

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Second Session Fifteenth Legislature
10th day

Monday, February 21, 1966

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

ANNOUNCEMENT RE BOY SCOUT WEEK

Hon. L.P. Coderre (Minister of Labour): — Before the Orders of the Day, Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw the attention of this legislature to the fact that this is Boy Scout Week. Our Cubs, Brownies, Guides and Rovers are taking the opportunity to think of the work they have done. I think it is only appropriate for this legislature to publicly thank the work of the hundreds of leaders throughout this province who are doing such great work. I am sure that members and the public generally are aware and the records will show, that nowhere will we find our young people involved in any general breakage of the law who have been active in this movement. Again, I say that a great thank-you should go to all those who are leaders in the Scout movement, and in the Guide movement, who have so unselfishly given of their time and money to guide our young people to be better citizens.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

REPORT OF PASSING OF HARRY GIBBS

Mr. J.H. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Before the Orders of the Day, Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to bring to the attention of the house the report that a former member of the legislature, Mr. Harry Gibbs, who was the member for Swift Current for 12 years, passed away last week. I just wanted to mention it now. I thought it would be appropriate if the Premier prepared the resolution for condolences for introduction today or tomorrow for the family.

Hon. W. Ross Thatcher (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I shall certainly be pleased to do that, and I would like to associate myself and my colleagues with the remarks made by the hon. member for Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank). I knew Mr. Gibbs personally for a number of years. He was a real gentleman and a real party representative in this chamber. I know that he will be missed, not only by the people of Swift Current and Moose Jaw where he has been living, but by the people in this province. He was a trade union representative who did a lot for the trade union movement.

TRIBUTE TO BOY SCOUT MOVEMENT

Mr. A.E. Blakeney (Regina West): — Mr. Speaker, before Orders of the Day, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) with respect to the Boy Scout Movement. It has been my pleasure to be associated with scouting at all levels having been a cub and a scout; a uniformed leader and a lay leader; and been on the regional, provincial and national councils of the Boy Scout movement. Certainly, in my opinion, and I think in the opinion of all members on this side of the house, it is a movement

February 21, 1966

which exemplifies some of the highest principles of manhood which, I am sure, all of us attempt to instil in the young people who come under our charge, either directly in our parental responsibilities, or indirectly in educational or other fields. Certainly it is a movement which deserves every encouragement and support from those of us who are able in any way to give such encouragement and support.

QUESTION RE INCREASE IN AUTOMOBILE AND GENERAL INSURANCE RATES

Mr. Blakeney: — I would like to ask the Minister of Welfare (Mr. Boldt) whether in view of the many reports, not only with respect to increases in rates under The Automobile Accident Insurance Act, but also general insurance rates, particularly fire rates, he has any announcement to make to this house with respect to rates, either automobile or general insurance?

Hon. D. Boldt (Minister of Social Welfare): — Mr. Speaker, I can assure the hon. member that by the time he will be asked to buy his license plates, he will know what the rates are.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mrs. Sally Merchant (Saskatoon City): — Mr. Speaker, before Orders of the Day, could I draw the attention of members to a group that has just come into the west gallery. They are from Estey School in Saskatoon. The school is one that is named after a former member for Saskatoon who sat on this side of the house as Minister of Education and as Attorney General, so they have a fine tradition in the name of their school to emulate. I know that the members today will want to join with me in wishing them a very profitable visit to the legislature.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

ACCEPTANCE OF GAVEL PRESENTED BY THE CITY OF LONDON

Hon. W. Ross Thatcher (Premier) moved, seconded by the member from Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank):

That this assembly do accept the Gavel presented by the Corporation of the City of London and that the warmest thanks of this assembly be conveyed by Mr. Speaker to the Lord Mayor and Officers of the City of London.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased indeed to say a word or two in regard to this motion. For all of us, either by birth or adoption, have connections with the mother country, Great Britain. For most of us anyway, there is no city just like the City of London. It just stands out by itself in the whole world as one of the most wonderful cities that the world has. This legislature is highly honoured by getting this gift from the City of London.

I trust, Mr. Speaker, that you will not use it as a sort of boomerang, a weapon to throw at the members. I hope you won't

have to do anything like that. But certainly members of this legislature will all through the future years, treasure this souvenir of the great City of London.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. M.P. Pederson (Arm River): — Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to associate myself with the motion that is before the house, and with the remarks that have been passed in connection with this presentation from the City of London.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that it may not be generally known to members of this house that this gavel was produced from the timbers of the ruins of the Guildhall dating back to the days of the so-called Last Great War. Having personally been involved, with many other members, in the dreadful days that surrounded this action, and having seen the ruins at that time, I must say that the connection with that era and with the tremendous courage of the city at that time fills me with a deep sense of pride that this gavel has been presented to our legislature out here in Saskatchewan.

I want to join most heartily in adding my voice to that of the Acting Leader of the Opposition and the Premier in supporting this motion.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — It has been moved by the hon. Premier, seconded by the hon. member for Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank):

That this assembly do accept the Gavel presented by the Corporation of the City of London and that the warmest thanks of this assembly be conveyed by Mr. Speaker to the Lord Mayor and Officers of the City of London.

Just before I put the question, I draw the attention of all members to this. It is a little hard to see, but the gavel is on the table of the second clerk, and it will stay there until this house rises. Those who wish to do so may go and see it. It is really a marvel of the carver's art. When you are close to it and handle it, look at it closely. It is really a wonderful piece of work as well as a most historical gift from London to our legislature.

Motion agreed to.

SECOND READINGS

Hon. W. Ross Thatcher (Premier) moved second reading of Bill No. 38 — **An Act respecting a Certain Election in the Constituency of Bengough.**

Mr. J.H. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — I would just like to say a word or two in regard to this bill, particularly in regard to the way it has been handled.

The press had it that we obstructed passage of this bill. This was perhaps technically correct but less than a minute before the first reading of the bill was moved, the leader of the house was speaking to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd). It was agreed at that time, I took it, that the bill would be

proceeded with on Monday, and there would be no objection to giving it all three processes today. We were very much surprised to see that immediately the Premier asked for consent on Friday. The reason for objecting to consent on Friday, as everyone knows, members on both sides of the house, certainly members on the government side of the house, wanted to adjourn at 5:30 on Friday. We were trying our best to accommodate them, and it was our time in the Address in Reply debate that was being sacrificed. That was the reason that we did not want to take up the time. It would have taken much more than the two minutes which was quoted in the paper, because it had to go into committee and the clauses had to be read. We had no wish to delay the sitting of the hon. member but under the circumstances with the time very short for the conclusion of the debate on the Address in Reply, we could not see anything else but to put it off until Monday.

Certainly we would be very happy to see the bill go through all stages this afternoon, including the Royal Assent, that is important too. It would have had to get Royal Assent on Friday or the member could not sit today until Royal Assent was given. So I don't think it was the impression given by the press that we were being ornery and mean about this. This impression was completely incorrect. I wanted to make this matter clear, Mr. Speaker.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

Hon. D. Steuart (Minister of Public Health) moved second reading of Bill No. 1 — **An Act to amend The Marriage Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, this bill contains amendments that are intended to resolve the problems that have occasionally arisen through application of the act. The amendment has been recommended by persons concerned in the administration of the act, who have noted the occurrence of difficulties and problems. For example, one amendment, Mr. Speaker, is intended to resolve a problem that has occasionally arisen in connection with persons intending to be married upon the authority of the proclamation of banns. Because seven clear days are now required to elapse between the date of the proclamation of banns and the date of the marriage ceremony, a period of almost two weeks is in practice required to elapse between these two dates, because banns are usually proclaimed on a Sunday and most marriage ceremonies are held on a Saturday.

An amendment will reduce the minimum period between the proclamation of banns and the marriage ceremony from seven to five clear days. This will permit a marriage to be held on the Saturday immediately following the Sunday on which banns were proclaimed.

Another amendment concerns the case of a minor where one of the parents has deserted the family but the mother and father are not legally separated. Under these circumstances where a child is living at home and would like to become married, the consent of both the mother and father is required. An amendment is being proposed to dispense with the consent of the parent who deserted the family and has not been contributing to either his wife or child's support.

Another minor amendment is being made for provision requiring consent of the parents. With these short remarks, Mr. Speaker, I move this bill be now read a second time.

Mrs. Marjorie Cooper (Regina West): — I note in reading the bill, Mr. Speaker, that section 46 is to be repealed. It seems to me this is a very important section and I just can't understand why this would be repealed because I can find nothing to replace it. Could the minister say why this section is being repealed?

