

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Second Session – Fifteenth Legislature
13th day

Thursday, February 24, 1966

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mrs. Sally Merchant (Saskatoon City): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to have the house acknowledge the presence of two groups of school children from the city of Saskatoon. In the west gallery is a group from Victoria School, which is the oldest school in the city of Saskatoon, on the Nutana side of the river. I think the young people from that school should take some pride in that. They are accompanied here today by their teachers. On the other side of the house in the east gallery, I would like the members to join with me in welcoming a very large group of students from Westmount School accompanied by their teachers.

We are very glad to have them here today, and I would like on your behalf to wish them a very enjoyable day.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. D.G. MacLennan (Last Mountain): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to welcome a class of 30 grade 12 students from the Derby School in Strasbourg to the legislature this afternoon. They are accompanied by their teachers, Mr. Windjack, Mr. Wood and Mr. French. The Strasbourg group is in the east gallery.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. G.J. Trapp (Minister of Education): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would also like to welcome the same group from Strasbourg to the house this afternoon. I taught for many years with Mr. Windjack, the principal of this school, and I see he is accompanied by Mr. Pat Woods and Mr. French. We welcome to the house these students and I hope they enjoy their stay here this afternoon.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

QUESTION RE SASKATCHEWAN HOUSE

Mr. E. Whelan (Regina North): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, in view of the story in last night's Leader Post regarding Saskatchewan House which quoted the Premier exclusively, would the Premier advise the legislature of the government's intentions regarding the future use of Saskatchewan House?

Hon. W. Ross Thatcher (Premier): — We have no present intentions that differ from what they have been in the past. When we have, we will let the house know.

**QUESTION RE NORTH SASKATCHEWAN WATER POLLUTION — NORTH
BATTLEFORD**

Hon. D. Steuart (Minister of Public Health): — Before the Orders of the Day,

February 24, 1966

Mr. Speaker, yesterday the hon. member from North Battleford (Mr. Kramer) asked a question concerning the problem of pollution in North Saskatchewan River, respecting the cities of North Battleford and Prince Albert, and I asked his indulgence to give him an answer today.

Well, our division of sanitation has been in touch and our sanitation engineers have been in touch with the sanitary engineers of the Department of Health in Alberta, and I have today written to the hon. Dr. Donovan Ross, the Minister of Health for Alberta, pointing out the seriousness of this situation. I have asked him to take every step he can to contact the companies, the industrial companies polluting the rivers, to put a stop to this. I have also written the Hon. Allan J. MacEachen, federal Minister of National Health and Welfare, drawing to his attention that a year ago we had contacted his predecessor, the hon. Judy LaMarsh, asking her to intervene in this same situation. It occurs every year although this outbreak, I am told, is a little more serious than it was last year and the year before but not quite as bad as the year 1954 when it was at its worst. We have also asked the federal Minister of Justice to see what legal steps can be taken to put a stop to this once and for all. This, as you know, is an inter-provincial question. Having been involved in it back in 1954, as Mayor of the City of Prince Albert, I know that it is a very involved question, and one that must be dealt with finally at the federal level. We find the province at that time found a great deal of difficulty and had to rely on the co-operation of the government of Alberta, which we eventually got, I might say, but it is a very difficult situation, a very serious one. But we are working as hard as we can to see that the industries involved do put a stop to this, and also that the government of Alberta and the government of Canada both face their responsibilities in this regard.

STATEMENT RE INCREASE IN BREAD PRICES

Hon. W. Ross Thatcher (Premier): — Yesterday, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) asked a question whether the government proposes to inquire into the recent increases in bread prices in Saskatchewan. Since these increases appear to be nationwide, it is our feeling that if any investigation or action is required it should be on a national basis. Accordingly, this morning I contacted the President of the Privy Council, the hon. D. Favreau in Ottawa, who is in charge of the Combines Investigation Act. I have been informed by him that this matter has been taken under advisement by the federal government and is being studied by their officials to see if any action would be appropriate.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

QUESTION RE REPORT ON LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE ON HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY

Mr. W.G. Davies (Moose Jaw City): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, could I ask the Premier when copies of the report of the Legislative Committee on Highway Traffic and Safety will be made available to all the members? I believe that they are made available to the press, to the news media but not to the members.

Mr. Thatcher (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I am informed that they have been tabled and the Attorney General (Mr. Heald) thought they had already

been made available to the MLAs but we will certainly check this and try and have them in your hands immediately.

RESOLUTIONS

MOTION: UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE RE FARM WORKERS

Mr. J.B. Hooker (Notukeu-Willowbunch) moved, seconded by Mr. T.M. Weatherald (Cannington):

That this assembly urges the government of Canada to extend Unemployment Insurance Benefits to include farm workers in order to overcome the difficulties of farmers in obtaining farm labour.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on this resolution, may I first take a moment to extend congratulations to our new members on this side of the house. I know through my association with them that they will represent their constituencies well. They will make a worthwhile contribution to this assembly and to the people of this province.

My first congratulations must go out to the hon. member for Bengough (Mr. Mitchell). I presume that he is also well known to most of the members opposite. They had an opportunity to observe him during the recent by-election. We know that they did not wish to see him here but now that he is here I know that they would want to join me in welcoming him as a member of this assembly.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Hooker: — I also know that you would want me to wish the hon. member well in the years ahead while representing the constituency of Bengough on the government's side of the house.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Hooker: — I would also like to congratulate the hon. member for upholding the Liberal record of by-elections. Five out of six is a very enviable record.

To the new Clerk of the assembly, Mr. Bradshaw, I say welcome to Canada and to this assembly. May your stay with us be enjoyable to yourself. We know that we will profit by our association with you.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Hooker: — When we speak of extending insurance benefits to the farming industry, we find that the record over the past years does not appear to be one of outright opposition by the government but rather continual inaction for many years. It is time that this state of affairs was ended. It is unfair and unreasonable to expect one segment of our labor force to be deprived of benefits enjoyed by others. By the federal government's inaction in this field we can only assume that our farm labor force are being treated as second-class citizens. Even considering the decline in the number of people employed in the farm force during the last few years, agriculture still provides employment for

more than three times as many workers as all primary industries combined. In 1963, the latest statistics available, the farm labor force totalled 641,000 people, 10 per cent of the total labor force in Canada. Of this total over 101,000 are considered to be hired farm labor and this figure remains fairly constant.

Possibly the decline in the farm labor force can be attributed to improved farming methods. Twenty-five years ago eleven persons were supplied with foodstuffs and fibre by the production of one farm worker. In 1963 this figure has changed from 11 to 33 persons and will no doubt go even higher. Agriculture, which in all fairness must give some credit to its farm labor force, contributes 5½ per cent of Canada's gross national product, that is the values of all goods and services produced in Canada.

However, the importance of agriculture to the economy does not end there. More than 314,000 people are employed in manufacturing industries using farm products. More than 42 fertilizer plants employ 1,200 people. This does not include those people employed in mining. Transportation of farm produce by rail employs 135,000 people. Thirty-five thousand people are employed in the trucking industry with the movement of farm products. Thirty-five per cent of all tonnage on the Great Lakes is movement of farm produce. Retail food stores employ 77,000 people. Consider the number employed in the oil industry, the farm implement industry, the automobile industry whose products are extensively used by agriculture. Then we have thousands of people who owe their employment directly or indirectly to the agricultural industry, and these people all enjoy the coverage of unemployment insurance.

Would it not then be reasonable to expect that those employed in the primary industry should receive the same consideration? Legislators are prone to think of farm labor as only seasonal work; in some cases, especially in straight grain farming, this may be true, but it does not apply to farm labor employed by ranchers, mixed farming and dairy operations. However, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that other classes of labor such as the fisherman, lumber industry, road construction and some building trades are likewise seasonal, yet they are not disqualified from the benefits of insurance against loss of employment. It then can be only reasonable to assume that farm laborers are being discriminated against. The farm labor force seems always to be greater in periods of unemployment. With the advent of the new Liberal government in this province, the economic boom, the industrial expansion brought on by the incentive programs of this Liberal free enterprise government, unemployment will cease to exist in the province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Hooker: — The movement of labor from the farms to other industry because of employment benefits elsewhere is sure to occur. Mr. Speaker, since the Second World War agricultural products have increased by 151 per cent; however, by the same token manufactured products purchased by the farmer have increased 195 per cent. If our senior government does not act quickly this figure could soon be reversed. We in Saskatchewan are concerned by the steady decline of the family farm unit. Unless we immediately start a program of training men to work in agriculture, treat them as we treat people in other segments of our labor force, then the decline will continue at an alarming rate. Many of our citizens who are entering the age when they should be taking things

easier are forced to sell their holdings because it is impossible to hire help and they themselves are unable to cope with the increasing work load.

Hundreds of custom combiners are needed to harvest our crops and are brought into our province, not because we haven't the machines but because we haven't enough adequate operators. Fruit and vegetables are often left in the fields because of a lack of experienced help. I am not proposing that putting farm laborers on insurance benefits will rectify all the problems facing agriculture. However, it will be a step in the right direction. If we are going to preserve the family farm, keep our farm laborers in agriculture, continue to supply foodstuffs for hungry peoples, keep the cost of agriculture produce at a reasonable level, then I urge each member of this assembly to unanimously support this resolution.

It has been gratifying to note that the Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister of Canada has indicated that legislation would be introduced this session extending unemployment insurance to farm labor.

Unanimous approval of this resolution can only assist in a speedy approval of this legislation, but it may also act as a directive to induce our federal members from western Canada to support this legislation when it appears on the Order Paper. I commend the federal government for the action it has taken and I take pleasure in moving, seconded by the hon. member for Cannington, Mr. Weatherald, the foregoing resolution.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. T.M. Weatherald (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, before turning to this very important matter of unemployment insurance for farm workers, I would like to express our thanks to the electors of Bengough for returning one more member to this side of the legislature.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Weatherald: — His victory has meant that we have now won seven out of the last eight by-elections and elections. I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that in the field of sports this would be considered a well-done winning streak, and I am convinced that in the field of politics it should be considered somewhat of a winning streak as well.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Weatherald: — Mr. Speaker, the member for Willowbunch (Mr. Hooker) has quite amply and adequately demonstrated many of the arguments for unemployment insurance for farm workers. However, I would like to dwell on one or two which I think possibly were not given quite complete and adequate attention.

Today, the world is speaking increasingly and to a greater extent about the need of an increase in food production. Despite the fact that more food is now being produced per man than has ever been produced before, food production in this country is still seriously limited by the lack of profitability and trained manpower. Today we speak of the need of a trained labor force in practically every segment of the economy, and I am convinced, Mr.

