

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
First Session — Fifteenth Legislature
28th Day

Monday, March 15, 1965

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

STATEMENT RE STOCK PILING OF CIGARETTES

Hon. W.R. Thatcher: (Premier) — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I would like to read a brief statement to the house. It has been drawn to the Treasury Department's attention that there is a considerable stock piling of cigarettes and tobacco by the retailers and wholesalers, in anticipation of making a profit by purchasing inventories prior to the effective date of the tobacco tax. I wish to announce the government's intention subject to the approval of the legislature, when it considers the Tobacco Tax Act, to require all retailers, jobbers, and wholesalers, to submit an inventory return of all tobacco stocks on hand as at the day prior to the effective day of the tobacco tax. The Treasury Department will assess the tobacco tax on this initial inventory return. Since the tax on the initial inventory could place a financial burden on the wholesaler or retailers, provision will be made to allow time for the payment of the tax. Also it is intended that the government will pay a commission to all dealers with respect to tax collected on initial inventories.

Although the Tobacco Tax Act has not yet been introduced into the house, we felt it was in the public interest to advise all retailers, wholesalers and jobbers, of the government's intention to levy the tobacco tax on all inventory on hand, as at the day prior to the effective date of the tobacco tax. We believe that this is a desirable step to eliminate any possibility of wind-fall profits on the sale of tobacco products acquired before the effective date of the Tobacco Tax Act.

Mr. Brockelbank: (Kelsey) — Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Premier a question as a result of this statement. He was reading about a tax on inventory, and this raises in my mind, as to whether or not this is a direct tax, and is within the powers of the province to levy. If it is a tax on inventory which the owners of the inventory is able to pass on to the purchaser, I think it is in danger of being regarded as an indirect tax. I wonder has this been looked into?

Mr. Thatcher: — Yes, Mr. Speaker, this has been looked into and the Attorney General's department has informed us that this will be legal. We are doing it precisely as Manitoba did, but we do want to make certain that all these tobaccoists who are buying up large stocks ahead of time, shouldn't think that they are going to avoid the tax because they are still going to have to pay it.

ANNOUNCEMENT RE MEMBERS OF CABINET & REGINA CITY COUNCIL BOWLING

Hon. G.B. Grant: (Minister of Highways) — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I would like to make an announcement. For some twenty years there has been an annual bowling match between the Regina City Council and the members of the cabinet and this event was held on Saturday afternoon last. I know that two of the members of the opposition, the hon. member from Swift Current, (Mr. Wood) and the hon. member from Melfort-Tisdale (Mr. Willis) will be vitally interested in the outcome of the event, since they participated last year and their names are on the trophy. I am pleased to advise that once again we upheld the honor of the cabinet and retained the trophy. It was through sheer maturity and ability, I can assure you and we beat the City Council team by seven pins on a three game total.

Hon. Members: — Hear! Hear!

WELCOME TO STUDENTS:

Mr. W.A. Robbins: (Saskatoon) — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are called, I would like to draw to the attention of the members of the assembly, that we are favored with a visit from thirty-one students from the University School in Saskatoon, along with their teacher, Mrs. Haug. They are seated in the east

gallery and it is a great pleasure, on my part, to introduce this class. I have known Mrs. Haug personally for a long time and she taught two of my children in Sunday School. I am sure the members of the assembly will be pleased to bring greetings to them and hope their visit to the legislature is informative and educational.

Hon. Members: — Hear! Hear!

EXPRESSION OF THANKS TO GOVERNMENT MEMBERS RE BOWLING

Mr. H.H.P. Baker: (Regina East) — Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to congratulate, and thank the government members for coming out and playing with us on Saturday afternoon. I think what happened there was that they had a re-count and we were, supposedly, ten pins ahead in the first game, and then, on the re-count, we were about four or seven behind. I don't know whether I should apply it to the Controverted Elections Act or not, but I can assure you that the association appreciated it, and I might say that the Minister of Labour, "All Strikes" Coderre did a fine job, and the professionals Boldt and Gardiner we might eliminate through Sunday sports and perhaps a few of us on this side too, I don't know. But anyway we thank you for coming out and congratulations. The Regina Ten Pin Association, I'm sure, appreciated that very much.

Hon. Members: — Hear! Hear!

STATEMENT RE LIST OF RETURNS.

Mr. Brockelbank: (Kelsey) — Mr. Speaker, before orders of the day are proceeded with, I would like to remind the house and speak to the Premier in particular. I believe it was on Friday I raised a question of a number of orders had been issued and had not been brought down, and I believe I forgot to send over the list that I had prepared. Well, I did some more checking and I find that up to and including February 18th, which was the eleventh sitting day and incidentally, this is the 28th sitting day, up to that time there were seventeen orders that had been issued for which returns had not been tabled. I would ask the government to look after these. I will send this list over to the Premier.

CONGRATULATIONS TO GLENAVON PIPERS HOCKEY TEAM

Hon. D.T. McFarlane: (Minister of Municipal Affairs) — Before the orders of the day are proceeded with, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all members, especially those in the southern part of the province, would want to join with me in congratulating the Glenavon Pipers hockey team in their success in the intermediate "C" provincial playoffs by virtue of their win over Lucky Lake on Saturday night. I would point out that this is the second year in a row that they have won the Intermediate "C" crown. They came from behind, and won the final game 7-6. I am sure all members would want to be associated with me in congratulating this club. It is of particular interest to me because I had the honor of coaching that team some years ago. I just want to say to the member from Elrose, (Mr. Leith) that we wish him better luck next time.

Hon. Members: — Hear! Hear!

ADJOURNED DEBATES

The assembly resumed the adjourned debate on bill no. 30 — An Act to provide for the Appointment of Legislative Secretaries to Members of the Executive Council, be now read a second time.

Mr. Brockelbank: (Kelsey) — I would ask in view of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Michayluk is away at this time, and that this bill stand on the order paper for another day.

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker, if we are ever going to get these Legislative Secretaries working this session, we had better pass this bill pretty soon. This is the third time that it has been before the house and I don't know whether the government can let this stand today, and I think I will have to ask you to proceed with the debate.

Mr. W.G. Davies: (Moose Jaw) — Mr. Speaker, I think that

everyone will acknowledge that there has been a good deal said about this bill, and I think it is quite right that there should have been a great deal said about the principles that are incorporated. I believe that they have caused throughout the length and breadth of this province, a good deal of anxiety. I think that this anxiety has been justified and that some of the reasons for anxiety have become apparent as we have discussed the bill.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I very often used to hear from my friends when they were in opposition, complaints about too many ministers. I used to hear the complaint in somewhat of this vein, that under a previous Liberal government all the business of the province was done with only seven or eight ministers and why couldn't the business of the government today be done with the same number? Well, Mr. Speaker, we have now, of course, twelve, with I presume thirteen ministers when a replacement is found for the late incumbent. When that takes place, it will leave us only two short of the number of ministers the former government had.

It does seem to me that when one adds up all the costs and when one considers all the likely costs it is very probable, indeed, that all of the expenditures that were made by a CCF government, will be considerably exceeded by the Liberal government. There has been some discussion about this. I agree that we have to be somewhat in the realm of the speculative here. But what is apparent is that up to six Legislative Secretaries will get \$2,000 a piece, that, in total is the sum of some \$12,000 or \$2,000 more than the salary of one minister, plus expenses.

We have no means of knowing just what these expenses will be, but I say that it would be a reasonable assumption that this could be another \$8,000 or \$10,000 or, — Mr. Speaker, the Premier shakes his head, I must say to him, however, that he doesn't know either, at this point, how much this amount will be, because as the Minister of Mineral Resources was telling us the other day, the orbit of responsibilities are quite various. It is hard to know for certain just precisely what these responsibilities will be. I suppose we could very well see spending go up to the sum that I have given as an assumed figure.

Well, I don't think that this is all: by no means the whole gist of the argument. What we are concerned with, is making sure, first of all, that the people who perform acts on the part of the government of Saskatchewan, are people who sit as ministers and are directly responsible, in this legislature and to the general public. I here suggest this afternoon that it could very well be that by the appointment of Legislative Secretaries — working under ministers, perhaps, but working certainly as members of the legislative assembly through the ministers, these members will perform tasks that are proper tasks of a minister of the crown, who is responsible to this house and to the public and province of Saskatchewan.

The deputy premier, the Minister of Agriculture, (Mr. McDonald) said last week in this debate, that better government was the objective of the bill. I am not so sure, in the terms of what we can foresee, how these positions will turn out to be that better government indeed will be the objective, or will turn out to be a successful objective in those terms.

The member for Elrose, (Mr. Leith) said that the British government provided an example that could be compared with what is intended to be done by this bill. I think it has already been pointed out that, with regard to the example given of the House of Commons, that there is a far cry between the appointment of Legislative Secretaries in the province of Saskatchewan and the duties of a position of assistant in the British government. The whole orbit of responsibility is completely different. There is practically a continuous operation in the House of Commons and certainly conditions at Ottawa are very, very hard to compare with conditions in Saskatchewan.

The member for Saskatoon, (Mrs. Merchant) speaking in the debate on this question suggested that we were rather preoccupied with some of the dangers. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, the many points that were mentioned in this connection. She said we had a mote in our eye. Well, I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that the: mote is not in our eye and that if it is in anyone's eye, it is in the eye of the Liberal party of this province. I suggest that considering what has occurred during the past several months, the notorious goings on in the inquiries that surround certain things at Ottawa, that these suggestions are by no means untoward.

The lady member from Saskatoon, (Mrs. Merchant) who raised the question of what she called "administrative bureaucracy" said, "I think that administrative bureaucracy should be reduced or made less serious by the creation of more assistance in the way of Legislative Secretaries". Now, I would like to suggest to the lady member from Saskatoon, (Mrs. Merchant)

that her argument actually places her on the other side of the coin in this debate. Because it seems to me that where you have a civil service working under their ministers in a fashion where everyone knows precisely the duties that civil servant must render for his minister, there is no doubt about where the responsibility lies.

I can picture a situation on the other hand, Mr. Speaker, where the institution of Legislative Secretaries would make more difficult the solution of any problem that might exist of administrative bureaucracy. I can see this position where the Legislative Secretary is interposed between the minister and the official of the department where there is a confusion of instructions; where by the very nature of his position there is intensified in the minds of members of the civil service, questions of confusion, difficulty of understanding instructions and wondering just where the responsibility lies.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I acknowledge that there has been an increase in the load of ministers, especially during the last decade and a half. I think most fair-minded people would say the same. How you cope with this, of course, is another thing entirely. I say that, first of all, this can be done by raising the number of ministers to the number that obtained before. This is the first obvious solution. Secondly, by adding to the number of people in the civil service, who as officials, directly serve the ministers who need assistance.

This is the orderly and the common sense way of achieving the objective that seems to be the intention of the bill. I thought, by the way, Mr. Speaker, that possibly the best argument for the bill was given, when the Minister of Mineral Resources arose the other day to defend the bill. At that time, he said that the Minister of Public Works, (Mr. Gardiner) in his capacity as Minister in charge of Jubilee matters, had some 500 invitations to address meetings of all kinds across the province, and that he needed an assistant, because an assistant would presumably make it possible for the minister to permit the Legislative Secretary to attend some of these functions and thereby relieve the minister for important matters.

Hon. A.C. Cameron: (Minister of Mineral Resources) — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I don't like to interrupt the speaker. I didn't say he needed assistance. I used him, plus the Premier, as an example of work piling up. I didn't make the statement . . .

Mr. Davies: — Mr. Speaker, in the course of his argument, I think you will recall, as the other members of the house will recall, that he used the example of the Minister of Public Works having received some 500 invitations to attend public meetings. Now it is one thing or the other, either the minister stays home while the Legislative Secretary attends one of these functions, and speaks on behalf of the minister, or the reverse takes place. Either way it occurred to me that for the people of the province of Saskatchewan to have to endure 500 meetings with one minister addressing those 500 meetings, particularly my friend, the Minister of Public Works, (Mr. Gardiner) that the best argument for the bill was actually that it would release them, to some extent, from that ordeal. But that is frankly the only argument that I can see justifies the bill at this time.

When my friend, the Minister of Agriculture, (Mr. McDonald) the deputy premier, was on his feet the other day, he had some rather harsh remarks to make about some of the people on this side of the house. He said that we totally misconstrued and misconceived the way in which a debate should be carried on. He said that we on this side of the house were not discussing the principle of the bill but were discussing the bill in detail. He referred specifically, as I recall at this time, to the words that we had addressed on this point to the matter of duties.

Now, I would like to say to the deputy premier, (Mr. McDonald) that we certainly on this side of the house, did not do as he has suggested. If anything can be discussed on the second reading of the bill, it is the duties of the persons that have authority under the bill. This is one of the grave shortcomings that it does not spell out in any detail what the duties of a Legislative Secretary are to be. We can recall various statutes where the duties of the people concerned are spelled out in some detail. Of course, here it does not do anything of the kind. These duties are to be described in the manner that the Executive Council shall direct.

It is my submission, Mr. Speaker, that had the government proceeded to enumerate these duties, they would not have, to a considerable degree, left themselves so open to the kinds of suggestions that we have been forced to make on this side of the house, because of the lack of detail in the listing

of these duties.

To me, therefore, Mr. Speaker, it would appear that we have a sort of a blank cheque proposition here. We are not aware of the nature or the extent of the duties. We do know something about the remuneration of those who may be appointed; but we are left in grave doubt as to what these people will do in practice when their positions have been filled. What has been said in criticism of this bill, has arisen as I have said, to a considerable extent because of the failure of the bill to make these matters clear.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal said, as I pointed out when I rose, about the principles that are inherent in this legislation and I don't want to be repetitive. I don't think to this point that I have been. It does seem to me, however, that if the question of better government is the objective of this bill, that objective has not been met. That objective has not been proven. What we have here is a bill that may create the possibility of excesses growing up, under the wing of government, that will not be good for the people of this province or the members of this legislature,

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, I just want to say a few words to the house in connection with a matter that was raised the other day, during debate on this bill on Friday last.

The member for Saskatoon city, (Mr. Nicholson) made certain statements to which objection was taken. I have had the opportunity to check the official Hansard records, and I find that the statement was as follows and I quote:

One of the main purposes of the legislation before us, is to have six members of the legislature, who will be paid by public funds and who will be in a position to travel around Saskatchewan at public expense, to secure contribution for political purposes.

That is the Hansard record.

In connection with that I want to say this, that while a member is, of course, free to express his opinion as to the results of any legislation which might be before the house, it is disorderly to suggest that there are bad or unavowed motives behind any legislative proposal, or for that matter, any stand taken by any member of this assembly. I draw your attention to Beauchesne's citation 154, sub-section 3:

The imputation of bad motives or motives different from those acknowledge. All these are unparliamentary and call for prompt interference.

I submit, therefore, that in making this statement, the hon. member from Saskatoon, (Mr. Nicholson) was attributing unavowed motives and I have to ask that he withdraw it.

Mr. A.M. Nicholson: (Saskatoon) — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you would be kind enough to repeat the words which were offensive.

Mr. Speaker: — The words which were taken exception to were as follows and I quote from the Hansard record:

One of the main purposes of the legislation before us is to have six members of the legislature, who will be paid by public funds, and will be in a position to travel around Saskatchewan at public expense, and to secure contributions for political purposes.

That is the quotation from the Hansard record, to which exception has been taken to, and I will repeat the citation if you desire me to.

Mr. Nicholson: — Again, I would like to have

it clearly pointed out, what is offensive, what of these words would be considered to be offensive?

Mr. Speaker: — I would take it all the words were considered offensive, the imputation of bad motives or motives different from those acknowledged. That is those acknowledged in the bill.

Mr. Brockelbank: (Kelsey) — Mr. Speaker, if it's offensive

Mr. Speaker: — As pointed out, the avowed purpose of the bill, is definitely not to do what the member said.

Mr. Brockelbank: (Kelsey) — I just want to mention one thing, Mr. Speaker, and really it is in regard to procedure on a thing like this. It would help a good deal if the member concerned could have the typed extract of the words which he said.

Mr. Speaker: — I have read him the Hansard report.

Mr. Nicholson: — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if this could be left until next time. I think as the member for Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank) has suggested, a member charged should be confronted with the words he said, and as I got your words into position, we were discussing the legislation before the house and I would think, I thought then, and I would think now, that it would be undesirable to have members in a position but it would be helpful if this could be delayed until I had a copy of the transcript.

Mr. Speaker: — Well, I tried to be as fair as I possibly could be to the member, I didn't want to say anything in regard to anything he said that wasn't on the record, and I have waited as long as I have for that purpose in order to be absolutely fair to everybody and all concerned.

I think the point of order was well taken and I am asking the member to withdraw. I will hand the Hansard record over to him. It is just available to him as it is to anybody else. There it is, but I don't think that we can have any prolonged debate on the matter, I must say that I do apologize for not having raised it the minute the debate on this bill started but I didn't want to interfere with the member from Moose Jaw who was already beginning his speech.

The member from Regina East, (Mr. Baker) is about to have something to say on the point of order, I gather.

Mr. H.H.P. Baker: (Regina East) — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I think that the member in question should have the opportunity of looking at Hansard, and saying that it isn't printed properly, but I can say to you that the first copy I got of my speech there were many words left out. Now, I think that he should be given a chance to check. I am not trying to criticize your ruling but I think in all fairness to him, because I can assure you that I wouldn't withdraw if I were in his position until I was sure that those were the words and that is the way they came out typewritten.

Mr. Speaker: — If the hon. member wished to make any imputations against our Hansard girls, of course, that is his business, but I think he is being very unfair.

Mr. Baker: — I'm not saying that, I say my speech that I got, and I'm not blaming them, perhaps the sound didn't pick it up, when you move away from your speaker, they don't catch the words, and I am pleased with what they do, but I think this could perhaps happen and what if one word was left out, the word could have been left out of there and changed the whole context.

Mr. Nicholson: — Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the member for Regina, (Mr. Baker) but I am sure that I was reported accurately, and Your Honor seems to take offence at one of the main purposes, I would be glad to change this to one of the possibilities of the legislation, and I gather that the rest

of the comments were not offensive. I would be glad to withdraw the quotation you underlined here, “one of the main purposes” and substitute “one of the possibilities”.

Mr. Speaker: — I have come to the conclusion that the house has to maintain its own honor and its own dignity, I leave it to the house.

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker, may I speak now?

Mr. Speaker: — Order, I must draw the attention of the house to the fact that the mover is about to close the debate, if anyone wishes to speak he must do so now.

Mr. C.G. Willis: (Melfort-Tisdale) — Mr. Speaker, I wished to take part in the debate last Friday, but at that time, I waited hoping to hear more from the other side of the house, the government side, as to what was involved in this bill, and as you know the debate went on until finally the member for Redberry, (Mr. Michayluk) adjourned it, and I didn't have the opportunity at that time to take part. I am pleased now to rise in my seat and oppose the bill particularly in view of the information that we have at the present time.

Last Friday the Premier introduced the bill. He was not very explicit as to what the duties of a Legislative Secretary, and, Mr. Speaker, neither is the bill. The bill is a very short one. It has seven clauses altogether. Clause 3 has a sub-heading “Duties” which says;

A legislative Secretary to a member of the Executive Council shall assist that member in such manner as the member may direct.

Now, Mr. Speaker, before we in this house are asked to agree to Legislative Secretaries being appointed by the government, we should have more information. This is not enough.

Even after the other members had spoken, besides the Premier, still the duties of a legislative Secretary were not cleared up. In fact, the more people from the other side, spoke, the more unclear the situation became. The other people besides the Premier seemed to have entirely different ideas as to what was involved in the duties of the Legislative Secretaries. Then, Mr. Speaker, this brings up the question of why, then, was the bill to appoint Legislative Secretaries to members of the Executive Council, introduced in the legislature? Some of the other side suggested that probably one reason was because the Liberal government wanted to boast “first” for Saskatchewan. That they would be the first government in Saskatchewan to appoint Legislative Secretaries.

Well, if they wanted to boast along this line, Mr. Speaker, they could also boast that this was a “first” as far as Canadian provinces were concerned but surely, this is nothing to boast about. They did say that at Ottawa and at London, England, there are Legislative Secretaries, but the situation here in the province of Saskatchewan, as was pointed out previously Mr. Speaker, is far different than it is at Ottawa or in London. There is nothing here to warrant the appointment of Legislative Secretaries.

Since this government was elected almost a year ago, we have had a tremendous number of appointments of high ranking officials, people who were appointed by Order-in-Council, executive assistants, Mr. Speaker, have been appointed here in force, and they have added tremendously to the administrative costs of the government in Saskatchewan.

In talking about the costs of these Legislative Secretaries, Mr. Speaker, I have wondered and nobody on the other side has cleared this up, I have wondered whether or not this question of Legislative Secretaries was looked at by the Johnson Commission. Now surely, Mr. Speaker, if we have a commission which is looking at the whole question of administration here and the cost of administration is the province of Saskatchewan, you would have thought that the government would have referred this question to the Johnson Commission. They would not only have referred it but they would have waited until the Johnson Commission which contains nothing about Legislative Secretaries and I submit, Mr. Speaker, that there is nothing in this report because the Johnson Commission has not looked at the question of Legislative Secretaries.

Perhaps the Johnson Commission has been too busy deciding other matters such as the question of laying off 310 highway construction people, but I submit, Mr. Speaker, that is the government wanted the Johnson Commission's recommendation on this, that they could have gotten it, but it appears that they have not as yet seen fit to refer this matter to the Johnson Commission and they have not as yet seen fit to give us any inkling of the thought as to whether or not this has been considered by the Johnson Commission.