Mr. Steuart: — Well, it is customary when we go into this clause by clause to explain this, but I will give the reason. This section is not being used. In practice a delayed registration of the marriage is made under the Vital Statistics Act. The following legal argument has been advanced where a marriage ceremony has been conducted but the marriage was not registered because of ignorance. The Director of Vital Statistics has not declared the marriage to be valid, possibly the marriage could be annulled. This could not have been the intention of the legislature. In other legal arguments since the Director of Vital Statistics is given the authority to declare that a marriage is valid, this authority seems to extend beyond the solemnization of the marriage, therefore, it could be beyond the power of the province to enact. These are the reasons why the Director of Vital Statistics wants this repealed. But if the member is not satisfied, when we bring it up in committee I'll check with her before and get some further explanation.

Mrs. Cooper: — I would need a further explanation before I could support this.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

Hon. D.V. Heald (Attorney General) moved second reading of Bill No. 3 — **An Act to amend The Companies Act.**

He said: This is a small amendment to the Companies Act and as the explanatory note indicates it adds the words to the present section in the definition of a private company: "where two or more persons hold one or more shares in the company jointly, they shall be counted as a single member". The effect of the proposed amendment will be to bring our Statute in line with Statutes in other provinces and also in the federal Companies Act. It was drawn to my attention a few months ago by one of the law firms in Regina that because this addition which we are now proposing was not in the section, there have been a number of companies incorporated in the province of Saskatchewan by various law firms, and because this proviso was not in the section there now becomes the question as to whether or not these companies are, in fact, private companies. Now, if this is true, then the Companies Office over the years has been in error in registering such companies as private companies, because normally they would have two signatures, whereas a public company requires three signatures.

Furthermore, as most of you will know, public companies without a prospectus being qualified their agreements are provisional only; and there are potentially serious consequences for many private companies in the province unless this amendment is proceeded with.

It is proposed to put the additional proviso in, which will bring it into line with other jurisdictions. With that short explanation, Mr. Speaker, I would move second reading.

February 21, 1966

Mr. A.E. Blakeney (Regina West): — Mr. Speaker, I don't mean to detain the house with any particularly extended comments on this bill. The Attorney General (Mr. Heald) has outlined the problem. It is a problem which I have become aware of in the last few weeks or months, primarily in the barristers' lounge at the Court House. I know that it has been the practice of some law firms to include in the memorandum, or articles of association, a provision with respect to this. That provision was of doubtful legality; this provision is a desirable one and I will certainly support it.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

Hon. D.V. Heald (Attorney General) moved second reading of Bill No. 5 — **An Act to amend The Municipal Hail Insurance Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, this is an act to amend the Municipal Hail Insurance Act. The amendments being proposed in this bill have been requested by the Saskatchewan Municipal Hail Insurance Association.

The bill provides that the Association may reinsure the contracts of insurance effected by its wholly owned subsidiary Additional Municipal Hail Limited.

Mr. Speaker, in past years, Additional Municipal Hail Limited reinsured its risks with line companies. Premiums amounting to about \$100,000 per year were paid for this reinsurance. The record of performance by the Saskatchewan Municipal Hail Insurance Association has been such that the Association, in our view, should now be permitted to reinsure these risks, the risks of its subsidiary company, should the delegates at the Association's Convention so approve by the two-thirds vote of the delegates. It has to be approved by their Convention by a two-thirds vote. We think they should be given this power.

The bill contains other amendments designed to facilitate the operation of the hail insurance plan. It provides that the board may, by order, withdraw from the operation of the act any land where for any reason it is of the opinion that the land should be withdrawn.

Mr. Speaker, this provision is designed to take care of a situation where a farmer whose land is not under the act, purchases a quarter section from a farmer whose land is under the act and takes no action to withdraw the quarter section. Under this amendment the board may withdraw the land, the principle being that all the land of a farmer must be under the act, or outside the act, either in or out. The farmer, of course, always retains the right to bring all of his land under the act by application to his municipal secretary.

Another amendment in the bill relates to the penalties for non-payment of taxes and for the postponement of such penalty. This merely confirms the practice that has been followed and brings the act into line with provisions of the Rural Municipality Act.

A further amendment clarifies the loss which will be paid by the Association for hail damage. Previously the act did not make clear that the Association was liable for only shatter loss in the case of crops cut, and lying in swath or sheaves, either on the ground or in stooks.

A further amendment provides the information which is to be supplied when making a claim and also simplifies the procedure.

These amendments tend to bring the law into line with the practice followed by the Association and by the line companies.

Mr. Speaker, with that explanation I would move second reading of this bill.

Mr. H.A. Broten (Watrous): — Mr. Speaker, these changes that are made were explained to me and another member on this side of the house. We would very much like to facilitate the work of the Municipal Hail. It has done a tremendous job for the Saskatchewan farmer in the past and these changes in the act, as far as we can see, would just facilitate the efficiency of the Municipal Hail as a whole.

Municipal Hail is a sort of an anchor as far as the hail insurance in Saskatchewan is concerned and as long as I can remember it has done a tremendous job for the farmer. I am pleased to see this change.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

Hon. D.V. Heald (Attorney General) moved second reading of Bill No. 6 — **An Act to amend The Trustee Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, this is an amendment to the Trustee Act. It is quite a simple amendment.

It was drawn to our attention when the amendments to the Trustee Act were brought in last year by the Trust Companies that from a practical standpoint it is almost impossible or prohibitive for a Trust Company with a large number of estates and trusts to maintain for each a separate bank account. The number of accounts could be exceedingly large and the work involved in handling such a mass of separate bank accounts and the necessary reconciliation of them would be most formidable. It is doubtful, furthermore, that the executors' compensation awarded would be sufficient to take care of the work involved, and I don't think anybody is anxious to do anything which would result in executors' compensation, or the executors applying to court for increased compensation. Therefore, we propose to make this slight amendment which will have the effect of exempting the Trust Companies registered and entitled to transact business of the Trust Company in Saskatchewan from the requirement to have a separate trust account for each estate or trust that they administer.

Now, by section 7, the proposed amendment to section 7, reference is made to registered securities and the amendment provides for the exception for Trust Companies from the present provision, requiring that securities be registered in the trustee's name as trustee for the particular trust for which the securities are held. It's the same kind of an amendment as the one to section 6. They would still have to hold them in trust but there would not be a requirement that they have to be in the name of that particular estate. So it's a similar amendment asked for by the Trust Companies Association of the province.

With that explanation, Mr. Speaker, I would move second reading of this bill.

Mr. A.E. Blakeney (Regina West): — Mr. Speaker, I think that no one can have any particular

objection to the proposals put forward by the Attorney General (Mr. Heald) since they will, by and large, simply reduce the amount of bookkeeping and facilitate the work of efficiently administering trusts. They have only one hazard and that is that if for any reason any of these trust companies should fail financially, or should fail to keep proper accounts, then innocent beneficiaries of the trust would suffer. This is in the highest degree unlikely to happen with respect to any of the established trust companies. I am not for one moment suggesting that any of the trust companies which are registered and entitled to transact business in Saskatchewan might not be perfectly sound. However, I would appreciate a comment from the Attorney General when he closes the debate to the effect that the government is reasonably satisfied on this score. I think that none of us will have missed the fact that the trust companies in other parts of Canada, and particularly in Ontario, were in very difficult circumstances, and indeed I think it's not too much to say were insolvent at the time of the Atlantic Acceptance failure. The situation was saved by some action on the part of the government of Ontario which involved a pledge of funds of the province of Ontario to a considerable sum of money. Because of an amalgamation, the government did not have to put up the money but this illustrates what can happen if trust companies are not prudent in the management of their investments.

My request then, Mr. Speaker, is that when the Attorney General is closing the debate on second reading, he include a comment on whether or not in the opinion of the government all of the trust companies which are registered and entitled to transact business in Saskatchewan are sufficiently sound so as to render it highly unlikely that they will either fail financially or will fail to keep their books and records in a proper condition.

Mr. Heald: — Mr. Speaker, in reply to the observations of the hon. member for Regina West (Mr. Blakeney), I would agree with his observation in respect to making sure, at least trying to make sure that these trust companies comply with all the requirements of the Trust Companies Act for registration, and we are certainly doing everything in our power to see that they do. We have stepped up, let me say, a system of inspections of trust companies in the province with the view in mind of making absolutely sure that the situation that the hon. member referred to would not happen in this province. We are doing our very best to scrutinize and screen very carefully any applications by new trust companies to do business in the province of Saskatchewan and I am satisfied that the trust companies which are here are complying with the act. As I say we will continue our investigations and inspections. If it comes to our attention that there are any violations of the provisions of the act, the matter will be dealt with forthwith.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

Hon. D.V. Heald (Attorney General) moved second reading of Bill No. 6 — **An Act to amend The Land Contracts (Actions) Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, this is an amendment which was requested by the Law Society of Saskatchewan at its last annual meeting. It's an amendment to the Land Contracts (Actions) Act. In that act at the present time, as all hon. members will know, provision is made that before a foreclosure action or a cancellation action an application for leave to foreclose has to be made to the District Court judge sitting as local Master. He looks into all the

circumstances and then decides whether to grant the permission to foreclose or cancel. He has power to allow leave, to dismiss the application or adjourn up to an eight month period. There is provision in the act at the present time for an appeal from the decision of the local Master to a judge of the Court of Queen's Bench. Then subsection 18 of section 3 in the act, as it presently is, provides that there shall be no further appeal.