February 24, 1966

Speaker, that when we speak of a trained labor force we must also speak of it in terms of a trained labor force insofar as agriculture is concerned. Unemployment insurance is a necessity if agriculture is to attract skilled workers while competing for these workers with other types of industry. Just recently, Mr. Speaker, an article appeared in the Saskatoon Star Phoenix of February 23, 1966, page 1, entitled, "A Manpower Crisis Is Affecting Agriculture in British Columbia".

In this article, John M. Kostey, an executive member of the B.C. Fruit Growers Association, said:

That agriculture in British Columbia would be wiped out unless there is government action to solve the manpower crisis.

He went on to say:

If something is not done very soon we are not going to have any agriculture. Something must be done or we are not going to grow another acre.

Mr. Kostey was supporting a brief presented by the B.C. Federation of Agriculture. In the same article, the Secretary of the Federation of Agriculture in B.C., Mr. Ron Pelling, said:

British Columbia is forced to import approximately \$10,000,000 worth of agricultural produce from the United States each year simply because there is not enough domestic labor to harvest crops.

Mr. Pelling said:

As many as 9,000 pickers will be needed in the lower mainland area for strawberry picking alone.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that the quotations which I have used from a recent article amply demonstrate some of the problems occurring in other parts of Canada, and these are problems which are certainly shared by our province of Saskatchewan. There are a number of areas in this province which are already in difficulty because of the lack of farm labor. Particularly in milk production is this becoming a fairly substantial problem. The production of milk requires considerable labor and when a producer is unable to attract this type of worker, he must reach his output. Today in Saskatchewan we have reached the point of being unable to supply our own requirements in milk production, and insofar as dairy products are concerned, we have become an importer. Lack of farm labor, I am convinced, is a considerable factor in this regard. The inability of farmers to attract people to assist on dairy farms has resulted in a serious curtailment of production in this province.

Mr. Speaker, hogs and cattle are two other operations which involve high labor content insofar as farms are concerned. Farmers who cannot attract labor in a competitive market for these operations again are forced to curtail production, and we miss many economic opportunities not only to boost farm income, but to improve food supply. The image of farm labor has also been poor. This is to a large extent partly due to the lack of a pension plan for people who have worked all their lives as farm workers. Lack of any unemployment insurance, low wages and long hours have also been factors which have been a great disadvantage for farmers in attracting capable men.

In essence, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that farm workers must be included in social security measures, such as pensions, unemployment insurance and workmen's compensation. This is the only way that farm work can be made attractive so that people will become more willing to become employed in agriculture.

The farmer must demand government action to see that his prospective employees have greater confidence and better qualifications. Mr. Speaker, with current high farm investment cheap help is certainly a very expensive illusion. The establishment of an adequate and skilled work force is a necessity in agriculture today if we are to maintain and improve efficiency and not only ensure an adequate supply of food for our country and the world, but to assist in the maintenance and profitability of the family farm.

Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly support this resolution because I am convinced that the inclusion of farm workers under the Canada Pension Plan has assisted this. I am further convinced that the adoption of unemployment insurance will not only be of great assistance to farm workers but will greatly assist agriculture in being able to hire people to assist on our farms.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Debate adjourned.

MOTION: INCOME TAX EXEMPTION

Mrs. Sally Merchant (Saskatoon City) moved, seconded by Mr. C.P. MacDonald (Milestone):

That this assembly urges the government of Canada to amend the Income Tax Act to permit exemption of costs incurred in the purchase of equipment and instruments used by workers in their employment.

She said: Mr. Speaker, this is the first opportunity that I have had, along with the members who have spoken ahead of me, to welcome the new members to the house. I haven't until now been able to publicly extend my welcome to the member from Moosomin (Mr. Gardner) and now, in particular, to the member (Mr. Mitchell) who was seated the other day for the first time as a result of the election in Bengough.

From my own point of view I would like to say how very much I enjoyed being in the constituency of Bengough prior to the election. I think probably the members opposite looked, most of them I met down there, looked as though they were enjoying themselves too, but I think at this point, in retrospect, we on this side enjoyed this more than they did. Welcome to this house, to the member from Bengough.

Mr. Speaker, in speaking to my motion, I really don't intend to speak at any great length because I believe that the resolution that I introduce to the house is one that will find favour on both sides of the house in that it is designed to urge income tax exemption for the tradesmen on the cost and the replacement of tools and equipment. I am sure that members on both sides of this house will support such a motion. As a member for the city of Saskatoon, I have a particular interest in it because in the city of Saskatoon, I think, we probably have at the moment, a large concentration of tradesmen and we will have as the city

increases in size. The projection for our city is that it will — and for this I apologize to the member from Regina East who is also the mayor of Regina — supersede in population the size of the Queen City. I think, in its way, we will have perhaps the greatest preponderance of tradesmen in the province of Saskatchewan. So as the member for Saskatoon, I feel a particular interest and concern for this particular motion which I introduce.

The building trades, at the moment, in the city of Saskatoon are employing a tremendous number of people. This is a group of people against whom I feel there has been some discrimination. I don't mean to speak at great length, but again I would like to say a few words in support of my motion because as I say, it has always seemed to me most discriminatory and unjust that every other income, except the wage earning tradesman's, is calculated with consideration for expenses that he has in order to earn that income. The farmer, for example, can calculate every kind of expense that he must make in order to make the business of farming produce an income. He calculates depreciation on his machinery, a thousand and one things before he calculates the income on which he must pay taxes. The businessman in the same way, no matter whether he runs a small business or a large business, no matter how that business is incorporated, whether in a personal way or in an incorporated fashion, that businessman can claim the cost and depreciation of plant and equipment and has a tremendous variety of ways in which he can exempt himself from taxes on the outlay that he must make in order to make his business produce an income.

The professions, similarly, can deduct any outlay that they may have for operating expenses, for office equipment, for cars, if they are valuable and useful in the practice of their profession. They have all manner of expenses that are considered legitimate expenditures for income tax purposes. Mr. Speaker, at this point in the economy particularly of the North American continent, sales and promotion has become not only an industry in its own right but it has become a part of practically every business and every profession if you want to put it in these terms. In this particular field, sales and promotion will allow a person to deduct even the cost of entertainment from their income before they calculate the taxable portion of that income, that is, of course, if that entertainment or expenditure can be proven to be a means of increasing business and in this way increasing income.

Mr. Speaker, I don't quarrel with this, not in any way, because I think that expenses involved in the conduct of a business or a profession should be deducted from income before the income is calculated for taxes. But in this matter only the wage earner amongst all classes of income-earning people, only the wage earner or the salaried person has his income tax deducted at source and his only claim as a deduction before his taxable income is calculated, his only deduction is the number and the kind of his dependents. This even though in many cases there are expenses that the general salaried person or wage earner must make in order to put himself in a position to earn that salary or that wage. But within this general group of wage earners or salaried people, within this general group it seems to me that the tradesman in particular is under a most particular hardship. He is in a position where in order to earn his wage he doesn't present himself only with what knowledge and skill he has, in many cases — and this is true particularly in the construction trades — he not only must have skill in his trade but in most of these trades he must make considerable outlay for the tools of his trade. He can deduct absolutely nothing either for that initial expense that

he must make in order to earn his living at his trade or for depreciation that will, in course of using the equipment that he must have, will inevitably take place nor is he allowed to deduct anything for replacement or repair on tools without which he cannot earn his living. This is as a rule tremendously expensive equipment.

Talking to tradesmen you will find that most of them have quite a vast investment in tools and the kinds of equipment that they will need in order to practise the trade by which they earn their living. Now, I realize, Mr. Speaker, that the federal government might be urged to other measures of tax relief for the general salaried person or for the wage earner, but I choose to single out this particular aspect because I feel that this particular aspect within the tradesman, or the wage-earning portion of the tax-paying public is a glaring injustice in that the very means that a man uses to earn an income are not by our present tax laws considered as a valid expenditure. For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I single this out as that portion of injustice against a portion of our population that I choose to speak for when I take pleasure in moving this resolution.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. M. Breker (Humboldt): — Mr. Speaker, before saying anything about this resolution, I would like to inform the house and the visitors present that in the Canadian school boy curling playoffs in St. John's, Newfoundland, Saskatchewan's rink skipped by Billy Ross of Humboldt is in first place.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Breker: — With five wins and two losses. I am sure everybody here wishes Billy and his rink the best of luck, and we hope to honor them as champions on the floor of this legislative assembly when they return.

I am in agreement with the intention of the resolution proposed by the member from Saskatoon (Mrs. Merchant). I believe, however, that the resolution should be amended to urge the federal government to grant exemption not only for tools and equipment required while carrying on their work, but also to provide exemption from income tax for expenses incurred by workers for transportation to and from their places of employment.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Breker: — For some time now farmers have been able to claim as an expense part of the amount spent for depreciation and operating costs of their automobile. Professional people like several of my friends opposite have also been able to claim expenses for their transportation, if these expenses have been incurred while earning their income. However, people who are employed do not have these privileges that self-employed people now enjoy. No matter what it costs them to get to and from work, the money spent for this transportation must be paid out of their net income.

The automobile has revolutionized the economy of North America. Industrial plants are more and more often moving to the outskirts of our sprawling cities. Employees often must travel

February 24, 1966

at least several miles and sometimes many miles to the place of their employment. The potash development out of Saskatoon clearly illustrates this problem. Almost all workers in the industry reside in the city of Saskatoon. The same situation will occur in Lanigan where people in the Humboldt constituency will be commuting to and from the Lanigan potash site.

Contrary to the opinion of the members opposite, we Liberal members are very concerned about labor. If we succeed in industrializing this province, and I am sure we will, we will of necessity become even more conscious of the needs and the problems of the labor force.

Mr. Speaker, many of our workers use car pools. They form them and they use them. Even so the actual cost of transportation to and from work is quite large. Many of the families that I speak of find it virtually impossible to manage without a second car. The new government of Saskatchewan has sparked an industrial boom.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Breker: — I draw your attention to pages two, three, four and five of the Votes and Proceedings of this assembly of February 21st, 1966. The hon. Minister of Industry (Mr. Grant) has listed 104 industries that are new or expanded since May 22, 1964. Each of these new complexes demands new personnel. Almost all of these new workers travel by car to their jobs. It is time that the inequality in the Income Tax Act is rectified. A man or woman who is employed should have the right to deduct his transportation costs to his or her place of employment just as the self-employed person now has the right to do.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I beg leave of the assembly to move an amendment, seconded by the member for Elrose (Mr. Leith) that the following words . . .

