) is to be summoned to the Senate at some time. Everybody expects that never again will a Liberal government go to the country with vacancies in the Senate. I am sure that members on this side of the house would agree that they cannot think of any Liberal in Saskatchewan who would be better qualified to occupy

that position. In due course we will be getting along without a Senate in Canada, but in the meantime, vacancies must be filled and I am sure that all hon. members here will want to extend their best wishes to the Deputy-Premier, if and when the summons comes to him.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Nicholson:** — I will be surprised if the Attorney General rises in his place to indicate that he is having any serious difficulty with his duties. The Minister of Public Health (Mr. Steuart) was able to take on some additional responsibilities not so very long ago, and he seems to be managing quite well, and I could go on across the first and second rows.

Mr. Speaker, it is significant that no backbencher has risen in his place to say that this legislation would be a good thing for Saskatchewan. I understand the Deputy Speaker does plan on having something to say, but I would suggest that backbenchers give careful consideration to deciding whether or not this is in the public interest.

I read in some of the eastern papers that the Premier was given the red carpet when he was east last weekend. It has been suggested that having had the success he had in Saskatchewan in 1964, that he might be a logical successor to Mr. Pearson, some of these days. I would suggest that he re-consider this improvident proposal he made when he was having some difficulty. This was a real difficulty in deciding what members elected should occupy cabinet positions. I am sure that those who are private members accept the fact that there does have to be a cabinet, and the Premier does have the responsibility of making what he considers the best decisions and those who were not given the nod to join the cabinet, I am sure, accept the fact that if they do their duties as private members, some day, if this government should be in office long enough, they would have a chance.

I would draw to the Premier's attention this very interesting book, "Mr. Prime Minister", written by Bruce Hutchinson, who was in the press gallery when the Premier and I were in Ottawa. It deals with all the Prime Ministers since Confederation, all fourteen of them, and it mentions that before Pearson, McDonald, Laurier, Borden, King and St. Laurent were the only Prime Ministers who succeeded. There was a very interesting section on Mackenzie King. He was one of the people who succeeded, and in this book on page two hundred and twenty-two, there is an interesting paragraph that refers to Harry Stevens, a member of the Bennett cabinet later, who became Meighen's chief lieutenant, rose to inform the house of a serious matter. The long simmering customs scandal had broken wide open. Steven's speech provided indisputable evidence that the customs appointment was rotten with graft and its officials in league with a nationwide smugglers' ring. Its Minister, Jacques Bureau, guilty of . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — A point of order. I am sure the dissertation of the hon. member is very interesting but what has it got to do with this bill? Should he not restrict his remarks to the principle of this bill?

**Mr. Nicholson:** — Mr. Speaker, I will come to this and as I was saying before, according to Bruce Hutchinson, the customs scandal of that day would clearly have defeated Mackenzie King and he would not have been Prime Minister again and the reference was to the customs scandal, and Mr. Speaker . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — On the point of order, should the hon. member not restrict his remarks to the principle of this bill?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Well, I think he should. Hon. members should restrict their remarks to the principle of the bill and I do believe that the hon. member is a long way from home and I hope he returns as soon as possible.

**Mr. Nicholson:** — Mr. Speaker, I am coming to Saskatchewan immediately, because this customs inquiry did disclose that at that time in Saskatchewan, we had corruption and graft in connection with customs and contributions to the campaign funds, and I am submitting, Mr. Speaker, that one of the main purposes of the legislation before us is to have six members of the legislature who will be paid from public funds, who will be in a position to travel around Saskatchewan, at public expense, to secure contributions for political purposes, and I have Canadian history to support . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! This is an unwarranted aspersion against members of the other side. Nobody has said this is going to take place and I think this is entirely and completely out of order, and I think it is a most disorderly suggestion and I am going to ask that you withdraw it.

**Mr. Nicholson:** — Mr. Speaker, I am suggesting that there is a commission inquiring at Ottawa which does involve at least one parliamentary secretary . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Yes, but the hon. member made the statement that parliamentary secretaries would be used for the purpose of running around the province to collect campaign funds, and I heard it correctly. That is what I ask you to withdraw, and I ask you to do it now.

**Mr. Brockelbank: (Kelsey)** — Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, I think probably it is quite correct that the member has the right to express his opinion as to what members may do, as long as he does not reflect on the individual member's honor, and certainly I say that if the hon. members are spending their time, in my opinion, running around the province, trying to raise funds for the Liberal party, this may not agree with the members on the opposite side of the house, but I think I have every right to express my opinion.

**Mr. Speaker:** — You have every right to express your opinion if you think that they are doing it, but this is not established, and I personally think that this is an aspersion and I think it is lowering the dignity of this house, and I ask that it be withdrawn in the interests of dignity of this house.

**Mr. Nicholson:** — Mr. Speaker, I wish you would hear me through, to hear what has been said in . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Withdraw.