Now, the purpose of this amendment is to provide an appeal from the judge of the Court of Queen's Bench, a further appeal only on the question of law. At the present time the field is restricted to an appeal to a Court of Queen's Bench judge. If this amendment is passed it would have the effect of providing that, on a question of law where some legal point is involved, it would be possible to appeal to the Court of Appeal. I think it is a reasonable amendment. I feel that on questions of fact you have the local Master who can make findings of fact. And on appeal to the Court of Queen's Bench, the judge has the power under the section to go into the facts again and make findings of fact. But for further appeals perhaps it's sensible and reasonable that the appeal should be restricted to a question of law. And that is the effect of the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I move second reading.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

Hon. D.V. Heald (Attorney General) moved second reading of Bill No. 8 — **An Act to amend The Farm Security Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, this is an amendment to the Farm Security Act, to update it really. The original act provides in subsections one and two of section two for a limitation of the application of the act to the years 1952, 1953 and 1954.

The act has been amended at three year intervals to bring this period up to date. In the present bill before the house, it provides for the amendment of the dates provided for in these two sections to the years '66, '67 and '68. Although this section would not come up for amendment until 1967, if the same three year interval were to be continued, the bill provides for it being amended this year so as to make it unnecessary to amend the act again next year.

Subsection 13 of section 7 of the act originally provided that that section remain in force until the first day of July, 1955. The act has been amended every second year since that date except for last year when the amendment was apparently inadvertently omitted.

Section three now brings this subsection up to the date of the first day of July, 1968 and by reason of the inadvertent omission of last year the updating is made retroactive to the first day of July, 1965. I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that this section will probably come up for amendment again in 1968.

With that explanation I would move second reading.

Mr. H.H.P. Baker (Regina East): — Mr. Speaker, I agree with extending this but I often wonder why this cannot be given some permanence and give it an indefinite period of time. I think this is a very important act and I would hope that we could amend it if it is possible at this session, so that we don't have to keep bringing it back every

second year. I realize that it has happened in the past, but I think that we must work on a degree of permanence for an act which is so important to the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Heald: — Mr. Speaker, by way of observation on the remarks of the hon. member for Regina East (Mr. Baker) I agree with him and we are looking into the possibility of making this a permanent statute. We haven't completed our investigations. There are some problems about making it permanent. But I hope that by another year we will be able to have a permanent bill. I thought the best thing to do this year was to bring it in for another three year period and that is why I have done it in this manner.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

Hon. D. Boldt (Minister of Social Welfare) moved second reading of Bill No. 10 — **An Act to provide for the Granting of Assistance to Persons in Need.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, the Saskatchewan Assistance Act is designed to ensure that only persons in need will receive assistance, that these persons will receive sufficient to live decently and that they will be helped to return to self support if possible.

The act will also enable the province of Saskatchewan to take full advantage of federal cost-sharing under the proposed Canada Assistance Plan. In somewhat more detail the legislation purports to do the following:

A single assistance program will replace the six programs which now exist. This will eliminate the present confusing variety of eligibility requirements, some of which have no relationship to need. It will also do away with duplication and administration and the allowances for basic maintenance will be increased by about 12 per cent for food, about 12 per cent for fuel, about 25 per cent for power. These are the items which have been questioned most frequently. Amounts for rent, clothing and board and room will be unchanged.

In substance these changes will mean an overall increase in expenditures of about six per cent. For example, a single person living alone will receive an increase of about six dollars per month; a couple about eight dollars a month; a family of four, twelve dollars; and a family of six about seventeen dollars a month.

Burial of indigents which has been a municipal responsibility will be included in the new program. So also will special allowances for older and handicapped persons who need special care.

Health services similar to those now available to certain present recipients such as older pensioners who receive supplementation will be provided to all recipients of assistance. Provision is also made for health services as required by medically indigent persons, that is, persons who are normally self-supporting but are unable to cope with expenses arising from illness.

Administration of the program in any given area will be the responsibility of a single agency. Where municipalities either singly or in association with other municipalities have a large enough caseload to warrant employing several field workers and a

supervisor, local administration will be encouraged. Where this is not feasible regional offices of the Department of Welfare will be responsible for administration. Where this occurs municipal representation of regional advisory boards will assure continued participation by local officials. Extensive counselling and other welfare services will be developed to the end that recipients will be rehabilitated and dependency prevented. This objective will take several years to achieve since it involves recruiting and training staff that are short in supply.

Work activity projects will be developed to assist in the rehabilitation of persons who cannot benefit either from training and educational institutions or on-the-job training with an employer. The projects will provide a combination of supervised employment, teaching of basic literacy and simple skills. They will be designed to improve the recipient's physical condition, work habits, and employee relationship.

All costs of the program including the allowances, health services and administration of local units and the department will be pooled. Municipalities collectively will pay five per cent of the total cost through a per capita of population annual assessment similar to that in the Social Aid Program. Municipalities are further protected from sharp increases in costs by a provision that their share of the costs will not increase more than three per cent a year, subject however to review every five years and whenever there is any major change in the component of the program. For example, if it should prove necessary in a year or two to make a further increase in benefits, a new base figure for the municipal share would be calculated, to which the three per cent escalation clause would then apply. There will be no residual responsibility of municipalities for welfare or health services to indigent people.

With these few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of this bill.

Mr. A.M. Nicholson (Saskatoon City): — Mr. Speaker, when the Minister of Welfare (Mr. Boldt) outlined the plans to the recent Provincial Municipal Conference which was held here, the legislation before us was well received by the representatives of local government. I am sure that there are many features that will make a strong appeal. The municipalities have felt for some years that the administrative costs for the cities in particular that have large caseloads, have placed a heavy burden on them. The costs of medical and hospital care from time to time placed a high charge on municipalities without being able to budget in advance. Frequently municipalities were not aware until they were notified that someone from the municipality was in hospital and the hospital or medical care had not been paid, and before this could be corrected the municipality was confronted with a very sizable bill.

I would appreciate it if the minister in concluding the debate would make some comment on the proposed increase in food costs. About a year ago now he was concerned that provisions for food for the cities was too high. I wonder if he would explain whether there has been an adjustment in the proposed schedule so that the proposal that he was speaking about now will in fact, for places like Regina and Saskatoon, mean an increase or a decrease in the bread and butter and the milk and eggs the people on social aid in the cities will have.

The other question on which I would appreciate having his comment, will this become effective regardless of if and when the

Canada Assistance Plan becomes law? I don't believe that the federal parliament has been able to get around to discussing this important legislation. It would appear that many other items are having priority before this. Will this legislation become effective in Saskatchewan on the date that the minister indicated when he was at the Provincial Municipal Conference namely April 1st?

I will have some questions to ask regarding the various clauses but in general I think that the proposals in this bill are in keeping with the best traditions which were established by Saskatchewan many years ago in trying to provide for those in society who for one reason or another require public assistance. This legislation will carry out several of the recommendations we have made to the federal government through the years.

Mr. A.E. Blakeney (Regina West): — Mr. Speaker, I simply wanted to add a word to the remarks of the hon. member for Saskatoon (Mr. Nicholson), and to say that I, and I am sure that most if not all of my colleagues on this side of the house, welcome this bill. It is one which, if it is to be dependent upon the Canada Assistance Plan, is one which has been under negotiation for five or six years in a general way with the federal government and one which has been consistently urged by this province and of course, by other provinces.

I was particularly interested in a couple of the principles which appear to be contained in the bill. Certainly welfare administration is something which is fraught with difficulty. And it is fraught with difficulty because it involves at least two elements: firstly the work of skilled professional people, and secondly, a knowledge of the local conditions where the welfare is being dispensed. The absence of either produces results which are unfortunate in some respect. It's not always easy to meld the two.

Where one has skilled professional people dispensing social welfare they tend to adopt uniform standards throughout large areas. The result is frequently an absence of the recognition of conditions which are peculiarly local and the result that comes about, the practical result, is that in some areas the program becomes unacceptable to the public because local knowledge involves at least two things. One is the variations in local costs, and it may well be that, for example, rent in one area may cost somewhat more than another. The other thing is the level of income in the area. I think that it tends to be unfortunate, in one particular sense, if welfare payments reach the average level of income in the area. It is unfortunate because the people who are earning this income tend to resent it and the program becomes unacceptable to the public. You may feel that this attitude on the part of those who are earning their income is ungracious, but you ignore it at your peril. If, in any area, welfare payments approximate to the average level of income of people who are earning, then you are in grave danger of discrediting the program in the eyes of those who are in the general area. This means that some local knowledge is essential. May I say that, however, the application only of local knowledge is almost equally unfortunate, or is even more unfortunate, since dispensing money is never the answer to welfare problems except in the short run. Counselling, however discouraging it may be, is still the best attack on welfare problems. This doesn't mean that many of the people who are counselled don't ignore the counsel, but that's life's little problems, and we are not going to cure that overnight. We shouldn't on that account be discouraged and we shouldn't assume that counselling is ineffective.