Mr. J.H. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — On a point of order, can a person who is seconding a motion, move an amendment?

An Hon. Member: — He's not seconding.

Mr. Speaker: — A person who moves or seconds a motion cannot amend his own motion.

Mr. C.P. MacDonald (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, I seconded the motion.

Mr. Breker: — Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I beg leave of the assembly to move, seconded by the member from Elrose (M. Leith) that the following words be added after the word "employment" in the third line:

And to permit exemption of the cost of the workers' transportation to and from their places of employment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. H.D. Link (Saskatoon City): — Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

MOTION: SHORTAGE OF BOXCARS, ETC., AND GUARANTEE OF PRICES FOR FARM PRODUCTS

The assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Larson (Pelly), seconded by Mr. Broten (Watrous)

Mr. H.A. Broten (Watrous): — Mr. Speaker, first I would like to join with our member from Humboldt (Mr. Breker) hoping that Billy does bring the cup home. I'm sure that all members agree with me on this. Our boys have showed good curling ability, and I'm sure they will make a very good try to bring it home for dear old Saskatchewan.

I would like to congratulate the new members of the house on their win and also welcome them to the house.

I would like to read the resolution, Mr. Speaker, that we are about to speak on. I think it would clear it and bring it back fresh into our memories.

That this assembly, believing the precarious economic condition of agriculture demands immediate action, urges the Federal Government to take immediate steps to:

- (1) ensure Canadian railways make available immediately enough boxcars, locomotives and other equipment to transport Saskatchewan grain to terminal elevators to meet Canada's export commitments; and
- (2) guarantee adequate minimum prices for all major farm products now.

The first part of this resolution seems to me should be quite clear and that when markets are available the government and the railways should make it their business to move grain forward at full speed. It should not be necessary to put committees on the job in an emergency when transportation is called on to do the job as large as the railways have had to do in this case. The government-appointed committees should be formed before they get into trouble and not after. I think this is very important.

Loss of movement of grain to forward positions at seaboard means loss of sales. I maintain, Mr. Speaker, that the members across the way have not said much regarding our loss of sales because of not having grain in position. Their friends of the CPR are in the wrong now, and the provincial government does not and will not stand up and tell those special privileged and vested interests their faults. We indeed have in Saskatchewan a special type of government that takes special care not to offend special interests.

I think it is high time all people in Saskatchewan realize this. In the final analysis it is the responsibility of the government, various organizations and the news media to inform people how important it is not to lose grain sales. My colleague, the member for Pelly (Mr. Larson), has given many facts regarding the importance of moving grain to seaports and having it there on time. Ocean transportation and convenience are important also meaning ships have left seaboard ports only because of grain not being in position at the seaboard.

Some of the targets that have been set by the Canadian Wheat Board are as follows: the Wheat Board on August 1, 1965 set certain targets that were to be filled by January 20, 1966. The

February 24, 1966

target set for the CPR was \$33,706 cars and cars actually loaded were 25,218; for the CNR 28,987 cars and the cars actually loaded were 22,284. In other words, the CPR is 8,488 behind the schedule and the CNR is 6,703 cars behind the Wheat Board target. Needless to say, Mr. Speaker, the railways have to get on their horse and get busy.

I'll move on to the second part of the resolution, Sir:

To guarantee adequate minimum prices for all major farm products now.

Here we are asking the federal government to guarantee minimum prices, believing that the farmers are in a precarious economic condition which demands immediate action and urging the federal government to take immediate steps to remedy this situation.

I would like to say a few words about two questions that we must ask ourselves. The first question is, "Are we the farmers in the precarious position as the resolution says?" and the second one, "Why should governments guarantee prices?" On the first point, are we in a precarious position, any group of producers who has had to accept the fluctuating prices that farmers have had to, for example, when hogs fluctuate between 20 and 42 cents, are in real trouble, and it is no small wonder that hogs are in short supply. If the car industry's price for their product fluctuated between \$2,000 and \$4,000 it would be in a precarious position also. Are we in that precarious position on the prairies? Mr. Speaker, over 35,000 farmers have quit farming in the last 20 years. Many of them were too small but not most of them, Mr. Speaker. When one considers wheat alone, at the moment we are now selling wheat for about \$1.85 a bushel Fort William; we received this much fifteen years ago when our costs were half as much. When any group of people have twice the costs of production and receive the same price for their product, they will be in trouble. When farmers get 15 cents a dozen for eggs they are in trouble, and many farmers have received this in the last few years.

When the farmers of a nation represent ten per cent of the population and receive only five per cent of the nation's wealth, they are in trouble. As further evidence, on the one hand the prices the farmers have been getting for agricultural goods have been falling; on the other, the prices for the things the farmers buy have gone up. In fact, Mr. Speaker, in the period between 1951 and 1964 the cost to farm went up 30 per cent and the products he sells on the average has gone down 16 per cent. That is to say, in a comparative case, a businessman or manufacturer's cost goes up 30 per cent and his products have gone down 16 per cent. The manufacturer who is faced with this problem is soon out of business. But the manufacturer has been able to up his prices, as we all know. But 35,000 farmers have quit in the last 20 years because they weren't able to get the same increase.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, farming in Canada is in a precarious position even if farmers have improved their efficiency more than any other single group in the nation.

Now, as to the second part, "Why should governments guarantee prices? First I would like to make one statement. Nearly all governments in the free world do a lot more to guarantee farm prices than does the Canadian federal government. Why do they do this? Our costs and income as farmers are governed to a large

degree by government policies, I should say federal government policies. Trade policies affect our costs and return, either because of trade agreements or lack of them made by the federal government and by pressures applied by federal governments in the trading areas of the world. Trade agreements made by federal agencies set prices and also give credit in the case of wheat agreements. Let us not forget the same prices 15 years ago and twice the cost in the case of wheat. Tariff policies affect our costs. These are government responsibility. Policies of all types affect our income such as tax policies. International trade agreements or lack of them, credit policies or lack of them affect farmers.

Do we give sufficient credit to our customers? Do we have sufficient leeway in bilateral agreements such as commodity exchange? Could we trade beef for shoes or something in that line so that we could get around the currency problems? Yes, governments do have responsibilities. We as farmers don't compete with farmers in other countries, we compete with the Treasury of other countries. In other words, Mr. Speaker, we compete with the farmer in the United States who gets a subsidy for wheat which is sold in other countries. We compete price-wise with the French farmer who gets a subsidy for wheat sold on the export market. We compete with the farmer who gets a subsidy for raising wheat for home consumption. In fact, Canada is the only country in the world that exports wheat and does not subsidize the farmer.

Needless to say, it is a Liberal government that sees no need for this. No wonder, Mr. Speaker, Liberal members in the west are scarce. The Conservative party will have to change its ways in this regard also or they will be scarce also. Yes, other governments in other countries do take responsibility in guaranteeing prices of farm products at a reasonable level. The farmer in Great Britain never received a guaranteed price for his products until the Labor Government brought in the Agricultural Support Act in 1947. Today the farmer in Great Britain gets nearly \$1,000,000,000 from the government to meet his costs. Why does the farmer in Great Britain get this subsidy, Mr. Speaker? He gets it because the government wants to give him a fair break and because he is competing with subsidized farmers all over the globe.

We have a right as farmers to receive adequate prices for farm products guaranteed by governments because we compete with farmers in other countries who get this type of recognition. In other words, farmers have higher costs through no faults of their own and many of the costs are not of their own making but by (1) government policies or lack of them; (2) standards which are real in the country they live in, such as wages, profits, taxes, and cost of living; (3) farmers not competing with ordinary farmers from other countries. We are competing against subsidized farmers.

In this country we must tell governments that they the government will have to guarantee minimum prices like other countries have had to do in order to fairly meet the conditions on the farm. I would like to say "a prosperous agriculture means a prosperous nation". It has been demonstrated that when we have had large wheat sales the whole economy is boosted. Yes, there are governments that will pick up the responsibility and not flounder. Let us advocate a square deal for agriculture and not half measures as has so often been the case. All the business people in the rural areas will also benefit from a decent program. Often we forget the whole world scene and when there is prosperity for the

February 24, 1966

farmer, there is also prosperity for the small businessman and his employees.

Mr. Speaker, I will support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. B.H. Bjarnason (Kelvington): — Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

MOTION: RE RAIL LINE ABANDONMENT

The assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Gallagher (Yorkton), seconded by Mr. Howes (Kerrobert-Kindersley).

Mr. R.H. Wooff (Turtleford): — Mr. Speaker, before I take up the tenure of my remarks I would like to advise you of my intention to submit an amendment to this resolution, and with your indulgence in order that the amendment and the motion might be clarified not only to the house but to those who may be listening on the air. I would like first to read the motion as it is on the Order Paper.

That this assembly urges most strongly that any federal authority established in connection with the proposed Rail Rationalization program be given full power to examine the services provided by all transportation media, and that no rail lines be abandoned before a proper assessment has been made of the effects of Rail Rationalization on the social and economic life of communities affected.

My amendment, Sir:

That all the words following the word “urges” in the first line to and including the word “full” in the third line, be deleted and the following substituted therefore:

“the federal government to establish a Rail Rationalization Authority at the earliest possible date, with”

I feel sure, Mr. Speaker, that the amendment will be acceptable to all hon. members on both sides of the house because of the urgency of the railway problem. Ever since the historic ribbons of steel were flung across this fair land of ours, we have had railway problems and railway difficulties of one kind or another. Some of these problems, Mr. Speaker, have involved either the promoters, the employees, the people receiving services, or governments, partly because of bonuses and subsidies that have been given to these companies from the public treasury, gifts of land and gifts of mineral rights and concessions in general. One thing is sure, Mr. Speaker, out of all of those caught up in the fiasco of the promotion and the building and the operating of Canada’s railways, none has been more involved than Mr. John Public. Who, Mr. Speaker, would have dreamed a short few years ago that the next scene in the fast moving railway drama would be the tearing up and the tearing down and the discarding of what it took our pioneer fathers a lifetime to build?

I think hon. members on both sides of the house must be aware not just of the need of careful consideration of all angles

of this difficult problem, Mr. Speaker, but of the need for as early action as possible on what has been well termed rail rationalization. If the term, Mr. Speaker, means what it appears to mean it will be the first time in our railway history that we have had anything rational.