Now, it could be that this question of Legislative Secretaries and Executive Assistants, and cabinet ministers too, Mr. Speaker, could have been referred to the Johnson Commission. The Johnson Commission could have been asked to make a study as to whether or not these people were necessary. Whether the cost added to the administration here would be justified. Well, Mr. Speaker, I would agree with the other people on this side of the house who have stated the case for extra ministers of the crown. I certainly would urge the Premier to take off some of the heavy load from their shoulders by appointing extra ministers where justified, and extra ministers can be justified. We have three ministers on the other side who are handling two departments. Granted the Attorney General and the Provincial Secretary's duties are not too onerous for one minister, but I can sympathize with the Minister of Highways, (Mr. Grant) not only in the heavy responsibilities that this major department requires in that he is also loaded down with the Department of Industry and Information. Then too, Mr. Speaker, I think that the Minister of Labour, (Mr. Coderre) should be a single minister with one department, the Department of Labour certainly could do with one minister. Too, the Department of Co-operation is of such importance that we could have one minister here rather than one person dividing his time between Labour and Co-operation.

It would only cost approximately \$12,000 for another minister, \$10,000 for his salary and probably \$2,000 for travelling expenses, whereas if six Legislative Secretaries were appointed by the government, their salaries alone would come to \$12,000 and expenses could easily bring us up to a \$20,000 total for such secretaries.

This, along with the six executive assistants, which I know of, Mr. Speaker, appointed at a cost of \$5,400 a year, brings a total cost of executive assistants and Legislative Secretaries to well over \$15,000. A major expenditure of this kind, Mr. Speaker, I think, should have been referred to the Johnson Commission. I think that the government should not have brought in anything along this line without a recommendation from the Johnson Commission. I don't agree with the member for Redberry, (Mr. Michayluk) when he got the cost of these Legislative Assistants up to \$100,000 but one doesn't know what would happen over the years, Mr. Speaker. It is very easy to go up from \$50,00 to \$1.00,000 in a period of a year.

I think again, that the administrative costs of this government would have become too heavy with the extra people involved and extra costs involved, with six Legislative Assistants. But, outside of the cost, which is serious enough, Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the house are concerned as to what duties these people would have.

Nobody on the other side of the house has as yet come up with a definite answer as to the duties, and the bill itself certainly does not clear up any questions which we would have. There is certainly a great deal of doubt. I don't think that the government should proceed with this bill — first until the whole question of Legislative Secretaries, the question of administration at the top level of this government, is referred to the Johnson Commission and second — until we know on this side of the house, as to what the duties of these people are to be.

There was some reference to this by the Premier when he moved second reading last week. I thought it was rather peculiar, Mr. Speaker, in listing the duties that he only listed one or two, I thought it was rather laughable, Mr. Speaker, that he should say that one duty of the Legislative Secretary would be to help the minister answer questions. Now, Mr. Speaker, you haven't been very active this session in asking questions, but in the past, you have been quite good at this, and as the former Minister of Highways, I can well recall the questions which you directed at highways. Mr. Speaker, I know that you didn't realize just what went on at the other end of the questions, and probably I should acquaint you, as well as the rest of the members here, just what is involved in answering questions.

Last session, Mr. Speaker, you prepared questions for the Department of Highways. We will take one of them which you prepared having to do with a highway in the Saltcoats constituency, although why you would ask regarding Saltcoats constituency, rather than the Melfort constituency, I

was at a loss to understand last year. But you asked the question, you had the question typed out and you laid the question on the desk of the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly, and the clerk took the question from there and the next day it appeared in the white paper, which we have on our desks . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — Order, I think the hon. member should stick to the principle of the bill while we are on it, he is wandering around on subjects which have no relation to this bill.

Mr. Speaker: — Just at the moment he is down in the best constituency that there is in this province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Willis: — I thought one of the principles of the bill, Mr. Speaker, had to do with the duties of the Secretaries. I am glad, Mr. Speaker, that you have given me the okay to proceed along the lines which I was following regarding questions which I gather from the Premier is one of the chief duties of the Legislative Secretaries.

Now, I mention that the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly would have the question appear on the white pages and the day following that the clerk got the question, this white paper would appear in every department of the government. The question which you asked ended up the next morning in the Department of Highways. I had a copy on my desk, the deputy minister had a copy on his desk. We both read it separately, and if there was any question in my mind as to how it should be answered, I would contact him and if there was any question in his mind as to whether the question could be answered, he would contact me. Well, if there is no difficulty here, the deputy simply assigned the question to some person in the department and they came up with the answer. They typed it and they laid it on my desk, and I read the answer over, and then carried the answer to the Legislative Assembly, the day following. The next day, two days after you asked the question, you would rise in your seat and you would say, “Mr. Speaker, (now we are talking about the other Mr. Speaker,) you would say you would want to ask the government such a question, and I, on the other side of the Legislative Assembly, rose and handed the paper which had been prepared by the department to the page boy and said, “The answer is herewith submitted, Mr. Speaker.”

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is all there is to answering questions. I couldn't understand the Premier's reference to having Legislative Secretaries help in answering questions, now, I don't think he meant by this that they were to go into the department and try to tell the deputy minister how the question should be answered. I don't think that he meant that they should pick the typewritten answer up in the office of the minister, and carry it across to the Legislative Assembly, surely this could be done by anybody. You don't have to have a Legislative Secretary to do this, and I didn't think that he meant that they had to stand up in the Legislative Assembly here, while the minister sat in his place and table the question, rather the answer to the question. I couldn't follow the Premier's remarks at all, regarding this duty of the Legislative Secretary. It seems as though the Premier was away out in left field when he was talking about this being one of the main duties of Legislative Secretaries.

If this is not a main duty of a Legislative Secretary, then we have to ask ourselves just what would be the duties of a Legislative Secretary? When some of the members opposite got up, particularly the backbenchers, the new members in the house, got up and talked about what they thought some of the duties were, and some of the cabinet ministers too, Mr. Speaker, were way out on a limb in answering these questions. It seems to me that they, too, didn't have any clear idea of just what their responsibilities would be. We find in section 5 of the act:

That the Legislative Secretary is to be in the city of Regina when the legislature is sitting.

and during the rest of the year, they are not to be in Regina, they are not to be in the office of the minister to whom they are attached. They are not to be in the department. They are to be at home. The act states definitely that during the sitting of the Legislature, they will be paid expenses if they have to leave Regina on duties assigned to them by the minister, and the act states, too, that, when the session is not meeting, that they would

be paid travelling expenses and other expenses if they had to leave home, on one of the duties assigned to them by the minister to whom they were attached.

Now, Mr. Speaker, for the life of me, I cannot follow the reasoning of the government. I don't know just what is involved here. I don't think the government knows, and on this side of the house, we would like to have more information regarding the desirability of having Legislative Secretaries. Because of this doubt, Mr. Speaker, because the government has not seen fit to submit this question of administration to the Johnson Commission, because of the mixed up ideas which appear from the other side, I propose to move this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, a motion amending the motion which appears on the order paper.

I would move, seconded by the member for Kinistino, (Mr. Thibault) my seat-mate, that the motion be amended as follows:

That all the words after "be" be deleted, and the following substituted therefor:

not now read a second time, but be read this date hence six months.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to move this amendment at this time.

Mr. Speaker: — This is the standard form, I understand this is referred to as a six months hoist. Because it is an alternative amendment, the debate continues on the motion and the amendment.

Mr. Willis: — Mr. Speaker, I wish to say one or two more words before I sit down, mainly to call to my defence the leading daily paper in the province of Saskatchewan. We find that the Leader Post comes out in support of the action which we are asking the government to take this afternoon. The Leader Post says in an editorial of last Saturday, and I quote,

That the government proposes to pay the Legislative Secretaries an extra \$2,000 a year, on top of their \$6,000 annual indemnity as members. In addition, they will be able to collect expenses without any limits being stated. The bill is vague as to their responsibilities; they are to help the ministers of departments to which they are attached. The onus rests on the government to prove that this additional expenditure is necessary to provide the additional help.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Leader Post for their comment, I want to say I agree 100 per cent with the last paragraph I quoted, stating, "the onus rests on the government to prove that this additional expense is necessary to provide the additional help". I maintain they have not, as yet, proved that this additional expenditure is necessary, that the additional help is necessary, and I think that they would be well advised to take this bill into further consideration.

Mr. W.E. Smishek: (Regina East) — Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the amendment, and in doing so I would like to say a few words in this respect.

Firstly, we have been led to believe that, after the session is over, it is the intent of the Premier to fill the vacancy created by the defeat of Mr. Pinder, (Hanley). This has been stated on several occasions, shortly after the Hanley by-election. It has also been rumored that it is the intent of the Premier to split his portfolio to that of the Premier and Provincial Treasurer, this would give the government an additional cabinet minister. If that does happen we will have fourteen cabinet ministers. Mr. Speaker, we were told during the last election campaign that if the Liberal party formed a government they would cut administrative expenses, particularly insofar as the Executive Council is concerned, they said there would be a cabinet of twelve.

Well, we know that on May 22nd, the government emerged with a cabinet of thirteen, not twelve as they promised. Certainly the people of Saskatchewan were not told during the election campaign that they were going

to have a cabinet in the front office, and a back room cabinet in the form of Legislative Assistants. Mr. Speaker, my colleague has just stated that it would be valuable to have some comment on this matter from the Johnson Commission. For this reason, I think the motion is very appropriate. The government should refer this matter to the Johnson Commission so that they might bring in some recommendations and then at some future time, we might take another look at this proposition put forward by the government.

I know, Mr. Speaker, in talking to some of the cabinet ministers on the odd occasion, they do tell us that they do have a very heavy work load. In fact, not too long ago, one of the ministers stated that he has never worked so hard in his life. I am glad to hear that the ministers have enough to do. Their statements belie the kind of accusations that have been made previously by spokesmen of the Liberal party, that there were too many cabinet ministers. I support the proposition that if there is need for more ministers, then the government should proceed to appoint them, but not bring in Legislative Assistants who at this stage appear to be nothing else but ribbon-cutters and possibly political organizers.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I would urge the members from both sides of the house, to support the proposed amendment and vote against the motion of adopting second reading of this bill.

Mr. E.I. Wood: (Swift Current) — I, too, like the member who has just sat down, note quite a change in the approach of the members opposite in regard to the work of cabinet ministers during last year. They have in the past, Mr. Speaker, gone up and down the country decrying the number of ministers which we had in the cabinet in Saskatchewan, saying that it was absolutely unnecessary to have this many. I think that when they have crossed the floor and found just what there was involved in being a minister of the crown, that they found there is a good deal of work involved.

An Hon. Member: — It is a heavy job.

Mr. Wood: — Yes, it is a heavy job. I had the honor of being a minister of the crown for some two and a half years, which was not a very long term of office. I will have to admit, and it wasn't thought to be one of the heavier departments in the government, but I found that it was all that I was able to do, and like someone else has said, I don't think I ever worked harder in my life.

The lady member from Saskatoon, (Mrs. Merchant) raised a bit of a question the other day, I thought, in regard to the amount of work in the department that should be done by the minister or should be done by the public service; or whether it should be done by the elected representative or by a member of the public service. I think this is a good question. I think that quite possibly, we could have a good government operated by quite a few less ministers even than we have now, but it would necessitate moving a great deal of the work and not only the detail, but the policies. The policies would have to be handled by the public service. Some might think this might be a good thing, but from experience, I feel, that a minister in charge of a department must know what is going on in that department. The minister is the captain of the ship and he is responsible for everything that happens in that department. It is impossible for him to get involved in detail. If he tries to do so, he is bogged down and becomes entirely useless to himself and to the province. He must at the same time have a good idea of what is going on in his department and of the work that is being carried forward. I think in this regard that the number of ministers that we had in the cabinet earlier was a suitable one. I think that things worked quite well in this regard. It left the minister with a heavy enough load and yet there were enough ministers that they were able to have at least a good acquaintance with the work and what was proceeding in their own departments. I see that the members opposite have changed their minds on the amount of work that these people have to do, but I would submit that they should consider leaving the things as they were in this regard.

Now, I agree that they did make a good many statements on these things throughout the country, that when they got in, they were going to change this, and they have made some changes. Now, in order to not go back on what they have said they were going to do, it becomes apparent that they must bring in some other way of going about this, and instead of having the fifteen members of the cabinet, they are now attempting to have a lesser number but to assist with the work by having some second class cabinet ministers brought in to help out. I maintain, Mr. Speaker, that in the best interest of economy and in the best interest of efficiency in government,

that they should retain the system of direct line of command, that the minister is the one that is in charge of the department, and he is the one who is responsible and that under him is the deputy minister and the other civil servants who are responsible to him and to no one else. I think if you cutter this up by bringing in other lesser appointees, that you are only going to make trouble all around.

When a man is in charge of his department and he is the one that is in command, he knows who is responsible and there is no difficulty in this way. You get two people in there, and you may be quite sure that you are going to run into difficulties and you're going to run into things that are inefficient and you are going to run into a poor situation insofar as economy is concerned. Just what position will these people hold? Aside from the thinking or the wondering of just how much they would be involved in political matters, they would not be able to hold any position of real importance unless they were some sort of a straw boss. This wouldn't get them anywhere and it wouldn't be a very satisfactory role for them. The minister would still be the one who is in charge, and these people would be square pegs in round holes and they wouldn't be able to fit into the situation as we have it now, unless indeed they were simply acting as ribbon cutters and doing political chores for the minister in charge.

Another point that comes to my mind is the matter as has been indicated in the house, that these assistants would be changed off from year to year. That you would have one man in one position one year and another year you would have another man in the same position. This is very good insofar as spreading around the experiences and the knowledge that might be obtained, but it would not be very efficient insofar as the department is concerned. Just about the time that the man is getting to learn something and be of some use to the minister, he will be changed and another person brought in. This idea of having temporary staff that is changed from year to year, I don't think would be a good one.

I think, Mr. Speaker, by the time the members opposite stop to look at this thing carefully, that they will have to agree that the way it has been carried on in this province for a good many years is the far better way to approach the affairs of the government. This matter of bringing in parliamentary secretaries is bound to be inefficient. It will be costly, and it will tend to have a loose approach to the affairs of the government, if not indeed bringing political work that is being paid for at the expense of the people of this province.

Having said these things, Mr. Speaker, I submit that the right thing to do with this bill, is to vote in favor of this amendment.

Mr. F.A. Dewhurst: (Wadena) — Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words in support of the amendment. I believe that it would be premature at this time to put this bill through the house, and I think that a greater time for study would be of benefit to all. I can agree with the statements made, but I cannot see what help legislative secretaries could be in this legislature. Especially when the other day, we saw a minister of the crown in committee who was refused the right to take part in the debate. That was in Committee of the Whole. So if the minister, a full-fledged minister cannot be of assistance in this legislature, of what assistance could the parliamentary secretary be? And if they cannot be of any assistance in the house, then I'm afraid that I cannot see any use for them outside of this legislature. So I think that the amendment was timely and is worthy of consideration, and I think it should be supported. I think greater consideration should be given to the principle involved in this bill, and I do believe that the people of this province are not in favor of this type of administration.

So for those reasons, I am definitely supporting the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. H.H.P. Baker: (Regina East) — Mr. Speaker, I wasn't going to say anything on this question but seeing that everybody gets into the discussions, it isn't fair that I sit by and listen all the time. I must say that I am going to support the amendment that was just brought in, to give this further study. I would think, in order to help out in the government administration, that two more cabinet ministers be appointed to fill the portfolios that are being held by two other men.

I think there was only one good argument that came out of the government side of the house on this whole question and that was made by the

hon. lady member for Saskatoon, (Mrs. Merchant) and that was regarding keeping bureaucrat control out of departments, and leaving it in the hands of appointed people. I can certainly associate myself with those remarks, and it could well be that these people could perhaps, could help to maintain that sort of authority. But I think you would find the opposite if a man like this was put in a department. He would be viewed with suspicion by civil servants, as a sort of a hireling for the minister or perhaps even for the Premier. This could be a very bad situation in the over-all administration, and I don't think the Premier and the cabinet would want to undermine the administration of the government of this province.

I think this money can be better used by paying the country MLA's more money. These people must maintain two homes. I mean that sincerely. It's not quite the same thing for those of us living in the cities, but the country members come here, they have to leave their farms and hire people to take their place and all they are allowed is \$4,000 with \$2,000 expenses. I think this is where the government should have directed its attention to see to it that our MLA's got a decent pay. As far as I am concerned, if there was a division marking the receipts for city or town or urban MLA's to country, I would certainly like to see them get much more than what is being offered here to these Legislative Secretaries. These people are not going to make any money by getting this \$2,000. They'll probably have to pad their expenses in order to come out on the right side of the ledger. But I think that it would be an error to put it in now. I would hope that the government would take another look at it and study it further, with the idea that I am suggesting now that higher pay be given, particularly to our rural MLA's. With that, Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to support this amendment. I think it is a good one and that the house should pass it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. I.C. Nollet: (Cut Knife) — Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a few words on the amendment. I would like to use my best endeavors to assist the Liberal members opposite in keeping their election pledges to the people of this province. One of these was that they would drastically reduce the cost of the Executive Council by reducing the number of ministers in the Executive Council, I don't know of any bill that deserves a six months hoist more than this particular legislation.

This is pretty well supported by the fact that scarcely anyone opposite has got up to voice his opinion in support of this legislation. It certainly would require a great deal of support, I would think, to pass a piece of legislation as vague as this, with no attempt being made to set out the duties and responsibilities of these Legislative Secretaries, secretaries that will be superimposed on the Executive Council and executive assistants already appointed to various portfolios. Particularly in my own department, I found that in my experience it was good, that it made for efficiency, the avoidance of bureaucracy, to have direct communication from myself through the deputy and to the branch heads. I have often thought of the heavy work load too, and the possibilities of acquiring an executive secretary but there is always this problem of fouling up the lines of direct communication between the minister, the deputy and the branch heads and I finally thought that in the best interest of efficient government and direct contact with our administrative people, that I would accept some extra burdens in terms of work loads in discharging my responsibilities. So I can't for the life of me, see why it is so vitally necessary now, not only to have executive assistants but Legislative assistants as well, whose duties are very ill defined, if defined at all, Mr. Speaker.

Well, previously, Mr. Speaker, we had thirteen front ranking members, full fledged members of the cabinet, now we are going to have six more so we are going to have nineteen, front and back. Perhaps, it is intended to be like Vicks vapor rub, a care for practically every political ailment that will afflict the Liberal party in the years ahead.

In their own interest, I would suggest, because of the very nature and vagueness of this legislation, that they would agree to a six month hoist to enable them to review very carefully, this entire proposal to proceed with appointing legislative assistants, something that has not been done in any other provincial jurisdiction in Canada, and apparently not so very favorably received by members opposite because very few have had the courage to get up and support this doubtful first for the province of Saskatchewan.

I will support the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: (Kelsey) — Mr. Speaker, I want to rise and support the amendment, I do this because I think it would be a very good thing for the government to give this matter further consideration. They have not been in office very long as yet, and I admit, that the first year, for ministers who have not had the experience before, is a rough time. They are all apparently living, coming through it except for the one political causality, and appear to be coming through alright, in a physical sense. So I think it would be just a good idea for the Premier to withdraw this bill and reconsider it and if he still considers it necessary, to bring it in at the next session of the legislature.

Now, I would also recommend that they consider having one or two or three more cabinet ministers, certainly I couldn't criticize the government for having up to fifteen cabinet ministers. This is, I think a good idea, but in a province the size of ours, a jurisdiction the size of ours, I don't think it is necessary or a good principle to have Legislative Secretaries at all.

As a matter of fact, if this bill does pass, providing for legislative secretaries, Mr. Speaker, I don't see why in the world the Leader of the Opposition shouldn't have a Legislative Secretary too. And we will be talking to them about that, just as well as the ministers having a Legislative Secretary. There is every bit as much reason in it.

I can imagine if this were before the house, all my hon. friends over here would talk about it. Now they propose up to six of these Legislative Secretaries and to pay them \$2,000 a year as a salary. Now the ministers of course, like all other members of the legislature, get \$6,000 a year indemnity, \$2,000 of which is tax free. If they are going to get Legislative Secretaries, members that are capable, what do they expect them to do for \$2,000 a year, one fifth of what the minister gets? If they are going to have them, they should be paying them \$5,000 or \$6,000 a year, instead of \$2,000. This keeps them on a part time job, a part time basis, and how are they going to determine what time they work and how many days a month, how many days a week each is going to work? Surely you can't expect these people to work full time when they get one fifth of the salary of the other full time employees who are members of the legislature, the ministers? So I don't think the thing is well framed at all, and I would certainly like to see no action on it until the government has further time to consider it rather than deal with it today. I don't want to hold up the debate for a long time. Let us just take another day at it.

Now I would beg leave to adjourn the debate, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — The member for Kelsey, (Mr. Brockelbank) has asked leave to adjourn the debate. Is leave granted?

Mr. Thatcher: — No, Mr. Speaker, if the Leader of the Opposition wants . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Thatcher: — . . . to adjourn until tonight, he can go ahead, but we are going to proceed with this bill.

Mr. Speaker: — I think the question has to be put to the house. The question before the house is shall this debate be adjourned? I think the no's have it.

Mr. Thatcher: — I'm afraid so.

Mr. Nicholson: — Mr. Speaker, I thought that . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — No, no, I am, if we ever. . .

Mr. Brockelbank: (Kelsey) — You can speak after the amendment . . .

Mr. Nicholson: — I have already spoken, Mr. Speaker, I thought I could have a word before this amendment is put. The member for Kelsey, (Mr. Brockelbank) I think has offered some valuable advice.

