

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**First Session — Fifteenth Legislature**  
**42nd Day**

**Monday, April 5th, 1965**

The Assembly met at 10:00 o'clock a.m.  
On the Orders of the Day:

**ANNOUNCEMENT OF CONTRACT TERMINATION BETWEEN GROUP RESOURCES CONSULTANT SERVICES AND THE GOVERNMENT OF SASKATCHEWAN**

**Hon. D. McFarlane (Minister of Municipal Affairs):** — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I would like to draw to the attention of the members of the legislature, that the contract between Group Resources Consultant Services and the government of Saskatchewan was terminated March 31st, 1965. The contract in effect engaged the services of Ray Woollam as the liaison officer between the Hutterite brethren in Alberta, and Saskatchewan, and the Saskatchewan government in locating Hutterite colonies in this province. At this time I want to draw to the attention of the house that, although the contract between Group Resources Consultant Services has not been renewed, there are still in existence two memoranda of understanding with Hutterite people regarding the establishment of colonies in Saskatchewan.

The first of these memoranda was signed on July 16th, 1963, with the Lehrer Leut, the second was signed May 5th, 1964, with the Derius Leut groups. Under the agreements, both groups must request land-owners, agents of realtors in Saskatchewan to consult with the Saskatchewan government Hutterite committee, before entering into any negotiations with respect to the purchase of lands. This stipulation applies regardless of whether such land agents are operating in either Alberta or Saskatchewan. Under the terms of this agreement, the government of Saskatchewan is also responsible for acquainting realtors in Saskatchewan and Alberta with the terms of these memoranda of understanding. It is for this reason that I am drawing this matter to the attention of the house at this time. The government expects to have Hutterite colonies in Saskatchewan and Alberta to honor the terms of these agreements and their failure to do so could create serious complications.

**ANNOUNCEMENT RE BOWLING GAME ON SATURDAY BETWEEN MEMBERS OF THE OPPOSITION AND THE PRESS GALLERY**

**Mr. E. I. Wood (Swift Current):** — Mr. Speaker, I am afraid it is incumbent upon me to inform the house of a bowling game which was held on Saturday, between members on this side of the house and the press gallery. I have to inform the house that we were able to out-do them in this sport, and we won. There were some totally unfounded accusations of having brought members in from other provinces to help us, but these accusations, of course, had to be shouted down. I have to say, Mr. Speaker, that I cannot claim any credit myself in this great and notable victory, because my bowling was really terrible. In fact, it was so bad that I was accused of bowling like a cabinet minister.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Lionel Coderre:** — Mr. Speaker, I believe we should have a recount.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Hon. members will recall that during a debate on April 3rd, objection was taken to certain words used by the member from Moosomin (Mr. A.H. McDonald), I did at that time place the whole matter in abeyance pending perusal of the Hansard transcript of the speech.

Having done so, I find that the words used by the hon. member were unparliamentary and further that the hon. member did immediately thereafter state as follows:

Mr. Speaker, if anyone would think this was a personal attack on them, I would be very surprised, and if they take it as a personal attack I hope they will accept my apologies if they

**April 5, 1965**

took it that way.

I presume that the house is prepared to accept the explanation and the apology.

### **ADJOURNED DEBATE**

The assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Hon. D. Boldt for second reading of Bill no. 58 — **An Act respecting the Department of Welfare.**

**Mr. A. M. Nicholson (Saskatoon City):** — Mr. Speaker, this bill proposes a new name for this Department of Social Welfare and Rehabilitation, I would like to make a few comments before the title passes into history. Although the minister is this year responsible for expenditures totalling over \$29,000,000, it is interesting that Saskatchewan did not have a Department of Welfare until 1944. At the very first session in 1944, although there were seventy-three bills passed, bill no. 1 on the Order Paper, was An Act respecting the Department of Social Welfare; bill no. 2 was An Act to amend the Industrial School Act; bill no. 3 was An Act to amend The Education of Blind and Deaf Children in Saskatchewan.

These three bills do indicate something of the very high priority which was given to welfare at that particular time. The Marsh report had something to say about the needs in Saskatchewan. This Marsh report was one of the interesting studies undertaken to point out some of the welfare problems that Canada would be facing in the post-war era. The Marsh report mentioned that the average mothers' allowance paid in Saskatchewan, prior to the election of the CCF government, amounted to \$13.77 per month, compared with \$35.97 in Manitoba, and \$35.19 in British Columbia. I am sure that the Minister of Social Welfare (Mr. Boldt) would agree with me that there is no province in Canada that has been disbursing as high a percentage of the available dollars to welfare work.