It is now, Mr. Speaker, one year since this problem was debated in this legislature and nothing has happened except the deterioration of railway service, fear and uncertainty in the minds of the employees, and grave concern in large segments of our most important industry, agriculture. I believe that it devolves on this legislature more than on any other to press the federal government for immediate action in seeking answers to what is developing into an alarming national problem.

Transportation, Mr. Speaker, is not just a game of profits. It is the life blood of our nation, something we cannot afford to fool around with at the whim of profit-seeking corporations. I said a moment ago that the onus was on this legislature to take the lead in this important matter. In doing so, Mr. Speaker, may I point out that of the 3,450 miles of railway line that the companies have proposed to abandon in the three prairie provinces, over two-thirds of that mileage is in the province of Saskatchewan. This, Mr. Speaker, I believe without any doubt puts the finger of responsibility on this legislature and this government more than on any other provincial body, not just to suggest that if and when the federal government gets around to the problem that certain procedures should follow but to stress the need for early action, for immediate action, not some time in the future, but now.

This matter involves not just 3,450 miles of railway track; it also means the loss of 60,000,000 bushels of grain storage. This in turn means \$60,000,000 in replacement values, and I submit to this house that when the chips are down and when the accounting is finished, whatever it costs to replace that storage will finally wind up on the back of agriculture. If this was all it would be bad enough, but at the moment just consider the thousands of farm valuations that are hanging in a precarious balance. Farmers who want to sell and farmers in many cases who must sell and people who wish to buy and people who cannot wait, many of these people find it pretty difficult to arrive at fair valuations when we have proposals such as the railway companies have made to abandon 3,450 miles of railway track. Consider the retail and the service outlets that in many cases are going to disappear entirely and disappear without any remuneration so far as the railway companies are concerned, a total loss of a lifetime of endeavour.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to return for just a moment to the storage problem, the loss that I mentioned a moment ago. I don't think that I need to belabour the fact of the rapid change in every field of the modern commercial world. Today wheat transactions of undreamed of magnitude take place sometimes overnight and delivery is to be made within the breathtaking time of a few months. This, Mr. Speaker, demands that as grain growers in the three prairie provinces we must keep tremendous volumes of grain poised ready for shipment at all times, which spelled out means adequate storage. It also means that for so important an industry as agriculture dealing in the very life and death commodities, not just of Saskatchewan and Canada but of mankind as a whole, we must not only have the means to produce, the means whereby we can store our grain, but we also must have transportation facilities to move rapidly great quantities of wheat on short notice, if we are

February 24, 1966

to meet the demands of a fast moving and constantly accelerating international trade.

I wonder how many members of the house noted his news item on wheat sales in yesterday's Leader Post, "Wheat Sales Claimed Loss".

"Canada lost wheat sales of 200,000,000 bushels in the current crop year because the railways could not move it", James Bentley, president of the Canadian Federation of Agriculture said Tuesday. He told reporters, "The Canadian Wheat Board, a crown marketing agency, had advised federation officials of this figure. The 200,000,000 bushels would have been over and above the record 600,000,000 bushels of wheat Canada expects to export in the crop year that began last August 1st and ends July 31 this year".

This, Mr. Speaker, may mean millions of dollars loss once again to western Canadian grain growers if the new International Wheat Agreement which is being negotiated at the present time should be reduced and there seems every possibility that it may prove to be at a reduced price. I suggest in my humble opinion that this news item was very kind to the railway when they said they couldn't move it. I am of the opinion personally that there was no real all out effort made on the part of the railways to move this grain and that it could have been moved had they done so.

I am in accord, Mr. Speaker, with the request of the resolution, but I think and I feel that it lacks the urgency that the situation demands. Something must be undertaken immediately on behalf of the grain growers, on behalf of our province, and on behalf of Canada as a whole. I don't believe that this will come about except by the bold planning and speedy, resolute leadership on the part of federal and provincial governments.

I therefore move, seconded by the hon. member for Weyburn (Mr. Pepper), this amendment to the resolution:

That the federal government establish a Rail Rationalization Authority at the earliest possible date.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if for the sake of clarity you would allow me to read the motion as it would read if it were amended, or would I be out of order? I therefore read the resolution as it would read if my amendment were incorporated:

That this assembly urges the federal government to establish a Rail Rationalization Authority at the earliest possible date with full power to examine the services provided by all transportation media, and that no rail lines be abandoned before a proper assessment has been made of the effects of Rail Rationalization on the social and economic life of communities affected.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. W.S. Howes (Kerrobart-Kindersley): — Mr. Speaker, I would first of all like to welcome our two new members to this house from Moosomin and Bengough. I think

we are all pleased to have made their acquaintance. I do think that there is some value in by-elections so that all members of a legislature get to know the constituencies involved much better.

Mr. G. T. Snyder (Moose Jaw City): — On a point of order. You, Sir, and your Deputy Speaker, are of course very much aware of the fact that when speaking to the resolution a member must refrain from speaking to anything other than the subject matter of the resolution. We have been very patient on this side of the house. We are very pleased to welcome other members to the assembly but I think you, Sir, will concur in the fact that you and your Deputy Speaker should be aware of the fact that the subject matter of the resolution is under discussion.

Mr. Speaker: — Yes, I am quite well aware of it. This also applies to the other ones.

Mr. Howes: — Well, we'll talk about the amendment. Mr. Speaker, I planned on speaking on the resolution, but on studying the resolution as amended, I think the amendment has the effect of strengthening the resolution. I agree entirely with that and I am quite prepared to speak to that and I agree with the strengthening of the resolution.

I think railroad abandonment has in the minds of many been whipped to death in speeches made in various places. However, Bill C-120 is still before the federal house and until amendments suitable to the people of this province are made, I think it deserves the attention of all members of this house in a non-partisan fashion and the attention of all residents of the province in the same manner.

The effects of Bill C-120, if implemented in a form that will permit wholesale railroad abandonment, would I think have disastrous effects on this province. In my constituency, as I said, one year ago, 142 miles of railroad are up for abandonment. Worked out on a percentage basis that equals 7.3 per cent of the proposed amendment in Saskatchewan and 3.7 per cent of the total proposed for the Dominion.

The member from Yorkton (Mr. Gallagher) the other day spoke of 40 to 50 miles in his constituency and I am quite sure we would be glad to trade with him. I don't know, Mr. Speaker, whether my constituency was singled out for special attention, but when I look at the size of Canada covered by my constituency, I think we're being given all the attention we want, in fact, quite a bit more than we deserve.

The effects of the abandonment are many. I don't think I have to point out the loss to municipalities in taxation due to loss of assessment. I don't think I have to point out the increased cost to farmers having to haul their grain much greater distances in my constituency. Many of our people will have to haul their grain at least another 30 miles and this cannot be done without considerable cost, both in new capital equipment, wear and tear on roads, wear and tear on capital equipment, I mentioned, and in gas and oil used. It will mean increased cost to government for grants to municipalities to build a standard road necessary to carry the heavier trucks that will be used. It will mean increased cost to municipalities all down the lane. It will mean

February 24, 1966

that municipalities will have to provide all-weather roads and in a large part of my constituency, roads of a hard surface type since our gravel supplies are running short.

Mr. Speaker, there has been some mention made in this debate about the assets of the railroads and the assets that the railroads received for building the rail lines in Canada. Some say they should not be given consideration when abandonment is considered. That may or may not be true, but I am sure that the people of Canada feel that these assets were given in return for the provision of a service and should that service be discontinued, then a return of the assets should also be considered. I do not, for one, feel that if government help is given the recipient of the benefit should be able to back out of the service at a later date. The assets received by the railroads are so vast that they are beyond comprehension. We all know what they received in western Canada, large tracts of land, land which they sold to secure funds and for which they are still securing large sums, in the sale of oil, gas and other mineral rights on this property. In many parts of Canada they received other benefits.

I was out to Vancouver Island a little over a month ago. I got talking to some people from the eastern side of the Island where they raise oysters. I found that all the oyster beds on the eastern side of Vancouver Island almost without exception are owned by the CPR. Now, I think you can consider whenever you eat oysters grown in B.C. you are making a contribution to the CPR, and that is because they have the foreshore rights.

As I say, their assets are great. None of us really fully realize what they have. They have in some areas of Canada branch lines that are definitely not revenue-producing. Consideration, to my knowledge, has not been given to the abandonment of some of these branch lines because the assets given for the building of those lines was so obvious that the public outcry would place them in an extremely embarrassing position should they wish to abandon. Mind you the CPR has never indicated too much embarrassment.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have mentioned about the attitude of the CPR and I think the attitude of the CPR so far as railroad service is concerned is well typified by what happened in the case of the Dominion passenger train. But there are other things that have happened in the past that show the deep and abiding concern of that organization for the people of this country. During the late fall of 1958 the CPR operated the only practical ferry service between Vancouver and Victoria, but that fall they advised they would not operate ferries in the winter since the business did not warrant it. This would have had the effect of leaving Vancouver Island almost isolated. I have many clippings here from Hansard that give the whole story. I think it's well worth reading just what happened out there at the time. It placed the government of the province of British Columbia in a position where it had to go into the ferry business, and today the B.C. government operates the largest ferry system in the world. The CPR claimed that you couldn't run a ferry in the winter between Vancouver and Victoria. With modern equipment the B.C. government is now doing it. They run a service every two hours. It only goes to show, as I said, what can be done with proper capital investments. The CPR apparently was not prepared to spend the required sums and the government was forced to go into the business.

Now, the matter of modernization is one that I think the

railroads could definitely give consideration to. In the United States in order to place the grain haul in a better competitive position the railroads designed special cars carrying large amounts of grain, approximately twice what the present car carries. The saving wasn't as great as they anticipated 13 to 14 per cent but 13 to 14 per cent can be a major factor. The use of these cars was pretty forcibly brought home to myself on the morning of February 8th, the day this house opened, when one was on the track on the left hand side of Albert Street in the northern part of this city. It would seem to me that a rationalization authority should be empowered to have the railroad justify their accounting procedures and also prove that they are making the maximum use of modern technology to cut costs. From personal experience it would seem that a great deal could be done in this field and that authority should be empowered to have the railroads justify the operation of competing lines side by side. We have examples in this province of lines within six miles of each other running for 120 miles and many other examples. This is a very wasteful practice and should end before any lines are considered for abandonment.

Another item of great interest as I mentioned is the matter of railroad accounting procedures. In all of the CN applications for abandonment is an item for off-line costs and in most cases this item in their application dwarfs the other costs on their respective branch lines. These off-line costs definitely require investigation and evidence from the railroads that they are justified. They are so large that I question them very highly.