I sometimes feel it is unfortunate that people regard social welfare counselling as part of the administration, and they judge the efficiency of a social welfare program by how much money can be ladled out and how little can be spent in administration. Now, this is a faulty measure because sometimes money which is paid out in aid is the money which is wasted in the sense that it will bring no permanent benefit, and money which is paid in administration is the money which in fact is saved because it will bring some permanent benefit. Certainly as the minister pointed out, the object of the program is to make people able to look after themselves. No government wants to run a program which will make people wards of the government in any continuing sense if it can at all be avoided.

The method of doing this in the act is, I think, rather ingenious, the method of setting up units. This is not new but it was not extensively used before. There were groups of municipalities that got together and were able thereby to support a skilled social worker. But I hope that the phrasing of this act means that this will be much more frequently the case. I acknowledge the difficulty facing the minister in recruiting these people. They are not easy to come by, but I would urge that every effort be made to get groups of municipalities to get a welfare officer who is trained and skilled and who will have a sufficiently small caseload and geographical area that he can get at some of these problem cases and keep them from being the bane of all social welfare workers, namely second generation or third generation welfare people.

I hope that the scheme of the act means that this is the program which the government is going to adopt and certainly I and my colleagues will wish them well. I am sure also that those of us who have wrestled with them will be happy to see the elimination of all of these categorical programs. Even when you are close to this type of thing it is not easy to keep in your mind the subtle differences between the means test under OAA and the needs test under OASSA or as the case may be. They become alphabetical and confusing pretty rapidly. For the most part their origins are historical and not based on the relative needs of the recipients. I would hope that the comprehensive program will allow administration not only to be more efficient but also to appear more fair and more understandable to the general public. As I say, I think this is important in welfare programs. It's all too easy, too, for members of the public to decry these sorts of programs and to suggest that people on welfare are just there for the ride. This is comparatively rare but I don't think that we in the administration of our programs should in any way contribute to encouraging public criticism of programs by making them complex, and the differences difficult or impossible to explain.

In the result then, Mr. Speaker, I welcome the bill and I hope that it means that the government will be entering upon a dynamic program of welfare counselling in an effort to rehabilitate as many of these people and place them in a position to support themselves, as is possible under the circumstances.

Mr. W.J. Berezowsky (Cumberland): — I think that if by the passing of this bill we can speed up or expedite and screen the applicants who need assistance of any kind, then it is of course a worthwhile venture.

I know that at the present time because of local prejudices certain people I know have been denied the kind of assistance

they need. I think that by centralization, the increased rate of assistance and ability to screen without any prejudice that we will be doing a much more effective job of helping those who need help.

I would like the minister to comment on this point. I think he is quite aware of situations that have existed in my constituency. I have, on occasion, had to write to the minister to look into cases. From his point of view, he may have thought his action was right, but from my point of view I thought I, too, was perfectly in the right to speak on behalf of people who I thought weren't getting the kind of square deal that they should have had.

I hope this bill will eliminate situations where a person who is half starved cannot get the kind of help he should have. I would like to point out to the minister that he did write me a letter, that I have at no time used my position as a politician to influence anybody be it in local governments or the minister himself. I have only spoken for needy people because it was necessary to speak on their behalf and I have spoken against people who didn't need it. Now, if it is the intent of the act to make it more efficient, to screen better, so those people who need assistance, get it, and those people who don't need it, don't get it, then I will certainly be happy to support this bill.

Mr. Boldt: — Mr. Speaker, first I would like to thank the member for Regina West (Mr. Blakeney) for the remarks he made. I think they were very constructive. It definitely is the aim of the department and the government to do what he outlined, or thought that we were going to do.

The member for Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) mentioned that there were some people not receiving aid because of prejudice, and that sometimes he thought I was right, and maybe he was right. I just want to let him know that I, at no time, made a decision whether a person is eligible for welfare or not. The regulations are set out so that the local people decide this. If somebody is not treated fair there are two avenues that we have used since we took office in 1964. Maybe it was different under the previous administration. But this is the only way I would want to have it. If the local welfare officials refuse aid they must advise the applicant that he may appeal. If the local welfare board upholds the welfare officer's decision, then he must in turn advise that he can appeal to the Welfare Board here in Regina and I believe this is the way we have kept policies out of welfare.

Then the hon. member for Saskatoon (Mr. Nicholson) asked the two questions regarding the increase in food. I would like to remind the hon. member that the Social Aid Act of 1958, the statutes were announced or arrived at in 1958. There were six years under NDP administration where no increases were permitted. When we took office we certainly had to clean up, if I may say so, certain areas in welfare where people were receiving aid that were not entitled to it. We have been busy. I can assure the hon. member that there are a good number of people today that were on aid when he was the minister, who are not on aid today; they are serving a useful purpose in society.

The other question was, "When will the effective date of increase of the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan take effect?" We have every assurance that the federal Canada Assistance Plan will be introduced into the federal house shortly and we go on the

assumption that the Saskatchewan Assistance Act will commence April 1st, 1966.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

Hon. D. Boldt (Minister of Social Welfare) moved second reading of Bill No. 11 — **An Act to amend The Child Welfare Act.**

He said: The amendments we are proposing to the Child Welfare Act are designed to remove certain out-dated references and procedures in the act and to streamline other procedures related to adoptions and other aspects of child welfare. We propose to delete all references to Children's Aid Society from the act for the simple reason that there are no longer any such societies in the province. We propose to facilitate holding court hearings pertaining to the neglect of the child by permitting less than the present five day notice of hearing if the person not having received five clear days is willing to waive the right, and to do away with the unnecessary formality of advising the Director of Child Welfare of the hearing.

Inasmuch as a child is committed to the care of the minister at the disposition of a hearing, we plan to do away with the inconsistency of vesting custody of a child in the Director while a case is being adjourned.

Another amendment is designed to give the minister more flexibility in deciding what is in the best interests of wards age 16 and over who leave school but refuse to try to find work to become self-supporting because they contend that the minister is responsible for their shelter and support until they reach 21 years of age.

With regards to wards who marry we propose that the fact that they have married should discharge him or her from the minister's care without the need to pass an Order in Council to terminate the wardship. At the present time the religious background of children who come into our care is determined by the faith of the mother, if the child is born out of wedlock, or the father if the parents are married. Because this is frequently difficult to determine, we propose to permit mothers or parents to designate the faith in which they wish the child to be brought up. The finalization of an adoption currently requires one year probation period. To speed this matter we propose that with the Director's approval the couple may apply for an Order of Adoption after a six month probation period. We are also proposing a new section that will remove some of the involvements encountered by adopting parents who move elsewhere during the probation period. To this we propose that judges should be empowered to finalize adoptions when the child is a ward of the minister and the application for adoption is made while the parents still reside in the province.

With these few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of this bill.

Mr. A.M. Nicholson (Saskatoon City): — Mr. Speaker, the minister has outlined a few important changes here. I would like a chance to question him, so I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

February 21, 1966

Hon. D. Boldt (Minister of Social Welfare) moved second reading of Bill No. 12 — **An Act to amend The Housing and Special-Care Homes Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, this bill is to amend The Housing and Special-Care Homes Act. As most of you know the cost of constructing housing and special-care homes is generally met by a non-repayable government grant amounting to 20 per cent, a CMHC loan amounting to 72 per cent and the remaining eight per cent is paid by the sponsoring group. In the case of municipal-sponsored projects this eight per cent is usually raised by the sale of debentures. Under municipal legislation it is necessary for the burgesses to vote before the by-law relating to the issue of debentures can be passed. We propose to simplify this procedure by withdrawing the need to submit this matter to a vote unless it is required by the Local Government Board. Provisions similar to this were in the former Housing and Nursing Homes Act, but were inadvertently omitted when the Housing and Special-Care Homes Act was passed during the 1965 session of the legislature.

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

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

Hon. J.C. McIsaac (Minister of Municipal Affairs) moved second reading of Bill No. 13 — **An Act to amend The Tax Enforcement Act.**

He said: There is just one short amendment, actually, to the Tax Enforcement Act in this bill. The act presently requires that a list of lands in respect of which there are tax arrears be prepared by the Treasurer and a copy of that list be advertised in Saskatchewan Gazette, and a newspaper circulating in the municipality. The act further requires that four copies of that list be posted in the municipal office and six copies be posted elsewhere in the municipality. This list actually states that if tax arrears are not paid a lien will be registered.