**Mr. Nicholson:** — Mr. Speaker, I am saying that at least one parliamentary secretary in the federal parliament . . .

**Hon. D.T. McFarlane: (Minister of Municipal Affairs)** — The member for Saskatoon (Mr. Nicholson) has imputed motives in this house. You have asked him to withdraw that imputation. He has refused to do so. I think, in the interests of the house and the requirements of the legislature, I think he should withdraw.

**Mr. Brockelbank: (Kelsey)** — On the point of order, Mr. Speaker. The member for Saskatoon did not impute motives to anybody. He spoke of what, in his opinion, were the possibilities of members, if they were appointed under this act, and it is a funny state, if they cannot speak about the possibilities of what may happen if a certain act is passed.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Maybe you heard the member incorrectly, but as I heard him he said that they would do this.

**Mr. Nicholson:** — Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the transcript . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Now, if I misconstrued his statement, that is something else, but I will assure the hon. member that I will get the Hansard copy of that and I will have the girls run it off today . . .

**Mr. Nicholson:** — Very well, if that is what I said . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — That is what he said, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Nicholson:** — If that is what I said, Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to revise, but the duties of these parliamentary secretaries have not as yet been

outlined. The duties of this particular group have not been outlined and several members spoke the other day suggesting that the taxpayers would be paying them to travel around the province politicking. The raising of campaign funds is a very necessary part of democratic action nowadays and I think that anybody in politics on the municipal, provincial, or federal level has to recognize that radio and T.V. and newspapers are a must. The Premier was on an American radio broadcast the other night . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — What on earth has this got to do with the bill in front of us? Now, I would ask the hon. member to stay on the principle of this bill. He has been in parliament long enough to know the rules, and let us have a little less of this nonsense that he is talking.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I think the point of order is well taken.

**Mr. Nicholson:** — Mr. Speaker, I was about to say that had the Premier been paying for this type of coverage, this would cost a great deal of money

**Mr. Thatcher:** — This has nothing to do with Parliamentary assistants.

**Mr. Nicholson:** — Oh, it has a great deal to do with parliamentary assistants. The Premier is asking the taxpayers of Saskatchewan to pay \$2,000 a year and reasonable expenses. He doesn't say whether reasonable expenses would be fifty cents a day . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Let us go into committee and we will tell you how much.

**Mr. Nicholson:** — The Premier had a chance to introduce the bill and some of his colleagues could have had a chance to say what is reasonable. Is fifty cents a day? Is one dollar a day? Is one hundred dollars a day? What is reasonable?

**Mr. Thatcher:** — We will soon tell you.

**Mr. Nicholson:** — Well there are some other things that will have to be told first. But I submit. Mr. Speaker, that until someone sitting behind the Premier, is prepared to stand up in his place and say that he or she thinks this is an expenditure which should be met, and that he or she would like to have a goal, I think the Premier should agree to withdraw this legislation. or at least hold it until the Dorion Commission in Ottawa. has had a chance to report. I submit that the house is lacking the information as to the reasonable duties which might be expected of this particular group of citizens. I suggest that anyone who has any desire to remain in public life in Saskatchewan, sitting opposite. should have a very careful look at taking on this position.

I suggest, in all seriousness, that the members of the cabinet each write a cheque for \$1,000 so that this amount of money, this \$12,000 should be made available to provide the relief of \$2,000 a year to individuals who are getting \$500 per month.

Somebody mentioned the social aid to six members of the legislature, who would be appointed to this particular position. The Premier intimated that they hold office for a year, so that if the government remained in office for four years, that each one on the government side would have had twelve months on public expense to travel around the province when the house is not sitting, to travel anywhere in Canada. Nothing has been said as to whether an office is to be supplied to each parliamentary secretary or how many secretaries will be available, or what the allowance will be for telephone. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that until this information is forthcoming from the cabinet benches, and until some of the members sitting behind the front benches have had a chance to speak in support of this legislation, that this house should reject the second reading of this bill.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. McDonald: (Moosomin)** — I am rather amazed — I suppose I shouldn't be, because I have listened to the same clap-trap for many years, emanating from the member that just took his seat (Mr. Nicholson).

Mr. Speaker, I am amazed with some of his reasoning. He referred to a statement of the Premier, in which the Premier had said that he hoped that legislative secretaries could provide the same service to this house and to the people of Saskatchewan, as Parliamentary Assistants and Parliamentary Secretaries at Ottawa, had provided to the house and to this country.

Then my friend attempted to join in some way, the present difficulties that some Parliamentary Secretaries have been charged with in the House of Commons and has imputed that any person that ever held this position either in Ottawa or elsewhere, is a rogue and a scoundrel. Many Parliamentary Secretaries and Parliamentary Assistants have made tremendous contributions to the welfare of this country, and many of them later in their career became Ministers of the crown and served this country well. I suggest, to impute that every person who happened to have held one of these positions is a rogue and a scoundrel, and to go back to the customs scandal of many years ago to try and prove this same point, is delving into the gutter which we should stay out of on this, and all occasions.