The Premier and I were at Ottawa when the federal government first appointed a parliamentary secretaries, and I must agree with hon. members opposite that many outstanding people have acted in this capacity. If my memory serves me right, the parliamentary secretaries at Ottawa were paid \$8,000 a year, when the federal cabinet ministers were getting \$15,000. This is the amount that I remember. I could be wrong, but I think it was slightly more than half of what the cabinet ministers were receiving at that time and I think the Premier is placing his cabinet ministers in a very difficult position. I realize the problems of selecting a cabinet from the group who were elected and I think that the Premier has . . .

Mr. I. MacDougall: (Souris-Estevan) — He spoke on this motion before. He is wandering all over the field again, and I think if he is going to keep his remarks to the amendment then he should stick to the amendment.

Mr. Speaker: — He is speaking now to the amendment.

An Hon. Member: — . . . postpones. . .

Mr. Nicholson: — I'm merely arguing in the light of what has been said, that this decision be delayed and I was pointing out some of the questions which have come up this afternoon which I think are valid, and I was saying that the cabinet ministers, I think, are being placed in an embarrassing position as the member for Kelsey, (Mr. Brockelbank) has indicated. They look very healthy. I think that cabinet ministers have done a reasonably good job during a difficult period. I think the Premier did an injustice to them, in suggesting that because a number of them are new in the cabinet that, that was an excuse for not calling a special session last fall. He need not have given that as an excuse. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the suggestion that delegations coming to Regina wouldn't be able to see the minister but would see the parliamentary secretary, this has not held up at Ottawa. The taxpayers want to talk to the minister who is responsible to the legislature, to the House of Commons, to the people, and they are not satisfied to be put off on the grounds that the minister is too busy, and he will have somebody else speak to them.

I think the Premier must face his responsibility. I think that it is clear that his duties are very heavy and he should have a Provincial Treasury. The Minister of Industry who was slated to a very important position, and his duties have been assigned to two ministers who have heavy responsibilities. I would think that if the government had fifteen cabinet ministers that they would not receive any criticism in the province. The Premier will know some of the private members at Ottawa who refused to accept positions as parliamentary secretaries some years ago. Their constituents felt that they had the abilities to be members of the cabinet. It is hard to understand back benchers being willing to vote for this sort of proposal without having their people back at home given a few months to consider the matter.

The Premier himself is going to be in a very strong position. It would appear that during a four year term, every one on his side of the house would have a turn either in the cabinet or as a Legislative Secretary. This places one person in a position which is not in keeping with the parliamentary tradition in Canada. The member for Regina West has pointed out that no other province has ever moved in this direction. In the federal parliament there are 265 members, twenty to twenty-five cabinet ministers. This is just under ten per cent of the total membership. But when 100 per cent of the members are sitting behind the Premier who are all in a position where they have a cabinet position or a parliamentary secretary's position, at the whim and the wish of one person, this is not in keeping with our best parliamentary traditions. So I hope that this will be a time when we might have a free vote, that the members back of the Premier would decide that this should be given a six months hoist.

The question being put on the amendment, it was negatived on the following recorded division.

Yeas — 17
Messieurs

Brockelbank(Kelsey)	Willis	Snyder
Wood	Whelan	Larson
Nollet	Nicholson	Robbins
Blakeney	Dewhurst	Brockelbank (Saskatoon)

Davies
Thibault

Smishek
Baker

Pepper

**Nays — 29
Messieurs**

Thatcher
Howes
McFarlane
Boldt
Cameron
McDonald(Moosomin)
Steuart
Heald
Guy
Merchant (Mrs)

Loken
MacDougall
Gardiner
Coderre
McIsaac
Trapp
Grant
MacDonald(Milestone)
Gallagher
Breker

Leith
Bjarnason
Romuld
Weatherald
MacLennan
Larochelle
Asbell
Hooker
Radloff

Mr. Speaker: — I must draw the attention of the house that the mover of the motion is about to close the debate, if anybody wishes to speak, they must do so now.

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker, I am only going to take two or three minutes at this time to answer some of the comments that have been made from the opposition. I believe that details of this proposal can be given in committee and we shall certainly be prepared to do that when the time comes.

The aim and objective of this government has been for many years and is today, to give good government, to give efficient government and to give the kind of government which we think the people of Saskatchewan need. It is our belief that having some legislative assistants would help us do this.

My hon. friends in the opposition may agree or disagree as they see fit, but, after all, the people of Saskatchewan did elect us on that kind of a platform. It seems to me if we say that this process would be helpful, we should be given the opportunity to try it out. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, if it does not work out, a year or so hence, we will not continue it.

I would suggest to you today, Mr. Speaker, that for every dollar invested in a parliamentary or legislative assistance, this government will save the taxpayers \$100 or \$200. I think that this is what they can do. . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — The hon. members opposite have talked about the great cost. I was going to explain this in committee, but for their edification, I will say that it is the intention of this government to have a maximum of \$500 as far as car expenses or travelling expenses are concerned throughout the year. We think that that should suffice for doing the job that they are required to do.

I was rather surprised at the remarks by the hon. member for Kelsey, (Mr. Brockelbank) a moment ago. He said why, “if you are going to have legislative assistants, why pay them only \$2,000?” He said, “You should pay them \$5,000 or \$6,000. Well all through this debate, my hon. friends have been complaining that we are spending too much money for these legislative assistants. This is kind of a strange argument to come up with at this time. The he said, “If your cabinet ministers are going to have legislative assistants, and mind you, you shouldn’t have one, then we should have one too.” Well, if they are useless, why do they want one?

I was a bit concerned by some of the remarks the other day of the hon. member for Saskatoon . . .

Mr. Brockelbank: (Kelsey) — May I ask the hon. Premier a question? If they are good, may we have one?

Mr. Thatcher: — I will say this, Sir, that this government wants to be fair, and we will give the hon. member and the opposition the same treatment that they gave us when we were in the opposition.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — I want to say a word about some of the remarks the hon. member for Saskatoon, Mr. Nicholson. I don't think the remarks which he made the other day were worthy of him. I have known the hon. member for a good many years, and, while he has got certain characteristics that annoy me from time to time and I am sure that it is mutual, nevertheless, I have always considered that the hon. member was an honest member and a member who spoke with integrity. And all that I would say to him is this, I wish that once in a while he would think someone else might be trying to do something that was honest and had integrity. I will tell you, Mr. Speaker one of the government's objectives is to give the most honest government this province has ever had. We are not going to appoint these Legislative Secretaries to go out and do political work. These Legislative Secretaries as MLA's will have a certain amount of political work to do, of course, as any other MLA has. But I can assure the member and this house, that their duty will not be simply to go out and make party collections as he intimated. I don't think that speech of the hon. member was worthy of him, and I think he should apologize when an appropriate time comes.

The hon. member for Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank) and a few others have said, "you really don't need these legislative assistants. Why don't you appoint a bigger cabinet? Three or four more cabinet ministers, no one will object." Well, Mr. Speaker, we think that the former government had too many cabinet ministers. The last Liberal government had eight. The CCF had almost twice as many, fifteen. Of course, when you have a cabinet minister, you must have a car for him, you must have a deputy minister and a whole department all the way through. We think when this government was elected, it had the choice of a great many able cabinet ministers. As a matter of fact, we have enough material on this side of the house, to pick a second cabinet without having very much trouble. We have men of that ability, when we need them.

We don't think we need as many ministers as my hon. friends did, to carry out this government. Our members of the cabinet are doing a job as effectively as they can. We think there are a number of places where assistants may be used. We would have one of these legislative assistants in the Department of Natural Resources. This one minister or parliamentary assistant, will have a great deal of responsibility in the setting up of the new department of Indian Affairs and Métis. We think that is important. We think the Minister of Natural Resources has already got a great deal of work to do, a legislative assistant could be of real assistance, by visiting Indian reserves, finding out what these Indians really need and so on. Mr. Speaker, we propose another minister or legislative assistant will be put in charge under the Minister of Health, in the Department of Youth. Surely my hon. friends, the members opposite, wouldn't say that this would be an unnecessary job.

Mr. Willis: — A full time job.

Mr. Thatcher: — No, it wouldn't be a full job, it will only be a part-time job. One of the arguments my hon. friends opposite have made is, "Why should Saskatchewan have parliamentary assistants when no other province has them?" Mr. Speaker, what province has the number of crown corporations that my hon. friends set up? None! What other province has the number of boards and commissions and branches and agencies? We are going to discontinue many of them, but they are still there. The parliamentary assistant could help in these fields. I know in my own department, I have a bi-cultural committee. My parliamentary assistant, if and when his appointment is made will look after this committee.

Mr. Willis: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, as I understand it, when a person is closing the debate, does he not have to confine himself to the remarks made during the debate?

An Hon. Member: — That is what he is doing.

Mr. Willis: — That is what I am doing. I am answering . . .

Mr. Willis: — Oh no, he is away off, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Guy: — You were asleep.

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker, these are some of the things that a parliamentary assistant can do. When I say that this government is carrying on with twelve ministers where my hon. friends had fifteen, I would also like to point out, that we are carrying on with about 325 fewer civil servants, than my hon. friends had when they left the government. We hope, as time progresses, we may be proceeding with fewer yet. So when you add it all up, Mr. Speaker, I think a case can be made for another first in Saskatchewan having some legislative assistants. I say again, that there is no ulterior reason for having assistants. We only want them because we think it would help us give the people of Saskatchewan “good government”.

SECOND READINGS:

Hon. D.V. Heald: (Attorney General) moved second reading of Bill No. 38 — An Act to amend the Attachment of Debts Act.

He said: Mr. Speaker, there were two or three important principles in these amendments to the Attachment Of Debts Act, and the first one has to do with the changing of the word ‘three’ in the fourth line in section two and substituting the word ‘five’. Now I appreciate that on second reading I shouldn’t go into detail, however, this is a change in principle and I would like to explain it.

The advent of the two-day and frequent three-day weekend render service of the garnishee summons difficult and in particular, for services being affected on a person residing outside of the place of service. There have been occasions where there has been a four-day holiday, which means there is no day on which the summons can be served. The purpose of increasing the three-day period to a five-day period is therefore, to facilitate services of summons permitting them to be served earlier than was previously possible. This is an amendment which we are suggesting as a result of practical difficulties in the three-day period, because of long holidays.

Now the next change in principle has to do with section six. Sub-sections one and two of section six are amended by striking out the words “and not employed by the day or hour” in the last line of each sub-section, This amendment was suggested by a resolution of the Law Society passed at the annual meeting of the Law Society last June, and that resolution indicated that the members of the Law Society felt that this amendment would be desirable. The purpose of the amendment is to permit garnishing the wages of persons employed by the day or hour.

Now many of the persons, employed by the day or hour are employed at points outside the city of Regina, and it has therefore been felt necessary to make some change in the procedure with respect to the serving of the garnishee process, in order to give effect to the garnishee summons and this is provided by making service on the deputy minister of the department concerned.

Now the other main change, of course, Mr. Speaker, has to do with the increase in the exemptions, and you will note that in sub-section two of section 21, the amount of exemptions of attachment by garnishee are substantially increased. The position at the present time is that a single person has an exemption from garnishee of only \$75. We are proposing in the amendment to increase this to \$100. At the present time, married persons regardless of the number of children which they are supporting, only have an exemption of \$150. We are proposing to increase that to \$200 in the case of the married person supporting at least one but not more than three dependents. That is to say, the married man supporting his wife and two children would have an exemption of \$200. In the case of a married man supporting his wife and more than two dependent children, the exemption would be \$225, so that, in that case, the increase would be \$75 per month for exemptions. In the other case I mentioned previously, it is a raise of \$50.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I feel that these increases in the amount of statutory exemptions are long past due. I would point out to the house that in British Columbia the exemptions at the present time are \$150 in the case of a married person, \$75 in the case of an unmarried person. In Alberta, the exemption is \$120 per month in the case of a married man, \$65

per month in the case of single person. In Manitoba, there may be some changes at this session of the legislature, but at the present time, according to my information, the exemption is only \$125 for married persons and \$75 for a single person. So that this increase will certainly put Saskatchewan well in the vanguard of all the provinces of Canada, insofar as statutory exemptions from garnishees are concerned. I would also like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that there have not been very many increases in this province for the past number of years, the last time there was an increase was in 1953, at which time it was raised to \$150 and I would point out that since 1953, the cost of living index has risen from \$115.5 to \$135.6 — twenty points. Now if we were going to only keep pace with the cost of living, it should perhaps be a twenty per cent increase. However, we have felt that we should do better than this, and we have accordingly increased the exemptions considerably more than the mere cost of living index would indicate.

I would point out that this is one of the pieces of social legislation that this government is committed to introduce into this legislature. I would also remind hon. members that last fall when the cabinet was presented with a brief by the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour, that I raised this point with them. I asked Mr. Elkin whether or not the Trade Union Movement in Saskatchewan was interested in suggesting an increase in the exemption from garnishee and he indicated that they were interested, and I invited Mr. Elkin and other representatives of the Federation of Labour to make representations to me with the object in mind of having such an increase made. However, to this day, I haven't heard from Mr. Elkin or anybody else from the Federation of Labour about an increase in this garnishee exemption. So we went on ahead on our own and I think that this is the type of legislation which everybody in this province and everybody in this house will support. This is a recognition of the fact that a married man, particularly with a number of children, simply cannot get by on \$150 being exempt from garnishee. We feel that the increase to \$225 will substantially ease the burden in the case of large families and low incomes.

Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of this bill.

Mr. A.E. Blakeney: (Regina West) — Mr. Speaker, I think with the substance of what the Attorney General had to say, I can agree and I think there will be no quarrel with the bill as it appears.

As he pointed out, there are three principles. One extends the period during which the garnishee summons can be effective from three days prior to the payment date to five, and I and the members on this side, certainly have no quarrel with that.

The other principle of amending the act to enable public servants to be garnisheed even though they may be paid by the day or hour is, I think a useful change. We in Saskatchewan, have pioneered generally in doing away with the privileges which surround the status of the crown, and one of these privileges was the privilege of a public servant not to be garnisheed, or not to have his wages garnisheed. There seemed to the previous government to be no reason why public servants should be exempt from garnishment any more than any other employee. However problems did arise, with respect to employees who were paid by the day or hour, just because they were scattered all over the province. I note that the Law Society has come forward with a suggestion on this and that the Attorney General has adopted it, and certainly we on this side of the house, will have no quarrel at all with the principle set out.

The third point that the bill contains is the increasing of the exemptions, and while, as the Attorney General very fairly pointed out, Saskatchewan's level of exemptions is now higher than Manitoba's, Alberta's, and British Columbia's. I think that even though that be the case, members on both sides of the house will agree that a level of \$75 and \$150 is not high enough and I think they will generally agree with the levels recommended by the Attorney General, \$100 single, \$200 for married and \$225 for married with four or more dependents.

I think therefore that the proposals contained in the bill will not be controversial and I propose to support the bill.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

Hon. W.R. Thatcher: (Premier) moved second reading of Bill No. 1 — An Act to amend The Department of Natural Resources Act.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I hope the hon. members will put this bill

through just as quickly as they did the last one. We may not need these Saturday, if this can go on.

Mr. Blakeney: — If they are as sound as the Attorney General's.

Mr. Thatcher: — Some days ago I made reference to a problem which for a number of years has existed in this province. A problem about which our people have very little to be proud. Today the government is bringing before the legislature, a proposal to establish an instrument which we sincerely hope will be the first step in rectifying an injustice that has been with us too long.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, I hesitate to interrupt the member but I forgot that it is a money bill and I think before it can be proceeded with, it has to have the recommendation, am I correct?

Mr. Thatcher: — I think I gave it to you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — Oh, at any time, alright.

Mr. Thatcher: — And so, this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, I am going to appeal to members on both sides of the house for their understanding and co-operation in dealing with this matter of extreme importance. I refer, of course, to the bill which is now before us to establish an Indian-Métis branch in the Department of Natural Resources.

We feel, Mr. Speaker, that this is an historic measure. However, we also realize that this government can only help the Indians and Métis, if at the same time they are willing to help themselves. It is a fact that in a period of unprecedented prosperity in our province, about 36,000 of Indian and Métis background are living in conditions of deprivation and squalor that would be the shame of some of the under privileged nations of the world. In most cases their housing is primitive. Very few have flush toilets and few have running water. When you go through the north, you find that most of the heating is done by old tin heaters. Good year-round roads on our reservations simply do not exist and in most cases, electricity and telephones are merely a dream.

These are economic problems which are overshadowed only by even more saddening social problems. Job discrimination is frequently practiced in a blatant manner in our province. Repeatedly the white man in Saskatchewan displays intolerance, a lack of understanding and complete indifference to the plight of the Indian. While some educational facilities do exist, far too little is done to demonstrate the value of education in raising the living standards of an underdeveloped people.

These are a few of the problems that I hope we will recognize at this time. I think our guilt becomes even greater, if we consider that the people of Métis and Indian background constitute more than four per cent of our total population. I don't think there is any use wasting time trying to decide who is to blame. However, we cannot avoid the perspective of history, which shows us that the decline of the people of Indian ancestry in Saskatchewan has come about as the white man society has evolved.

In recent years the problem has been compounded by certain factors which ironically have arisen from advances which have indeed taken place. For example, since the end of the war, the better level of medical services available to our Indian people, has improved the birth rate. Health standards have risen throughout the north, and this, of course, has resulted in a major decline in the infant mortality rate, this sharply increasing the populations on reserves. Coupled with one of the world's highest birth rates the final result is a growth rate of our Indian population of about 41 per cent a year.

Even if no other reason was to exist, it is clear that in the years ahead, our responsibilities to this group of citizens must increase and our concern in dealing with their problems must increase proportionately.

It is quite true that some programs do exist for a large number of our northern Indians, and these are administered by the various provincial departments and by the federal government. However, we cannot believe them, despite their intent, and the good intentions of the administrators

of these programs, that so far they have found any kind of a real answer to the problems in the north.

We know that the federal government is not satisfied that no changes are needed. In November of 1963, the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration proposed to a federal-provincial conference at Ottawa that the provinces involve themselves, in a program of development of our native people through a shared-cost formula. Since that time, an inter-departmental committee has been working on development of programs which the provincial government can extend to people of Indian ancestry. On October 28th last, the Minister of Natural Resources, (Mr. Cuelenaere) laid before a federal-provincial conference at Ottawa, a submission from this government on the administration of Indian Affairs. And in that brief, we pointed out that Saskatchewan believes the time has come to accelerate the process by which these people become an integral part of Canadian society. We pointed out also, Mr. Speaker, that without an extension of provincial services to Indians, the problems of achieving integration and the quality of opportunity are confounded since every feature of the existing system is such that a different status is continually and inevitably made apparent.

This government is unshaken in the belief that the Indians must be aided, if they wish to become a part of the society around them. That society, Mr. Speaker, is a provincial society.

Some days ago, the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) suggested to the house that we are proposing to establish ghettos for the Indians of Saskatchewan. Well, we would point out that this could not possibly be our intent because, in effect that is now the social environment in which our Treaty Indians live.

We view the extension of provincial government programs to Indian people as an absolute requisite, if they are to be permitted to rise from the poverty in which they now exist, and without infringement of existing treaty rights, move into the main stream of opportunity and to develop.

We recognize, of course, that nothing can be done without the full co-operation and consent of the people affected. This government, Mr. Speaker, does not intend to proceed without that consent and co-operation. This assurance we gave to representatives of the Indian people at a government sponsored conference at Saskatoon, last September and I can assure you that we intend to honor that pledge.

This bill calls for the establishment of an Indian and Métis branch in the Department of Natural Resources. We realize that in deciding on the character of the agency, charged with co-ordinating these programs, we have to avoid at all costs, the danger of further segregating our Indian people through the establishment of a special department. We felt rather that we could avoid that danger and more effectively plan programs through the establishment of a branch rather than a department. But the day may come, Mr. Speaker, when this government believes the Indian problem to be important enough that we will have a special department and a special cabinet minister. We will watch and see how the program evolves and then make that decision some years hence.

Accordingly, we decided to relegate to this new agency, the responsibility for research and program planning and the co-ordination of programs for Indians carried out by other departments in the government. We believe this approach is the most sound one at this time.

Our first step will be to recruit a director for this branch, someone qualified to administer strong positive programs of action. I may tell you, Mr. Speaker, that we have advertised throughout the dominion of Canada for this director. We have asked federal assistance in finding a man with the requisites that are needed and the department has now narrowed these down to three. One of these gentlemen we think will be picked very shortly for the experience which he has in the field of Indian affairs.

I don't want today, to go into any details about the programs we have in mind to assist in the raising of the living standards, but I would mention that we view programs of training and placement in employment as of prime importance. Already, Mr. Speaker, I think you would be interested to know that for the past several months, some of our placement officers out on the fields have been trying to find jobs for the Indian people. Up at Lac La Ronge, in the new copper mine, we already have placed seventeen on a full time basis and quite a number of others on a part time basis. In that connection, we have initiated action in the

north and we expect progress reports will be made from time to time.

I would also like to make specific reference to some of the more pressing development problems on Indian reserves that we contemplate bringing about through this branch. First of all, electrification on reserves. At the present time, distribution of electrical power on reserves is limited to building owned by the federal government. It may take a period of years before we can bring electrification to the reserves, but we certainly hope that this branch will make a start and soon.

Provision of telephone services, at least the provision of a pay phone is the objective. At the present time, only two reserves out of sixty-eight in this province have a service as essential as telephones.