Now, the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities has suggested that since the list is published in the Gazette and in the newspaper, it is not necessary to have four copies posted in the municipal office and six copies posted throughout the municipality. This amendment will require the posting of one copy of the list in the municipal office only. Now, they tell me that this provision is not now being practised, that most Secretaries, I am told, put the four notices under the one thumbtack on the wall, and the six throughout the municipality are often in some cases tacked to the nearest telephone pole.

With those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I will move second reading of this bill.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

Hon. J.C. McIsaac (Minister of Municipal Affairs) moved second reading of Bill No. 14 — **An Act to amend The Local Improvement Districts Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, this bill proposes certain amendments to the Local Improvements Districts Act. Throughout the year the committees of the Local Improvements Districts, the LIDs as they are known, suggest certain changes in this act to permit more

effective government in various districts. The officials of our LID branch in my department, on occasion, also encounter some difficulties in carrying out certain provisions. These amendments here will bring this act more into line with the other municipal acts and will also alleviate some of the problems encountered in administering the act. I believe that all of the amendments are of a non-controversial nature, and can be, perhaps, best discussed in committee.

With these remarks I will move second reading of this bill.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

Hon. J.M. Cuelenaere (Minister of Natural Resources) moved second reading of Bill No. 15 — **An Act of Consent respecting the adoption of the Manitoba-Saskatchewan boundary as surveyed by the Manitoba-Saskatchewan Boundary Commission during the years 1961 and 1962.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, the title to the act almost explains it. The object and the purpose of the act is merely to ratify and confirm the survey of the boundary between the provinces of Manitoba and Saskatchewan. The work was done under the Boundary Commissions during 1961 and 1962.

Mr. Speaker, with these very few words I move second reading of this bill.

Mr. W.J. Berezowsky (Cumberland): — Mr. Speaker, has that section around Flin Flon been completed? I don't think it was finished last year. It was a section that wasn't surveyed. Is it now completed?

Mr. Cuelenaere: — Mr. Speaker, the survey was completed a very short time ago and it is now completed.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

Hon. J.M. Cuelenaere (Minister of Natural Resources) moved second reading of Bill No. 16 — **An Act of Consent respecting the adoption of the Saskatchewan-Northwest Territories boundary as surveyed by the Saskatchewan-Northwest Territories Boundary Commission during the years 1953 to 1962.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, this bill is somewhat similar to the previous one except that it is to ratify and confirm the survey of the boundary between Saskatchewan and the Northwest Territories. The work on the boundary was conducted under the Boundary Commission during the years 1953 to 1962. I move second reading of the bill.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

Hon. D. McFarlane (Minister of Agriculture) moved second reading of Bill No. 17 — **An Act respecting Agricultural Societies.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, the Agricultural Societies have a long and proud record of service and support to the agricultural industry in the province. Many societies have celebrated their fiftieth anniversary and several have observed their seventy-fifth anniversary.

February 21, 1966

Agricultural Societies are administered by the Director of the Extension Division of the University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, and the provincial government, the Department of Agriculture, makes various grants to the different societies. They conduct a wide range of agricultural events ranging from fairs — and there are over 50 of these in the province at the present time — to pure-bred livestock shows and sales, field crop and garden crop competitions, and farm boys and girls camps. They sponsor the 4H clubs and arrange field days throughout the province and arrange demonstrations and short courses and lectures and so on. In spite of the fact that the act has not been substantially altered for many years, the revised act does not involve very significant changes in principle. The provision was undertaken at the request of the Agricultural Societies Association, and in close consultation with the Director of Agricultural Societies and Director of the Association.

The objects of an agricultural society have been rewritten to bring them more in line with modern activities of the societies and the needs of agriculture in the province today. Where the organization of an agricultural society, in the present act today, rests very largely on the discretion of the minister, the revised act requires approval of the Agricultural Societies Association, but still maintains a measure of ministerial direction. Annual fees and like membership fees are not prescribed in the revised act but will be fixed by each society. Some additional latitude is given in the dates of the meetings, the reports, the filings, the returns, and so on. The section on grants has been re-written to remove some of the obsolete provisions. The present very restrictive section on liquidation has been revised to authorize disposition of the assets of a liquidated Society to community organizations in the districts. While the changes from the present act are not major changes in principle, we believe the revised act will better meet the needs of the Agricultural Societies, and give them modern terms of references in their program of service to the agricultural industry.

With that brief resume, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading.

Mr. J.H. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

Hon. D.V. Heald (Attorney General) moved second reading of Bill No. 9 — **An Act Providing for Certain Temporary Changes in the Law respecting Agricultural Lease-holds.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 9 is a bill of a temporary nature, applicable to 1965 crops. It is in a form similar to previous statutes passed in other years. The purpose of the bill is to give tenants whose leases expired, the right of re-entry for the purpose only of removing threshed grain which could not be marketed during the lease year 1965, owing to shortage of elevator storage space, or impossibility of sale. This is a statute which has been going on for a number of years and this is simply updated to make it apply to the crop year 1965 for tenants whose lease expired, say at the end of the year.

With that explanation, Mr. Speaker, I would move second reading of this bill.

Mr. E. Whelan (Regina North): — Mr. Speaker, I think this legislation is necessary. It is realistic, particularly when there is a shortage of storage space, or when a period of bad weather prevails. This particular year when there is a boxcar shortage, I think it is necessary for the government to re-introduce it.

The Mediation Board seldom makes an order under this legislation but it does give the board the right to negotiate. I certainly approve of the principle contained in the bill.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

Hon. D. McFarlane (Minister of Agriculture) moved second reading of Bill No. 18 — **An Act respecting the Prevention and Control of Disease among Animals.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, the present act, The Contagious Disease of Animals Act was enacted mainly to give authority to the provincial testing program for the control of brucellosis. Now that the federal Health of Animals Branch has undertaken the responsibility and in fact, completed three years ago the first general test of the province, the present act in some respects would appear to be obsolete. While other diseases were mentioned in the act it is considered that this somewhat vague authority was inadequate if emergency situations arose, or if health inspection of stockyards was required, or if special measures for disease control were necessary.

The Livestock Products Act also does not carry sufficient authority for making regulations for the control of animal diseases. The need for broadening the meaning of the present act is becoming increasingly apparent as diseases such as anthrax and rabies are now being diagnosed with more frequency, and diseases such as infectious bovine rhinotracheitis, mucosal disease, vibriosis, not encountered 10 or more years ago are now diagnosed quite regularly in the province. Changing farm practices, confinement feeding, and feedlot problems have changed the general disease picture. Increased and improved veterinary services, coupled with technological advances and diagnosis have resulted in a changed attitude toward these day-to-day disease problems.

The fact that rabies has been identified in southern Saskatchewan through the wildlife population, and that skunks appear to be mainly responsible for infecting farm animals, has made it necessary to redefine and broaden the meaning of animal to include all animals and birds. Rabies, however, is only one factor.

Diseases of fur-bearing animals are not covered under this act and if virus enteritis of mink ever spreads into this province, regulations for its control too, would become very necessary. Aside from such specific instances, there are other diseases involving wild life and domestic animals, and also involving humans which made it desirable to have all animals covered under the new act.

Foot and mouth disease can infect deer; anthrax has killed buffalo in Alberta; and wild birds are now known to carry the virus of horse-sleeping sickness; and there are wide varieties of diseases in nature of consequence to farm animals and humans. The cause of the variety of diseases which may need regular control in the proposed new legislation, either uses the words infectious or contagious when defining disease or specifically

mentions any one disease.

Extreme measures may be warranted even before a definite diagnosis, and until the cause of the problem, has been determined. This could happen in a case of rinderpest, bovine, pleuro pneumonia, or African swine fever, or even foot-and-mouth disease.

The international movement today is such that the introduction of these and other infections is by no means a remote possibility, and present legislation would be unequal to the situation. Disease, therefore, is now being defined as any condition which adversely affects the health of the animal, and authority is given to make regulations covering the disposition of diseased animals, the quarantine of premises or areas, except dwellings, and the prohibition of any sale in any infectious or contagious disease. This is confirmed and vaccination for this infection will also be done as required.

A definition of “dealer” and “stock yard” has been added in the case where health inspection of animals exposed for sale at auction marts and stock yards not under federal control is desired. This could be implemented to mean a specific disease problem. For example, improper records, or no records at all or stock yards, added greatly to the difficulty of the Health of Animals Branch in bringing the hog cholera epidemic in eastern Canada under control a few years ago.

A new provision is the authority given to the minister to pay compensation for farm animals which have died or been destroyed on account of disease, and to assist in the disposal of carcasses, and disinfection of premises after disease outbreak.