At a meeting held in Regina on November 22, 1963, comprised of representatives from the local railroad retention committees, government, railroads and other interested parties, this matter of off-line costs was discussed. It would seem that the railroad answers on this question were not satisfactory. A rationalization authority should definitely give this matter a great deal of consideration.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this amended resolution asks that the interests of the people of this province be protected. I feel that this is extremely important. We all agree that some rationalization may be necessary, that rationalization should take into account the factors that I have mentioned here today and also the many other social and economic factors that will be involved, factors that have been touched on by other speakers. I could talk for some time on this subject but as I said when I started that it has been whipped to death. I will support the amendment and the amended resolution.

Mr. J.A. Pepper (Weyburn): — Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

MOTION: SHORTAGE OF BOXCARS, ETC., AND GUARANTEE OF PRICES FOR FARM PRODUCTS

The assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Larson (Pelly), seconded by Mr. Broten (Watrous).

Mr. J.H. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Mr. Speaker, I got the information I was asking for in regard to this bill. It has particular relation to the part of the bill that has to do with the grants to agricultural societies and exhibitions, but I think that anything I want to say

February 24, 1966

in regard to that particular point can be said in Committee of the Whole so I will not make any further remarks at the present time.

Motion agreed to.

MOTION: AMENDING THE SCHOOL ACT RE MENTALLY HANDICAPPED CHILDREN

Mr. A.M. Nicholson (Saskatoon City) moved, seconded by Mr. E. Whelan (Regina North):

That this assembly believes that every child has the right to develop his potentials to the maximum and recommends that the government of Saskatchewan give consideration to amending The School Act and other legislation if necessary, to make mandatory the education of all educable and trainable mentally handicapped children, and to recognize in its grant structure the additional costs of such education.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the fact that the house is in such a good mood at this time, and I trust my remarks will be in keeping with the attitude of the house.

I might explain that one of the reasons this resolution is before the house is that on Monday of this week the national crusade was launched in Canada for more than half a million of our mentally retarded children. As a centennial project the Canadian Association for Retarded Children has organized a campaign to raise \$15,000,000 to make an assault on this major health, education and welfare problem. The federal government has agreed to contribute \$5,000,000, the various provincial governments another \$5,000,000, and it is hoped that the public will contribute \$5,000,000 over a three year period.

A group of 150 specialists representing all the Canadian provinces have been working almost two years, and they have agreed on 13 different one-of-a-kind demonstration projects across Canada.

It's not surprising that this cause is receiving support right across our country. Mental retardation is Canada's most severecrippler, disabling ten times as many as diabetes, 20 times as many as T.B., ten times as many as polio. It has more than twice the combined incidence of blindness, cerebral palsy, polio, rheumatic heart disease. There are about 30 out of 1,000 children born who are retarded. However, it is estimated that 95 per cent of the retarded are trainable to the point of self care.

As a result of research through many years some 200 causes of retardation have been identified. Among the most common are genetic accidents, toxic agents, birth injuries and glandular disorders. The search for the cause and hopefully for cures continues.

From whatever cause no family can be immune. Mental retardation plays no favorites. It has been estimated that one person in ten will have a neighbour, a close friend or relative who has a personal reason to be concerned about this particular subject.

To launch the Canadian Crusade last fall, Mrs. Rose Kennedy, the mother of the late President Kennedy, came to Toronto to be the key-note speaker. Mrs. Kennedy explained why her family had

been so active in promoting research in the field of retardation through many years. The Kennedy's first two children were healthy, normal boys, the second becoming the president of his country. The third child, Rosemary, was retarded. Her birth was followed by the birth of six other children, all of whom have become very well known in the United States. Mrs. Kennedy remarked that she had made this statement publicly on many occasions to give encouragement to parents who became frustrated as they tried to cope with the complex problems of rearing a retarded child.

From what I have said it is not surprising that the crusade is receiving a warm response from Saskatchewan people. I will be disappointed if we are not the first province in Canada to reach our share of the \$5,000,000 which is being solicited from the general public. Saskatchewan's share in this category is some \$200,000. We are most fortunate to have a person with the organizing ability of Mr. Crittenden of CKCK-TV to lead the Saskatchewan Crusade. I have been greatly honoured to be asked to be co-chairman with Sid Buckwold for northern Saskatchewan, to work with George Solomon and Don McPherson, co-chairmen for southern Saskatchewan. We have been amazed to discover the interest there is in this particular centennial project. Our work in northern Saskatchewan has taken us to the constituencies of the Leader of the Opposition, members for Cut Knife, The Battlefords, Rosetown, Elrose and Kerrobert-Kindersley. We apologize for not being able to visit other areas in the north where no doubt there will be as keen interest as found elsewhere. A special word of thanks to the member for Elrose (Mr. Leith) for helping Eston in his constituency to be the first community in Canada to reach its objective.

Eston with a population of 1,600 people undertook initially an objective of \$1,000, but I have been advised that to date \$1,950 have been contributed. They hope that they will reach \$2,000, and I will be surprised if any community in Canada will contribute more on a per capita basis than the people of Eston and district. Mr. Crittenden must be given a good deal of credit for the splendid support given the crusade by the Saskatchewan media. The story "Second Chance for Michelle" was carried in the Saskatoon papers and carried on TV and the story was told on radio. Mrs. Florence Pratt wrote the story for the Star Phoenix and Doris Hearne for the Western Producer. Michelle is the 16 month old daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Mike Seba of Middle Lake. Through the co-operation of her parents, the family physician, Dr. Radomski of Humboldt, and the child specialist, Dr. Gerrard, the crusade was given an excellent story to start the campaign in Saskatchewan. Michelle is as beautiful a child as anyone ever saw. She looks and acts like a normal little girl and so she is except for one factor; Michelle has phenylketonuria or P.K.U., an inherited metabolic disorder which unless treated early causes irreparable damage. P.K.U. is one of the causes of mental retardation. Researchers have found that P.K.U. occurs about once in every 2,000 births. Doctors expect to discover one or two cases in Saskatchewan each year. P.K.U. is transmitted when both parents are carriers. Methods of diagnosing P.K.U. successfully were discovered some 20 years ago but more recently a blood-testing method of detecting highly concentrated phenalalonine and amino acid present in all protein foods, and the cause of P.K.U. was discovered. This was followed with the development of special diet preparations, low in protein, so that today treatment of P.K.U. may be started a few days after birth, and if necessary, continued through life. In most cases, by the time the child reaches five or six, the brain is beyond the stage where damage can be done. For some two years now every baby born in Saskatchewan hospitals has a simple blood test for P.K.U. before leaving the hospital. If a special diet is necessary

the Department of Public Health pays for the considerable cost of providing this specially prepared diet in which protein has been cut to the barest minimum.

After Mrs. Seba and her husband and the doctors had been questioned for almost an hour by representatives of press, T.V. and radio, Mrs. Seba was asked if she objected to her name and pictures being used. Mrs. Seba, who is a trained nurse, said that she wouldn't be in Saskatoon for this interview with Michelle and her husband if she was not anxious to help other parents and other children. Michelle was their fifth child. Had she been their first, or their second, or their third she would have been severely retarded as there was no formula available then when these children were born. Both Mr. and Mrs. Seba are described as carriers of P.K.U. According to the experts, when it happens that a couple marry who are both carriers, one out of four children would be perfectly normal, two would be carriers and one would have P.K.U. In the Seba case one child out of five has P.K.U. But fortunately modern science has made it possible for them to be spared having to care for a severely retarded child who would eventually require institutional care. I think anyone familiar with the story of little Michelle would feel that if two such discoveries could be made in this province each year and the children grow up to be healthy citizens, this is really a major breakthrough.

In Saskatchewan two of the thirteen major projects will be based here. At the University of Saskatchewan at Saskatoon there is to be a mental retardation unit associated with the Department of Pediatrics and the Chromosome Research Unit. This is to be a three year project.

The second is a co-operative school work program based in Regina for the educable retarded so that they will be trained for work in actual job settings during the last two years of school attendance. Before the crusade has been launched in Canada, the possibilities of the school-work program have been noted in both Prince Albert and Swift Current. They already have concrete evidence of what can be accomplished when people in the community identify themselves with a problem and wish to do something about it. The retarded who cannot manage to get beyond grade four in school have demonstrated that there are some essential jobs that they can do as well as university graduates. The trade unions have agreed that existing union agreements are not violated when handicapped persons are given a chance to join the work force as part of an educational and training program. A sixteen year old boy who had never managed to get a job on his own is working in a kitchen in a large city restaurant. When the employer was first asked how his new employee was getting along, he remarked that the new boy would never set the world on fire. It was explained to him by the educational authorities that the boy wouldn't be with him if he was able to go on to university and that this employer would in all probability have to be supporting this lad on public welfare if he was not given a chance to proceed with his training. The boy is to have half the day in the educational facility and half the day with the employer. When the young lad was asked how he liked his job, he was quite thrilled with it. "How long do you hope to stay washing dishes?" "For the rest of my life, I hope". A lad who had been trying time after time to fit into the work force but because he was retarded was turned away entered life with several strikes against him.

Mr. Speaker, I have taken some time to outline the extent and the importance of this problem before coming to the actual

resolution and I have a special word for the Premier in his capacity as Provincial Treasurer.

The loss to the Canadian economy from presently unemployable adults is estimated in excess of \$500,000,000 per year. Without special training these Canadian citizens cannot be productive so they do not pay taxes, they do not buy food, clothes, or take vacations with earnings. When institutional life claims them the Canadian public pays the cost in taxes. Tests show that 95 per cent are trainable to the point of self-care and the vast majority reach higher status. A study was done on nineteen cases removed from custodial care for the industrial training. After training each took over a new place in society and became self-supporting taxpayers. On each of these nineteen about \$68,000 would be saved in the cost of lifetime care in an institution.

The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd), the member for Regina West (Mr. Blakeney) and the member for Touchwood (Mr. Trapp) as Ministers of Education are aware of the problems of mental retardation. There is permissive legislation in effect in Saskatchewan, but it seems to me that we have now reached the stage where there should be legislation which would make it possible for all educable and trainable retarded children to expect an education which would prepare them for as useful a role as possible in modern society.