I am aware of the fact that during the past twenty years, the welfare programs in Saskatchewan have been highly regarded all across Canada, indeed, all through North America. While this department has been in existence, representatives from nearly all the provinces have come to Saskatchewan, at one time or another, to find out how things were being done in this part of the world.

I am naturally disturbed when I read in tonight's Leader Post that another valuable member of the Department of Social Welfare has resigned. Social Welfare Minister Boldt confirmed reports that Miss Battel had resigned, but declined to make any comments on the reasons. The story mentions that Miss Battel has been director of child welfare since 1952. She graduated from the University of Saskatchewan and the Montreal School of Social Work. She joined the Social Welfare Department in 1945, serving as a child welfare officer in charge of the Moose Jaw district and later as supervisor of older girls and unmarried mothers. I am sure the minister will agree with me that people in the welfare field in the other provinces of Canada, and in the federal department of National Health and Welfare, regard Miss Battel as the outstanding Director of Child Welfare activities in all of Canada. It does make me sad to find that Miss Battel's resignation has been presented to the minister.

It has been drawn to my attention that in addition to Miss Battel resigning, we have recently lost the Superintendent of Embury House, the Superintendent of the Saskatchewan Boys' School, and the Superintendent of the Men's jail of Prince Albert. These three have all gone to the province of Manitoba, and they have all been assigned very important positions. Mr. Slough, the Superintendent of our Prince Albert Men's jail has been made the Director of Corrections in the province of Manitoba. I am sure that the people in the other provinces of Canada will have a good deal of sympathy for us as we lose these outstanding people in the welfare field.

However, I want to commend the minister for bringing in this legislation to change the name. The name Social Welfare and Rehabilitation is rather a cumbersome name and Rehabilitation is naturally part of the role of welfare departments in every province, and the name was added when my predecessor, Mr. Sturdy, took over the Department of Social Welfare back in 1948, and incorporated some of his duties in the field of rehabilitation with veterans of the Second World War.

After saying that the changing of the name is to be commended, there are two sections which I think are unfortunate. I have examined

similar legislation in nearly all the provinces. The statutes of nearly all the provinces are in the legislative library and I have not been able to find anything comparable to Section 6 and Section 15.

I am sorry the Provincial Treasurer is not here but I ask the House Leader to read carefully section 6. Somebody on the treasury benches would do well to explain why any one minister in this day and age should be seeking from the legislature authority, section d, in any case where the total cost will not exceed \$500, to do such acts and things other than those provided for by subsection 2 of section 6, that the minister deems advisable for the purpose of providing for the welfare of persons in Saskatchewan.

Well, I think it would be hard to think of anything that was not in the welfare of persons in Saskatchewan, and to give the minister a blank cheque, without any authorization from the legislature, or without any reference to his colleagues in the cabinet, is unknown as far as I can find anywhere in Canada.

So, I hope that when we go into committee, the government will have no objection to striking out section 6 and, at least, giving the cabinet the authority to make these decisions. I know that the present minister would not want to spend \$500 of the taxpayers' money for something that would not stand up, but I certainly cannot see any reason why any cabinet minister would ask his colleagues in the cabinet, and his colleagues in the assembly, to pass an act which give him the authority to make this sort of disbursement.

**Hon. D. G. Steuart (Minister of Health):** — We trust him up to \$500.

**Mr. Nicholson:** — Well, I know you could give him \$5,000,000 and he could spend \$500 a minute, or an hour, there should be some limit. I think that to give a blank cheque without some limitation, without requiring an amount to be passed by this assembly, is a measure which this house in its right senses should not be passing.

In section 15 (sorry the Attorney General, Mr. Heald, isn't here). Section 15 . . .

**Mr. Cameron (Minister of Mineral Resources):** — On a point of order . . . May I point out that second reading is on the principle of the bill, the member is proceeding from section to section, and discussing sections of the bill which, I think, is contrary to the debate on second reading.