The hon. member had the audacity to say that there was no one on this side of the house that would defend this legislation, and he said that perhaps I would, because I was going to the Senate. Well, if he has any information about me going to the Senate, I wish he would table it in the house and then everybody would know, including myself. I want to say to the hon. member that I will probably be in public life in Saskatchewan a lot longer than he will.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. McDonald: (Moosomin)** — Then the member went on to claim that there were no backbenchers taking part in this debate. Mr. Speaker, I ask you to just think back to when the Premier introduced the Second Reading. Members were popping up over there like jacks-in-a-box, so fast that nobody on this side of the house could get on their feet, and if you want everybody on this side of the house to make a speech on second reading, I suppose it is possible, and we can spend the next two or three days here, arguing and wasting time, but I do not think that is necessary, and I am confident that some of the people who sit behind me will be taking part in this debate. I do not know whether they will or whether they will not. I have not discussed it with them.

I want to say, in my humble opinion, that Parliamentary Secretaries in the House of Commons have made a contribution to the welfare of this nation and can make a contribution in the future, and that Legislative Secretaries in this assembly can certainly make a contribution to the public life of Saskatchewan.

When my friends opposite became the government of Saskatchewan, if my memory serves me right, the cabinet at that time had eight ministers. It grew from that day, and when they left, we had a cabinet of fifteen ministers. The present cabinet has twelve ministers. If one were to accept as fact, some of the criticism of my friends opposite, they are now admitting that three out of the fifteen cabinet ministers in the last government were out collecting funds for the CCF party, and I would not doubt that. I would not doubt it. This is exactly the interpretation I can take from the remarks of my friends opposite.

Then they have suggested that one of the responsibilities of a Legislative Secretary, would be to tramp about Saskatchewan and perhaps other parts of the Dominion, collecting funds for the Liberal party. Mr. Speaker, anybody who has that type of thinking in his head ought not to be sitting in this chamber. There are responsibilities for younger members of this house and they should be given the opportunity to acquaint themselves with the problems and responsibilities of cabinet administration, and I think it would be an excellent training ground for young members, who, if they can prove their worth as an administrator, to give them the opportunity to get this training before the responsibility of cabinet administration is thrust upon their shoulders. This is the main reason that this government has asked for this assembly to give consideration to making provision for a maximum of six members to be placed in this position. No one has said that six members would be appointed at this time, and I am very doubtful if there would be that number at this date, but as the responsibilities of a provincial government grows and as the province grows and prospers, then in all probability there would be need for a maximum of six members.

They have asked for the duties to be spelled out. Mr. Speaker, in second reading we are debating the advisability of appointing a maximum of six Legislative Secretaries. My friends opposite, despite the fact that



many of them have spent years in government, have never realized the fact that the place to discuss the duties of the proposed six Legislative Secretaries is when the bill goes into committee. This is when the details . . .

**Mr. Walker:** — No. No.

**Mr. McDonald: (Moosomin)** — You still haven't realized it. I wish you would sit down and read a little while and then maybe you could come up with some of the answers that I am trying to get through to you at this moment.

But, I am suggesting, Mr. Speaker, to my friends opposite, that I need look no further than the responsibilities that have been assigned to me in this present government to realize that I could certainly perform the duties that have been assigned to me much better if I had an assistant to help me. When one takes on the Department of Agriculture, The Saskatchewan Guarantee and Fidelity Company, Saskatchewan Government Insurance, The Milk Control Board, the Crop Insurance Board, on the Treasury Board, and add them all together, there are many days when I spend few hours in my own office. The public, I think, are entitled, when they come into this city, to see a Minister, to see at least someone who can speak for the government, and if I am out in some other area of the province, who are these people going to contact? They figure there is not anyone. And I suggest to you that a Legislative Secretary can perform a worthwhile function. In the Department of Agriculture at the moment, there are many problems to which I ought to be giving immediate attention, but this is not possible because of the many responsibilities that I have. If a Legislative Secretary were available to me, I suggest that some of these problems could certainly be taken care of by him.

Some complaints have been made with regard to an expense account, and to listen to my friends opposite, one would think that these people were going to be given a blank cheque to run around Saskatchewan and elsewhere. Many acts make provision for reasonable expenses. What happens when we appoint boards and commissions? How are their expenses spelled out — reasonable expenses. What is reasonable? Reasonable is the cost of travelling — the cost of meals — staying overnight and this type of expenditure. I suggest that to drag this into this assembly at this time is nothing more or less than a red herring, and I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that in my opinion, every dollar that is spent of the taxpayers money in providing these additional services to our people, we will return many times over in services to the people of Saskatchewan.