This section is designed so that if it should prove necessary compensation could be paid for farm animals which die of rabies, or to assist the owners with the disposal of dead animals and disinfection after an anthrax outbreak. In general we think that this updating of the act will put us in a position to take steps as may be necessary to protect our growing livestock industry in this province against disease.

With those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I wish to move second reading of this bill.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

Hon. G.J. Trapp (Minister of Education) moved second reading of Bill No. 20 — **An Act to amend the Secondary Education Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, this small amendment is required in order to manage comprehensive type schools. Boards in cities, towns and units are proceeding to set up arrangements for joint administration. This amendment establishes authority for this procedure. I don't think it needs any lengthy explanation, but it allows boards of various types to make arrangements with other boards to operate and administer a joint school. I would move second reading of this bill.

Mr. A.E. Blakeney (Regina West): — Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether I am clear on the purposes of this bill. As I understood the Minister of Education (Mr. Trapp) this bill is to provide for the establishing of a joint board to administer a comprehensive school. There have in

the past been schools operated by two or more school boards and I instance the technical high school at Prince Albert which is operated by three school boards, the Public School Board, the Separate School Board and the board of the Prince Albert School Unit No. 56. I assume that the legislation which is provided for here will be legislation which will give a name to, and facilitate, similar arrangements where such boards may be operating with respect to the comprehensive schools. If this is the case, then there can be no particular objection to this proposal since it is necessary in order to facilitate these joint efforts.

If, on the other hand, there is some other or further purpose it would be appreciated if the minister would indicate it. There may well be other amendments to the Secondary Education Act; I don't know whether other amendments will be forthcoming at this session. If they are not, an opportunity to consider some of the problems arising under that legislation will be sought.

I think that a not dissimilar problem is arising where boards are being established which are joint in the sense that they are boards operating two school districts, one under the School Act and one under the Secondary Education Act — the so-called Board of Education. It is my understanding that a joint board under the Secondary Education Act has nothing to do with the Board of Education which operates two school districts, one under the School Act and one under the Secondary Education Act. The problem of the Board of Education is one which surrounds the difference in the tax base under the School Act and under the Secondary Education Act. If changes in either of those acts in order to resolve that problem are contemplated it would be appreciated if the minister would in closing the debate, refer to this. If, on the other hand, I am correct in thinking that joint boards here are dealing only with comprehensive schools only, then any remarks on the problems of Boards of Education would be out of order and I will refrain from making them.

Mr. Trapp: — I might inform the hon. member from Regina West (Mr. Blakeney) that this has to do with joint boards and not with boards of education.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

Hon. G.J. Trapp (Minister of Education) moved second reading of Bill No. 21 — **An Act to amend The School Attendance Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, the amendment here is deleting a section which calls for the Attendance Officer to provide the teacher with a census of all the students who are eligible for school attendance. Now, for many years this has not been done by the Attendance Officer. It is rightly and has been done for many, many years by the school principal or the school teachers, and now in most areas the Attendance Officer in the units is the Unit Secretary. He is not aware of the students that are in the various areas of the unit and really it is done by the principal I can say in all cases, or teacher, so it is obsolete anyway. So I would like to have this part deleted from the act.

I move second reading of this bill.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

February 21, 1966

Hon. G.J. Trapp (Minister of Education) moved second reading of Bill No. 22 — **An Act to amend The Teachers' Salary Negotiation Act.**

He said: This is somewhat similar to No. 19 in content in that it provides for the Teachers' Salary Negotiation Act to be mentioned in conjunction with joint boards and boards of education that they operate a school that the Salary Negotiation Act will also apply to those joint operated schools. This is the purpose of this amendment.

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

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

Hon. G.J. Trapp (Minister of Education) moved second reading of Bill No. 23 — **An Act to amend The Teacher Tenure Act.**

He said: This is to see that the Teacher Tenure Act applies to schools operated by a board of education or a joint board. There is some doubt now in the act whether these would be recognized and I think it should be stated. The purpose of this amendment is to assure that the Teacher Tenure Act applies to schools operated jointly or operated by a board of education. I move second reading of this bill, Mr. Speaker.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

Hon. L.P. Coderre (Minister of Labour) moved second reading of Bill No. 24 — **An Act to amend The Hours of Work Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, in giving second reading to this bill, the amendment is brought in to clarify the exemption sections which deal with work performed on or about the farm. The main difference between the old and the new provisions is that the present exemptions legally permit full exemption under The Hours of Work Act for any employee, as an example, who installs waterworks on farms. The new section clarifies his position and makes it so that if a person is on the farm doing work other than farm culture then the hours of work do apply. I move that Bill No. 24 be now read a second time.

Mr. W.E. Smishek (Regina East): — In checking the proposed amendment contained in this bill, it would appear there is some tightening up of this particular section. I don't know really what problems the Department of Labour did experience in the administration of this particular section, but I would be inclined to go along with the amendment. Mr. Speaker, the other day when the minister gave notice that there is going to be an amendment to the Hours of Work Act I had hoped that there would be some real and significant amendments proposed. I do regret the minister did not see fit to bring in meaningful and important amendments which I think are necessary and needed in today's changing work place. I think it is time the government moved into legislating a shorter work week. They made promises back in 1964 that they would maintain and improve workers' wages, vacations and hours of work. If this is the way the government proposes to be improving legislation, we will be waiting for many, many years before we will have any significant improvement in the hours of work legislation. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the time is right now to bring meaningful and important changes. I do regret that the government did not see fit to bring

in the 40 hour work week. I also regret that during the last session the Minister of Labour saw fit to move a six month hoist to the bill I proposed. In view of that, Mr. Speaker, I might inform the members opposite that it is my intention during this session to bring in a further amendment to the Hours of Work Act which will be meaningful, which will be significant, and which is going to be a bill that labor has been asking for, a bill proposing a 40 hour work week for the majority of the people in the province.

Hon. W. Ross Thatcher (Premier): — Which will be defeated.

Mr. Coderre: — It is very peculiar, Mr. Speaker, that every time the hon. members opposite get up on their feet in regard to any type of legislation which can be progressive they always have a heck of a lot more to add to it. They had 20 years to bring in this legislation. Now that they are in the opposition they are talking a lot. Some mention has been made in this house, Mr. Speaker, that there shall be a review of the minimum wage. When this situation takes place you will find, Mr. Speaker, that the hours of work will automatically adjust without having to be told. I don't think that we need any members of the opposition to tell us what to do, how to do it. Though they can criticize when the legislation comes in, they can bring in the proper amendments if they see fit.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

Hon. L.P. Coderre (Minister of Labour) moved second reading of Bill No. 25 — **An Act to amend the Annual Holidays Act.**

He said: In introducing Bill No. 25 the same explanation deals with it, Mr. Speaker, so I need not go any further explaining the intent and purpose. They are identically the same.

I move that Bill No. 25 be now read the second time.

Mr. W.E. Smishek (Regina East): — Mr. Speaker, here too the amendment as noted is very small, very insignificant and is again a wee bit of a tightening of the legislation. But again, Mr. Speaker, I wish to comment that this is not in keeping with the promises that workers were led to believe that, with the election of the Liberal government, some significant and important measures would be taken to improve annual vacations.

It will be remembered, Mr. Speaker, that the CCF administration was the first to lead with an Annual Vacation Act which gave every worker in the province two weeks' annual vacation after one year of service. Several years later the CCF government amended the act to provide for three weeks' annual vacation after five years. In this respect, Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan still leads the way. It is the only province which provides by law three weeks' annual vacation after five years of service with the same employer. There are many changes taking place in industry with the advent of technology at the work place. I think it is time that governments recognized if we are going to keep our work force employed, that improvement in annual vacations is very important. Also, Mr. Speaker, it has been recognized by engineers, by scientists, by health authorities that in today's automated industry people are subjected to a great deal more pressure and that people do need more time off work in order to be able to keep up with

February 21, 1966

the speed that our world is moving at. I think it is high time, Mr. Speaker, that governments recognize this need — the importance of improving annual vacations with pay.

I had hoped when the minister announced the other day that amendments will be brought to the Annual Holidays Act that we would have moved this year with three weeks annual vacation after one year of service and that we would have recognized that four weeks vacation by law is timely.

Many unions and employers have negotiated in collective bargaining agreements four weeks' vacation after longer periods of service, in some cases after 20 years, some cases 15, and in some cases 10. The government itself, to its own employees, some years ago recognized the need for extended vacations. Four weeks' annual vacation after lengthy years of service has been recognized as a principle. Mr. Speaker, the amendment proposed, as I said, does tighten the statute a wee bit. I am disappointed because the amendment does not go far enough. I would urge the minister that in the future let's have something with some meat on it instead of these kinds of skeletons.