**Mr. Speaker:** — The point of order is well taken.

**Mr. Nicholson:** — Mr. Speaker, here is a new principle that I am opposing, and I ask members on the treasury bench to oppose giving one of their colleagues these wide powers.

There is another section that has one hundred words, in one sentence, and what does it ask us to do? Well, it asks us to give the minister powers which no minister in any other province, that I have been able to find, has been able to get. The minister censured the member from Arm River (Mr. Pederson) not so long ago. He said the member from Arm River (Mr. Pederson) sneaked into one of his offices. The Minister of Social Welfare does not own or run the offices, and to censure a member of this assembly for sneaking into an office and asking for information . . . Here we have in section 15, a proposal to deny the member for Arm River (Mr. Pederson), or the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Gardiner), or the Minister of Public Health (Mr. Steuart), the right to go to the Prince Albert regional office of the Department of Social Welfare and ask a question about an old-age pensioner. This is the sort of request that I am sure the lady member for Saskatoon (Mrs. Merchant), receives from citizens who enquire about applications for old age assistance . . .

**Hon. D. G. Steuart:** — I think the hon. member knows very well the hon. member rose in his place the next day, and pointed out that if he gave the implication that if members of this assembly could not go to any of his officials, he wanted to correct that, and another thing — he is just hashing over old ground and old debates . . .

**April 5, 1965**

**Mr. Nicholson:** — Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the interest of the Minister of Public Health (Mr. Steuart), but if he was listening to me he would have heard me say that section 15 would deny the member for Arm River (Mr. Pederson) his right. It would deny this Minister of Public Health (Mr. Steuart) the right to go to the regional office in Prince Albert and make an enquiry about Mr. Jones' or Mr. Smith's old age assistance, and this is a typical request that every member must have. One of my constituents 'phoned me after Christmas — his application had been in for two months and he had no word. I 'phoned the regional office and they said that the federal authority, which shared this on a fifty-fifty basis, had not been able to clear it, but in due course I was advised that this had been cleared by the federal authority and the old age applicant, in due course, is going to get his allowance. But if section 15 passes, the staff in Saskatoon would be denied the right to give any member of the legislature this type of information without the written consent of the minister.

Then there is some reference to confidentiality, and I suggest that we do not need legislation of this sort to have some fundamental rules observed, and I would suggest that, with the greatest respect, the minister himself should observe this type of courtesy. In Friday's Star Phoenix, I read:

That Mayor Cole denies admitting social aid over-payment.

There has been a controversy for over six months in Saskatoon, and, I think, it is unfortunate that until the minister makes his charges, and gives the people who are accused a chance to be heard, these comments should not be made. I think that no member of the crown requires the sort of provision that is set out in section 15. A number of my colleagues over on this side were living with a suit against us for a couple of years. I now have a letter from our lawyers saying that Drs. Kramley and McDonald have withdrawn their action. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that members of the government might well leave their destiny to the courts of this province which have very high standards. I see no reason why any member should ask this legislature for legislation such as is described in 2 of section 15. So, Mr. Speaker, I hope that the other members on Treasury will have a good look at section 6. I hope the Attorney General (Mr. Heald) will have a careful look at 15, and that they will be prepared to recommend amendments which will be acceptable to them, which will give the Department all the protection needed, and which will not deny members of this legislature and members of the cabinet the right to go to any regional office in the province and seek information that their constituents might wish them to give regarding the delay in the issuing of pensions, or any other problem which they might consider to be of special interest.

So, I hope that some of the members on the government side who have not had a chance to read this bill carefully, will have a chance to say something before the bill is given second reading.

**Mr. Martin Pederson (Arm River):** — Mr. Speaker, I, too, have some very grave misgivings to say the least, about the new principle that strikes me as having been interjected into our form of government by various clauses in this act that is before the assembly.

I must concur with the senior member from Saskatoon (Mr. Nicholson) in particular, with many of the remarks that he made regarding section 15, because this is the one section that, I believe, Mr. Speaker, does lay down a new principle. I am not too concerned if the minister thinks I am a bit sneaky. It is not the first time that I have had appellations such as that applied to me when I have tried to do what is right, but I am not going to tolerate, Mr. Speaker, the denial of the rights of a member of the legislature to seek advice, to seek help, or anything else, from public servants, and it does not matter much to me what the act says in this regard. I will always go to the officials involved and ask them, and I will hope that they will be honest and straightforward enough to give me an answer.