**Mr. McDonald: (Moosomin)** — I think that if my friends opposite are prepared to let this bill move into Committee of the Whole, then all of the detailed information that they are seeking can be provided to them, and I want to close my remarks by again saying that, in my opinion, many people who have served in similar capacities elsewhere have made a tremendous contribution. Why should any consideration be given to the suggestion of the member from Saskatoon (Mr. Nicholson) that this bill should be delayed until the Dorion Commission completes their report? What has the Dorion Enquiry got to do with this legislation? Nothing — absolutely nothing. I know my hon. friends would like to introduce into this house a debate on this matter that is going on in Quebec at the moment. We have no right to be discussing it here, and in the second place, as far as this legislature is concerned, it is none of our business, and I think we should proceed with the work that is our business, and if you people would only realize that the intent and the purpose of this legislation is to provide better government, and to provide better service to the taxpayers of this province, then I think we can get on with the job and do what we were elected to do.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. A.C. Cameron: (Maple Creek)** — Mr. Speaker, I want to speak very briefly. I think what they are trying to do is confuse the whole issue. As I understand the bill, it arranges for the appointment of one or more, but not exceeding six, Legislative Assistants.

If we look over the cabinet, as the member from Saskatoon (Mr. Nicholson) suggested we would do to justify this and show the need, all we have to do is look at the Premier's portfolio. This man assumed the position as Premier of the province, the heavy portfolio as Provincial Treasurer, head of the Liquor Licensing Commission, The Arts Board, the Fuel Petroleum Act, Government Finance, and a host of others. Can anyone sit across there in his

seat and conscientiously say that this Premier today is not entitled to a Parliamentary Assistant to help him in his work?

**Mr. E.I. Wood: (Swift Current)** — No.

**Mr. Cameron:** — There is one. Take the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Gardiner). This is the Centennial Year. The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Gardiner), I understand, has official invitations to address over 500 meetings this summer in the interests of the Centennial. Even if he was a magician, it would be impossible for him to address 500 meetings. Does someone suggest that the people of Saskatchewan, in celebrating this Centennial, or this Diamond Jubilee, should not be entitled to a representative on behalf of the Minister of Public Works, who is the Minister in charge of the Centennial, to come and bring his greetings? To be present on his behalf, is that what you would deny the people of Saskatchewan? Here, too, may be a need for a Parliamentary Assistant.

I can recall when the former government had fifteen cabinet ministers, I think it was, the Premier had one Portfolio, and that was Premier. Personally, I think he had sufficient at that. But he had in addition, a cabinet minister without portfolio. I think it was the hon. Mr. Sturdy. He was the spare wheel of the cabinet. I can recall, day after day, his duties were to be out in the rotunda and to welcome all the visitors, one by one. He attended all of the ladies' teas that he could possibly attend on behalf of the Premier. I can recall investigating and asking for vouchers showing his expenditures during his term in the city of Saskatoon. It might be interesting to point out that those expenditures came in during the time there was a federal election on. Here was the special assistant to the Premier, going about the province, on behalf of the Premier. I wonder what work he was doing in many of these instances? — and paid, not \$2,00 but a full cabinet minister's salary.

**Mr. Wood:** — No.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Yes. Pardon me, I was wrong. \$1,000 less.

Then, he says why don't some of the backbenchers get up? Why don't some of the cabinet ministers justify this? Why are they sitting quiet? Why does the Premier attempt to close off the debate? It is self-evident to anyone who has any sense of fair judgment about him that the Premier is certainly a man worthy of the assistance of a Parliamentary Assistant. If he appoints one, he appoints one. If he appoints two, he appoints two. But they will overlook these ones but by innuendo and by snide remarks, would have the people believe that there was a sinister motive behind this, — that it would be a place to put political organizers on the payrolls — they would be going around the province collecting memberships — they would be doing political work, and the people would be paying for this political work!

Then he suggests, if you want political organizers on the payroll and give them this dignity of Parliamentary Assistant or Executive Assistant, whatever it is, pay for it by collecting \$1,000 from each cabinet minister.

I have observed the member from Saskatoon (Mr. Nicholson) over a considerable number of years in the house and I have never before witnessed what we witnessed this afternoon when he tried to justify his stand by referring to scandals in Ottawa where some Parliamentary Assistant is up before the courts. He would discredit all Parliamentary Assistants that have made such a tremendous contribution to this country. Can he condemn the Royal Canadian Mounted Police because some policeman may get into difficulty? Can he discredit the clergy because some clergyman may find himself in difficulties before the court? Can he discredit the people in general? These are exactly the tactics he is trying to use, and I am surprised that with his years of experience in the House of Commons, and in the responsible position he used to occupy in private life, and at his age he should get down into the gutter the way he has done this afternoon.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Sam K. Asbell: (Bengough)** — Mr. Speaker, as a new member and a backbencher in the province of Saskatchewan, I do not claim to be one of the youthful age nor do I claim to be one of the sages, but I take it upon myself, Sir, to speak as an elected member of this house, proud to represent the constituency I come from, and proud to be a member of this legislature. Sir, if it befell me that I could further service this province as a Parliamentary Assistant to

the advancement of our commonwealth, I would, not only be proud to serve in that capacity, Sir, but I would be proud to further the welfare of this province. I find his implication most derogatory. I would take it, Sir, and I make this most personal, that these remarks coming from a former member or a present member of the clergy to impugn and degrade myself . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — And everybody.