Mr. Coderre: — I hear Gabriel blowing his horn again. After twenty years, Mr. Speaker, I can assure this house this government will certainly continue to look after the welfare of the working force of this province better than the former administration has done. This government believes, Mr. Speaker, in the bargaining process to the maximum and will respect this bargaining process. It has been mentioned a moment ago there are many organizations or people who are now having five weeks' holiday with pay. This has been done through the bargaining process. The government fully respects that. I don't believe there is anything else to add, Mr. Speaker.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

Hon. L.P. Coderre (Minister of Labour) moved second reading of Bill No. 26 — **An Act to amend The Northern Co-operative Association Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, in introducing Bill No. 26, as many members are aware, this is to make it possible to reduce the annual instalments payable to the Provincial Treasury for the balance owing on the original purchase of \$275,000 for the six stores that were formally operated by the Saskatchewan Government Trading which had consistently lost money. The Indians and Metis have made it pay. Two of these stores will be paid out as of March 31st, leaving a balance roughly of \$88,000. Now, rather than make it compulsory for the four stores remaining to make a minimum annual payment of \$12,000, the amendment makes it possible to negotiate a smaller annual amount more suited to their earning power. They can still pay beyond the amount that has been set; naturally they will be able to earn the 50 per cent grant on the amount to pay. I think this is a good indication, Mr. Speaker, that people of Indian ancestry can do a better job in handling their affairs than the Socialists have done in the past.

I move that Bill No. 26 be now read a second time.

Mr. A.E. Blakeney (Regina West): — Mr. Speaker, I only hope that the minister knows something more about the Department of Labour than he displays

that he knows about the Department of Co-operation. I certainly hope he knows more about the Department of Co-operation than he does about Northern Co-operative Trading Services or its predecessor, Saskatchewan Government Trading. He speaks as if it was the government of which he was a member who introduced the enlightened policy of turning over . . . Mr. Speaker, I have a great deal of assistance from members opposite, and it's a greatly . . .

An Hon. Member: — You need it.

Mr. Blakeney: — That may be. That may be but I need it from somewhat better qualified persons than those opposite.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, he speaks as if it were the policy of his government to turn over the crown corporations to co-operatives owned and operated by the people of Saskatchewan. I know that Saskatchewan Government Trading was in fact turned over to a local co-operative and is controlled by the people who use it. I know that Saskatchewan Fish Marketing Service has been turned over to a co-operative and is controlled by the people who use it. I wish, Mr. Speaker, that I could say the same for the crown corporations which the government opposite has dismantled since it came to office. What caused me to rise to my feet was the wholly erroneous statement, evidently concurred in by the Minister of Public Health (Mr. Steuart) but then of course, he is not very well informed in this field either, that Saskatchewan Government Trading had in fact lost money. In fact, Saskatchewan Government Trading consistently made money, year after year, and if any of the members opposite can tell me any two or three year period in which that corporation lost money I would be delighted to hear from them. I don't think, in fact, that it lost money in any single year since it was set up in 1949; but if it did it was only for a single year and its record of earnings was consistently good. Profit was not large. The object of the corporation was not to make large profits and certainly the object of the successor corporation, Northern Co-operative Trading Services, will not be to make large profits. Each of them have the same objective, to return the maximum amount in dividends by way of cash, or goods at low prices, to the people of the north. I realize that that is an objective which won't find much favor from members opposite, but it is one which was pursued by Saskatchewan Government Trading with a good deal of success and is now being pursued by Northern Co-operative Trading Services. I think in fact that it speaks very highly for Saskatchewan Government Trading that this co-operative was set up and I believe that since 1949 every effort was made to introduce the Indian and Metis people of the north to commercial operations.

Committees were set up, advisory committees to these stores, and after a period of some eight to ten years it was believed that these ventures could be launched as co-operatives and that the people of the north could take a greater interest and part in providing themselves, through Saskatchewan Government Trading and Northern Co-operative Trading Services, with the goods that they needed to purchase. This was done. A look at the bill will indicate that in the early years the new venture was to be guided by the organized co-operative movement and as time went on the organized co-operative movement would withdraw and leave the store to the operation of the local co-operative. This is in fact

being done, or it was being done until the change of government. I expect that not even they would have the temerity to turn back on such an enlightened policy and so I expect it is still being done. And if it is being done it is greatly to the credit of the persons who established Saskatchewan Government Trading and those who conceived the idea of creating a co-operative from it, and it is greatly to the credit of the northern people themselves, the Indian and Metis, who are in fact making a go of this venture. I think that the fact that it has been tried — and I haven't seen any new ventures in the last two years of this kind — the fact that it has been tried is, as I have said, greatly to the credit of those who started it and to those who are carrying it on successfully. I think that the minister does himself little credit when introducing a bill like this when he makes somewhat snide but wholly erroneous remarks about the predecessor of Northern Co-operative Trading Services Limited.

Mr. Coderre: — My Socialist friend across the way always tried to put words in the mouth of somebody else. I made it quite clear a moment ago that the Northern Trading Stores were losing money at that particular time when it was under the government administration. The only reason that they made any money is that they were selling to all government departments up north and were compelled to buy to these stores. If they say that .09 per cent is a profit, well, I suppose it is, but I'm telling you it is very minimal. The only time that they showed a reasonable profit that was a little above that, that was just pre-election year, so I presume that there was a lot of handling or 'finagling' in order to bring up the books at that particular time so that they wouldn't be criticized. But I did say a moment ago the Socialists couldn't do a good job; then they had to unload it. They gave it to the people themselves, the Indians and Metis, and they have done a good job. I made it quite clear. But he is trying to warp the picture constantly.

I mentioned also sometime in the past that there are new ventures. Apparently at this point in the debate I cannot inject any new ones. But there are many new ventures coming on continually and will continue under this administration. When you consider, Mr. Speaker, that some 50 co-operatives in this province this year and last year have been celebrating their 50th anniversary, it indicates that the co-operative movement is a lot older than the Socialists across the way and will live.

Socialism does not breed co-operation, Mr. Speaker; it destroys it.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

Hon. L.P. Coderre (Minister of Labour and Co-operatives) moved second reading of Bill No. 27 — **An Act to amend The Co-operative Association Act.**

He said: In introducing the next bill, Mr. Speaker, I should like to say that these amendments have been requested by the Co-operative Union and groups within the co-operative movement.

The amendments, by deleting certain words, are made to clarify the powers of an association and to spell out its own procedures for amending its local by-laws over and above the minimum provisions in the act. For example, an association might want three-fourths of a majority for amendments to by-laws originating

from the floor instead of a minimum of two-thirds as prescribed in the act.

There is another amendment that enables 100 members of an association or ten per cent of the total membership, whichever is less, to petition the directors to call a special meeting. These alternatives will be useful for a large association where ten per cent requirements would be almost impracticable.

Another section of course, is applicable where we find that some highly specialized agricultural production co-operatives have a small membership. Sometimes the membership declines to seven and where there are six directors. The amendment would enable the association like this to have a quorum where all members are directors and the majority constitutes a quorum under the standard by-laws. In other words, it makes it possible for co-operatives incorporated under other legislation to register under the Co-operative Association Act and to secure the extra powers in this act. Sometimes it is found that co-operatives don't have or do not wish to continue to be registered under section 134.

With these explanations, Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill No. 27 to amend the Co-operative Association Act be read a second time.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

Hon. L.P. Coderre (Minister of Labour and Co-operatives) moved second reading of Bill No. 28 — **An Act to amend The Credit Union Act.**

He said: In moving Bill No. 28, Mr. Speaker, the amendment provides that the section enables members at an annual meeting or a special meeting to authorize the board to borrow up to 50 per cent of the combined share capital, surplus and deposits to finance credit union operations.

The amendment provides that these ceilings on borrowings by credit unions shall not apply where the proceeds are used in making loans guaranteed in whole or in part by the government of Canada or the provincial government or a municipal body.

Another section is that in case of dissolution of a credit union any unclaimed balance may be paid over the Mutual Aid Board, within one year instead of ten years in case where a credit union is continuing.

A new section 116 is added to give the Mutual Aid Board the power to take in these unclaimed balances mentioned in the new section 52A and to maintain the records and pay them out if the holders are located. The Mutual Aid Board is appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council.

With these words, Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill No. 28 be now read a second time.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

BROADCASTING TIME RE SPEECHES

Mr. F.A. Dewhurst (Wadena): — Mr. Speaker, I note from the report which is in our White Paper here that the time allocated to the members on both sides of the house works out to 21½ minutes per member for the

February 21, 1966

government side members and 20¾ minutes for the official opposition. That doesn't take into consideration the half-hour, 30 minutes for the lone Conservative member. These figures I have worked out is as of the time that the report was made out. It is true that since the results of the by-election in Bengough it would make some difference on these statistics but nevertheless when the report was made up it favors government members by ¾ of a minute per member.