For the minister to submit an act which lays down a principle that they shall be denied the right to give to a member of this assembly information on behalf of one of his constituents, in my opinion, violates all of the principles for which, I believe, democratic institutions such as this exist. I most certainly take strong and violent objections to the wording as it appears in this particular section, dealing with the principle which we are talking about. I found in a previous debate, Mr. Speaker, that the minister made certain statements regarding my actions, and then turned

around and established that my actions had, in fact, been based on the evidence that people had been approaching me and telling me the things that I said in my statement.

Then he turned around and accused me of sneaking in to one of his department officials and asking them about this. His report of what I was told was correct. I was told that the person on whose behalf I was inquiring, had been in error, but it did not alter my original statement when I said that many people had come to me and told me these things, and I believe that it would behoove the minister to be a little cautious about the attitude that he takes in many of these matters. This is not the first time that we have seen an example of his almost holier-than-thou attitude.

**Hon. J.W. Gardiner (Minister of Public Works):** — Mr. Speaker, again on a point of order, this is discussing a previous debate that took place in the house, and I think the hon. member should be brought to order on this account. There has been nothing said in this debate with regard to the arguments of the hon. member.

**Mr. Allan Blakeney (Regina West):** — Mr. Speaker, on a further point of order, who is this speaking? The member for Regina South . . .

**Mr. Pederson:** — Mr. Speaker, on a further point of order, I am dealing with the principles in this bill, which I understand is right and proper, and in order to clarify the principle that I am speaking of, I must use the example that has already come before the house, which deals precisely with the item that is enunciated in sections 15 of the act. If the hon. minister has any objection to that and wished to defend his colleague, that is fine, I am prepared to debate that all night, but I do say that the Minister of Social Welfare (Mr. Boldt) has on numerous occasions stood in this house and displayed the attitude that is exemplified in the principle laid down in this bill, that he is the “be-all”, the “end-all”, the only one who can make these types of decisions. That, Mr. Speaker, to me is a denial of the fundamental rights of the members of this legislature, and if he pushes this bill through, and it gets by committee of the whole with that section intact, I can tell him, Mr. Speaker, that I will speak on this on every occasion that is presented to me from one end of the province to the other. If this is not an example . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Pederson:** — . . . of the type of arrogance that the minister has displayed, then I do not know what will be required to illustrate it.

I have listened to him several times when he has evidenced this type of attitude and I am not too surprised to see it in the act.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to belabor the point any longer, I want to make it abundantly clear now strongly I object to this sort of action being incorporated in an act of the legislature, with the wide and extensive powers that this gives the minister. I think that these are powers that no other minister in the government, in this province or any other province, has asked for or has received. This is nothing short of dictatorial powers and I most strenuously oppose it on these grounds, and will continue to oppose it even if the act passes in its present form.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, I simply want to add my words to those of the previous speakers, more particularly with respect to section 15. I would urge members on the other side to take a good look at the principle contained in section 15, and more particularly the principle contained in these words:

that no information respecting anything done by the department under or pursuant to any act or other law shall be made available to any person other than the minister, the deputy minister, or the person employed by the department, without the written consent of the minister.

**April 5, 1965**

Now, this in effect says that nothing can be made available to anyone, no information gathered by that department can be made available to anyone without the written consent of the minister . . .

**Hon. Lionel Coderre** (Minister of Labour): — It is not what . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — Yes it does . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — It says no final payment . . .

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, this section has two principles, one which says that no file, document or paper, that is kept by any person and deals with the personal history of a person shall be disclosed — that is number one, that is one category of information. And the second category of information is — no information respecting anything done by the department under or pursuant to any act or other law — that is the second category — shall be made available to any person other than the minister, without the consent of the minister . . .

**Mr. Ian MacDougall** (Souris-Estevan): — He can't read . . .

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Well, I will try to struggle along and read this act, and I would pit my skill at reading legislative enactments against that of the member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. MacDougall) . . .

**Mr. C.G. Willis** (Melfort-Tisdale): — No contest . . .

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Well, it is a frequent little taunt hurled, particularly by the member for Moosomin, that members on this side cannot read and, if they can read, they cannot understand, but we will have to do our best with our limited understanding.

But I say that this act, and more particularly this section, contains two principles, one of which would say, "No files or documents shall be made available", and the other would say, "No information respecting anything done by the department shall be made available to anybody". Who were the people who are to be excluded?