My reading would indicate that Saskatchewan is probably leading most Canadian provinces, but unfortunately we are not doing as well as a number of the States south of the border. On page 36 of the Annual Report of the Minister of Education, I note that there are only 15 places and 67 teachers where there are classes in Saskatchewan for the educable retarded. There are 21 places and 51 teachers where the trainable retarded are receiving instruction. If this resolution is passed and the government carried out our recommendation, there would be a much larger number of the educable and retarded who would become entirely or partly self-supporting.

I am greatly indebted to Dr. Samuel A. Kirk, Director of the Institute for Research on exceptional children at the University of Illinois, for several books including "Early Education of the Mentally Retarded", "Education of Exceptional Children" and several other published articles and papers. Dr. Kirk is a Swift Current boy and a graduate of the University of Saskatchewan. He has been chiefly responsible for the State of Illinois having led this continent in identifying and caring for society's mentally retarded. The late President Kennedy invited Dr. Kirk to Washington to be one of his chief advisors on the President's mental retardation committee. Dr. Kirk in his book, "The Education of Exceptional Children" explains that the educable mentally retarded has been defined as:

One who has potentialities for development in:

- (1) Minimum educability in the academic subjects of the school.
- (2) Social adjustment to such a point that he can get along independently in his community, and
- (3) Minimum occupational adequacy to such a degree that he can later support himself partially or totally at the adult level.

Educable mental retarded children are not usually recognized as mentally retarded at the pre-school level. Although they are

February 24, 1966

sometimes slow at talking and walking, retardation is not so great as to cause alarm on the part of the parents. Most of them are not known to be mentally retarded until they enter school and they begin to fail. Kirk and Johnson have listed the purposes for a program for educable mentally retarded and this should make a strong appeal to every Canadian:

- (1) They should be educated to get along with their fellow men.
- (2) They should learn to participate in work for the purpose of earning their own living.
- (3) They should develop emotional security and independence in the school through a good mental hygiene program.
- (4) They should develop habits of health and sanitation through a group program of health education.
- (5) They should learn to occupy themselves in wholesome leisure time activities.
- (6) They should learn to become adequate members of a family.
- (7) They should learn to become adequate members of a community.

The trainable mentally retarded child was described by Dr. Kirk as one who because of subnormal intelligence is not capable of learning in classes for the educable mentally retarded but who does have potentialities for learning:

- (1) Self-care.
- (2) Adjustment to the home or neighborhood.
- (3) Economic usefulness in the home, a sheltered workshop or an institution.

Studies in the United States show that there are between three and four per thousand school age children who are trainable. Half of these are at home and half in institutions. I am aware that there continues to be a difference of opinion as to whether training of these children fits into the function of the school or not.

Parents have argued that they as taxpayers have helped to pay for the public schools and that their children should not be deprived of the benefits just because they were born or had become less fortunate. Some lawmakers have passed laws which make it mandatory for the school system to supply schools for all children; others have passed laws to exclude children who disrupt the classroom. Our School Act, section 118, reads:

A board may establish special classes of instruction for children who are from any physical or mental cause unable to take proper advantage of the regular public school courses of study.

In 1956 there was an amendment added as follows:

May provide financial assistance to any person or organization conducting such special classes.

As I mentioned previously, I am not aware of any province in Canada where better education facilities are available, but we must ask ourselves each year, is what we are doing the best that is possible in this particular year.

In the minister's last report, as I mentioned previously,

there is mention that for the first group there are 998 educable children being taught in these 15 different places by 67 teachers. Then there are in 29 different places 51 teachers teaching 452 trainable children.

I might explain one of the reasons why Saskatchewan is leading Canada in this particular field. I am sure that all members are familiar with the name of John Dolan. I am not sure that it is known that the Dolans are farmers in the Girvin district. After having two children and they were not having any more, they decided that they would like to adopt a child. They did adopt a little girl about a year and a half old. They had her two years before they became aware of how severely she was retarded. The Department of Social Welfare, of course, doesn't place children for adoption, representing them as healthy children, if it is known that they are retarded, so the department said, "Well, we are sorry. We will take the little girl back". By this time the Dolans were attached to the child. They felt that she needed a home and support. They said, "No, we think that she should have the support of a family". Soon she was old enough to go to school. They hadn't realized how cruel other children can be when there is a retarded child brought into the group. They didn't realize that teachers don't always appreciate the problems of retardation. Finally the school board decided that this child must be taken out of school. The Dolans thought of building a school on their own farm, of engaging their own teacher. On reflection they decided this wasn't the solution. They heard of the special classes in Saskatoon and went to Saskatoon to inquire about having the little girl go to school there. "Where do you live?" "We live at Girvin". "Well, that settles that problem. This is for people living in Saskatoon". "If we buy a house here, will this entitle her to go here?" The answer was "Yes", so they bought a house and drove the little girl eighty miles to Saskatoon and home again each day. The little girl didn't fit into the class for slow learners so we have the John Dolan School in Saskatoon. There is a special board and the Department of Education makes special grants for this type of school.

But, I think, Mr. Speaker, in the year 1966, as we plan for Canada's Centennial, we must be aware that there are only the 15 different places in the province where we have facilities for the teaching of the educable retarded and another 21 places where facilities are available for the trainable retarded. This places a real load on the parents. I find that in places like Allen, Biggar, Central Butte, Herbert, Kindersley, Kinistino and other communities here, the parents have had to give a great deal of time and effort and money to create sufficient public opinion to do anything about teaching retarded children.

In the course of the last few weeks as we have tried to involve people in raising Saskatchewan's share of the \$5,000,000 to be raised from the public, again and again, we are asked the question, "Now, shouldn't the governments be supplying this money?" I have said repeatedly that I have never known of any government, whether it be a federal, provincial or a municipal government, that has ever had enough money to do all the things that the government would like to do. So governments must be influenced by public opinion to some extent. How much more taxes will the public provide? How badly do the people want a given service? I think it is unfortunate that parents of the half million retarded children in Canada, in all provinces, have had to carry more than their share of the cost in providing educational facilities. There are just 10 of the 59 school units in the province of Saskatchewan that have made provision for facilities for the trainable retarded.

February 24, 1966

It seems to me that we probably have enough children in each unit so that there would be justification for having a room. In recent weeks I have met parents in northern Saskatchewan who have had to provide the leadership, and I think this is one of the main reasons why this resolution is before us. Until I became involved in this crusade I wasn't aware of the extent of the problem and what this means to society to deny these children an education.

As we plan for our 100th birthday, I hope this assembly will pass this resolution which urges the government:

To give consideration to amending the School Act and other legislation if necessary to make mandatory the education of all educable and trainable mentally handicapped children and to recognize in its grant structure the additional costs of such education.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. G.J. Trapp (Minister of Education): — Mr. Speaker, I must say that I agree with much that has been said by the member from Saskatoon (Mr. Nicholson) regarding retarded children. I think, like himself, I am involved in this national crusade for retarded children. I think much will be accomplished in the coming year in this regard.

I must say, however, at the outset, while I agree wholeheartedly that much must be done in future years in this regard, I do not think that the time is right at the present to make it mandatory for all school systems.

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate at this time.

Debate adjourned.

MOTION: SICKNESS AND ACCIDENT INSURANCE

Mr. W.G. Davies (Moose Jaw City) moved, seconded by Mr. W.E. Smishek (Regina East):

That this assembly urgently requests the government of Saskatchewan to consider the introduction of a plan by which both employed and self-employed persons and their families are provided with income protection during periods of sickness or incapacity that are not covered by existing public benefits or programs.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make just a few remarks this afternoon with respect to the purposes of this resolution; perhaps the intent is pretty clear by the wording of the resolution itself.

May I begin by saying that it is rather ironic and certainly anomalous that a worker today who is injured on the job may be immediately covered by Workmen's Compensation and may receive in this, some relatively at least, generous protection, while if he suffers disability or sickness off the job, he gets in many cases no protection at all. I don't say that Workmen's Compensation per se is a perfect institution; it is simply that there does exist some reasonable protection for the employee on the job to

cover injuries that are suffered during the course of his work. But there isn't a comparable protection for those who become sick off the job.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that both self-employed and employed persons encounter a great degree of hardship when they experience illness, especially if that illness or disability is prolonged off the job. If that disability does happen to be of the lasting or permanent kind, lasting through his lifetime, it can really make a wreckage of that person's life and the life of those who are connected with him and depend on his income as the breadwinner.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that one has only to talk to Social Welfare workers to know of the considerable number of examples that exist of families who are overnight plunged from a fairly happy and prosperous condition into poverty and unhappiness. Especially these days when families habitually owe a great deal of money through mortgages on homes, loans for personal effects, and so on, the dangers are even greater than they were perhaps, say a few years ago when many families were committed much less than they are today, financially speaking.

Now it is true that trade unions in recent years have to some degree been successful in getting cash benefits for sickness through effective bargaining means. However, the amount of the benefits varies considerably, and trade unions, of course, represent only about one-third of all of the employed population. It is clear that their efforts have operated in a pretty narrow field. There are, of course, benefits that are operative for non-organized employees, but again because these do not come about through collective bargaining, they are not as likely to be as effective as those that are negotiated through employee-employer action. And they vary a great deal and offer even less protection in most cases than agreements that are negotiated for sick pay protection between unions and their employers. For very many self-employed persons, Mr. Speaker, there is no coverage whatsoever, and all in all, it may be said that benefits for sickness or disability, apart from one's employment, are generally of an inadequate nature if they do exist at all.

It is generally conceded too that a program of benefits for illness or disability is a necessary adjunct to a health insurance program, and that it is, in any event, an inevitable component of any comprehensive and well integrated system of social security.

Here, I would like to refer to the International Labor Organization convention on social security, which includes the provision of sickness benefits, namely:

The contingency coverage shall include incapacity for work resulting from a morbid condition, and involving suspension of earnings . . .

This is I.L.O. convention 102, concerning minimum standards of social security which was passed in 1952, articles 13 and 14.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as a leading country in the world, Canada has generally subscribed and conformed to the I.L.O. conventions on labor and social security. Yet in this respect I think you will see that we have not done those things to which we have generally conformed in I.L.O. conventions.

I want to tell the house that cash sickness benefits are

payable in the following countries and I don't say that this list is necessarily completely inclusive. I would like, very quickly, to read into the record this list of countries that do have these benefits, Mr. Speaker. They are Albania, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, China, Chile, both Nationalist China and Communist China are included, Columbia, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, the Dominion Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, France, West Germany, East Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Iran, Iraq, Italy, Japan, Libya, Luxembourg, Mexico, Nicaragua, Norway, Paraguay, Peru, the Philippines, Portugal, Romania, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, U.S.S.R., the United Kingdom, the United States of America (in respect of the states of New York, New Jersey, California, and Rhode Island as well as the whole railway industry), and finally, Venezuela and Yugoslavia. This is a list of 47 countries. I have excluded from the list Australia and New Zealand. These countries are excluded because they do have programs but these programs are based on an income test.