I recall a few years ago that I sat on this committee several years running allocating radio time. The argument was brought up year after year that there are two sides to every story. That there was the government side of the story and the opposition side of the story, therefore there should be half the time allocated to each. Mr. Speaker, I didn't agree at that time that there should be half of the time allocated to the government and half to the opposition. Nor do I say so now. I still don't believe that this radio time should be divided as to government and opposition. We are here as members representing constituencies and it should be divided as equally as possible on the basis on members.

In the past, also, the time was not allocated to one side of the house or the other for the Speaker. While it is true that the Speaker represents formally the government side of the house, in the legislature the Speaker has to play a neutral role. The Speaker has to come in whether it is air time or not when necessary. Therefore the time for the Speaker was not allocated to one side or the other. That being the case in the past, the time was split just as closely as possible to a fraction of a minute with the benefit going to the opposition.

Now, on this occasion I see that it is ¾ of a minute less for the official opposition members than it is for government members. Yet the member for Arm River gets an extra 13 minutes, or gets an extra 10 minutes, but I know that it was due to no kindheartedness on behalf of the government members of that committee. It wasn't their generosity that forced him to take the extra ten minutes. I am sure of that. I've sat on this committee too often before to know what goes on in those committees.

Also too, Mr. Speaker, I see that the total amount of time is reduced to 1215 minutes where in previous years it has been 1500 minutes. I don't know why the time was cut down. The time was cut off for the first part of last week during the Bengough by-election. It is also, I understand, cut off for today and Wednesday. I believe that it is very unfortunate that that is the case because the listening audience get used to tuning in to their own station at a certain time whether it's a direct broadcast or delayed broadcast. They get used to that given time on the air. They would be listening to the debates last Friday of the proceedings; today when they tune in there won't be any broadcast on. Unless they have happened to catch when it will come on they will assume that now that the Throne Speech debate is over, the broadcast has ended. Tomorrow a lot of the people who would otherwise be listening to the air may not be tuned in on time. Then on Wednesday if they tune back in they will find it not there again so they will still become confused. So I think it is very bad that the government has cut down on the time and doesn't go through with the continuity of these broadcasts as they have been going on in previous years.

Mr. E. Whelan (Regina North): — As a member of the radio committee, I regret that the

total time for broadcast has been reduced from 1500 minutes which has been the usual length of time for broadcasting from the legislature to 1215 minutes this year. This represents a reduction, Mr. Speaker, of 385 minutes less than the usual broadcast time.

As my colleague, the hon. member for Wadena (Mr. Dewhurst) has stated, in this particular week there are two days without any broadcasting, a blackout for Monday and again on Wednesday. I feel that the continuity of broadcasting will be lost and many of the people will feel that the broadcasts have been discontinued if they turn the radio on today and find no broadcast being carried.

I think it is in the interests of the public that the information that comes from these debates be made readily available and that full radio time be accorded. We moved a motion in the committee which was defeated on a four to three vote. I would hope that extra time might be secured by the government to make up for the three days that were lost during the Bengough by-election. The objective would be of course to better acquaint the public with the transaction of legislative business.

With the restoration of the full 225 minutes that was lost, the total number of minutes broadcasting would be 1440 which is still one hour less than the usual time. Mr. Speaker, many people in the province would not gain the knowledge of important public issues without these radio broadcasts. For this reason I would hope that the time would not be curtailed during this session. Mr. Speaker, I know that some of the government members have always opposed public costs, the public costs of broadcasting from this house, but I hoped that they would put aside this bias in the knowledge that citizens of this province, generally speaking, are in favour of these broadcasts.

Mr. D.W. Michayluk (Redberry): — Mr. Speaker, I, too, am one of the members on this side of the house that feel quite perturbed over the fact that the present government has provided a break in broadcasting during the two major debates, that is the Throne Speech and the Budget debate.

It appears to me, Mr. Speaker, that the present government is not in favour of the legislative broadcasts as they were in the past, and it has been brought out by the speakers who have taken their seats several moments ago. Possibly one of the reasons for a cut, or the discontinuance of broadcasting, is to confuse the public as to whether these broadcasts or legislative broadcasts will be continued or not.

I can recall that about a year ago, a statement was made and reported in the Saskatoon Star Phoenix by the now hon. Minister of Public Health (Mr. Steuart) that in the future, broadcasts from the legislature may be discontinued. It seems the government would like to discontinue these broadcasts from the legislature for this reason. I sit in the legislature. I go home on the weekends, and I pick up some of our daily papers, and it appears to me that some of the reporting from this legislature is left unreported. What perturbs me mostly, Mr. Speaker, is what is not reported in the papers. Certain things which come up in the house are not reported at all or are being just given a very, very minor report in the press.

Now, I also recall in a television program over the television station from Moose Jaw, on the program "Probe", the Premier

of this province was interviewed prior to the Bengough by-election. A question was put to the Premier in respect to whether the legislative broadcasts will be carried on. Prior to the session, of course, he gave an explanation as to the reasons, regulations by the federal government that prevented broadcasting before the Bengough by-election. He said that if a fuss was made over the allocation of time in respect to legislative broadcasts that these broadcasts may be discontinued completely.

This is the position taken by the Minister of Public Health (Mr. Steuart); this too is the position taken by the Premier, the government does not want this little bit of truth to go out from this side, outside of the legislature in the form of the legislative broadcasts. We know, Mr. Speaker, that we have a biased press to a certain extent. They know that the people of Saskatchewan may hear a bit of truth, this is what they want to muzzle. Thank you.

Mr. W.J. Berezowsky (Cumberland): — Mr. Speaker, I will just add a few words to what has been said. We know that the public of Saskatchewan like to know what is going on in the government not only during the session but outside of the session. I would like to point out to all members of this house that we have a situation at the present time where the public do not get this information. This government is trying to stifle information over the radio just as they have been stifling information in the press.

I am told by reporters of the press that the only information they can get as to what the government is doing is through the Premier's office and in no other way. This is not democratic as far as I am concerned. Under the former CCF government reporters could go to any department of government. They could get information on government policy. They could get information on government programs. Today the only place they can get it is through the Premier's office. Now the government wants to stifle this legislature. I don't think this is fair and I don't think this is democratic.

An Hon. Member: — I don't either, Bill.

Hon. J. W. Gardiner (Minister of Public Works): — Mr. Speaker, I've been in the house ten years and have never heard such ridiculous arguments as I have heard so far this afternoon. I am quite certain if we had had radio this afternoon for the hour and a quarter that we were on that the public would wonder if there was an opposition in the house as bill after bill went through. And I'm quite certain they wouldn't want to have today's proceedings on the air if we'd have bought extra time for the proceedings. Of course, they wouldn't mind probably if we upset the course of the house to make way for radio broadcasting as perhaps we have in the past. I think many of us in the past who have opposed this have used this as the major argument about the way in which radio broadcasting from the legislature can upset the normal procedure of this legislature. I don't think radio time or anything else should be allowed to interfere with the normal practices in the legislative body if at all possible. That is the reason why when some time had to be reduced, because of two or three days that we could not broadcast, that it was felt that the two major debates plus those days, the private members days in which resolutions were being presented and speeches could be made in the house would give at least a reasonable appearance to

the public over radio that this should be done. And of course, this is what has taken place. The two days this week that private members' resolutions are going to be presented are going to be over the air, and then of course, the budget address and then the speeches of the members in the Budget debate. I think this was a very reasonable conclusion to come to. Had we extended it beyond that time we would have been back into the same type of thing as today. We would have been back into legislation which might have gone through quite rapidly. Perhaps members wouldn't have too much to speak on because many acts as we know that come in are very brief and probably shouldn't receive the particular attention of the members in order to make the type of speech that they would like to make over the air.

With regard to the remarks of the member for Wadena (Mr. Dewhurst) I would just tell him that we divided the time as in other years exactly by the number of members in the house. Then we multiplied it by the numbers on both sides of the house and then we divided the time accordingly. He wasn't on the committee that I remember, or if he was his memory isn't very good because I divided the total minutes 1215 among the members of the house. It was then multiplied by the number sitting on the opposition side and the number on the government side. Then each of the groups agreed to give a few more minutes to the member for Arm River (Mr. Pederson) bringing his total to 30. I would like to say to the hon. member that it was carried out as far as I know in the same manner as in the past and also to point out that there is more time, probably the most time given to the opposition that ever has been given since radio time came into effect. There is a closer proportion to 50-50 in this house today than it has ever been as far as broadcasting is concerned. I can assure my hon. friend, of course, that after the next election they will probably be lucky if they get any time at all because there won't be any of them there to have any time.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that I think the usual procedure has been followed by the committee. I believe that fairness has been shown to all insofar as it can be with regard to radio time. I think that also the procedures of this house have been paid some attention to by the committee in seeing to it that the normal procedures can continue by and large every day of the session.

The assembly adjourned at 5:25 o'clock p.m.