For one thing, orders of this legislature will be excluded. There is no point in us passing an order of the legislature asking the minister to produce anything if he does not want to, because he simply does not have to. He has a statute which supports him. No judge may order any of these documents to be produced, nor any information to be produced, because the minister need not give a written consent. The Provincial Auditor can be excluded from viewing any information gathered by this department under any act, because the Provincial Auditor is, indeed, a person. He can be barred from access to this information unless the minister consents, and it does not require any affirmative action by the minister. All he has to do is not consent, and the Provincial Auditor is excluded. MLAs are excluded, as the member for Arm River (Mr. Pederson) pointed out. A good number of other people who ordinarily consult with the Department of Welfare are excluded. People in the John Howard Society habitually take the 'phone, and say, "I have got this fellow here, what can you tell me about his background?" And this is the way that many of the welfare organizations work, in close co-operation and informal co-operation with the Department of Welfare. That is the way they work and that is the way they should work, but that is the way they will not be able to work, if I perceive this principle properly.

Similarly, with judges of magistrate courts, who seek information from probation officers, some of whom may have gathered information under this act, and who technically, as I view this, will not be able to make available this information to such a judge. This is, indeed, their job. Now maybe they can get a chit from the minister, but I think this is the wrong approach. I think that there should be no blanket-barring of the interchange of information of this kind without the written consent of the minister.

I would draw your attention the very wide wording of this last bit, "no information respecting anything done by the department under of pursuant to any act or other law." There is a long list of acts which are administered by the department. It is found in section 5 — a great list of acts which are administered by the department. A great number of things are done by the department. Great quantities of information are gathered.

One might look at the Housing and Special Care Home Act, which is just now before us. A great number of provisions in here call for information to be obtained by the Department of Welfare. Agreements are to be entered into with the federal government, all of which are secret unless the minister allows us to look at them. Contrast this with some of the sections of the Housing and Welfare Act, which say that "No person shall prevent or obstruct or attempt to prevent or obstruct entry or inspection on any authorized person under the act, and no person shall refuse to furnish information, or furnish any false information". My point here is that the minister is given the very widest powers to obtain information, he takes these powers unto himself — I think mistakenly — I think this is a bad piece of draftmanship, but here in this Department of Welfare Bill we have a piece of draftmanship which says that none of this information can be disclosed to legislatures, courts, provincial auditors, MLAs, welfare agencies, or to any of the other people who have a legitimate interest in these things, without the written consent of the minister.

Now, I think, that the section is aimed at provided some protection for welfare workers against being subpoenaed in courts. I think that section 15, subsection (2), seems to me to be not unreasonable in principle, when it attempts to protect welfare workers when they are being subpoenaed in court.

I think it might well be that this is over cautious. I have not studied all the cases. I have here Kryschuk and Zulynik, which, admittedly, is the case before the Provincial Magistrate, Judge Wakeling, who says that this information cannot be compellable in any case, so the law may well say that it is not compellable. I am referring, Mr. Speaker, to twenty-five Western Weekly reports, new series, at page 77.

If that is the law in Saskatchewan (and I am not aware of any case which overrules it) this information is not compellable anyway. However, I do not object if the department and the Attorney General wish to frame a section which will allow social workers to keep in confidence information which is given to them in confidence by members of the public. That seems to be not unreasonable, but to couch this in language which seems to me — I think by accident, I certainly hope accidentally — to give to the minister the widest possible powers (as I view this section) of preventing people who have a legitimate right to get this information, from getting this information except on sufferance of the minister, is wrong in principle. I must adopt the language of the member from Arm River (Mr. Pederson) in saying that if this stands, and if I conceive it rightly, then certainly I would have to voice objection to this at every appropriate opportunity which came to me.

My plea tonight is to ask the member for Shellbrook (Mr. Culenaere) and the member for Lumsden (Mr. Heald), the hon. Minister of Natural Resources and the Attorney General to take a look at his and consider it, with the Minister of Social Welfare, so that when we come to consider this in committee, we can have the benefit of their mature judgement as to whether or not this clause, and the principle contained therein, is not every bit as iniquitous as we say it is.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Hon. D. Heald (Attorney General):** — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. member who has just taken his seat would permit a question? Specifically, I take it from what your remarks indicate, that you are not objecting to section 15, sub-section 2. There are certain portions in section 15, sub-section 1, you are objecting to. Could you specify what part of the wording of section 15 that you find offensive?