**Mr. Asbell:** — . . . and this entire house of backbenchers, and his own backbenchers. They have no more personal advancement of this province and rather than think that they should be lowered and degraded by these implications, I would prefer, Sir, not to be involved in public life as it is today.

**Mr. Gordon Snyder: (Moose Jaw City)** — This is a popular phrase, but I had not intended to involve myself in this particular debate until the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) made his contribution, and I felt almost obliged to make a few comments in this respect. I think one of the biggest problems that is involved at this present time is the failure of the government opposite to recognize what their real problem is, and their real problem revolves around the fact that they failed to appoint enough cabinet ministers to do the job. I don't know whether the Premier has not been able to locate enough talent without running them through this so-called training ground. This was not the impression which he left during the election campaign when he said "elect us, we have got a stalwart band of brilliant young men willing to take over from these tired old people across the way". I think this was the impression.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — True.

**Mr. Snyder:** — Mr. Speaker, I recognize full well that the Premier himself is carrying a rather heavy load — a load which I would be inclined to believe he will not carry for any great length of time. I think he will see fit to appoint someone to take over some of the arduous tasks that fall on the shoulders of a man who was chosen to be Premier of the province. Now, I fully recognize some of the problems which are involved. I know there are a lot of social activities, as well as activities which take him about the province, and the job of Provincial Treasurer is a very arduous task indeed, without carrying the additional responsibilities, but I would, on behalf of members on this side of the house, suggest, perhaps that some of his members who are not burdened quite as heavily as himself could take some of these responsibilities.

The Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron), who is not in the house at this moment, I think could be well advised to assume some of the heavy load that falls on other ministers. One of the earlier publications which the government submitted to all members of the house, showed his responsibilities as being Minister in charge of Mineral Resources and Saskair, and this Minister apparently is going to dispose with at least part of his responsibilities by selling Saskair. So I would suggest that here is one of the solutions to your problem. Give this Minister a little more to do and he will have less time, perhaps, to think up these trite phrases, these pointless suggestions, that he comes up with from time to time.

I recognize full well there is another area which could be explored and that is a suggestion that has been made from this side of the house before, and one which I feel rather strongly about. The Minister who is presently in charge of both the Department of Labour and the Department of Co-operatives (Mr. Coderre) could very well shed some of this responsibility and appoint a member from his side of the house, among these virile, able, capable young men to take over one of these two portfolios. I think this is a reasonable suggestion. Delegate your responsibility in the normal, logical fashion and for Heaven's Sake, do not run around appointing these people to act on a temporary basis, to be political hacks, to run around the province doing your political work. Pay your organizers and stand up and be counted. Appoint them as political organizers. Call them as such. Let us not have this back-door method. Appoint cabinet ministers for doing cabinet minister's jobs — political organizers for doing political organizers jobs.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Snyder:** — The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McDonald) only a short while ago, drew to the attention of the house, the fact that in some circum-

stances people would come to the capital city in order to see a minister, and find it difficult because of his obligations. I recognize this full well. I think anyone that is in a position to recognize the responsibilities of cabinet ministers, accepts this. I would also remind members, that deputy ministers are there for this particular purpose. Deputy ministers have the privilege of giving information, of doing such things as they are responsible for and the deputy minister is almost always available to provide this kind of information and perform many of the tasks which a minister would normally take care of. The deputy minister has the authority to do these kind of jobs.

So I say, before I take my seat, appoint more cabinet ministers. You know you are short on that end. We know you are short. If you have not trained these people within that time, we will be gentle with them for a while. We will let you bring them in and groom them properly. Add to your cabinet and bring them up to the required level. Appoint cabinet ministers where they are needed. Appoint your political organizers where they are needed, but let us keep them separate and apart. I certainly have no intention of supporting this particular bill, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mrs. Sally Merchant: (Saskatoon)** — Mr. Speaker, I do not think I really had intended to speak on this bill until I heard some of the remarks that have been made by members opposite. I very much regret that the member for Saskatoon should have taken the stand that he did. Some of the regrettable things he said implied that because such things had happened among the Parliamentary Secretaries at Ottawa, they must happen here. It seems to me to be such a very strange line of reasoning. It is as though, because a judge was once impeached, you immediately do away with the judiciary. But listening to the remarks that have been made on the other side, it seems to me so peculiar that their assessment of what Parliamentary Secretaries would be, is so very different from what ours on this side is. It would seem to me that the members opposite are seeing the mote in their own eyes, when they impute political possibilities to this position. They have painted vividly pictures of what the Parliamentary Secretaries would do. Most of it has been nefarious and underhand activity.

I would like to paint my own picture of what I vision the Parliamentary Secretary as doing. From the point of view of a backbencher, it seems to me that as a Parliamentary Secretary, whatever form it may take, it would be an opportunity for a person such as I am, and as all elected members are, a person who feels very responsible for the things that go on in government, in all departments of the government and yet, as a backbencher, who feels, and I think perhaps, the members opposite who have sat in the backbench of the former government will agree with me, who feels in a sense, remote from the activities of government itself. It would be an opportunity for backbenchers to become involved to whatever extend it is possible, in government itself.