The clearing and breaking of arable acreage will be proceeded with, where this is feasible. Total reserve acreage in the province today is 1,200,000 acres, of this only 170,000 acres or about fourteen per cent has been broken.

These are a few of the special programs that we contemplate. We cannot exclude, of course, the investments we shall have to make in the field of community development, social welfare and the health services. In these latter areas, however, we have been assured that the federal government will assume a major share of the costs. It will be the responsibility of the province, however, to initiate and administer the program.

I want to emphasize again, Mr. Speaker, that this bill has no intention of trying to replace federal services. What we want to do is simply to supplement the federal services, so that the overall benefits to the Indian and Métis will be greater than they are today.

There were, of course, two approaches we could have taken. We could have chosen to develop first the health program, then a community development program and so on. On the other hand we can approach the problem on a broader front, and move unto all the programs on a year-by-year basis. Mr. Speaker, we have chosen the latter course, because we believe we cannot deal with one problem without dealing with all the other problems that touch on it. for example, we are convinced that you cannot extend welfare programs, without at the same time extending economic development and educational programs. Therefore, we propose to bring out Indian people into the main stream of provincial life by introducing them gradually to the whole range of available services, not delaying the introduction of one service until another has been introduced.

Mr. Speaker, we're reading a good deal today about Selma, about Alabama. In my opinion, the treatment that Saskatchewan gives her Indians is not much better than the people of Selma and Alabama are giving their negroes. I sincerely hope, that this matter will not come into the realm of politics. If the hon. members of the opposition can suggest a better approach, then this government will certainly be willing to look at it. this is not, I assure this house and the people of Saskatchewan, going to be any political department. This department or branch is being created for only one reason, to try and do something tangible for these people. I hope that hon. members. Will agree that, at least, the objective is desirable.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this legislation will meet the approval of hon. members on both sides of the house.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — May I move second reading, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — I think we'll have to have His Honor's message first.

Mr. Thatcher: — I think I have it here some where. Mr. Speaker, I beg to inform the assembly that His Honor the Lieutenant Governor, having been informed of the subject matter of this bill recommends it to the consideration of the assembly.

Mr. E.I. Wood: (Swift Current) — Mr. Speaker I would like to have a few words to say in regard to the setting up of this branch at this time.

I would certainly like to compliment the Premier on his approach to this problem this afternoon. I think it has been a constructive approach,

and I compliment him on this. I only wish that the politics had been left out of our dealings with Indians as well in the past, as what has been done by the Premier this afternoon. I am afraid that I cannot say that for the Liberal party in the past. I am quite sure they have not been as careful as the Premier has been today, and I wish to compliment him on that.

I also want to compliment the government on the interest that they are showing in Indians. There is no one who is going to argue that the Indian and Métis people of our province do not need care and attention and that this is one of the urgent problems that is facing us. I believe the hon. members, if they ever care to look up one of my speeches that I made in the house, will find that the Premier today, has re-echoed the words very much along the same line that I took in this same chamber last year in regard to the Indian and Métis problem, and I'm sure that there is a great deal more to do for the Indian people of the province. I would refute, Mr. Speaker, any implications that the former government was careless in regard to the Indian problem and was not aware of it and did not take steps to do what they felt they could on this, and I think our record has not been bad in this regard.

I would like to point out one thing in regard to education, that in 1946 there were some twenty teachers and 800 pupils in the north, and if you will turn, Mr. Speaker, with me to page 71 of the latest report from the Department of Education, you will find that it shows 110 teachers in the north and enrolment of some 3,551. Of course, this takes in schools such as Uranium City and Island Falls and so on, but if you will subtract those from these figures, you will find that, instead of twenty-seven teachers, there are some eighty-five teachers in the north and instead of some 800 pupils, there are some 2,000 Indian and Métis pupils. I think this does show an encouraging change through the years in bringing education to the Indian people, the necessities of education which is one of the more important things.

I think that our hospitalization programs which we have brought in has been a wonderful thing for the Indian people. It is a recognized fact that the Indian and Métis people make a higher use of hospitalization especially Métis people, of course, make more use of this per capita than what the rest of the population does. I think it has been a real boon to them to have this type of service at a cost that they are able to afford. The same with the medicare, it was designed to help the low income groups and this is a low income group which is finding our medical care program of real assistance, I may say, Mr. Speaker, especially before the raise in premiums was brought in last fall.

I could go on to some length in dealing with these things, but I think the Premier has been very good this afternoon in not endeavoring to lay blame as to where the plight of the Indians is at the present time, and I will not further pursue this discussion.

I would like to say a few words however, in regard to the discussion concerning the allocation of responsibility for services to Indians. The Premier mentioned this today, and I have had something to do with this in the past. As all members know, this matter of evolution of responsibility for Indian affairs from the federal government to the province has been under discussion for a good many years. The Premier mentioned a meeting of November 1963 at Ottawa. It was my pleasure and privilege to sit at the table and to head up the Saskatchewan delegation in the sub-committee dealing with Indian affairs, when we met with the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration. That was a very good meeting. We sat down around the table that day discussed the affairs of the Indians throughout Canada. It seemed to me that the western provinces were taking a little more interest in these matters than some of the other provinces were, but it was a good discussion and it was quite apparent at that time, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Favreau, who was then the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, was very interested in having something done along the line of having the Indian people brought into the main stream of the society in the provinces. As long as we have had the reserve system, we have a federal Department of Indian Affairs which looked after the Indian people of Canada, and the rest of the people of the province were under the provincial governments, where we had two governments dealing with the people concerned, there was a natural line of segregation. Where you have one government looking after one group and another government looking after another group of people, in the same province, you are bound to have segregation, it can't be helped. I believe that this is becoming more and more apparent as the years go by, and I was glad that Mr. Favreau took the approach that he did.

We looked forward to a conference last spring. A secretary was to be set up between the federal and provincial governments in regard to a

conference, last May, but I understand this did not take place but there was a conference held this fall. I have followed with interest what the newspapers have said about this, and I must compliment the government again. I think they carried through with very much the same argument, the same line which we had advanced earlier. I think their position taken was sound in that they said that they were prepared to go forward provided they got the agreement with the Indian people concerned. And this is a very important thing. If there is any indication that we are going to take away their treaty rights or to tear up what we now have, this would be very serious indeed, and I appreciate the government's position on this and I think it was well taken and a good one.

I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, however, in mentioning these things to the members opposite, that as they are moving into this area of taking over the services from the federal government. I think they must be very careful that they don't take it from a federal department and move it into a provincial department. You bring the Indian people into the main stream of our provincial life and to do this, I don't think we should have a department that is responsible for the different programs which concerns these people. I appreciate what the Premier has said on this. I believe that it is his intention that this department, this branch which is being set up, should co-ordinate the different programs that are being brought forward. This department won't be in charge of education for Indians but they will help to co-ordinate the work among Indians under the Department of Education. I think this is good, and I think it must be born in mind that we cannot have a department set up that is going to treat these people separately and give them different treatment than what is given to other people in the province. They must endeavor to have a branch that is prepared to co-ordinate the work among Indians in regard to education, municipal affairs, social welfare, and health and all these things so that they will be under the same laws and under the same treatment and the same jurisdiction as what the other people of the province are, and I am glad to note that the Premier has said these things.

The Indians don't want paternalism. I have a clipping here from the Leader Post of June 25th, 1964. It says;

Further segregation is a real concern to Indians with the creation of Premier Thatcher's proposed Indian Affairs Department, according to a number of Saskatchewan Indians. Indians have requested the same treatment and privileges granted to other provincial citizens, and argue the government has not proposed separate departments for Ukrainians, Hungarians, or Polish citizens of the province. Many Indians feel that a new and separate department is working against the Indian aim of integration.

I am quite sure the government is aware of these feelings and I am simply pointing these things out of warning. I am sure that they are aware of this and they will not allow this department to be an agency that is going to be dealing directly with Indians in regard to education and these other programs, instead of working in a co-ordinating way.

Now, I notice the change that has been brought in here. I notice from the budget that it has already been mentioned that the Community Development Branch of the Department of Municipal Affairs will be cancelled out, and this is now put under the Department of Natural Resources. I can't see anything particularly wrong with this. I am a little sorry that we have lost some of the people we had in the Municipal Affairs and Community Development Branch, because I think we had some good people there who could be of use in this new branch.

Another thing I also wanted to point out is that I feel that the very fact of coming into this department that has different branches, such as a branch for parks, fisheries, forestry, and wild life, and setting up the branch for Indians, could possibly have a connotation that wouldn't be quite as acceptable to these people as a Community Development Branch that we had earlier. But this is simply a matter of terminology and I don't think it is really too important.

I notice in the size of the staff which is proposed in the budget, is some eighteen people. I am assuming that quite a number of these will be placement officers, and I agree that the finding of employment for these is something that is very desirable and I must congratulate the government

on the interest that is being taken in this. But again, I would like to point something out that I hope has not been overlooked. We already have an employment service in this province. We have it throughout Canada. We have the National Employment Service. Now I don't want to criticize any show of interest that is being made in the Indians, and I don't like to criticize an attempt to really do something for them, especially along this line of getting them work, but ideally, I feel that employment should be handled for the Indians the same as it is for other people. The National Employment Service should be the people involved in this, and I think, with a little encouragement, possibly they would be prepared to step into this area in a way they have never done before. We should not have one agency seeking employment for the non-Indians. I think that this is a case where the National Employment Service should be approached to see what they could do to extend their efforts and to make some specific efforts in regard to finding employment for Indian people.

Now, this is just a thought in passing. It is not meant to be criticism of what you are trying to do, but ideally, I feel that again you should have the same agencies handling the affairs of the Indian and non-Indian people.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that I am not opposing this move, I tender my very best wishes, and I am sure the very best wishes of this side go with this work, that much will be accomplished for the Indian and Métis people of this province. Again I wish to point out that this branch should stress the co-ordination and co-operation with other departments of government in dealing with Indian affairs and not attempt to be a department which would administer programs directly for the Indians.

I will be supporting this bill.

Hon. G.J. Trapp: (Minister of Education) — I am very pleased that this bill has been introduced to set up a branch to work on behalf of the Indians and the Métis people of the province. I feel very strongly that this sort of legislation is long overdue in Saskatchewan. For many years there have been serious problems concerning the Indian and Métis people of our country, and I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that the passing of this bill will lead to a new and fuller life for the people of Indian ancestry, that have been treated too long as second rate citizens. I would hope that the new legislation would mean greater educational opportunities for the children. Let us all be aware that if Indian children and Métis children are to live successfully in our society they must have equal opportunities.

As one who knows something of the problems of these children, I must say that if they are to compete successfully with other children, their homes must be improved. If these children are to attend integrated schools, which I have seen them do, they must have as good home facilities as those of other children. They must have lighting in their homes so that they can spend time in the evening reading and doing school assignments, as other children do, if they are to keep up their school assignments like other children. This has been one of the greatest drawbacks, that I saw in the area in which I worked with these people. These boys and girls could not be expected to do the same kind of assignments that other children were asked to do because their homes did not have adequate lighting. I would hope that the setting up of this branch would lead to the bringing of electricity to many Indian homes. I am certain that more Indian people would spend more time at home with their families if they had electricity and T.V. and so on. This is one of the problems of having the family staying at home more with their children and I think electric lights, radio and T.V. would do more than any other one thing to encourage these people to have upgrading programs to take advantage of the new opportunities, and feel certain that these can be accomplished. I would hope that this new branch would work closely with the federal government so that we will not have two standards of service in Saskatchewan. I think we all agree that we now have two standards, one for the Indian people and another for the rest of the population. This is a very serious dividing line and it is not good.

I feel that it is very important that the Indian people do not lose benefits which they now have. Furthermore, I hope that before any changes are made in the status or services which these people now have, they will be consulted. It would seem that we are all agreed that the people concerned must be consulted before changes are made and that if changes are made, they must be acceptable to the people affected. I think we must all understand that this cannot be all done immediately. I hope the

March 15, 1965

Indian and Métis people will be patient, as they have always been, I honestly think that sometime they have been too patient with us.

In supporting this bill, Mr. Speaker, I would urge that this branch attack many of the problems of our people of Indian ancestry as quickly as possible so that they may become full citizens of our community of Saskatchewan.

Mr. F.A. Dewhurst: (Wadena) — Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

Hon. D.G. Steuart: (Minister of Public Health) moved second reading of Bill No. 40 — An Act to amend the Saskatchewan Medical Care Insurance Act, 1961.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak concerning this act, which is an act to amend The Saskatchewan Medical Care Insurance Act, 1961, first might I say that I am pleased to report the medical care plan is working well at the present time, because I think we have been able to obtain good co-operation from the College of Physicians and Surgeons, and from other professional groups of people, who have been responsible for giving service under this plan, as well as the people administering the plan, and the general public as well.

Now this plan can be successful if full co-operation of the professions providing this service is obtained, and I would hope that all members would view the proposed amendments to the plan in this light.

Some of the amendments are of a technical nature, others involve government policy, and others are intended to strengthen the administration of the plan in co-operation with the various professions providing insured services.

Now, all of the amendments, except the amendment relating to summary conviction proceedings, were recommended by the Saskatchewan Medical Care Insurance Commission. The Commission's duties do not extend to the area of premium levy and collection, therefore, they never make recommendations to the government about premium levy enforcements or premium payments.

A definition of "resident" is being included in the act, for the first time. This definition is similar to the definition of resident in the Saskatchewan Hospitalization Act. The definition clearly indicates who residents of the province are for the purpose of this act.

Another amendment will permit approved health agencies to participate in the payment being made for services received outside the province. This amendment should be of benefit, or convenience to subscribers of the approved health agencies making arrangements for this purpose, recommended from time to time by officials of the approved agencies.

The act now governs the amount specialists' receiving payment under agreements, may be charge unreferred patients. Now we propose to amend the act and this restriction may be made more flexible by providing for these charges to be fixed by regulations made by the Commission.

The act, at the present time, severely restricts the divulging of information by persons employed in the administration of the act. It is proposed that this provision be amended to authorize the release of information for all practical purposes as presently required, including full co-operation with the organizations or professions providing the service.

As far as summary conviction proceedings, provisions are being made similar to those in the Saskatchewan Hospitalization Act, these are mainly technical amendments. The important policy change is to prevent the possibility of a person being imprisoned for failure to pay a fine and Mr. Speaker. we believe that this should not be possible because, in effect, the person would be imprisoned because, in the first place, he had failed to pay the premium.

Now, in all health insurance plans, the possibility exists of occasional over-servicing on the part of person providing the service. Also, occasional examples of unusual patterns of practice arise from time to time. In other health insurance plans, the payment agency has complete

authority to determine the amount to be paid in individual cases. In other words, in other health insurance plans, if it is felt that there has been over-servicing, or of unusual patterns of practice develop, it was possible for these plans to pay at a different rate. This is not possible under the present Medical Care Act.

We propose that this authority be given to the Commission. Because decisions respecting services are a matter of professional judgement, these decisions can only be made by members of the professions concerned, and it seems essential that they be made with the approval of the governing body of the profession to which the practitioner belongs. In the long run the evaluation procedures will only occur with the full co-operation of the professions affected. Mr. Speaker, these amendments we feel will improve the operation of the medical care plan. It will give addition flexibility to some administrative procedures and facilitate full co-operation with the medical profession and other professions providing the services, in the payment process and in molding the program to meet current and future needs.

I feel that amendments are timely and necessary if we are to bring about effective control of costs, as well as maintaining effective quality of service rendered under the Medical Care Act, and I would hope that these amendments receive the full support of all members of this house and I move that this bill be now read the second time.

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, there are a number of provisions in this bill which I am not sure I fully appreciate, and accordingly I will be asking the minister some questions in committee, but if I may say so, in general, I do not object to the principle contained in the bill. I propose very briefly to review some of these, simply to outline for the minister and the other members what I think these principles are, so that, if I am in error, we can at least have staked out the area of my error for the consideration of the committee.

The definition of residents; I quite agree with this, and I have no doubt the minister found this definition in the draft bill which was left in the files of the department which was prepared when I presided and which files were left in their entirety, if I may say so. The other provisions, with respect to enabling approved health agencies to look after out-of-province medical expenses, which might be incurred by a member of an approved health agency, are, I think, unobjectionable. This is one of the tag-ends which did not get looked after when the original bill was introduced. I think the situation of what would happen when a member of Medical Services Incorporated incurred a medical expense outside the province, and accordingly was going to pay this but it wasn't necessarily going to represent payment in full, just didn't get dealt with and this amendment, as I appreciate it, will deal with this subject and give the patient the option of handling it the way he wishes.

The minister, in introducing the bill, pointed out that an additional degree of flexibility is being introduced with respect to the amount of the specialist's fee. As the act now stands, if a citizen goes to a specialist without being referred, he can be charged by the specialist the difference between the specialist rate and the general practitioner's rate, assuming that the specialist sends in his bill directly or is a member of an approved health agency. The amount which, (and if I may use simply the example of an approved health agency) the amount which the specialist can charge directly to the patient is confined to the difference between the specialist rate and a practitioner rate.

I notice that this ceiling is being re-phrased to read charges authorized by regulations made by the Commission for the purpose of the sub-section. It appears in a couple of places and I will be specifically asking the minister in committee just what the need for flexibility was. I think that if it means that the general structure of rates, which had been previously adopted, the idea of limiting the charge to the difference is to be done away with in its entirety, then I think I will find myself in opposition unless there are some additional explanations which I don't appreciate. But if it is a way simply to deal with special cases that arise, then probably no objection will be found to it.

The secrecy provisions were, I think, pretty strict, and I'm not surprised that they have been found to be a little bit too stringent in certain cases. I think all of us who were here in 1961 when this bill was passed were of the view that we should try to make the secrecy provisions just as rigid as might be workable at all, in order that the intent of the legislation of both sides of the legislature that the medical affairs of patients ought to be a matter of secrecy, could be clearly and definitely

set out in the act. I am not surprised that we erred on the side of over-stringency and that some additional variation of these provisions has been found to be necessary. I think that the minister would probably agree that even with the new provisions, there will be ample protection for the citizens to be secure in the knowledge that his medical affairs are still a matter of private discussions only and not a matter which is generally public property in the public service, or even in a wider scope.

The provisions with respect to the collection of the medical care insurance premium and the removal of the indirect possibility of imprisonment is something which I agree with, and here again I suspect that the minister found this in the file which was left with him, because I certainly know that . . .

Mr. Steuart: — That was missing.

Mr. Blakeney: — That was missing eh? Well, you look again. However, I then refer to section 50 of the bill which contains a principle with respect to a re-assessment of medical accounts, and here, I think, this was something which people working with the plan know that the time would have to come when unusual practices, I don't want to call them abuses because they aren't abuses in every case, but that unusual practices either of over-servicing or over-utilization would have to be examined to see whether they might not harbor abuses. I note that the minister has included some provisions here enabling re-assessment, as he points out that these are provisions which are contained in most private insurance plans, they were contained in two doctor sponsored plans, and they are contained in plans like those which operate in our neighboring provinces, such as Manitoba Medical Services.

As I read them they apply, not only to physicians but in sub-section 3 also to other providers of health services. This presumably applies to the relatively small part of the health services paid for under the Medical Care Insurance Act, but rendered, not by physicians but by dentists or physiotherapists or persons of similar qualifications.

There is clearly the possibility that a right to re-assess might be used to discriminate against a particular patient or a particular doctor, and I know that care will have to be taken, both by the Commission on behalf of patients and by the professional organizations on behalf of their members, to see that this will not become a vehicle of pressure or victimization levelled against any particular practitioner or patient, but I am confident that that will not arise and accordingly, I think we can adopt the suggestions of the minister in this regard with some degree of assurance.

I have, I think dealt with all of the main principles which I have been able to ascertain as being included in the act. I see no objection to any of them in principle. I will, as I have indicated, have some questions to ask the minister in committee and the questions might elucidate the matter sufficiently for me so that I would have an objection, but until that time, I find myself able to support the bill.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

Hon. D.C. Steuart: (Minister of Public Health) moved second reading for Bill No. 41 — An Act to amend The Health Services Act.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this bill is an act to amend the Health Services Act, and the proposed amendment will repeal all the provisions providing for, or referring to the Saskatchewan Health Services Advisory Commission.

In 1963, I would remind the house, Mr. Speaker, this act was amended and provision was made for this commission to be established in place of the Health Services Planning Commission, and for this commission to have somewhat different functions than the Health Services Planning Commission but still those of an advisory nature.

Now the history of the Health Service Planning Commission indicates that it was not entirely satisfactory as an advisory body, presumably the past administration recognize this and introduced amending legislation in 1963.

A short history, the commission was established in 1944 as a planning and advisory body, composed only of civil servants and there were five or six members. The commission administered the hospital plan, the

hospital standards, municipal and regional medical care legislation as well as other related programs from 1946 to 1950.

On April 1st, 1950, all administrative functions of the commission were transferred to Public Health and the commission became inactive. The commission's advisory functions, as set out in the act, were amended in 1952 and the commission mostly consisted of nominees from interested organizations. There were about fifteen members. As required by the act, they met at least five times a year and after several years became inactive.

I think it is interesting to note that meetings of the commission for the various years were in 1954 — 5, 1955 — 5, 1956 — 5, 1957 — 2, 1958 no meetings, 1959 — 4, 1960 — 1, 1962 — 2 and 1963 — none.

The chairman of the commission was the Deputy Minister of Public Health and each meeting was called by him, and, of course, in 1963, amendments changed the name of the commission and re-worded the functions. There were meetings on February 15th, 1961 and on April 14th, 1964.