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Yes, Mr. Speaker, I find myself in a little difficulty here, because my objection was fundamentally to the principle. My objection to the principle contained in the last six lines of section 15, sub-section 1, is in the strongest possible terms . . .

**Mr. Heald:** — . . . no information . . .

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Yes, my objection to the previous five or six lines or the principle contained therein is, as to whether or not it could not be restricted somewhat in its scope. I do not object to the idea that files and documents and papers should not be made public, but I can see of many, many instances where files, documents and papers will be made available at least on an informal basis or the information contained therein, and there

**April 5, 1965**

is no difference between a file, document, a paper, and the information contained therein, to John Howard workers, magistrates and that sort of person.

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

**Hon. David Boldt (Minister of Social Welfare):** — Mr. Speaker, first I would like to say that the former Minister of Social Welfare (Mr. Nicholson) again showed his true colors. He had to bring up every argument that we had in the Throne Speech, and in the Budget Debate, he still has not forgotten the Saskatoon Social Aid, and he has not forgotten Mr. Slough, Mr. Gray and Mr. Howie. He likes to repeat this and he will repeat this until he is in his grave.

Now, I was surprised to hear some of the statements made by the member from Arm River (Mr. Pederson) — and I will excuse him — but I certainly will not excuse the former Minister of Social Welfare (Mr. Nicholson) and the member from Regina West (Mr. Blakeney) who just sat down.

I was really surprised that they do not agree with the principle of the bill. When I accused the member for Arm River, some time ago, about coming into my office, I made a statement then, which later on I corrected or gave my personal feeling on. What I did object to was what the member from Arm River (Mr. Pederson) did. He got the right information from my department but he gave the wrong information to the public. He certainly was not honest then . . .

**Mr. Pederson:** — Mr. Speaker, the hon. minister has been asked to withdraw that sort of a remark once before, in connection with this case. I think he should do it again.

**Mr. Boldt:** — I proved at that time that the former member was misleading, and he knows . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — Withdraw.

**Mr. Speaker:** — The member for Rosthern has made an imputation of dishonesty against the member for Arm River (Mr. Pederson), and I think you should withdraw it.

**Mr. Boldt:** — I will withdraw it, but he certainly did not convey the right information. He gave the public different information than what he got from my staff, and he knows it.

**An Hon. Member:** — No, no.

**Mr. Boldt:** — The former Minister of Social Welfare says he has looked . . .

**Mr. Pederson:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the minister has made a withdrawal and he has made a further statement in connection with the withdrawal. He said that I got this information and then made a false statement to the public. This is not true, the television broadcast that he refers to took place prior to my seeing his official.

**Hon. D. Heald (Attorney General):** — On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, what the hon. minister just said was that the hon. member from Arm River (Mr. Pederson) gave different information to the public than he got from his office. That is not necessarily uncomplimentary. Different information is not necessarily false information. There is no imputation of dishonest there, not in his last statement.

**Mr. Boldt:** — Then the former Minister of Social Welfare says that he went all over the acts in the other provinces, and in no province have they got this power that the minister is seeking. Well, you know they have a very short memory. The member from Regina West (Mr. Blakeney) he certainly



has a short memory. I have here the Statutes of 1962, and I will read almost word for word what we are proposing. This is an Act to amend The Child Welfare Act, Chapter 11, 1962, and if you look at this act, you will see. I quote:

In the public interest, no file, document or paper that is kept by any person, or in any place, and that deals with the personal history, or record of a child or adult that has come into existence through anything done under, or pursuant to this act, shall not be made available to any person, other than the minister, or a person employed by the Public Service Commission in the department, without the written consent of the Director.

**An Hon. Member:** — The exact words . . .

**Mr. Boldt:** — Yes, the exact words. If the former minister would stay with the truth — he always tries to mislead the people. Here it also says, clause 2:

No member of the staff . . .

and here is a true indication . . .

**Mr. A. M. Nicholson (Saskatoon City):** — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege. I understood the hon. member to say that another hon. member always tried to mislead the people, I would submit that this is unparliamentary and ask that it be withdrawn.