There is another advantage that I see, and this is to the department. The member from Moose Jaw mentioned breaking the government down into more and more departments. It has seemed to me, over the course of the years, that when you build a department, you build an administration and you build a bureaucracy that belongs to that department. This is something that I, as a person, and I think most taxpayers, object to. If there are ways of containing the growth of the administrative bureaucracy that surrounds government, then I think these ways should be sought. I think assistants in departments is the way in which you can do this.

I think particularly of the Department of Education, or the Department which the member for Saskatoon (Mr. Nicholson) formerly directed, the Department of Social Welfare, — these two in particular are departments where, had there been someone else responsible to the people, there might not have been the development of the kinds of administrative problems we have been hearing about. I do think that we live in a system where people consider that their elected members are responsible for their departments. When the departments become too big, it is almost impossible for a Minister who is responsible to the house, to be in touch with every part of that department.

Take the Department of Education for instance. Over the course of the years, it has had added unto itself any number of functions, recreation, culture, all the things that have been added in here and it seems to me that over the course of the last few years, and I am not being critical of the Public Service when I say this, but it has seemed to me that for lack of control at the top, for lack of sufficient time in the day of the Minister, there has been a tendency to turn over the government of the country to the Public Service. As I say, I am not critical of the Public Service in this,

but I do think that we are putting more responsibility on the Public Service than should normally be expected of it.

So I rise today, Mr. Speaker, simply because the picture that has been painted of Legislative Secretaries going about the country collecting memberships and doing political jobs is far from the picture that we have on this side of the house. It is, as I said at the outset, a case of the opposition seeing the mote in its own eye.

**Mr. J.E. Brockelbank: (Saskatoon)** — Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to assure the lady member from Saskatoon (Mrs. Merchant) that it is not because we are on this side of the house that we see what we see as far as Legislative Secretaries are concerned. We see Legislative Secretaries in a poor light because there is an example set elsewhere in Canada.

Other provinces of Canada, and in this case, all of these provinces are larger and have huge administrative set-ups. None of them have seen fit to appoint Parliamentary or Legislative Secretaries. I think this is an argument in favor of not appointing these particular people in the province of Saskatchewan.

Now that we have witnessed the high water mark of the Liberal party's plan to rescue the farmer from cost-price squeeze, namely the Premier's passion for purple petrol, the remainder of the session may be anti-climatic as far as the farmer is concerned anyway.

It appears that the remark of the hon. member from Arm River (Mr. Pederson) which he made in the house the other day, has frightened most of the prospective Legislative Secretaries back into the weeds, because there have not been very many of them come out to speak in favor of this bill.

The establishment of Legislative Secretaries is a departure from the practice of this house, or any other provincial house, as a matter of fact. The only precedent the government can point to is the appointment of Parliamentary Secretaries at Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker, in one of his decisions yesterday, made reference to the shambles that is Ottawa today. I would have to agree with Mr. Speaker in his comment about Ottawa. When we examine the state of affairs at Ottawa, the party opposite is quite touchy and I could well appreciate their feelings, if I were in their boots.

The influence peddling that has gone on in and about the structure of Ottawa is partly due to the ineffectual leadership of the Liberal party and also to the ineffectual leadership of the Conservative opposition at Ottawa. This has put all the parliamentary secretaries in an unenviable position, and until such time as the Dorion Enquiry is concluded, these secretaries, I am afraid will be under a cloud of suspicion.

It has already been pointed out in this legislature that Saskatchewan does not require legislative assistants. In the remarks of the Deputy Premier, the Minister of Agriculture, (Mr. McDonald) and the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron), they took care to describe to this legislature, the terrific loads some of the cabinet ministers were carrying. We would agree that these cabinet ministers are carrying a heavy load, if they are doing their work properly, and I am sure they are trying to do the work properly. This is a real good argument in favor of more cabinet ministers. I think that no one can argue with that. The Premier should feel free to appoint as many cabinet ministers as the previous administration had, without arousing any public antagonism towards his government. I do not think there is any need for him to feel ashamed to have to admit that he misjudged the situation a little. This is the time that he should correct it, instead of going around the back way with legislative secretaries.

Apart from that, I would say that the duties have not been defined, and I think it is quite important that we should know the general outline of the duties of these people, so that we can judge the whole picture more clearly in principle at this time. We have not been appraised regarding what department these assistants will be attached to. Will they be floaters? Or will they have two or three departments, or will they be attached to one department permanently for their one year period? We know nothing of such details and I suspect that the Premier is leaving himself open to a great deal of criticism but that, of course, is his problem. We are just trying to make him aware of this.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would say that I do not believe the public of Saskatchewan should be required to pay field men for the Liberal party.