Both the Health Services Planning Commission and its advisory committee may have served a useful function. However, these bodies appear to be somewhat cumbersome. When the former administration wanted advice concerning specific matters, it often appointed another commission for that purpose. A good example of this is The Thompson Advisory Commission, a planning committee on medical care.

If specific advice is needed, our feeling is that we will consult interested groups, including professional associations, and if necessary appoint ad hoc committees. In fact, in the last nine months we have been doing exactly that, and we feel it has been working quite successfully.

There appears to be only one province, Mr. Speaker, and that is Manitoba, where similar bodies exist. This seems to indicate that this mechanism might have had difficulties, and our feeling is, it is better to reply on ad hoc working parties for specific programs, specific projects, or to deal with problems as they arise.

In short, we see no need for this type of advisory committee, and I think that it should be recognized that it can only be of benefit to those who use it, if they have absolute confidence in proceeding in this manner.

It is our feeling that while we call on and will continue in the future to call on interested individuals, interested groups, professional groups and we have been, and will be guided at times by their advice, and will appreciate their advice, we don't feel that we wish to proceed with this type of advisory committee and under the present legislation, it must meet on a regular basis and for this reason, Mr. Speaker, we wish to amend this legislation and do away with this particular committee.

Again, I just want to emphasize that it isn't that we feel that this committee might not have worked under the former administration, but we do feel that when they were the administration they had the right to proceed, to seek advice from whatever source they wished and to set those advisory boards or councils or groups in whatever manner they wished. We would hope that the house would feel that we are entitled to the same right, to seek advice from individual groups in the manner we wish, and for this reason I would hope that the house would support these amendments and I would move second reading of this bill.

Mr. W. Smishek: (Regina East) — Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to second reading of bill 41, An Act to amend The Health Services Act. The minister has pointed out that the bill proposes to eliminate the Saskatchewan Health Services Advisory Commission. Mr. Speaker, because of the extensive argument, I intend to present as to why the commission should not be done away with, and because of the time, I would beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

Hon. D.C. Steuart: (Minister of Public Health) moved second reading of bill No. 42, An Act to amend The Hospital Standards Act, 1965.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this is an act to amend the Hospital Standards Act, 1965, and very briefly, all the amendments provided in this proposed act provide for the repeal of the 1964 amendments that in turn provided

for the establishment of hospital appeal boards giving certain direction to hospital boards in respect of medical staff appointments.

I think a short history of medical staff appointment problem would be in order. In general since Saskatchewan became a province in 1905, very little evidence of problems between hospital and medical staff existed. Prior to 1956, no legislation governing medical staff appointments probably appears. There were only a few isolated problems. We have a list of some of them. In September, 1956, there were set up regulations to provide for boards of conciliation to deal with failure to appoint or re-appoint doctors or where doctors had been suspended or dismissed. The recommendations were not binding. There were also provisions for a board of inquiry into specific hospital administration problems, and various cases were taken before the boards of conciliation from 1956 to 1963, concerning disputes at Redvers, Weyburn, and Wilkie, North Battleford, Eston in 1958, Wilkie in 1962, but from 1956 to 1962 there is no evidence of any problem because physicians' applications were refused. The only problems were related to physicians being suspended or dismissed and conciliation boards that did not agree with hospital boards' decisions.

Then, of course, came the medicare dispute, and the Woods Commission Report, inquiring into the failure of physicians being appointed in Estevan, Saskatoon, and Regina. The Estevan problem was settled in 1963. The act was amended March 17th, 1964 and there still existed problems in Regina, Saskatoon and Eston.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think the real question here in proposing that we rescind the amendments to the Hospital Standards Act that were passed in 1961, the real question here is one of local autonomy and local responsibility. The responsibility of hospital privileges has been placed very squarely on local hospital boards. It is not their only responsibility. In fact, they have broad authority over the administration of our hospitals. They have had this authority for a great many years. I feel that, by and large, local hospital boards have discharged their responsibilities in a mature, conscientious manner, through the years. While it is true that disputes arose from time to time, and outside conciliation was resorted to, I think it was resorted to with reasonably satisfactory results.

It is noteworthy that from 1956 to 1962, the disputes did not involve refusals by hospital boards to grant hospital privileges. It was after 1962, after the medical care dispute, and after the advent of Community Clinics that disputes arose concerning the granting of hospital privileges. So we find that over fifty years in the province of Saskatchewan, the problem of granting hospital privileges was handled in a satisfactory manner by local hospital boards without undue interference by the provincial government.

There is no question in my mind, Mr. Speaker, that as a result of the medicare crisis and the events that followed, a new and a heavy burden was placed on many hospital boards, and as a result the mechanism for granting privileges apparently ran into difficulties in some hospitals. Now the government of the day appointed a commission to inquire into the whole question of hospital privileges, and this resulted in the report of Mr. Justice Woods, and in the amendments to the Hospital Standards Act in the 1964 session of the legislature.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as the then opposition, we supported these amendments for one reason, and for one reason only. We wanted to see the hospital dispute resolved and this was obviously the government's only solution. I think, Mr. Speaker, it was typical of the former administration that their only answer was to use the power of the legislature to settle this problem. We felt then, and subsequent events tend to prove, that we were right. The proper and democratic answer would have been to get the parties concerned together, and attempt to conciliate the disputes that arose and existed in the various parts of the province. When we assumed the responsibility of government, we used this approach and I am happy to say that it worked. We gave hospital boards the opportunity to face their responsibility in this regard and they have done exactly this.

By rescinding the 1964 amendments to this act, we will be demonstrating our faith in local government because we are convinced that hospital boards are an integral part and parcel of local government.

But, Mr. Speaker, if every time local government appears to be having difficulty in some area of their responsibility, the provincial government steps in and takes away some of their autonomy, it won't be long before local government will cease to be a factor in our democracy.

Now, many people have expressed concern to me about this bill and what will result with these amendments of 1964 are rescinded. I recognize their right to be concerned and to voice their opinions, but let me state, Mr. Speaker, very clearly, that our administration believes that in considering a doctor's application for privileges, his character, his medical qualifications should be the criteria used by boards in determining what privileges are to be granted.

We have opposed, and we will continue to oppose any suggestion that a doctor's creed, color, or politics, should have any bearing on his being granted or denied hospital privileges. We will oppose just as strongly any suggestion that a doctor be denied privileges just because he practices in a Co-op or a Community type clinic. If, Mr. Speaker, this bill passes, and we find physicians are being discriminated against, or being denied hospital privileges for reasons other than their qualifications and their character, we will take the necessary action to rectify the situation.

In other words, I am suggesting that this legislature return the responsibility to hospital boards that they enjoyed before the 1964 amendments, and that they be given the opportunity to face their responsibility. If they fail, or they shirk their duties or fail to face their responsibilities, we will not hesitate to bring in legislation to guarantee to all people their proper rights.

Mr. Speaker, we have confidence in local government, we have confidence in our hospital boards, confidence that they will face this and other responsibilities that they do bear as members of a hospital board. I am sure that all members in this house will agree with our aim, and that is to maintain an atmosphere of good-will in every phase of hospital administration. Now, Mr. Speaker, this cannot be forced, it cannot be accomplished by legislation, it will only come about when everyone concerned with our hospitals recognizes that their first, and only concern, must be for the good of the people who look to their hospitals for help. The 1964 amendments were opposed, incidentally, by the Saskatchewan Hospital Association, and in my opinion, they will either hamper hospital boards in the discharge of their duties or they will act as a crutch for hospital boards if they are not prepared to face their responsibilities. Mr. Speaker, either alternative is, I feel, not in the best interests of our hospitals or of our people, and I move second reading of this bill.

Mr. Speaker: — It being 5:30, I leave the chair until 7:30 this day.

An Hon. Member: — Mr. Speaker, I wish to pose a question.

Mr. Speaker: — You can pose it just as easily when we resume, without running overtime.
The Assembly recessed at 5:30 p.m.

Mr. W.G. Davies: (Moose Jaw) — Mr. Speaker, when we adjourned at 5:30 for supper, I had somewhat sadly come to the conclusion that this would be yet another occasion when I would have to disagree with my friend the hon. Minister of Public Health, (Mr. Steuart). Even after an excellent supper, I was confirmed in that opinion, so this to me, only strengthens the belief that I had earlier.

Mr. Speaker, the minister when he spoke this afternoon, raised a number of points. One of them had to do with the conciliation proceedings which, as he pointed out, were in effect between the years 1956 to 1962, as the only means by which a physician or other person affected, had recourse. He suggested that it had been effective in these years and that this procedure should be effective from here on after the repeal of the present regulations which are mentioned in the bill.

He also, Mr. Speaker, said that this bill would demonstrate the faith of government in local governments, and it would restore a measure of autonomy which he suggested had been denied or removed by the passage of the 1964 amendments to the Hospital Standards Act.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, that to me the outline of government policy, as expressed in this bill, has aroused among a great many Saskatchewan people much uneasiness and considerable alarm. In my view, the government action is proposing this bill is not only ill-advised, but in the analysis,

is contrary to the interests of the professional people and to the interests of the general public. I say, first of all, there can be no real or legitimate basis on which the action proposed can be suitably explained. It can't be said that the action has been taken so that this will further harmonize relationships between the medical profession and the government. Nor can the deletion of these provisions from the act be explained by saying that the profession is restive or disturbed owing to the sections which are to be repealed. After all, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that if good will and justice are present in the relationship between professional people, there should be absolutely no reason to fear procedures which ensure that good will and justice are achieved beyond any reasonable doubt and which only come into play when there is a question that good will and justice have not been exercised.

I want to remind the house this evening that the sections that we are asked to repeal resulted because of a very full and penetrating inquiry of Mr. Justice Mervin Woods. They are in fact, the implementation of the chief recommendations that he made after this full and prolonged investigation.

Now, may I say again that the legislation propounded on the basis of the recommendations of Justice Woods does not intrude on the rights of hospital boards to decide on the granting of hospital privileges to physicians. It does not say that boards should not listen to the recommendations of other doctors who may be called upon to advise as to the persons who will have privileges or shall not have privileges. It states, to begin with, that a doctor shall not be disqualified from appointment or re-appointment to the medical staff of a general hospital or in his hospital practice because of considerations which have nothing to do with his capacity as a doctor or his ability to care for patients. It states that the board of governors of a general hospital shall apply the granting of hospital rights uniformly, consistently and impartially. It states that the board shall, in discharging its duties under the Hospital Standard Act, base its decisions on the principle and I'm quoting at this point:

Every member of the medical staff at that hospital shall co-operate with other physicians in providing services where any failure to do so would hurt the life or health of the patient or the operation of the hospital.

Now in other words, Mr. Speaker, the procedure employed should at no time pose obstacles or terrors for any board or any physician or any organization of physicians, who have proceeded in their decisions on a fair, reasonable basis without prejudice of any kind.

Mr. Speaker, it has been suggested that the appeal board legislation which we will set out to repeal in this bill, has somewhat frustrated hospital boards; that it has weakened their capacity to act and that it is in some way offensive to local government as an institution.

Now I would like to submit this evening, Mr. Speaker, that the appeal legislation enacted in 1964, does not invade the economy of a hospital board, but that the exact opposite is true. Further I would submit that legislation that provides an appeal procedure as did the 1964 legislation, in matters of hospital privileges, is absolutely essential if the full autonomy of hospital boards is to be preserved. It would be useful to examine the question of what is the lay-control of a hospital board. Everybody would admit that a hospital board should be strong, responsible and independent. Its sole purpose should be the provision of the best possible care to the patients within the walls of its hospital. Everyone knows that legislation of long standing in this province has made hospital boards theoretically supreme in all but strictly medical matters. In matters of administration, in matters of staffing, the medical staff are advisory to the hospital board. This whole system functions very well without any hitch, as long as there is no conflict between doctors. At that point, the hospital board is placed in a very difficult position. To my mind, this was one of the principal matters that was commented upon by the Woods Commission. The Justice, as a matter of fact, makes a statement at one point in the report, and I am quoting here . . .

That the chairman of the board . . .

and he is commenting on one of the cases;

. . . stated that the primary concern of the board was the care of patients in

the hospital. This is a proper attitude. In assessing the qualification of an applicant for privileges, some such principle must govern the decision. This requires the establishment of objective standards.

Then, Mr. Speaker, the Woods report went on to point out that different standards had been used by the medical staff in this case in recommending on hospital staff appointments. The Commission pointed out that no real effort has been made by this medical staff to discover just what experience or what training the new applicants had had in certain relevant fields of medicine. And the Woods Commission recommended that reasons in writing be given by the medical staff or any committee of the medical staff when an application is not approved; so that the hospital board and the applicant will know which of these standards they had failed to meet. The omission set forth five areas in which standards could justifiably be set and they are:

- the standards of professional training professional competence
- ethics
- character
- personality

(This is to be found on page 103) it is clear that only if objective standards are set in the relevant fields that are to be examined by a board, and the report of the medical staff that is making recommendations to the hospital board, specifically sets forth the area in which the applicant is deficient in some respect, only then is the hospital board in a position to accept the recommendations of the medical staff as being for certain in the interest of good patient care. Again I point out that it is emphasized by the commission that the best patient care should be the only legitimate objective of a hospital board.

Now the Royal Commission, as members may know, set forth its recommendations in more detail, that a board of appeal or of review should be established to deal with a complaint or complaints that arise from refusal or deferral or delay in granting hospital privileges. It recommended also that the appeal board should be permanent and be ready and available to act promptly. It recommended that a majority of the board should be members of the College of Physicians and Surgeons of the province or in any other province in Canada, that not less than one half of this majority should be appointed on the nomination and the recommendation of the college.

What is the significance of a review body in relation to the autonomy of a hospital board? Well, I say that it has a very direct relationship because it was very difficult as matters stood before the appeal board legislation, and will I suggest, be equally difficult if this legislation is deleted from the statutes, for a board to be in a position where its final decision cannot be challenged, because when there are differences of opinion and where the board has to rely upon the opinion of a medical group that has advance recommendations to the hospital board and upon which it is largely compelled to act, then unless the hospital board is absolutely sure of the employment of all the prospective criteria, it is in a very unenviable position. So that actually speaking, the appeal body, by its very nature, reinforces the job that the hospital board has to do because the hospital board which has access to the findings of an appeal body is in a far better position to guarantee and assure its autonomy and to discharge its responsibilities as laid down by the legislation than if an appeal procedure did not in fact exist.

I think it is manifest to everyone today who knows roughly what goes on in the hospital, that the practicing doctor has to perform a great deal of his work within the confines of the hospital. In many instances, it is impossible for him to give the proper attention to his patients if he doesn't do this within the walls of the hospital. So that denial of privileges to any physician in this province, is pretty grave for that doctor in the exercise of his profession. I am saying that, without hospital privileges, the conduct of his duties is first of all severely limited and circumscribed and secondly, that he cannot give the patient the best care that he can give unless he has available to him the services that can be rendered within the walls of the hospital.

The, Mr. Speaker, there is another matter, and that is the question of the rights of the patient to exercise a free choice in choosing a physician. If his chosen doctor does not have hospital facilities then it is an offence not only against that physician but against the rights of the patient himself.

May I also point out, Mr. Speaker, that the patient is a member of a community which has built the hospital to which he has directly or indirectly made contribution. All of our hospitals are public or private. I would think when you say 'private' you would say 'quasi-public'. Each of these institutions, I think, has the implied responsibility to serve all members of the public, even where a hospital is not controlled by public bodies. Every citizen has some rights because of the way in which hospitals are built and financed in the province of Saskatchewan, not only because of contributions in past years, but because of the method that we now employ in financing hospitals where very sizeable amounts of public money go into capital charges of all kinds. As everyone knows, this kind of thing has been going on at an accelerated pace, in the last decade especially.

So I am saying at this point, Mr. Speaker, that a curtailment of the rights of the physician of the patient's choice in using a hospital to treat him, damages his rights, not only insofar as his free choice of a physician is concerned, but regarding his rights to be treated by his own doctor in a hospital to which he has contributed in capital costs and in other ways.

Now may I also point out that there may be a tendency here for us to think of this as an issue related only to the rights of so-called community clinic doctors and doctors in the organized profession. I think that this would be a narrow consideration and I don't think that this is really the case at all. Because actually the appeal legislation permits any physician however connected to a medical group to claim his rights under an appeal board, if he considers himself unfairly dealt with in the case of hospital privileges.

In analysis then, Mr. Speaker, I am saying that we are considering the proposition of repealing legislation which requires that fairness impartiality and reason must underlie the decisions of any hospital board in awarding hospital privileges. Persons who feel that those principles haven't been exercised, may utilize the right of appeal to an impartial and a knowledge tribunal of unimpeachable integrity. Also, Mr. Speaker, as in the case of hospital boards and their medical advisors, judgement of a crucial order to the individual concerned is given. The government of the province of Saskatchewan, has a clear right to see that the liberties of the individual are protected. I am saying that justice must not only seem to be done, it must be done. When a question is raised by personal application, justice has to be done and plainly some records must be provided by the government of the day, to an appeal board.

I am here suggesting, that this is not done by the means that the minister suggested before he sat down at 5:30. At that time, he said that the pre-existing board of conciliation method would be ample to handle future cases of dispute between physicians and hospital boards. Well, I want to point out that this is hardly the case when one examines the regulations. The setting up of a board of conciliation by the minister for the purpose of dealing with cases of such difficulty involve the appointment of a person nominated by the Saskatchewan Hospital Association, or the Catholic Conference of Saskatchewan, one person nominated by the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Saskatchewan, one person representing the Department of Public Health, and such other members who may in the minister's opinion be best qualified to examine the matters that are under dispute. The minister may appoint the chairman of the board.

First of all, the clear weakness is the fact that a physician who is at odds with the professional organization, has some concern in seeing, as his representative, a member named by the profession. The report of the Royal Commission made it abundantly clear that in cases of refusals of hospital privileges that were heard by the Commission, the basic reason for discrimination was a philosophical difference between doctors or groups, of doctors. A doctor who is denied hospital privileges because of his views on how medical practice should be organized, is therefore, likely to be a member of a minority group.

I am suggesting therefore, that for somewhat obvious reasons, the arrangement that is contemplated simply doesn't meet a case of this type. I think too, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Justice Woods was cognizant of the fact that this kind of a tribunal existed under the old regulations. It is a fact that after exhaustive hearings and abundant investigation, he decided to recommend the appeal board setup that is now in the Hospital Standards Act and which this bill sets out to repeal.

I said that, apart from all other reasons, Mr. Speaker, the government has a clear duty at this time to see justice done, to determine

eligibility for hospital privileges or any allegations of discrimination, whatever the case within this kind of an obit. The government has the duty of seeing that justice is done. I say the real question that we have before us this evening, in facing the government on this legislation, is to pose to the government, the question of why? why? why? What clear and distinct and straightforward reason exists for the repeal of this legislation? If the answer is, that it seeks to establish a dubious kind of harmony between the government and organized medicine in the province, the answer just isn't good enough. I say that type of an answer is a morally bad reply. It is obviously one that ignores the clear and inherent responsibility of a government to afford the kind of even-handed treatment that governments must assure by their very nature, it can also be said to assure even-handed treatment to the members of a profession that have been accorded privileges by this legislature, that extended in a very wide range indeed, because the professional organizations, as in the case of the professional organization of medicine, exist by the fact of legislation that has been laid down by this legislature, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are some matters that I would like to investigate that arise out of some of the comments that the minister made earlier today. I would like to have the opportunity of making this examination and speaking further on this point in the debate. I would therefore, at this time, Mr. Speaker, beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

Hon. G.B. Grant moved second reading of bill no. 43 — An Act to amend the Rural Telephone Act 1962.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I feel like the football player who has been dressed for a full game and is called in to play at the last five minutes. I am so fully rehearsed and everything, I'll probably fall flat on my face, getting on the field.

The proposed amendment to The Telephone Act is brought about by a feeling that the procedure necessitated at the present time for the acquisition of right of way or easements for pole lines is pretty cumbersome, as it is necessary to go through the same procedures for an area big enough to hold a pole as is necessary to go through when you are acquiring 100 acres of land.

The proposal is that there should be a new section 23A1 and this would permit rural telephone companies to obtain easements under the Public Utility Easements Act, in the same manner of public utilities. In this case, The Homestead Act does not apply to such easements and the telephone companies would be relieved of the extra expense and inconvenience of obtaining homestead certificates.

The second part of this section A2 simplifies a procedure that, at the present time, calls for the minister's approval on every land transaction including easements and it is suggested that the minister's approval be not required for easements costing \$100 or less. I think the explanation is quite clear and straight forward and I would hope that both sides of the house would see their way clear to support these suggested amendments.

I move second reading, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. E.I. Wood: (Swift Current) — Mr. Speaker, during the last year or so, there has been a good deal of discussion among rural municipalities and rural telephone companies in regard to the lines along the roads. A good many rural municipalities have been very desirous that the roads be widened, that the poles be put in a place which would not interfere with the widening of road allowances.

I believe there has been some difference of opinion. In fact, so far as I am concerned, the Department of Municipal Affairs has carried on a small battle with the Department of Telephones on this for some time. From this legislation which we have here before us tonight, it appears to me, that they have more or less won their battle and this I am very pleased to see. I think it is something that is going to be approved by the rural municipal people in the province, that will allow the telephone companies to set up their poles in an easier manner, off the roadway. I am quite sure that this will be well taken by the rural municipal people and by the telephone people in the country as well, and I would be supporting this bill.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

March 15, 1965

Hon. G.B. Grant: (Minister of Highways) moved second reading of bill no. 44 — An Act to amend the Highways Act, 1961.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I have to change hats now, the previous one was for the Minister of Telephones, now this is for the Minister of Highways.