**An Hon. Member:** — Mr. Speaker . . .

**Mr. Nicholson:** — Mr. Speaker, I asked for a ruling on this.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Well, I do not know exactly what he said, to tell you the honest truth, because the whole lot of you over there were putting up such a thundering racket I could not hear. Now I will send for the record and I will deal with that in the usual way.

**Mr. Boldt:** — Then clause 2 says:

No member of the staff of the department shall be competent, or compellable to give in evidence at any trial, hearing, or other proceeding, any written or oral statement made to him in confidence in the course of the performance of his duty under the act.

Now you say nobody had these powers. You socialists were the ones who wanted this power. All we are doing now is taking this act and putting all the Social Workers under this legislation. This is exactly what we are doing — exactly what you did in 1962, but you people there have such short memories. While you are there, you think this is socialistic legislation. You were the ones who brought it in, and the very people that suggested it at that time, are the people that suggested this should cover all Social Workers. Here is another thing.

**Hon. A. Cameron (Minister of Natural Resources):** — Word for word.

**Mr. Boldt:** — The senior member from Saskatoon said “How are you going to give the minister the power to spend \$500.” Well, this money is already voted by the legislature.

We have had numerous examples. For instance, an inmate in the Prince Albert institution loses a \$15 coat while he is there. I have to bring in an Order-in-Council to have the cabinet approve of this item! I think that I should have the power to say O.K., we are going to pay the \$15. We are asking to go as high as \$500 on money that has been voted by this legislature. There are no new monies involved, and I am certainly surprised that the former Minister of Social Welfare (Mr. Nicholson) has

**April 5, 1965**

such a short memory, but he always likes to dig up old dirt, from way back. Bringing in Mr. Slough, bringing in Mr. Gray, bringing in Mr. Howie, and now you are bringing in another individual — always bringing these in and you will repeat them as long as you will sit in that chair.

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — It won't be long.

**Mr. Boldt:** — Mr. Speaker, this bill has nothing to do with the Social Aid record in Saskatoon. I do not know how this could be brought in as a principle of this bill. He also read a press statement — which was issued on Friday or Saturday about Mr. Cole. I do not know what it has to do in this bill. There is no principle involved about Social Aid, but yet the former minister (Mr. Nicholson) at every opportunity has to get up and spell out these things that hurt him most and he knows he is as guilty as the worst of them. So, here you have a member of a law firm who should be able to read, who is in this house, and who says he is against the principle of this bill. I would like to match his intelligence with mine as a farmer. He certainly cannot have read the acts, or he would have known about this.

**Mr. Cameron:** — His own legislation.

**Mr. Boldt:** — His own legislation, I think there is also an amendment, passed in 1961, and for the benefit of you people over there. You had twenty years of experience, and these statutes were all written while you were the members of the government, and you do not know what is in them. I am sure the former Minister of Social Welfare (Mr. Nicholson), does not know the acts, he does not know the legislation, he does not know the regulations, and he does not know any department of which he was minister for four years.

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

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister would permit a question before he takes his seat?

He read the Child Welfare Act, and I wonder whether the minister would advise the house whether he sees no distinction between providing secrecy for the files and documents under a single act, The Child Welfare Act, and providing secrecy for any and all information of every kind under any act and any law?

**Mr. Boldt:** — Yes, I see the difference, and the reason why this is so is that we have a lot of Social Workers who go beyond the Child Welfare Act. They should have the same protection. Where there is a husband-and-wife trouble and a Social Worker goes to see them, I think he should be protected, and this is what we are asking for.

**Mr. Cameron:** — The same legislation.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! It has been moved by the Hon. Minister of Social Welfare, Mr. Boldt, that bill no. 58, An Act respecting the Department of Welfare, be now read the second time.

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division, and bill read the second time.

**Yeas — 28**

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

Nays — 23

Brockelbank (Kelsey)  
Cooper (Mrs.)  
Wood  
Nollet  
Blakeney  
Davies  
Thibault  
Willis  
Whelan

Nicholson  
Dewhurst  
Berezowsky  
Smishek  
Link  
Baker  
Wooff  
Snyder  
Brotten

Larson  
Robbins  
Brockelbank (Saskatoon)  
Pepper  
Pederson

**Mr. Speaker:** — It now being 10:00 o'clock, the house stands until tomorrow morning.

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