I suggest that the long list of countries that have sickness benefits point to the fact that public programs for sick or disability pay are by no means any novelty across the world today. They are effective in the major countries of the world. If anyone wants to check on these references, by the way, I am sure the Legislative Library will supply them through "Social Security Programs Throughout the World, 1958", produced by the United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

Mr. Speaker, I said a few minutes ago that while there are a number of employers or private schemes that are in effect for workmen and other sections of the population, they are sparse and are apt to vary considerably. The ratio of benefits to earnings may be relatively high or low. This depends on the amount of premium that the employer or the employees jointly are willing to pay and that the insurance carriers, if any, are willing to underwrite. The duration of the benefits may be from two to fifty-two weeks. There may be a variation in the waiting period before benefits become payable. There may be a host of other restrictions and limitations before the individual who becomes sick and disabled is able to qualify. Fundamentally there is in these schemes, no universal pooling of risk but pooling is a necessary characteristic of a social insurance plan which leads to a greater degree of equity in the distribution of the burden of costs.

Mr. Speaker, to many people it appears that a public program of cash sickness and disability benefits that provide at one stroke universal coverage and standard benefits would be the best means of getting a desirable benefit along the lines I have indicated as socially necessary.

One eminent authority, Mr. Arthur J. Altmeyer, in his Social Security Bulletin of March, 1947, summed it up very briefly when he said:

The object of temporary disability insurance, as of any social insurance, is to provide basic protection to covered workers and to provide it at the lowest possible cost. If commercial insurance carriers take part in the program it is impossible to achieve a second objective, that is insurance at the lowest possible cost, and it will be more difficult to ensure basic protection of all covered workers.

Mr. Speaker, the basic structure for an income maintenance

program for temporary disabilities already exists in part in the Workmen's Compensation Act of the province of Saskatchewan. The Saskatchewan Act covers a very large part of the wage-and-salary-earning population so far as occupational accidents and industrial diseases are concerned. Subject to maximum earnings of \$6,000 per annum for benefit purposes, the benefit rate for temporary total disability is 75 per cent of earnings for the whole duration of the disability. The formula varies somewhat in the case of partial disability or permanent partial disability, but the 75 per cent figure generally may be taken as an effective one.

This act and its benefits, I want to point out, is non-contributory in character; that is to say there is no contribution required by the employees affected. The plan is paid for by employers on the basis of the accident experience in each industrial division or sector.

As I remarked, it seems to me that it is completely incongruous that workmen should receive income protection during periods of accidents and yet not receive protection during periods of illness off the job. The need, after all, in the latter case is equally as great. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that a cash benefit program for sickness would also complement and supplement existing programs like, say, hospitalization and medical care. The worker who is disabled by non-occupational illness or accident would not only be safeguarded from the cost of medical care and, of course, hospitalization, but would also be protected against the loss of income which would result from disability.

The Saskatchewan Health Insurance program that we all know about would thus contribute substantially to reducing the costs of the disability program by making available diagnostic, curative, and rehabilitative services on a very comprehensive scale. Again, the incentive under the health insurance program, that is, to restore the person to good health as soon as possible, would help to guarantee the disability benefit program that I would like to see become effective, could be administered more efficiently and more economically than would be the case if a cash sickness benefit program existed in isolation from all other programs.

I have said I personally think that a great deal could be said for a system of benefits that would cover all employees and all self-employed persons under the Workmen's Compensation Act.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that there is no good reason why the machinery that we have working relatively effectively under the Compensation Act needs to be duplicated if we were to decide on some kind of a sick-pay plan in Saskatchewan. I have spoken about self-employed and employed persons as deserving of protection. I don't need to tell any member of this house that in a province like ours there are a large number of farm people, self-employed tradesmen, small merchants, older operators of equipment, trucks, and so forth who would benefit from the kind of protection that I suggest can be made effective without too much difficulty.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that in my opinion, one of the greatest gaps we have left in protective social security legislation is in the field of assistance to those family bread-winners who become ill or disabled away from the job, especially for long periods of time. You know families in this unfortunate position suffer very greatly from these unexpected and catastrophic disabilities. Not only are their savings dissipated, not only is the maintenance of the home in danger, particularly these days when so many people have large mortgages

February 24, 1966

to carry on their homes. There is danger also to the orderly process of family education and the happy development of the family from adulthood to maturity. These are jeopardized unless we can find the protection which at the moment is lacking.

Of course, situations of this kind also place added strains on branches and agencies of government that are set up to supply aid of one kind or another and are called upon to jump into the breach in situations where people become sick and disabled.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I hope that I have indicated as succinctly as I can the reasons for placing this resolution on the Order Paper. I hope too that the rationale for sick-pay plans of a public variety has been established by the examples that I have given.

I will, therefore, at this time, Mr. Speaker, move the foregoing resolution, seconded by the member for Regina East (Mr. Smishek).

Debate adjourned.

MOTION: OLD AGE SECURITY PENSION

Mr. J.H. Brockelbank (Kelsey) moved, seconded by Mr. J.E. Brockelbank (Saskatoon City):

That this assembly is of the opinion that the government of Canada should increase the old age security pension to \$100.00 per month payable at age 65 without a means test.

He said: Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure for me to have the opportunity to speak on this motion which I propose to move, seconded by my son, Mr. J.E. Brockelbank (Saskatoon City).

Now, Mr. Speaker, everyone will agree that this is a very reasonable request, especially when we have just been informed that a certain Mr. Argue has now gone to a position where he will get \$15,000 a year until he is 75 years of age and then half of that as a pension. I am sure that now everyone in this house will support this motion . . .

Hon. D. G. Stuart (Minister of Public Health): — The Liberal party is like the Kingdom of Heaven, open to all.

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — I would like to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if the members of the government feel very sad and want to go into mourning, why we would have no objection if they want to adjourn the house tonight.

Mr. Stuart: — You should have followed Hazen. You, too, might have been a Senator.

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — It is wonderful how things happen. While I am on my feet and before I start into my address on the subject, I want to say my public words of welcome to the two new members, the member

from Moosomin (Mr. Gardner) and the member from Bengough (Mr. Mitchell). As everyone on this side has said, we didn't do anything to help them get here, but now that they are here it is hoped that they will enjoy being here and that they will make a good contribution to their province of Saskatchewan.

Canada is just about to celebrate its 100th anniversary. Saskatchewan a hundred years ago, of course, was almost unknown country. I should qualify that, Mr. Speaker, the southern part of Saskatchewan, what is now the settled portion of Saskatchewan, 100 years ago was practically unknown. There was something known about the northern part of the province, the area where there is trapping and hunting and so forth. But in the southern part of the province, there was little known. And it is during this century that practically all of the development has taken place in this area which is now the province of Saskatchewan.

A great many of the pioneers came to this province before the turn of the century but it is also true that a great many of our pioneers came to Saskatchewan around the turn of the century and up to 1910 when the settlement was expanding, new land was being broken, bush was being cleared, homes were being built, railways were being built, roads and trails were being improved. These pioneers who came to Saskatchewan endured all the trials of cold and heat and drought, of flood and frost and rust and of grasshoppers, and without many of the advantages that we have today when it comes to encountering these difficulties. In the face of all these difficulties they built our land. They were stout people. Now the last of this tribe of pioneers are approaching their retirement age, the pioneers who came here 60 years ago or about that time. A few of these people became wealthy, not too many, Mr. Speaker. A few more were able to assure themselves of comfortable retirement but a great many of them have not enough saved nor do they participate in a retirement plan. In the great majority of cases it is not a question of being their fault. They have worked, they have given their lives to the development of our country, and this is a time when we should not be thinking of the question of property. They all deserve comfort and security and certainly some of the luxuries that are available today.

The question may rise: Is \$100 a month too much? I think the answer to that is simple. None of us members in this house would like to undertake a job of living on \$100 a month for a year, much less would we like to undertake to live on \$75 a month for a year. This should be the measure or one of the most important measures which we use to decide whether or not this is a satisfactory proposition.

The province of Saskatchewan, the Dominion of Canada, is of course, a rich country. Our problems from time to time have not very often been a scarcity of goods. The problems have sometimes been a surplus of goods. And we have been told over and over again that it's the business of selling, the business of getting the goods to market that is so very important. If this is true and I think everyone will recognize it is true, how foolish we are to say to these elder citizens in Canada who do not happen on their own to have a good standard of living, to say to them, "You must live to a very, very poor standard of living". I don't think there is any question about it. We can afford this. It is ridiculous to suggest that this country is so poor that some of our pioneers must live at any lower standard than \$100 a month. There is no question about it that this country can produce the goods and services to sustain that kind of standard. It is physically and economically possible to do this and it should be possible

to make this financially practical as well.

Now there are some advantages in it as well for the province of Saskatchewan if this were put into effect. To have \$100 a month for all people at age 65 without a means test would mean that Saskatchewan would be relieved of participation in the Old Age Assistance Pension. Saskatchewan would also be relieved of participation in a good deal of additional assistance which is now needed because of the very low pension figures at \$75 per month. But there are plenty of things that the province can do.

Although here in Saskatchewan we have built a great many low cost residences for our senior citizens, there is still room for lots more. Much could be spent throughout the province of Saskatchewan and certainly throughout the Dominion of Canada on building better low cost housing for our senior citizens. We could provide more subsidized nursing homes. While it is true that our senior citizens want to maintain their independence just as long as they can, it is also true that some of them will not be able to do this. Some of them in their later years will need nursing care and we should have good nursing homes for these people that would be available to them, homes where they can be as happy as possible under the circumstances. Provinces could do a good deal in providing home care for the senior citizens. Many of them would not need a constant service of nursing provided they had a home and nursing care, qualified people to call to see them and look after them sometimes once a day; sometimes it might only be every other day or twice a week to help them with some of their home care.

All of these things would not only be of benefit to our senior citizens but would also be good business for the province as well.

I have already stated that our senior citizens want to maintain their independence to the greatest extent possible so things we do should be, I think, with that in mind; and for some cases particularly in our cities, in our larger centres, there could be service to give meals. They are talking about this in Britain now. They call it "Meals on Wheels", one good meal a day taken to the home for an elderly citizen who is not quite able to look after himself or herself. This is a field that could be investigated and where a good deal could be done.