Under the present Highway Act, there seems to be a conflict of two sections and I refer to section 2 of 30, and paragraph 12 of section 2.

Briefly, provincial highways are designated by an Order-in-Council under authority of paragraph 12, of section 2, and it is the custom to cancel annually the Order-in-Council and issue a completely new one to incorporate the additions and deletions to the highway system.

Subsection 2, of section 30 seems to say that, regardless of the new Order-in-Council, a one-time provincial highway remains a provincial highway until notice is given by the minister to the municipality, or to the government department concerned. The objective of this proposed amendment is to remove this conflict, and make the Order-in-Council, under paragraph 12, the dominant factor. It does not propose to discontinue the practice of notifying the municipalities. We feel that this is necessary as well, but that the Order-in-Council, designating the highway system of the province should be the predominating factor.

The other proposed amendment to the bill deals with the use of country elevators in connection with the enforcement of weight regulations as requested by the Highway Traffic Board. The present subsection provides for acceptance, as prime facie evidence of accuracy of a scale, a certificate of inspection dated within sixty days prior to the date of the offense.

The amendment provides for acceptance of such a certificate of inspection within sixty days subsequent to the offense. Under the Weights and Measures Act, the elevator scales used are required to have an annual inspection only, and this provides a little more leeway on the use of these elevator scales and does not restrict the use to those that have been inspected sixty days prior.

I would hope that both sides of the house would concur in these amendments, we feel that they will facilitate the work of the department. I now move second reading of this bill

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

Hon. G.J. Trapp: (Minister of Education) moved second reading of bill no 45 An Act to amend The School Grants Act, 1960.

He said: Mr. Speaker, these amendments to the School Grants Act, 1960, propose to do the following things,

Section 2 makes the act applicable to the operation of a Board of Education. As you know, three cities are interested in forming Boards of Education, and this would make it possible for Boards of Education to operate under the various acts in the same manner as it is now applied to the Public School Board.

In the event that any urban public school or high school or separate school or separate high school boards take advantage of new legislation proposed in bill 53, we would need this so that they can come under The School Grants Act, 1960. Bill 53 will come up later in the session.

Section 31, makes possible the payment of per diem grant at a high school rate on account of high school rooms operated by Separate School Boards, even though a high school district operates in the community. At the present time, if there is one high school district operating in the community, you cannot have another one. Now if you are going to have separate high schools, then they must be treated the same. It makes \$1.50 a day for high schools in a high school district, so it makes the same thing available to the separate high schools as is available to the high school districts at the present time.

Section 32, insures that fees paid by one board to another, located in the same urban centre, shall not be recognized in The Grants Act calculations. This flexibility is required to make sure that we do not duplicate in our grant formulas, derived assessments on account of fees. I think Saskatoon might be a case it point. There is a proposal that they

will have the collegiate system collect all the taxes and all the grants and they will pay to the separate high school system what it costs to educate a student in the public high school system. Now, if they count these fees, this will be thousands of fees for high school students, if you put it in the ordinary grant formula, Saskatoon would lose quite a bit of money. We tried it out. We have to have some flexibility in this section of assigning costs and fees, because it will work adversely if you have thousands of students who are transferring from one system to another. It is really to facilitate what may happen in Saskatoon, if they form a Board of Education, and have arrangements between the two boards. The high school board there will collect all the revenue for high schools and will pay to the separate high school system, so much pro tempore. This will facilitate this arrangement and make it possible in our grants system a bit of flexibility, so that they can get as fair a deal as they had before.

We want to make sure that they will get as much grant as they had under the old system, but with thousands of pupils transferring, from one system to another, it works to their disadvantage if we just leave the system as it is today. I don't think anybody foresaw this happening when separate high schools were envisaged that one board would collect fees, all the revenue for high schools, and then would pay fees to the separate high school system, on a per student basis. It is going to mean that thousands of students will be paying their money to the present collegiate board. So this is really the main principle of the section. It tries to give us a bit of flexibility so that these people can get the same amount of money they would have received under the other system.

With these few words, I now move second reading of this bill.

Mr. A.E. Blakeney: (Regina West) — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister would answer a question before he resumes his seat. The question was; does he propose to bring in any other amendment to The School Grants Act, covering grants to private high schools or is this the only amendment to the School Grants Act, that he proposes at this session?

Mr. Trapp: — I don't intend to bring in any other amendments. I wouldn't like to be quoted but I think, under section 5, that you may pay grants and I think we will do it under that at the present time.

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, with respect to the specific provisions which are contained in this amendment to the School Grants Act, I have nothing very extensive to say.

I would like to make some comments about the School Grants Act in general, more particularly about section 5 of the School Grants Act, which is not provided for in this amendment, and about the proposal to use section 5 for a grant to private high schools.

I believe my remarks to be in order, I give notice to this effect, that I am going to ask so that the matter of order can be decided, if anyone raises a question on it, and then I ask leave to adjourn the debate.

Mr. Speaker: — The member for Regina West (Mr. Blakeney) has asked leave to adjourn the debate, is leave granted?

Hon. W.R. Thatcher: (Premier) — Mr. Speaker, we do want to get home some time this year. The government has been adjourning debates one after another today so far, and, very respectfully, may I suggest to the hon. member for Regina, that probably he can get at the item he wants, when this \$140,000 which is a new item, will be in the estimates, make a speech on this private school bill more appropriately now, than at this point? This really isn't in the bill at all, and with respect, I would hope that as he says there is no matter of contention on this, that this bill could be allowed to go through and he can have his debate when the matter is up in the estimates.

Mr. J.H. Brockelbank: (Kelsey) — Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, I agree that there have been three second readings adjourned under the heading of second reading, but I can assure the hon. member that they will not stand for days and days and days on the order paper, when they will be called. Members will be expected to deal with them, but surely you can carry over for one day. This can be done to allow an adjournment and have them proceeded with very promptly.

I can assure the hon. Premier that if we got the same kind of attention to the private members' motions that are adjourned by the cabinet ministers, we would make progress.

Mr. Thatcher: — Well, Mr. Speaker. I guess we will agree if the hon. member from Regina insists, but in view of what I have said, in view of this special item that is in the estimates, I wonder if he would re-consider asking for adjournment. If he won't, well, we will go along with it . . .

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on the point of order, I appreciate what the Premier is saying in this regard. I do think that a question such as grants to private schools, which is a matter of a new departure in principle from our previous practice, is something which is probably better debated in the house on second reading than it is on estimates. If I am right in my thinking of the propriety of the situation, then I think I would like the adjournment, not to impose any delay on the government. If I may still speak to the point of order, I note that we had five second readings today, which isn't all that bad.

I think I would like to ask leave to adjourn.

Debate adjourned.

Hon. G.J. Trapp: (Minister of Education) moved second reading of bill no. 46 An Act to amend The Secondary Education Act.

He said: Amendments to the Secondary Education Act proposed in bill no. 46, are for the following purposes; to include under the definition of board, a Board of Education. I think we have had that come up before. If there are going to be Boards of Education formed, then we need to have them in the act, if urban districts should form such boards under the new provisions proposed in bill 53.

Section 3 — to correct an omission from last year's new legislation on separate high school districts. It is the Separate High School Board which becomes responsible for the education of Catholic high school children upon the formation of a separate high school district. I think that was omitted from last year's act.

To make this act conform with the School Act, in the matter of qualifications of voters.

To require the secretary of the high school district to provide the town or city clerk with a list of voters from the rural portion of the district. This is a problem to identify the people who are voters of the town district, who are not in the town. This has been a problem for years. It was formerly the duty of the R.M. secretary who was bound by the restrictive regulations under this act, and a number of people never got onto the list under the R.M. Act, and consequently all ratepayers who were not electors deprived of their school franchise. This would likely correct that in the act.

To broaden high school board's powers to enter into agreements with other boards as in Saskatoon. This has become desirable in the light of several new fee-for-service agreements which have been concluded between collegiate boards and separate schools since the new Separate High School legislation was introduced a year ago. It is to allow for this change. I move second reading.

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, there were a few comments I wanted to make on this. I will make my comments brief and simply so that; insofar as I understand these sections, I don't think that I take particular objection to them. I did want to make a couple of comments which really amount to notice of motion of questions, I am going to ask the minister when we get into committee.

The Secondary Education Act, when it is expanded, or shall I say, when Secondary schools are going to be operated by Boards of Education, a problem arises with respect to who is doing to elect the Board of Education, because the electorate for a Separate school is not the same electorate for a separate high school. Similarly the electorate for public schools is not the electorate for a public collegiate, because in the School

Act the basis for adherence to public school or separate school is based upon a matter of faith, on objective determination of faith, whereas in the Secondary Education Act, the matter of support for a separate high school or a public high school, (if I may use that term) is based upon the choice of the parent, or the taxpayer, as the case may be, and I am not sure whether section 4 of the bill, which inserts a new section. 12 is designed to resolve that difference or not.

A couple of other questions surround the Secondary Education Act. In the amendments which were made last year, it has come to my attention, it has been brought to my attention by constituents in Regina that there appears to be an effect stemming from the changes of the Secondary Education Act, which I doubt was intended, in that the act says that after a separate high school district is erected, at that point parents can make an election, but the act also provides that separate high school district can be erected only on January 1st. It follows that parents can only make an election after January 1st and the act further provides that if they make an election after January 1st, it shall not apply until the next January 1st.

From this, it follows that the parents will always be one year behind the erection of the separate school districts when this, I think, was not the intent of the legislation at all. I think the phrase which says "after the erection of the high school district" should have said, "after the affirmative vote to erect a high school district", because the time limits are included in the act on that basis.

I will be raising this little problem with the minister and wondering whether there is anything that could be done with respect to it, by way of a small amendment in committee. It may have been brought to his attention. I see him sort of nodding his head and I imagine it has come up in other jurisdictions as well, but I know it to be a question which, I think, by pure error in draftmanship and a very, very fine error in draftmanship, as I believe it to be, might work a hardship on some parents or pupils in Regina for a one year period, during which parents of pupils would be faced with the very difficult alternative of paying fees for their child for a period of months or alternatively switching schools, This was not what the legislature had in mind.

With those comments, Mr. Speaker, I will resume my seat, indicating that I propose to support the bill, believing that the minor questions which I have raised can more effectively be dealt with in committee.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

Hon. D.V. Heald: (Attorney General) moved second reading of bill no. 47 — An Act to amend The Conditional Sales Act, 1957.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the general purpose of these proposed amendments is to provide a lapsing procedure for conditional sales agreements respecting goods affixed to land, in respect of which notice was filed in the Land Titles Office.

Years ago, the Conditional Sales Act made provision for the fact that certain chattels, goods and chattels, which normally are goods and chattels and not subject to land titles practice, because of the fact that they were attached to land, to a building, therefore, the provision was made for the filing of a copy of the conditional sales agreement in the Land Titles Office. An example which comes to mind readily is a furnace. A furnace if sold by itself is a chattel, however, if it is attached to a basement in a home it then becomes goods affixed in realty and the provision in the act is such that the conditional sales agreement under such circumstances can be registered against the title to the land, to protect the vendor of the goods for, the amount unpaid.

Now, this is fine, however, it has been drawn to our attention that while there was provision for registration, there was no provision to get the conditional sales agreement off the title under any circumstances. In the Land Titles Act, there is provision for getting a caveat off a title. If a caveat is filed against your title and it is your view that it is improperly there, there is a provision for you to serve a notice on the registered owner and he has a thirty day period in which to obtain a Judge's order continuing the caveat, but if nothing is done at the expiration of the thirty days, the caveat automatically comes off.

These amendments that we are proposing here tonight, Mr. Speaker, simply make provision for getting a conditional sales agreement off the

title, and the provisions are very similar to the provisions of the Lana Titles Act with respect to caveats.

The amendments also provide for the registration against the title to land of notice of an assignment of a conditional sales agreement. This is to say that, if the paper is purchased by somebody else, then, of course, there is provision for keeping the record of the title up to date, and there is provision for an assignment to be registered against the title.

Both of these amendments, I might say, Mr. Speaker, were requested in a resolution the Law Society passed at its annual meeting last June.

Section 2 of the bill provides for an Address for Service to be contained in form B. This is the form of notice to be filed where a conditional sales agreement, relating to the goods affixed to land, has been entered into.

The provision of an Address for Service facilitates the lapsing procedure contained in the new section 17C. In other words, you have to have somebody to serve the notice on, section 2 provides for an Address for Service.

Section 3, this is the new section 17A, provides for notice of change of address for service to be filed at the Land Titles Office.

The new section 17B provides that an owner may apply to a judge for an order withdrawing the notice filed under section 17. Now this is an additional remedy in addition to the thirty day notice. In other words, if you feel that this conditional sales agreement is improperly registered against your title, and you don't want to wait for the thirty day period, you can go to a judge beforehand, as you can under the Land Titles Office with a caveat, and you can make an application and if he agrees with you you can get the conditional sales agreement off without waiting for the thirty day period.

The new section 17C provides for a lapsing procedure. It provides that the owner of land on which a notice is filed, may require the Registrar to notify the seller at the end of thirty days that the notice filed under section 17, shall lapse. This section is based on section 152 of the Land Titles Act, with respect to procedure for lapse in caveats.

The new section 17D provides for filing of notice of assignment as I have said.

Now section 4 of the bill provides for new forms to be added to the act as a schedule. Form E is required and is the form for a change of address. Form F is the thirty day notice. Form G is the form of Certificate of assignment.

These are the basic changes that we are proposing, Mr. Speaker, and I move second reading of this bill.

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General was good enough to supply me in advance with a review of these provisions of the act. I have previously gone over them, I think they are good provisions, I think they are another step in providing some ways of cleaning up some of the registers which we are required to keep as part of our judicial system. I think this is another step in the right direction and accordingly I will be supporting the bill.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

Hon G.J Trapp: (Minister Of Education) moved second reading of bill no. 49 — An Act to amend The Teachers, Superannuation Act.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the main principle of this bill has been much talked about in the last six months. It is to provide an increase in pensions for teachers who retired before 1963.

Briefly it will consider those teachers whose pensions on a single life basis are less than \$2400. These are the teachers affected by this bill and the average increase, I might say would be about \$325.

There is a great need in this area when we are only considering those cases that are under \$2400 on a single life basis. Most of the

teachers on pensions are married and are on a joint life and last survivor policies, so they are around \$1700 to \$1800. It is only those people who are on the single life basis that would get less than \$2400. it doesn't mean to say that most of them are getting nearly \$2400. the maximum on the joint life and last survivor would be around \$1700 to \$1800. It is very important that consideration be given to those teachers who taught during the thirties on very low salaries.

I am very proud to have a part in this, Mr. Speaker, because I think these teachers, not only had low salaries but now they also have low pensions. I might also say what this bill proposes to do is now being done voluntarily by the teachers of the province who as you probably know, started last July 1st, taxing themselves one half of one per cent of their salaries, collected it and paid it out to these older teachers as a supplementary allowance.

This bill is doing very much the same thing as the active teachers were doing for their profession. The employed teachers would be relieved of this burden on July 1st of this year, when the government would begin paying these supplementary allowances.

Some people have asked from time to time, "why does the government do this for the teachers and not for other people?" Well, there is a very good reason why. The government has a direct responsibility to teachers that it has not to many others. When the Superannuation Act first went into force, the government did not directly contribute to teachers' pension fund as other employers usually do. It was thought at first that school boards should, but if the school boards had paid into the superannuation fund, they would have received some of this money from grants, so it would have been a matter of the government paying to school boards, the school boards paying it back to the government for pensions. So it has always been considered that the government should probably pay some part of the superannuation of teachers in view of the fact that employing boards were not making any direct contribution to teacher pensions.

I think it is important that the public understands that school boards as employers do not pay anything directly into the pension fund for teachers. So the government, instead of giving grants to boards and then having the boards pay it, probably should pay something directly.

I move second reading of this bill.

Mr. W.A. Robbins: (Saskatoon) — I would like to say just a brief word or two. First of all I would like to commend the government for this action, with respect to bringing up teachers' pensions. Those teachers taught in the thirties, as the Minister of Education, (Mr. Trapp) has intimated, at very low salaries and as a result of this, of course, ended up with very low pensions as well.

I had some experience teaching in the province in those days and I wouldn't want to bore the house with my experiences, but there was one which I think I should mention to the house. In 1938, I walked thirteen miles a day, taught ten grades, did the janitor work and was supposed to be paid \$35 a month, but I didn't get the money until six years later. Now this is an example of some of the problems that teachers faced in this particular period. It was inevitable that their pensions would be very small, because they were related to the salaries that were being paid at that time.

I shall have more to say about this particular bill, when it gets into committee. I do think the government is to be commended for doing something in relation to the problems of those teachers who taught at very low pay particularly in the thirties.

Mr. A.E. Blakeney: (Regina West) — Mr. Speaker, I would just like to add a word or two to the comments of the member for Saskatoon, (Mr. Robbins) and to reinforce his comment that the step proposed by this bill is a good one.

This bill puts into statutory form the policy of increasing teachers' pensions which has been adopted over the period of some decades now, of some number of years at least and goes a step further, a desirable step further, in my view. I think it will be recalled that in the early forties, the minimum pension that a teacher might get was \$30 per month, or \$360 per year. By bonuses provided over and above the pension, out of the resources of the province, on the basis of Order-in-Council, this \$30 was

March 15, 1965

progressively increased to \$100 as it now stands. So that no teacher receives less than \$100 a month or \$1200 a year in pension.

The bill, which is proposed will place in statutory form the increases that have already been granted and will carry forward these increases still further. I agree that these are desirable changes and I propose to support the bill.

Motion carried and bill read the second time.

Hon. A.H. McDonald: (Minister of Agriculture) moved second reading of bill no. 50 — An Act to amend The Agricultural Machinery Act 1958

He said: Mr. Speaker, in moving second reading of this particular bill, I don't think it is necessary to say very much in that, on February 18th, last, motion was debated in this house, dealing with most of the matters that are contained in this bill no. 50.

•

The bill simply makes provision to move part of the responsibilities of the Agricultural Machinery Act of 1958 to the Family Farm Improvement Branch, and part of the duties that have been carried on under the AMA to be transferred to the university and, of course, it will discontinue some of the work that has been performed to date by the AMA.

I think, with those few words: Mr. Speaker, I will move second reading of bill no. 50 — An Act to amend The Agricultural Machinery Act of 1958.

Mr. I.C. Nollet: (Cut Knife) — Mr. Speaker, my worst fears that I mentioned on speaking to the resolution some time ago, that was introduced in this house, have been fully realized and justified by the amendments to this legislation.

Contrary to what has been said, that testing will be done at the new location at the university, this is absolutely incorrect and is borne out by the amendments made. For example, the repeal of section 6 destroys the Agricultural Machinery Board. The repeal of section 38 destroys any report being made by the board, and no provision is made for any report in connection with any testing that might be done at the university. The repeal of section 39, which gave immunity from legal action to the Machinery Board as a result of reports, objective reports made on the testing results of machinery, have been abolished too.

I would like to point out some very significant facts in connection with the abandonment of the Agricultural Machinery Administration last October. I would draw attention to the fact, Mr. Speaker, that the government had no legal right to abolish the Agricultural Machinery Board or the testing services or any other aspects, until the legislation, then on the statute books, was repealed.

I draw attention to the fact that it was mandatory on the minister and the government to provide a board to administer the Agricultural Machinery Act. Section 5 of the act that is being repealed, subsection 2, states;

The Agricultural Machinery Administration shall administer the act, test and publish reports, etc.

The board was not re-appointed at the expiry date of the appointment last October. So I say again, that this was an illegal act. According to the legislation on the statute books, this board should have continued the administration of the act. The testing services should have been maintained until this legislation was taken off the statute books. This has not been done. Section 6, paragraph 1,

The Lieutenant Governor in council shall appoint a board, called the Agricultural Machinery Board.

Again I say, the government had no legislative authority to abandon the board as it did. The correct thing to have been done would have been to have continued the administration of the act by the board. Section 38 provides for annual reports and it says;

The Agricultural Machinery Board shall make and submit a report to the Minister

of Agriculture an annual report which shall be submitted to this legislature.

When speaking in the house previously, the Minister of Agriculture, (Mr. McDonald) waved about a document that he had in his hand which I can lead to believe is the annual report submitted by the Agricultural Machinery Board, for the fiscal year ending 1964-65. Because at that time, when I quoted from the annual report, that was tabled in this legislature, he asked me where I got the document I was quoting from, assuming that I was quoting from the report which apparently he held in his hands. If this is correct, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture, (Mr. McDonald) should lay that report on the table and submit it to this legislature because this act will still be in force until April 1st of this year. I know that under the existing legislation, the report does not need to be tabled until the succeeding year, but since this will be the final year and since he waved this document to the house, I would ask that he table that annual report, because some of the information contained therein may be of very considerable interest to the members.

I note that when the minister was speaking in the house, he stated that the Agricultural Machinery Administration had not done any testing on complicated machinery. That it had not tested combines, for example. Well, Mr. Speaker, I have here in my hands three reports . . .

Mr. McDonald: (Moosomin) — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I never said any such thing . . .

Mr. Nollet: — Oh yes, the hon. member said so.

Mr. McDonald: (Moosomin) — I certainly did not.

Mr. Nollet: — Well, I must take his word for it, Mr. Speaker, but at least he said that they had not tested any complicated machinery and I shall peruse the record to find out what the minister did say . . .

Mr. McDonald: (Moosomin) — Mr. Speaker, I never said any such thing. If the . . .

Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, I said that I would take his word for it, but I still say I will peruse the records to find out just what he did say.

An Hon. Member: — Go ahead . . .

Mr. Nollet: — You bet I will do it. I have here in my hand test reports of three combines that were tested and these were published under the authority of Hon. A.H. McDonald.

Mr. Speaker, my friends opposite have been posing as the friends of the farmers. I have received more criticism, I am sorry the hon. member for Qu'Appelle Wolseley, (Mr. McFarlane) is not in his seat. He was the designated agricultural critic and I would think that if he were in his seat, that he ought to take serious objection to the repeal of this valuable service to the farmers of this province.

They can talk about purple gas and make these election promises to get farmer votes but if they had, at the same time, told the farmers of Saskatchewan that they were going to repeal this protective legislation, they probably would not be sitting on the government seats in this legislature, Mr. Speaker. Their margin was that close. Many other promises that were made and unfulfilled, had the farmers been told of subsequent action that was taken by this administration, they certainly would not have received the vote of many farmers in this province.

I want to point out again, Mr. Speaker, the vital necessity of this kind of protective legislation. Every farm organization in this province, and the major farm organizations right across Canada, have asked for this legislation.

I repeat again, that a special select committee of this legislature recommended that testing be 'undertaken and the previous administration complied with that recommendations, and as I recall it, without any opposition from the hon. members who now sit on the government side of the house.

Without any opposition at that time, whatever.

I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that the sales of farm implements in 1963, our implements are all valued at some \$93,000,000; when you add repair parts, well over \$100,000,000 a year of purchases. Farmers are major consumers and in this particular area, farmers are justified, and the government has a responsibility to see to it, that these costly machines are adequately tested under field conditions, in order that the farmers may more reliably make their selections when purchasing this expensive machinery, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to draw your attention, Mr. Speaker, to a cost benefit study that has been made. It has been maintained that this legislation was redundant that actually the Agricultural Machinery Administration was not doing a very adequate job of testing. That machine companies had much more elaborate establishments to test machinery and that they did, in fact, as they do, test farm machinery. But I leave it to the common sense and judgement of this house and the farmers of this province, that any organization that has a financial vested interest in a particular product, is not going to do the kind of objective testing that was undertaken by the Agricultural Machinery Administration under actual field working conditions. These tests have been of tremendous value to our farmers, not only in terms of selecting the most reliable type of machine, suitable for their particular soil conditions, and that they could purchase in full confidence that a machine had good or bad or indifferent operating performance.

A cost study was made, Mr. Speaker. The benefits and savings under group one indicate this;

That a savings in repair parts to be realized over a ten year period, (estimated minimum lifetime of the machinery) as a result of AMA's first four years of operation. It is calculated the saving here would have been around \$4,800,000. The equivalent amount for repair, labor savings, for machines which were removed from Saskatchewan markets as a result of tests based on estimated sales, times the purchase price of the machine, \$344,000. A total savings of some \$10,000,000 less the cost of the AMA program over a four year period, a total of \$372,000 and leaves a net saving over a ten year period on repair parts alone, liability of repair parts alone, of over \$9,000,000.

I'm not going to quote anymore. I could go on, Mr. Speaker, to indicate the savings that have been made to farmers as a result of AMA testing over the period of time when this testing program was in effect, Mr. Speaker.

I promised hon. members opposite that I would oppose these amendments as I will, at every stage as they proceed through this legislature, from the second reading, to the committee, and on third reading. I feel obligated to the farmers of this province to do so.

It is very striking, Mr. Speaker, that this has been done, this action of discontinuing the functioning of this organization in spite the fact that the legislation was mandatory, that the act be administered by a board, that machinery testing be carried out, and all of the services were disbanded with complete impunity and disregard for this legislature. Also in total disregard to the requests of the farmer organizations in this province who asked that this service be continued.

Now, no amount of excuses by the Minister of Agriculture, (Mr. McDonald) or anyone else, or to say that this service is going to be expanded at the university, is wrong. For all purposes, machinery testing is at an end. The university it is true, will be undertaking research work but the university will not do field testing. They will not provide reports to farmers as was done before. It is completely different type of agency and no one in their right mind, including the university people, would want to undertake the kind of testing that was done by an independent agency under this legislation, Mr. Speaker.

I certainly decry the actions of the government in completely disregarding this legislature and the farm organizations from repealing this act. They will hear a great deal more of it as time goes on.

There are one or two more remarks, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to refer to before I take my seat. I would like to point out that farm products are rigidly tested, graded and inspected, in the interest of consumer protection and it seems to me, only logical, that the costly implements of production required by farmers to produce these products, should also be tested in order to give this producer and this consumer, in terms of an agriculturist, the kind of protection that he is entitled to.

I have mentioned the value of sales and to what it means to lose this service, Mr. Speaker, I expect to have more to say regarding this legislation, when the estimates in connection with the Department of Agriculture are before this legislature, Mr. Speaker.

I will continue to oppose it, in this house, and continue, when this house adjourns, to inform the farmers of this province that a valuable service has been taken away from them. One that has been painstakingly built up over the years. It is not easy, Mr. Speaker, to obtain the necessary equipment and trained personnel to do this kind of work. The only shortcoming was that we actually did not allocate enough money to do a still better job of testing. The minister can talk until he is blue in the face about an expanded service at the university but this will not be so and it will not be the kind of service that has been taken away from the farmers of this province.

I think I have very clearly indicated, Mr. Speaker, that I will not vote for second reading of this bill.

Mr. A. Thibault: (Kinistino) — Mr. Speaker, I would like to add a few words to what has been said this evening about the AMA. I want to tell you that I received several letters in connection with the AMA. I didn't receive any in connection with purple gas in my constituency. I know that the people are very concerned about this service.

I can remember when we wanted comparative tests, the only thing we could do was to get the Nebraska tests. When we wrote to the university for comparative tests, you could not get them. They said we can give you a list of machinery but we do not tell you how each machine will perform. With the AMA, we could get this. And now this service is being discontinued.

I am quarrelling with the university doing some research. The best they could do was to complement the AMA and work together. But if we cannot get comparative tests then the AMA has disappeared as far as the farmers are concerned. I certainly cannot do otherwise, but to oppose this bill.

Mr. F.A. Dewhurst: (Wadena) — Mr. Speaker, as a farmer, I cannot let this bill go through the house without some comment.

Mr. I.H. MacDougall: (Souris-Estevan) — How many acres?

Mr. Dewhurst: — It doesn't matter how many acres. I still know what is good for the farmers. As a farmer, I cannot let this bill go through the house without registering a protest on the actions that are being taken at this time.

I, like the member for Kinistino, (Mr. Thibault) have had letters from many farmers. They feel much put out that this AMA service is being taken away from them.

As the former Minister of Agriculture, (Mr. Nollet) pointed out, a committee was set up to study the problem of agricultural machinery, the prices thereof etc, and how it effected the farmers of this province. Evidence was brought before the committee as to how a lot of unworkable machinery was unloaded on the farmer who had no recourse, how the farmer was being used as a guinea pig for certain companies to have them to do the experimenting on their machinery. If the machinery proved half worthwhile the company could improve it. If it proved a flop, the farmer just held the bag.

The AMA was set up as one of the recommendations of that committee, and it has done a good job in this province. You could go to any farm organization and ask the farmers, in any farmers gatherings, how many of them receive the AMA reports. You would find that; a considerable number did receive them. A number received them directly on the mailing list, but many more received it by picking it up at their Ag-rep office, when a number of these reports were available.

A number of them would get an AMA report, not one for every individual farmer; but they would get together in groups of three or four or five, and discuss the pros and cons of a machine. Also the reports showed which were the better type of machines, and which were not. Some say these were made when the AMA brought out the recommendation on cultivator shovels, to show what cultivator shovel was adaptable for one machine to the other, and which ones under various types of soil conditions would stand up the best.

Now, we see all this being taken away from the farmers. I would have no objection to the university doing a certain amount of research, but I think that should be done to complement the AMA rather than to try to pretend that it replaces them. It is very difficult for me, Mr. Speaker, to realize why there are so many people on the other side of the house, who pretend that they are farmers, or are representing farming areas but they don't seem interested at all in the welfare of the farmers. The farm organizations, the Farmers' Union, the Wheat Pool, are all in favor of the retention of the AMA service and testing. For some reason or other, someone decided it must go. We have had no indication as to who has requested that the AMA be done away with, but we do know that there is a number that have requested that the AMA be retained.

On the other hand, some of the other bills we see no one asking to be done away with, but we see that other amendments are being taken away when people are also fighting to retain those amendments in former bills. It is a very difficult pattern to follow, Mr. Speaker, and I don't know why the farmers should have to be the guinea pigs all the time. It appears because the farmer don't have an organization such as the Manufacturers' Association, or some other professional associations, whereby they can put pressure from behind the scenes on the powers-that-be. Those things fall by the way side, and I would plead with the government to reconsider this action and retain the AMA because it has meant invaluable service to the farmers and untold amount of dollars saved, and not only the actual amount of dollars saved. Who knows how many more dollars may have been spent unwisely had we not had this AMA service?

It is one of those things that you may say that an "Ounce of prevention is better than a pound of cure", and this was the ounce of prevention that was stopping the farmers from being gored and rooked by unscrupulous implement companies. I must say that I shall, along with the member for Cut Knife, (Mr. Nollet) oppose the abolition of the AMA and bill no. 50 which is now before us.

Mr. L.M. Larson: (Pelly) — Mr. Speaker, I am rising to oppose the principle of this bill. I think that my views are comparatively well-known inasmuch as I seconded the resolution dealing with this matter previously.

I want to say at the outset, that I am extremely surprised, and disappointed that this kind of a bill should come before this legislature. I am like other members, a bit sick and tired of listening to all the friends, the so-called friends that the farmers have over on the other side of the house. I am one of those that have benefitted from the work of the AMA. I have need their reports extensively, followed them closely, together with many of my neighbors.

I have to oppose this on principle, because many have approached me to do so. I am surprised, as I said, that there is such a persistent move afoot to remove this legislation. I have followed the Minister of Agriculture very closely in these remarks, I am not going to say that they are facetious, but they certainly sound this way to me.

He says there was too small an amount of money spent. Now this would be a very easy matter to correct, Mr. Speaker, if this was all that was wrong, and it would be very simple to correct this if this is the main problem and the main reason. It was also said that the machine companies spend millions of dollars, well, probably they do, I'm not going to quarrel with this point — I think the price they charge for machinery, they ought to spend a lot of money in developing the various models they come out with.

Now with regard to the job that the university can do, I put on the records of this house during my previous remarks, some of the reasons why I don't feel that the university is the proper place for this type of comparative testing. I can recall the days when we organized field days to see machinery in operation, and we had one of the engineers, Mr. Speaker, from the university out to conduct these tests and these field days. I personally asked these men, "Now, how does John Deere compare with Massey Harris?" "How does Massey Harris compare to International Harvester?"

and so on. He invariably said that it is not their job to say which is the best or the worst, their job is to try to make the particular machine work to the best of its capacity. In the AMA we had something better, we had a written comparative report of how machine "A" compared against machine "B", whether machine "A" was superior to machine "B". This was the real value, this was the real strength in this kind of testing and comparisons.

Now, the university I can quite easily see would be reluctant to make these kind of statements. I think it would be asking too much. I think it would be unfair to ask a university to publish this kind of report, which must, if they are to be practical be honest and unbiased.

So I say that the transferring of this job to the university will not do what farmers expect, and farmers have become accustomed to having AMA.

Now I am not going to take a lot of time. I hear grumbling that we are saying too much over here, but I must, Mr. Speaker, rise and oppose in principle this kind of legislation. I think it is wrong and I want to say in concluding that I am extremely surprised that the gentlemen opposite can sit quietly by and vote and support this kind of thing which they know in their own hearts, particularly the farm representatives, is not going to be well taken in the country and is going to take away from the farmers a service that they have come to look upon as being authentic.

I ask these farm members to be conscientious and to remember some of these things when the vote is called.

Mr. E.I. Wood: (Swift Current) — Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise and say a few things in regard to this bill which is before us, I feel, myself, Mr. Speaker, that this organization concerning agricultural machinery has been very useful to the people of this province. It was set up with the idea of doing a job to prove to the farmer the relative value of various pieces of equipment, having a judgement on this that was passed by an organization that was not in any way responsible to anyone but the government of this province. They could be entirely fearless in bringing forth any ideas that they had, and this they did. I have heard from time to time, many remarks of commendation from farmers in my area concerning the literature that was put out by this organization concerning a wide range of machinery which they had tested, and on which they brought in reports.

Having, as it has had, a history of value to the farmers and the people of this province, I don't see why at this time it should be destroyed. This is something that to me is a little hard to understand, as to why the minister would wish to destroy something which has been for a number of years, very useful to the people of this province. One is inclined to think that there are interests of others than the farmers which are being considered. Of course, this is quite logical, the farmers are not everybody and from time to time we have to consider other people's view points, but it is rather hard in a case of this kind to make a valid comparison between the industrialists and the farmers of this province.

Undoubtedly the companies making these machines have rights as well as the farmers have, but I feel, and I think most of the members of this house feel, that when the balance has been made between the interests of these two, that the farmers interest should be paramount and they should out-weigh, insofar as we are concerned, the interests of others in this regard.

Now, I understand that much of the work that has been done by this AMA organization is being transferred to the university. I have to admit, Mr. Speaker, that I have never been able to quite get through my thick head just what the university is going to do in this regard, I don't understand that it is going to be the same thing as what has been done by the AMA itself, earlier, but whatever they do, I was sure that they would do well. We have this confidence in the university. The university people, I believe, have stood for knowledge and truth and they are prepared to make known their statements on these things without fear or favor. I think that any university that didn't do this would not be a seat of learning. I think this is what universities have stood for through the years, that they will make a fearless approach to any subject and are prepared to let the chips fall where they will.

As I said a few minutes ago, I am sure that they will be quite fair and clinical in their approach to anything they have to do with regard to testing or appraising of machinery, under any job that is given to them along these lines. But they do, Mr. Speaker, from time to time, receive

grants from interested organizations and I think these monies are of quite an important factor in the operation of a university.

The question that arises in my mind is whether or not the companies from whom some of these grants may be forthcoming, are quite as objective in their approach to these things, or are quite as prepared to be fair-minded as what the university people themselves are. Is it fair to put our university people in this position that they may cause some hard feelings between themselves and the people who have hitherto been their supporters and who have hitherto assisted them?

I think it was much better to leave the thing in the context of what we have had through the years, where this is the straight responsibility of this government and the funds for its upkeep come from this government, and there is no question whatsoever of the other interested people being either hurt or their biased approach having anything to do with the furthering of funds for education and other purposes.

Because of these things, Mr. Speaker, I cannot see that I am going to be able to support this bill.

Mr. J.A. Pepper: (Weyburn) — Mr. Speaker, the Agricultural Administration Act provided means that a farmer could have a certain implement of his choice, which he perhaps wished to purchase, tested and a report provided for him on its performance.

As you all know, many farm organizations have expressed their views in regard to this program and are certainly opposed to the abolition of the AMA. With the AMA, we were able to get comparative tests, which I think was very important, which, if this bill is passed, we will be unable to secure.

For the price which we have to pay for machinery, Mr. Speaker, some protection should be given to the farmer, so that he might purchase the machine which he thinks will give him the best service for the price he has to pay. The fact that some sixteen thousand farmers made use of this AMA service proved that it was being used, and of benefit to the farmer.

So needless to say, Mr. Speaker, I am opposing this bill.

Mr. J.H. Brockelbank: (Kelsey) — Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say a word or two before this debate closes; and I think we should realize that what we are doing, the bill is very definite, we are doing away with the testing in Saskatchewan of farm machinery. The sections that provide for testing are being repealed and there is no provision made for the university to test farm machinery. There is only a section that provides that the government could make an agreement with the university to carry on research, conduct investigations, and inquiries, but they have in drafting the bill, kept clear away from the idea of testing farm machinery. This is one thing that needs to be done because the farm machinery companies are not — their primary interest is not to make the perfect farm machine, their primary interest is to make profits for their shareholders. This is what my hon. friends agree over here, the way it is set up.

Only as a secondary thing, when it becomes necessary to achieve the first objective and to that extent, do they pay attention to the question of quality and efficiency of farm machines. And we know that the manufacture of a lot of farm machines is in the hands of so few people that it is for all practical purposes, pretty well a monopoly.

I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, to my hon. friends opposite, that if they want to help the present economic system to continue to function, then they have got to put into effect this kind of safeguard for the people. This kind of testing of the products that comes out of privately owned industry for the protection of the people, and I certainly would like to see this bill not proceeded with.

Mr. Speaker: — I must draw the attention of the house to the fact that the mover is about to close the debate, if anybody wishes to speak, they must do so now, or be precluded from doing so.

Mr. C.G. Willis: (Melfort-Tisdale) — Mr. Speaker, I have waited patiently, to see who was going to rise on the other side.

An Hon. Member: — The Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. Willis: — The Minister of Agriculture, (Mr. McDonald) that is right one person, Mr. Speaker, from the government which prides itself on representing the farmers of this province. I have here the list of members in the house, Mr. Speaker, with their declared occupations. The top of the list is Mr. Sam K. Asbell, implement dealer and farmer what does he do when an important bill like this comes up? He doesn't comment. Is he in favor, or is he going to sit by and let the Minister of Agriculture lay down policy for him, along with the rest of the farmers?

The, Mr. Speaker, the second person here who is listed as a farmer is the Hon. David Boldt. He is absent tonight. If he had been sitting in his seat, he too would have been silent, because the Minister of Agriculture has decreed that this must be got through, that he is the only person who is to speak from the other side, Mr. Speaker. There is the "late" member from Humboldt listed as a pharmacist and farmer . . .

Mr. M. Breker: (Humboldt) — On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I have been classified already as a druggist by the hon. member from Wadena, (Mr. Dewhurst)

Mr. Willis: — Mr. Speaker, I have just referred to the hon. member from Humboldt, (Mr. Breker) as the "late" member . . .

An Hon. Member: — He is still alive.

Mr. Willis: — The roads were very poor this morning, I understand, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Breker: — Mr. Speaker, I will pick up my cheque at the Whip's office tomorrow morning.

Mr. Willis: — I'm not sure, Mr. Speaker, whether he went home over the weekend to attend to his pharmacy business or his farming business, but if he is really and truly a farmer, he should be up on his feet protesting or on the other hand saying why he is in favor of doing away with the Agricultural Machinery Testing for farmers.

Then the next person here, Mr. Speaker, and this is a real friend of the farmers, the hon. A.C. Cameron, Minister of Mineral Resources, who at times can wax very eloquently in that sanctimonious voice of his, when he is talking about injustices to the farm population. What did he do today, Mr. Speaker? He is sitting on his hands beside the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McDonald) who speaks for him when it comes to an important question like this.

The next person here is a hatchery owner. I'm not sure, Mr. Speaker, whether the AMA tested any hatchery equipment or not, I would say I think not, and probably Mr. Coupland, could be justified in sitting in his seat and letting the Minister of Agriculture, (Mr. McDonald) do his speaking for him.

Then there is another farmer here, Mr. Speaker, from the Yorkton constituency this time, Mr. Gallagher. He too, is content to allow the Minister of Agriculture to speak for him and I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that this is indeed a serious situation when we have so many farmers on the other side of the house, who not only do not speak in favor, but refuse to get up and say why they are opposed to the AMA.

The, Mr. Speaker, we have another farmer, Mr. James B. Hooker, (Notukeu-Willowbunch) another new member of this house, we know some of the feelings of the older members here in this house, the member for Maple Creek, (Mr. Cameron) in the past has attacked the AMA.

What does Mr. Hooker, (Notukeu-Willowbunch) do when it comes to the AMA? He sits in his seat and allows the Minister of Agriculture, (Mr. McDonald) to talk for him.

The, Mr. Speaker, we have another farmer, a farmer, garage operator and trucker, Mr. Fern Larochelle (Shaunavon). We don't know, Mr. Speaker, whether he is opposed to the AMA or whether he is for AMA. He is a new member

of the house, again he is content to allow the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McDonald) do his speaking for him.

Mr. McDonald: (Moosomin) — It speaks for itself.

Mr. Willis: — Mr. Speaker, we have the hon. pardon me, Mr. Speaker, not yet the hon. not even the Legislative Assistant yet, but we have the member for Elrose (Mr. Leith) listed here as a farmer. Again he is content to allow the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McDonald) to abolish the AMA, without protesting, without saying if he is in favor or if he is opposed to it.

Mr. McDonald: (Moosomin) — Louder, we can't hear you, George.

Mr. Willis: — Then, Mr. Speaker, there is another farmer listed here who is doing the speaking for the people on the other side. The hon. A.H. McDonald (Moosomin) the Minister of Agriculture, he has indicated that he is opposed to this and he is going to tell why he and the rest of the members on the other side are opposed to it. The rest of the members sit on their hands and let the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McDonald) get up and say why this must be done away with.

Mr. Speaker, is this the grand old Liberal party, I wonder? Then there is the hon. D.T. McFarlane, Minister of Municipal Affairs. He is not here tonight but I am sure that if he were here tonight, Mr. Speaker, he, too, would be sitting on his hands and allowing the Minister of Agriculture to speak for him.

It is too bad that Mrs. Sally Merchant (Saskatoon) isn't a farmer. I am sure that if she had been a farmer, and this bill was up tonight, that she wouldn't be sitting down, Mr. Speaker. She would be up talking on behalf of the farmers of this province. At least, I think one member across the way would have the courage of his convictions to get up and say whether he is opposed to it, or whether he was in favor of this measure of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McDonald)

Then, Mr. Speaker, there is one here who is shown on this list, he isn't speaking in the house this time because he is out, maybe he was not in favor of doing away with the AMA.