**Mr. G.G. Leith: (Elrose)** — Mr. Speaker, I, like the member from Saskatoon, did not really intend to take part in this debate until just a few minutes ago. But several things have been said that I think need answering, not from the front row of the government party, but from the back row. To say that these positions will be used for political purposes is a slur on the people who might be appointed and a slur on the position of executive officer of the crown. I think it will be wise for members opposite to stop this line of attack, as it is not doing anybody any good.

I want also to remind the members opposite that have spoken that it is not fair — it is not safe to draw inferences from one example. It is not fair to say that the member for Arm River is a bad member or that the Conservative party in Saskatchewan is a bad party, just because the Conservative party of England got into trouble a few years ago. This is the same kind of inference you people have been trying to make.

I also want to remind members opposite that during their years in office, they did not mind making new experiments in government. They were, in fact they still are, not afraid to go to other countries to seek examples that they think we should emulate here in Saskatchewan. I will mention the position of the Legislative Commissioner. They have gone to the government of New Zealand where such a man is employed. They have mentioned briefly that some of the Scandinavian countries employ Legislative Commissioners. They say that it has worked well there, and that it is perhaps wise for us to think about using them here.

I would like to add to the words of the lady member from Saskatoon (Mrs. Merchant). I am one of the people who would like very much to have one of these legislative secretary's jobs. I say this first, to explain my position.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Leith:** — Thank you. I do not think the \$2,000 a year extra is going to influence anybody to want the position badly. I think that members on the back row of this group to your right, Mr. Speaker, would like to be legislative secretaries because they want the experience in government. Secondly, they want to help the people of Saskatchewan get better government. Thirdly, of course, they want to help their cabinet ministers in any way they can.

I would think that the Department of Highways could very well have a legislative assistant to look after the rail line abandonment problem, and to try and stop it here. This is just one example. I think that if members opposite looked over the various departments that cabinet ministers on our side of the house are handling, and the extra boards and commissions that they are handling, they could easily see places where legislative assistants could be of very great assistance.

Earlier, the member from Regina West asked the question as to where they would fit in the hierarchy of government. I agree that there might be a problem here. I cannot see that the Legislative Assistant should be interposed between the minister and his deputy. I think that it would be wrong for him to interfere in the flow of authority down from the minister to the deputy and to the department.

It would also be wrong for him to be in the way of responsibility flowing upward through the administrative triangle from the deputy to the minister. I can see, as in the case of the problem of rail abandonment in Saskatchewan, where the legislative assistants can perform excellent service.

In closing I want to tell members opposite something they do not seem to know, and that is that legislative assistants or parliamentary secretaries have served the British House of Commons with brilliance, both under the Conservative and the Labour governments in Britain. In fact, Sir, if I am not wrong, I think that it was the Labour government of Great Britain that introduced this concept into British parliamentary practice. I think it would be wise for members opposite to look this up and satisfy themselves accordingly. They have done signal work in British government and they have done signal work in Canadian government and just because we happen to be the first provincial government that is thinking about employing them this is no reason to oppose it.

I urge members opposite to think about it and go with us on this motion.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. D.W. Michayluk: (Redberry)** — Mr. Speaker, I did not in any way, prior to this afternoon, want to participate in this particular bill no. 30 on second reading. But after listening to two prospective legislative secretaries, I was convinced that I should rise and say a few words in respect to some of the comments that were made in respect to bill no. 30.

The hon. member for Regina West, the other day in this house, mentioned the fact that no other province in the dominion has had secretarial or legislative assistants including provinces with larger populations and governments spending larger budgets, and that therefore there was no reason why we in Saskatchewan should be taking this step.

The hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McDonald) had mentioned that in 1944, the then government of the province of Saskatchewan had eight cabinet ministers. This is correct, Mr. Speaker. The eight cabinet ministers of that time dealt with a budget of approximately \$30,000,000. Criticism was levelled at the government that held office from 1944 to 1964 on the grounds that during the twenty years, the number of cabinet positions was raised to fifteen.

I want to bring to the attention of this house, Mr. Speaker, the fact that during these twenty years the provincial budget had risen from some \$30,000,000 in 1944 to \$214,000,000 in 1964. On top of this, Mr. Speaker, there were numerous crown corporations that had come into existence over the twenty years. The Saskatchewan Power Corporation alone, a corporation worth about \$500,000,000, came into being. The Saskatchewan Government Insurance, the Saskatchewan Transportation Company, the Timber Board, the Clay Products, the Sodium Sulphate, and, of course, each of the ministers became chairman or ministers responsible for these crown corporations. This was an added task. I personally, Mr. Speaker, do not see any reason why the present administration is limiting the number of cabinet ministers to twelve at the present time. If I am correct, the present Premier has suggested that he may appoint one additional cabinet minister after the current session is adjourned.

I know that some of the present cabinet ministers have had no legislative experience. Eight of them have been in this house, or have been sitting in this legislature, or have had previous legislative experience, therefore I do not feel that being a minister in charge of a department is too great a task for them, although some of them are carrying two portfolios.