Elderly people also want to have recreational facilities. They are just as much interested in having an interesting life as our younger people, and we haven't paid too much attention to this need or to providing the kind of recreational facilities that would be suitable for elderly people. Something has been done by voluntary effort in Saskatchewan in that line but there is room for a great deal more. But above all, help the senior citizens to maintain independence just as long as they can. That is most valuable.

There are some other little things that we could do. For example, I notice that the Saskatchewan Transportation Company has had a very successful year, and I know that the S.T.C. buses in the middle of the week from Tuesday to Thursday very seldom are full, usually lots of room. There is no reason why we could not give to our senior citizens passes on these buses which could be used at this time of the week when they are not crowded because our elderly citizens want to occasionally travel. They have sons or daughters or families in some other part of the province, and this would be very valuable to them.

The city of Regina has done something about this with regard to its transportation facilities here. It is just interesting to ride on the buses in Regina and watch the old age pensioners come on to the buses, show their pass, come in — this is a great convenience to them — come in and sit down. I'll bet you they are very proud of those passes and they value them very highly.

Everyone I think will agree that the ideal situation in regard to health services would be to have health services available to all people without any individual money barrier. We have gone some distance toward that in Saskatchewan. We do have both hospitalization and medical care and only a relatively small barrier of the personal tax which has to be paid. If we are ever going to reach the situation where there will be no fees, no personal fees for this service, and in some provinces they have no personal fee for the hospitalization plan, a fine thing would be to start by giving to all old age security pensioners a card entitling them to services under the medicare plan and under the hospitalization plan. This would be of great value to these people. We have had programs for these people under which they can get a supplemental allowance and when they get this allowance they then get a health services card. Sometimes those supplemental allowances are cut off. Mr. Speaker, do you wish to call it 5:30, Sir?

The assembly recessed until 7:30 o'clock p.m.

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — At recess I was just saying that here in Saskatchewan we had provided a supplemental allowance for certain of the old age pensioners and with that supplemental allowance went a card which entitled the holder to medicare and to hospitalization. I was about to say that when through changing circumstances a pensioner lost his supplemental allowance it was not the supplemental allowance he lost that he cried about, but it was the loss of his medical care and hospital insurance card that hurt him so very much. This privilege to the aged people, of having sure and certain access to the best of medical and hospital care, is one of the most valuable and valued things that they can have. And that is why I recommend that we give very serious consideration to providing for all our old age security pensioners this service without them having to worry about buying the cards.

What we get in pension, whether it's \$75 or whether it's \$100 a month, is still not too much, and it would help them materially if we gave them this card as well. I have in my hand a proposed budget prepared by the Canadian Conference on Ageing. It is entitled "Modest but Adequate Monthly Budgets" and for an elderly person living alone the total requirements are \$138.96 per month, for two people \$223.82 per month. We are not suggesting in the resolution that we make the pension \$138 but we could come a great deal nearer to a desirable minimum than is \$75 a month.

The Leader Post had an editorial a short time ago on February 5th on "Aged and Ageing Ignored". One paragraph in it says, and they are quoting from the report of the Senate Committee I believe:

The Committee found that 38.5 per cent of the Canadian males between 65 and 69 had incomes below \$1,500 a year. For females the percentage was much higher, 85 per cent. At 70 the percentage of males with incomes below \$1,500 rose to 60.6 per cent while the female percentage remained approximately the same, 84.7 per cent.

February 24, 1966

So it is true that there are a great many people who need additional assistance and that these very high percentages of people at this age are living on incomes that are very low indeed.

Another clipping from the Leader Post of February 3rd and it's headed "Senator Croll on Aged", and he says:

As the Committee ploughed through its work he said it was established that the old can't wait any longer. What they need, they need now. The people we are concerned with haven't got time on their side.

I think that is something that we should remember too that we should act before it is too late to do good to many of these people. Now, I would like to quote just briefly from three places in the Senate Committee Report. The first is on page nine and this is in the matter of establishing government responsibility. The Committee says:

Broadly it may be said that governments have the overall responsibility to see that (a) older people have sufficient income to support a desirable minimum standard of living; (b) the necessary range of basic services and facilities required by older people are provided and available to them; and (c) that under whatever auspices such services and facilities are provided, acceptable standards are maintained.

It is accepted by the Senate Committee and I think it is accepted by everybody that governments now do have a responsibility in this respect, and it is right that we should accept that responsibility and carry it out properly. On page 17 of the report:

Any suggestion that these older people when the \$75 pension is not sufficient should be expected to depend for supplementation on public assistance after a means test is utterly unacceptable. Public assistance should, of course, be available to them as to others in the population to meet residual needs and to deal with special circumstances. But it is the Committee's conviction that main reliance for meeting their ordinary requirements should be on benefits to which they are entitled as a matter of right and that the proportion of older people requiring means-tested supplementation should be very small at all times.

I agree with that most heartily, that they should be entitled as a matter of right to an income which will give to them at least some kind of a desirable minimum standard. There is one more quotation on page 16:

Having lived through two world wars, the great depression, and the period of marked inflation, these older people find themselves now with few personal resources and dependent on the support of government programs to a much greater extent than the new retirees are likely to be.

The time is now when we should be doing something about it, Mr. Speaker.

Now, the Senate Committee recommended a guaranteed income of \$105 per month. This has some merit as to the amount, but in spite of what the Senate Committee says, it still keeps a means test because no pensioner would get this supplement to make his

income up to \$105 a month unless he showed by submission of a return like an income tax return what his income was. Now, you know, Mr. Speaker, all of us know that the great majority of the older people who are in this income bracket, who have \$100 a month or less, are not people who have been accustomed to making out income tax returns. To ask them to make out an income tax return is ridiculous. Furthermore, they would get this additional assistance a year late, at the end of the year, after the time when they needed it. So I think that much better is to have the basic pension of \$100 a month, and it shouldn't stay there for all time in the future either. If we are going to have continued inflation in the future, this figure will need to be adjusted in the future to take care of that inflation. It should also take care of a little bit of the increased ability of the country to increase the general standard of living.

One hundred dollars a month at 65 is a matter of right I don't think is impossible to finance. Certainly it isn't impossible to supply the goods and services that these people would be able to buy if they had the \$100 a month as a minimum. I don't think it should be too difficult to finance it. In the first place we would save to some extent on what is now paid out on the Old Age Assistance plan and with some adjustment in the income tax the situation could be taken care of.

You know there are some iniquities in our income tax structure. At the present time a person who has a \$3,000 taxable income pays four per cent of that taxable income as an Old Age Security tax. But the person who has \$12,000 taxable income pays only one per cent of his taxable income as an Old Age Security tax. This is because of the ceiling of \$3,000 on the assessable taxable income. There is no good reason why this ceiling should be there. There is no good reason why this ceiling shouldn't be raised to \$10,000 or \$20,000 or some other figure. Having a ceiling at this point so that the tax is only paid on incomes of \$3,000 and less is in fact asking the poor to support the poor. This kind of philosophy went out of date about the end of last century. It has no business being in effect now.

Now, as a last word to my Liberal friends in this legislature, I would remind them, and they are proud of this, it was a Liberal government that started the Old Age Pension back in 1927. They started the Old Age Pension because they were in a pinch and under pressure, but ever since that time, Mr. Speaker, Liberals have been bragging about it and proud of it. It makes them feel good to have done it. Once again you have a chance to put the pressure on another Liberal government. I can tell you that if you put the pressure on, if this Liberal government at Ottawa makes the change and pays \$100 a month at 65 without a means test, your successors in the Liberal party will be proud of it, bragging about it for years to come. So I ask you, not only in the interest of the old folks, not only in the best interest of our country, but even in the best interest of your own political party, support this motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J.E. Brockelbank (Saskatoon City): — Mr. Speaker, as seconder for this resolution regarding \$100 a month old age security pension at the age of 65 without a means test, I would just like to offer a few comments.

In our affluent society in which we exist today, the assistance

February 24, 1966

programs that are offered for unemployed, for the physically ill, for the mentally ill and others, are quite evident and accepted. It seems incongruous to me and I am sure to a lot of other people that the governments of Canada should require any rhetoric whatsoever to persuade them to implement the body of this resolution. It also seems incongruous to me that today we have the announcement of an appointment of the senator for Saskatchewan and that senator will draw one-half a million dollars from the public purse of Canada, barring any unseen misfortune to himself. Not only was there one senator appointed today; I understand there were ten.

There are many of our elderly citizens living on the edge of poverty or in poverty, and I speak from practical experience of having had the opportunity of visiting these people in the city of Saskatoon. I might say that I also had the opportunity of visiting elderly pioneer people in the constituency of Moosomin and in the constituency of Bengough. These people were right up against it, Mr. Speaker. I am sure that no greater deed could be done for the pioneers of this province than for the newest members of this legislature to join together with all of us and give this resolution unanimous support.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. D. Boldt (Minister of Social Welfare): — Mr. Speaker, I believe the government agrees with a lot of the things that were said by the hon. member from Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank), although I would like to make one statement that the seconder was his son. The member from Kelsey has said so publicly that he will not be a candidate in the next election, so his son has seconded the motion increasing his income after he leaves this house. In my humble opinion, this is almost worse than a senate appointment.

Mr. A. Blakeney (Regina West): — That's a very humble opinion.

Mr. Boldt: — I would like to point out to the members opposite that during the last federal election it was stated that if the increase was made of \$100 a month at the age of 65, this would mean an additional expenditure of \$850,000,000 by the federal treasury. Unless the people opposite would suggest to us how to find ways and means to raise this amount of money when the federal treasury has been deficit financing, I don't think it is fair to suggest that we should ask the federal government to increase this pension.

Mr. A.M. Nicholson (Saskatoon City): — Cut out two or three submarines.

Mr. Boldt: — However, I believe that there are a lot of people in need who are receiving \$75 a month and they should receive more. However, I am also of the opinion that there a good number of people that don't even need the \$75. There are people whom we could classify as millionaires; I know that Mr. John Diefenbaker and Mr. Pearson are both getting the \$75. Now, I think if based on need we could maybe perhaps increase these people that are in need to more than \$100. Somehow I believe that the idea of welfare based on need certainly will meet the people's needs rather than give away public money in many areas where the need does not exist. The welfare program in Saskatchewan is based on this and

I think this is one of the fairest methods of seeing that the taxpayer's dollar is wisely spent. However, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few more comments and I beg leave to adjourn this debate.

Debate adjourned.

The assembly adjourned at 9:56 o'clock p.m.