Then we come to Mr. G. Romuld (Canora) farmer. He too, is a new member, Mr. Speaker, he doesn't get up and say whether he is in favor of this, or whether he is opposed to it. Too bad these new members cannot let us know, Mr. Speaker, but no, they have to sit in their seats while the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McDonald) gets up and tells why and what the government is planning on doing.

It is too bad, Mr. Speaker, that you haven't a voice here, I'm sure that if you had a voice in this legislature, that you would express yourself one way or the other. You wouldn't sit back and allow the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McDonald) to speak for you in this regard. You, too, are listed as a farmer here, Mr. Speaker, I think it is too bad that you haven't the opportunity to speak on this question.

Then there is one other farmer here, Thomas M. Weatherald (Cannington) again a new member and he must be a new farmer too, Mr. Speaker.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I must protest, here we have a very important bill, a bill which affects all of the farmers in Saskatchewan. All of the farmers who last year, as reported in the AMA report, had a realized net income of \$370,000,000 and last year spent a total of \$97,000,000 for machinery. Twenty-six per cent of the income of the farmers of this province, Mr. Speaker, spent last year for machinery, and not one of these so-called representatives of farmers had the courage to get up and either agree with the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McDonald) or say that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McDonald) has twisted their arm and they have to remain seated.

Hon. D.G. Steuart: (Minister of Public Health) — Are you for it or against it?

Mr. Willis: — Mr. Speaker, this is indeed a sad situation, reference has been made to the large number of farmers in the province who receive these reports. Almost 16,000 farmers in Saskatchewan were interested enough in the AMA to have their names on the mailing list and the report says that

more than 300,000 reports were distributed throughout Saskatchewan last year, 300,000 reports will not be received next year by farmers in this province, Mr. Speaker, because the members opposite allowed one member to determine the policy. They are to blame for the blackout of the AMA. They sit back and they will be given the credit or the blame, I think it will be the blame, when the people of this province have the opportunity of protesting their action in another election.

Mr. J.B. Brockelbank: (Saskatoon) — Mr. Speaker, I will admit right now that I am not a farmer . . .

Mr. I. MacDougall: (Souris-Estevan) — You probably know as much . . .

Mr. Brockelbank: (Saskatoon) — I'm getting lots of remarks from the farmers on the other side though. I would be interested in hearing from the Minister of Agriculture, (Mr. McDonald) in his concluding remarks, state the reasons he would give to the farm organizations for doing away with the AMA.

I am not asking this question in an attempt to embarrass anyone, I merely want to know why and what reason he would give to the farm organizations. Perhaps he can clear up some doubts that are in my mind.

Mr. Speaker: — I must again draw the attention of the house to the fact the mover of the motion is about to close the debate.

Mr. McDonald: (Moosomin) — Mr. Speaker, my friends opposite seem to forget the fact that here a few days ago, there was a full dress debate on this particular matter and members on this side of the house placed themselves on record. It is not the intention of members on this side of the house to simply stand in their place and to waste the time of this legislature. We prefer to proceed and to bring into effect the program of the government which I am sure farmers and other people of Saskatchewan . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

An Hon. Member: — They voted for us,

Mr. McDonald: (Moosomin) — . . . are far more interested in than they are in the ballyhoo that we have listened to here tonight. There has been absolutely nothing new added.

I thought that the remarks of the member for Melfort-Tisdale, would have taken the prize if there is one.

Mr. Willis: — Thank you, Hammy.

Mr. McDonald: (Moosomin) — He generally stands up and opens his mouth and puts both feet in it, and of course, he was very successful at doing that tonight.

Now, I do want to answer all of those questions that were raised by members opposite, that are worthy of an answer. But as far as the member for Melfort-Tisdale (Mr. Willis) is concerned, as usual I don't think his contribution to the debate was worthy of any further comments.

Mr. Willis: — I noticed nobody answered.

Mr. McDonald: (Moosomin) — Then the member for Cut Knife (Mr. Nollet) one of his first statements this evening was that testing would not be done and the statement that I had made that testing would be done at the university, was untrue. Well, if the member from Cut Knife, (Mr. Nollet) wants to tell me and the president of our university that we are both liars, that is alright with me.

Mr. Nollet: — I don't have to, Mr. Speaker. The act speaks for itself.

Mr. McDonald: (Moosomin) — It's alright with me.

Mr. Nollet: — You can't find the word testing any place in it.

Mr. McDonald: (Moosomin) — Your interpretation of the act may lead you to believe

that. I've always known you couldn't read and now I know you can't understand what you do read. Then the hon. member, (Mr. Nollet) complains about the board having not been reappointed. Mr. Speaker, during the whole period that my hon. friend refers to, there was continuous conversation being held between the Department of Agriculture and the university. And the university will be appointing a new board to advise them in their activities.

Mr. Nollet: — There's no provision in the act for it.

Mr. McDonald: (Moosomin) — My hon. friend, if you will just be quiet.

Mr. Nollet: — Whom are you trying to kid?

Mr. McDonald: (Moosomin) — If you will just be quiet, a moment, I will explain to you. You know the reason you never learn anything is that you never listen.

Mr. Nollet: — I won't learn anything from you, that's for sure.

Mr. McDonald: (Moosomin) — This legislature has no right in this act, or by any other act, to tell the university that they shall have a board, no right whatever. And the university has informed me that they will appoint a board. I believe them. If you don't believe them, I couldn't care less.

My hon. friend, (Mr. Nollet) also suggests that the government had no legal right not to appoint this board. I suggest to you that last May 22nd, the people of Saskatchewan voted in a new government.

Mr. Nollet: — Read the act. Can you read?

Mr. McDonald: (Moosomin) — They voted in this government they voted in this gentleman as Premier and this gentleman asked me if I would be Minister of Agriculture and I agreed.

Mr. Nollet: — And he told you to get rid of the board.

Mr. McDonald: (Moosomin) — And I shall administer this act, and not you. The people on the 22nd of April said they didn't want anymore of you . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — I gave him the job of cleaning up the place.

Mr. McDonald: (Moosomin) — . . . you never learn that. It has been very difficult. It has been most difficult to clean up some of the mess that you left behind.

Then my hon. friend, (Mr. Nollet) wanted to know about this yellow document. This has bothered him.

Mr. Nollet: — What is it?

Mr. McDonald: (Moosomin) — None of your business. This is part of my confidential report.

Mr. Nollet: — Put it on the table.

Mr. McDonald: (Moosomin) — Then he said, "Why don't you lay it on the table?" The only document that I have to lay on the table, has been laid on the table. The annual report of the Department of Agriculture, the only report.

Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, would the hon. member, (Mr. McDonald) tell the house what the document is he was waving around so gleefully. What is the document?

Mr. McDonald: (Moosomin) — This is a private document belonging to me.

Mr. Nollet: — What is it though?

Mr. McDonald: (Moosomin) — Alright. its none of your business what it is. What have you got in your desk? So they laid the report on the table. The only report that I have to lay on the table has been laid. It has been available to the members opposite. Apparently they haven't read it. If they have, again, they couldn't understand what they were reading. Then again . . .

An Hon. Member: — The Premier might get it on you.

Mr. McDonald: (Moosomin) — The member attempted to . . .

An Hon. Member: — Watch out, Arthur.

Mr. McDonald: (Moosomin) — . . . put some words into my mouth, saying that I had said that no combines had been tested. Well, of course, I brought this matter to his attention and he agreed that I had not made that statement.

Then he was going to read the verbatim report of the motion that was discussed at an earlier date in this house. Well, he doesn't need to do that. I'll tell him what I said on that occasion. I told him that never since the AMA came into existence have they tested a machine that was built by the largest machine company on this continent. Not one.

Some Hon. Members: — Oh, oh, come on.

Mr. McDonald: (Moosomin) — Not one.

An Hon. Member: — Alright, let's have it.

Mr. McDonald: (Moosomin) — What is?

Mr. Willis: — Massey Harris.

Mr. McDonald: (Moosomin) — Massey Harris is not the largest machine company and again you don't know what you are talking about. The largest machine company on this continent is John Deere. And not one machine. Why? Because John Deere refused to put their equipment to the test of the AMA.

Mr. Thatcher: — They don't trust these socialists.

Mr. McDonald: (Moosomin) — Why? I don't know.

Mr. Thatcher: — They don't trust these socialists.

Mr. McDonald: (Moosomin) — The largest machine company on the North American continent, with larger sales than any other company on this continent, refused to put their machinery to tests.

Mr. Nollet: — That's no reason to get rid of the AMA.

Mr. McDonald: (Moosomin) — Then the ex-minister . . . Have you made your speech or did you want to make another? If you haven't got any more to say now than you have said so far, I would suggest you be quiet.

Mr. Nollet: — I'll not embarrass you any more.

Mr. McDonald: (Moosomin) — Then he goes on, he says, if the farmers had have been told that this government would have done away with the AMA, that we would have never been here. Mr. Speaker, the farmers and I think you are aware of this, have known for many years that the Liberal party in opposition, did not approve of the AMA, in its present form. Then he said, farm organizations across Canada, have asked for this type of testing. What province in Canada, other than Saskatchewan, has done any machinery testing? What province in Canada have held an inquiry along this very line. Many provinces have had inquiries but not one province in Canada recommended testing with the exception of this. And what did this committee that sat in this legislature in 1952 recommend? I happened to have been a member of that

March 15, 1965

committee that perhaps they ought to read the recommendations of that committee. That committee recommended that the university should do the very thing that they are doing for us now.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McDonald: (Moosomin) — And if you don't believe me, turn to page 3G, item 4, under the recommendations and read it for yourself.

Now, then the ex-minister, (Mr. Nollet) with tears as big as crocodiles, as big as pumpkins as a matter of fact, in his eyes . . .

An Hon. Member: — . . . bleeding ulcers.

Mr. McDonald: (Moosomin) — He says, I am going to fight it on second reading. I am going to fight it in committee. I am going to fight it on third reading. I'm going to fight it in the country.

Mr. Nollet: — Would the hon. minister read this recommendation for us?

Mr. McDonald: (Moosomin) — This report was printed in 1952. He was the Minister and it took him six years to implement any part of the report.

An Hon. Member: — Shame.

Mr. McDonald: (Moosomin) — Where were your tears during this six year period? Whom were you crying for then?

Mr. Nollet: — It only took you a few months to abolish it.

Mr. McDonald: (Moosomin) — It would have taken less than that if we could get it through this house faster.

Mr. Nollet: — Alright. Would the minister read the recommendation form?

Mr. McDonald: (Moosomin) — Sure, I'll read it.

Mr. Nollet: — Alright, read it.

Mr. McDonald: (Moosomin) — Mr. Speaker, I ask you to either put that little fellow in his seat or I will have to go over and do it myself.

Mr. Nollet: — Quite a job doing it.

Mr. McDonald: (Moosomin) — It wouldn't take long.

Mr. Nollet: — Longer than you think.

Mr. McDonald: (Moosomin) — I'll read it to you.

An Hon. Member: — How about a little decorum in the house.

Mr. McDonald: (Moosomin) —

That the provincial government consider the creation of a farm implement board . . .

Are you listening?

. . . farm implement board to test, inspect, certify under actual working conditions, farm implements and machines sold in Saskatchewan, that the federal government be requested to make available testing facilities at the experimental stations, for the purpose of proposed board and also the full use to be made of such facilities at the University of Saskatchewan.

Then, he went on and talked about the testing under actual field conditions in Saskatchewan. Well, on a previous occasion; Mr. Speaker, I advised this house that the testing that was being done in Saskatchewan, on May 22nd, by the farm machinery industry was virtually nothing. And after we became the government, one machine company alone brought twenty-two machines into Saskatchewan to do actual field testing. I told the house on a previous occasion that in the next calendar year, more than one hundred times the number of machines will be tested in Saskatchewan than were tested last year.

Mr. Willis: — Will we get a report?

Mr. McDonald: (Moosomin) — You'll get more reports than you bargained for.

An Hon. Member: — I guess.

Mr. McDonald: (Moosomin) — Then, my hon. friend, (Mr. Nollet) said, companies are not going to do the objective testing that was done by the AMA.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you, do you know of any business in Saskatchewan or elsewhere today, that is more competitive than the farm machinery industry? If a company has billions of dollars invested in farm machinery, do you mean to tell me that they can afford to put a lot of garbage on the market? Their very existence depends on the public acceptance of the product that they are selling.

Then my hon. friend, (Mr. Nollet) also got caught up in his own imagination and he said, why, the farm organizations have protested. There is only one farm organization in Saskatchewan that has even contacted me with regard to this legislation and that is the Saskatchewan Farmers' Union. The Saskatchewan Wheat Pool has never been in touch with me. Neither the Saskatchewan or the Canadian Federation of Agriculture has ever been in touch with me. The only farm organization has been the Saskatchewan Farmers' Union.

Then he went on to say that no one in their right mind including the university, would continue to do this testing. I agree, I agree. That no one in their right mind would continue to do it.

Then he went on to talk about farm products being tested and graded and that farm machinery should be tested and graded in the same fashion. He closed his remarks by saying that the greatest weakness in the AMA to date was that they did not allow enough money to be spent on this program. I agree, Mr. Speaker, I agree that a lot of work that has been done by the AMA was worthwhile work. But if you look at the sum of money that was being spent to test the machines that are built by not one machine company, but virtually all of the machine companies on this continent, and some from abroad, with a budget of \$150,000 to do it. I think it was the height of folly. Certainly the AMA could have done a job if this legislature had voted, I would estimate some place between \$3,000,000 and \$5,000,000 annually, to test farm machinery, then you would have a worthwhile program. But to dribble away \$150,000 a year on tests, which, Mr. Speaker, I submit to you, isn't sufficient funds to develop a bearing let alone a farm machine. You cannot develop a new style bearing for \$150,000 and you couldn't test it after you develop it, for \$150,000, let alone the farm machinery that is used in Saskatchewan. This is utter nonsense, Mr. Speaker, and I don't think for one moment that this legislature would be prepared to vote the kind of money that would be necessary. Even if they were prepared to vote, I believe that there are many other agricultural programs that are needed a great deal more at this moment, than this particular program.

Then some hon. members, I forget who it was, I think it was the hon. member for Pelly, (Mr. Larson) talks about comparative testing. Comparing machine A with machine B. This has never been done by the AMA. Never. What comparative testing did they do? AMA owned a standard machine. In some cases it might be a Massey Harris, in other cases an Oliver, in some other cases it may be a Cockshutt. And they have tested the machine that they were testing against this standard machine. But you were never testing John Deere versus Cockshutt; Cockshutt versus Massey Harris; Massey Harris versus Oliver; Oliver versus something else. Never have they done that. There is a misconception in what they have been doing in the past as well as a misconception of what they will be doing in the future.

Several members opposite have suggested that the university would be placing themselves in jeopardy if they were to do this type of testing at the university. Mr. Speaker, I think that is the height of folly to suggest that the university might be putting themselves in an awkward position if

they wrote an adverse report on a machine because the university may have received a grant from that particular company at some time or another. I have enough faith and confidence in the university to feel that they will write and say what they believe to be true and I also have enough faith and confidence in the machine companies, that whether the university wrote an adverse report or a glowing report, they couldn't care less as far as their contribution to the university is concerned.

Then my hon. friends, I think it was the member for Kelsey, (Mr. Brockelbank) wanted to know why the machine companies didn't concentrate on making a perfect machine. Mr. Speaker, it is possible in this day and age, to make virtually a perfect farm machine. It is possible to make a machine that they can tell you the day you buy it, when each and every part of that machine will break down. But in order to do that, you would have to develop and follow the same procedure in the farm machinery industry as are adopted and followed by the aircraft industry. Mr. Speaker, this would mean that a combine that cost \$8,000 to \$10,000 to day would cost \$200,000 or \$300,000 if they were to be built using the same procedure and programs that have been followed in the aircraft industry. This is not possible for the simple reason that nobody could afford to buy one if this procedure were used.

Then I was amazed, during the previous debate, we were told that the only person who opposed AMA in the past was the Premier. Now, my hon. friend, the member for Maple Creek, (Mr. Cameron) and the Minister of Mineral Resources, has been accused of being opposed to the AMA. I have been chided a little, which I don't mind, and there are a lot of members back here, I wouldn't even try twisting their arms, I think they are a little bigger and probably a better men than I am, but I have the confidence that the members behind me, will support me on this legislation and I also have the confidence, Mr. Speaker, that the machinery testing and design and engineering facilities that will be available in this province from here on, will surpass any facilities that have ever been available to us in the past.

I move second reading.

Mr. Speaker: — It has been moved by the hon. Minister of Agriculture, (Mr. McDonald) that bill no. 50 — An Act to amend the Agricultural Machinery Act — 1958, be now read the second time.

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division.

Yeas — 28
Messieurs

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

Nays — 15
Messieurs

Brockelbank (Kelsey)	Willis	Robbins
Wood	Whelan	Brockelbank (Saskatoon)
Nollet	Nicholson	Pepper
Blakeney	Dewhurst	
Davies	Snyder	
Thibault	Larson	

Hon. A.H. McDonald: (Minister of Agriculture) moved second reading bill no. 51 An Act to amend The Department of Agriculture Act.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I presume this

bill will not be controversial. The amendments to the Department of Agriculture Act are those amendments that are necessary to make it possible for us to give two awards annually to master farmers in the province, one in the north and one in the south or in the east and the west, as the case may be.

We believe that these awards will be an incentive to our farmers and ranchers to do better in the future than they have in the past. and that it will also be a reward to those people who have made a major contribution to agricultural interests generally. As I explained, at an earlier date, we do expect that the winners of these awards will have an all expense paid trip to Europe for themselves and their wife; or a similar amount in cash.

With this rather short explanation, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of the bill.

Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, I certainly am not going to take any serious objection to this bill because it is of such minor significance that it is not worthy of opposition.

When the hon. minister was speaking previously, I thought that they were going to come in with some great new programs and policies. He says, let's get on with the work of this legislature. The important things that we pledged the people of Saskatchewan to do but . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — Sour grapes.

Mr. Nollet: — . . . the people of Saskatchewan didn't know that you would be bringing in such a tremendous, significant contribution to the agricultural economy, as being in master farm awards.

Mr. Thatcher: — Are you opposed to it?

Mr. Nollet: — All I have to say, Mr. Speaker, after alternative Liberal and Tory governments in Ottawa in the post-war period and possibly in the years ahead, it will take more than a master farmer to survive.

Mr. Speaker, it was once proposed to me that we make available master farm awards. I was opposed to it because in my opinion, it is sheer hypocrisy. You can pick good people and fortunate people any time who because of good circumstances and good management and abilities, have made a success of farming. But to take those and set them up as examples and say to the rest of the farmers, "You too can achieve this great end." I watched this in operation in other provinces. The result has been that the farm people are fed up having people who were fortunate because of various circumstances, held up and rewarded. It is like saying to the rest of the farmers, "You too can beat the adverse economic circumstances that surround the agricultural industry."

I would much rather, Mr. Speaker, build up a service, through the agricultural representatives branch and other services like the Family Farm Improvement Branch, that would help lift up the farmer that needs help the most. My instructions have always been to the Ag. Reps. as they went about, "Never mind the good performers, they don't need your help and advice as much as the farmer that lacks in skills and farm management abilities." "They are the ones to see."

This puts emphasis, Mr. Speaker, in my mind, in the wrong place. It can be used very advantageously, as an example to other farmers, to say in effect to them, that you too can beat the cost price squeeze, and all the rest of it. But this will not contribute one iota to solving the basic farm problems of this province. It certainly isn't going to detract attention away from the fact that we have in Saskatchewan, many farmers who are living on sizeable farm units, who are not able to make a proper living.

I am not going to oppose the bill. I just want to chide the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McDonald) for bringing in such a questionable program as master farm awards . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — Sour grapes.

Mr. Nollet: — . . . after getting rid of the AMA.

March 15, 1965

An Hon. Member: — And yet you are going to vote for it.

Mr. McDonald: (Moosomin) — Mr. Speaker, may I close the debate?

Mr. Speaker: — I must draw the attention of the house to the fact that the mover of the motion is about to close the debate. If anybody wishes to speak, he must do so now.

Mr. McDonald: (Moosomin) — Mr. Speaker, I would just like to point out that the member who has just taken his seat, (Mr. Nollet) said that it was always easy to go around and pick a master farmer. Well, Mr. Speaker, after twenty years of socialism, it is not quite that easy to find that successful farmer in Saskatchewan. This will take some endeavor to find that particular person.

However, I do think that there is some great benefits to be derived from a program of this type. It seems to me that if we are able to send some of our better farmers to Europe once in a while, that there are some lessons that they can learn and bring back to this country, lessons from which I think all farmers can benefit. This is one of the major purposes of this program. It is to give some of our best farmers the opportunity to travel abroad to see what European farmers are able to do and to hope to bring those methods back to Canada, so that we can adopt them.

One of the matters that I would like to bring to the members' attention at this time, and one of the reasons that this bill is before us, is the fact that, for instance, in the cattle industry today, how many people realize, in this house, that the average calf that goes into a feed lot in Canada today, costs about \$100 to be ready to enter a feed lot. There are places, today, where the exact same animal can be brought to that position for \$7.80. We have got some lessons to learn in Canada with regard to agriculture. I, for one believe that some of our top notch farmers and their families ought to have the opportunity to go abroad to learn these lessons and to bring them home so that our farmers in Canada can compete.

I move second reading.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

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