There are, however, four new ministers. The Attorney General (Mr. Heald) is a new minister. Of course, I do not think that these people who are connected with the legal profession are the ones who find themselves in difficulty as cabinet ministers.

Then there is another member, the member for Regina South (Mr. Grant), who has had no legislative experience. However, he has had experience in public life. He was mayor of Regina, prior to his coming to this legislature. I do not think that he would find his ministerial position as Minister of Highways very difficult, if he was not loaded down with the Department of Industry and Information. Suggestions have been made in this house that we on this side would not raise any objections if the present Premier would appoint more cabinet ministers to take the load off ministers who have double portfolios.

Then there is the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Cuelenaere) who is in the same category of the hon. member for Lumsden. He too is of the legal profession. I do not think that he should be encountering any difficulty in respect to the Department of Natural Resources. He also, has had municipal experience, having been mayor of the city of Prince Albert.

Now, we come to the fourth one, and that is the hon. member for Touchwood, the Minister of Education (Mr. Trapp). He has had some experience in public life as a school teacher. The first time that I had the pleasure of meeting him was at a STF council meeting in about 1946, when he was the President of the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation, which is quite an organization. To be head of this organization gives a person a good amount of experience and practice so that, as Minister of Education, I do not think that his task should be too hard.

Of course, there is this too, that it is sometimes difficult to teach old dogs new tricks. So some of them may find their jobs difficult.

Mr. Speaker, what concerns me mainly, is that there is a variation in the number that may be appointed. I would like the Minister to say that

**March 12, 1965**

he will be appointing legislative secretaries from either side of this house, possibly giving an opportunity for some of the backbenchers from this side a chance to have some necessary training for future cabinet posts. However, I do not assume that we will be given this opportunity. I think that it will be limited to the backbenchers that are on the side of the government.

Of course, the bill limits the salary to \$2,000 and if the maximum number of these secretaries are appointed that will mean a total cost of \$12,000 — the cost of an additional minister. Then these six legislative secretaries will each require an automobile, Mr. Speaker, I presume, to perform their duties in opening public buildings and speaking at public meetings, and drinking at teas, and so on, as was mentioned. So each of the six will require an automobile at about \$3,000 or \$3,500. This would add up to in the vicinity of \$18,000, another cabinet minister's salary.

Then, of course, comes an item of undetermined nature, the expense account. I have some experience of travelling within my constituency only, Mr. Speaker, as a member of this legislature. I know what expense it involves to attend to the problems of my constituents. I would assume that possibly \$2,500 would be about the right figure to strike off. Now, \$2,500 for the six of them would come to probably the salary of three additional cabinet ministers. So that in all, Mr. Speaker, if we in this legislature vote for this bill no. 30, we are going to spend anywhere between \$80,000 and \$100,000 to keep these six legislative secretaries going for a year.

Now, I do not know how much has been said regarding this government's promise when elected, to reduce expenses . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — We will do it.

**Mr. Michayluk:** — Sure, they have been reducing social aid. They have been making the Saskatchewan people pay more for medical care, and here, when it comes to legislative secretaries, there seems to be no limit. Now, Mr. Speaker, I said at the offset, that I did not anticipate, prior to this afternoon, that I would be participating in this debate. I have a lot more things that I could say, so with your permission I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the hon. Mr. Cuelenaere, that Bill no. 39 — An Act to Amend the Regional Parks Act, 1964, be read the second time.

**Hon. J.M. Cuelenaere: (Minister of Natural Resources)** — Mr. Speaker, in rising to close the debate on the matter of the bill relating to regional parks, the principle of the bill is simply to authorize the . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — The member is about to close the debate. If anyone wishes to speak, he must do so now.

**Mr. Cuelenaere:** — . . . the principle of the bill is to authorize the Minister to establish a depreciation allowance schedule and apply that schedule to each of the regional parks and to pay the amount of the allowance to the regional park authorities on a fifty-fifty basis.

I propose to give full details when the bill goes to Committee. I think that, in closing the debate, I need only answer two questions that were asked in the course of the debate.

The hon. member from The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) asked and I believe that this was his question, "Is there any schedule prepared?" Mr. Speaker, it is proposed that the regional park authorities be paid ten per cent per year for a ten year period on a shared basis. This amount is to be paid each year on the full capital costs, not on the depreciated value after the first year.

The other question that I was asked, I believe it was by the hon. member from Melfort (Mr. Willis), and I believe I have the question accurately, asked whether the park authorities would be required to use or apply the grant on capital projects. . .

**Mr. Willis:** — No.



**Mr. Cuelenaere:** — I am sorry. It was the hon. member for Moose Jaw who asked the question. In answer to the question, I can only say that the grant will be paid to the regional park authorities and it will be left to them to decide how it will be spent. It is hoped that it will be used mainly on maintenance of their capital assets.

Mr. Speaker, if there are any further questions, I will be glad to answer them in committee and at this time, I move that the bill be now read a second time.

Motion agreed and bill read a second time.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:00 o'clock p.m.