

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Second Session — Fifteenth Legislature
16th Day

Tuesday, March 1, 1966

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. J. E. Brockelbank (Saskatoon City): — I would like to introduce a group of students from St. Mary's Separate School in Saskatoon. I believe that Saskatoon is leading the way again this year in the interest that is being shown by the teachers and students of that city. I hope that they have an informative and educational stay here, and a safe journey home. I believe, Mr. Speaker, they are in the west gallery.

Mrs. Sally Merchant (Saskatoon City): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to join in the remarks of the member for Saskatoon (Mr. Brockelbank) in welcoming this St. Mary's group. I am looking at and seeing some very familiar faces amongst them. It is very nice to have the schools, as the member from Saskatoon has remarked, show the interest that they have. In particular, I think we are glad to have St. Mary's.

Hon. D. V. Heald (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, before Orders of the Day, it is my pleasure this afternoon to introduce the members of the grade 12 class from the Lumsden High School who are seated in the Speaker's Gallery. They are accompanied here today by Mr. Terry Koral, their Social Studies teacher.

Mr. Speaker, about a year and a half ago, Lumsden built a new high school. They are in the process of calling tenders for a new eight-room addition to this high school. I am sure we are all pleased to have these students with us today. They have been here since the middle of the morning and they have toured the buildings. I am sure you would want me, Sir, to express to the teacher and to the students our hearty welcome and to express the wish that their stay will be useful, productive and educational.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

ANNOUNCEMENT RE ST. DAVID'S DAY

Mr. W. G. Davies (Moose Jaw City): — Mr. Speaker, before Orders of the Day, I would like to draw the attention of the House to the fact that this is St. David's Day. I expected my seat mate to be present this afternoon and to say a little more than I feel I should say considering the shortage of time since radio broadcasting will be starting very shortly. However, I think all members of the House would want to acknowledge the fact of the Welsh race, the contributions the Welsh have made to culture, art and the state, and in many other fields. I think sometimes it is rather ironic that the name Welsh is actually derived from a Saxon word which means outlander or foreigner. After the British race were beaten back into the mountains of Wales they acquired this name even although they were, of course, the oldest or one of the oldest races of the British Isles.

March 1, 1966

I believe, Mr. Speaker, the House would also want to recognize the individuality and the love of freedom which has always characterized the Welsh race, who have been a tenacious and a gifted people in all that they have undertaken.

In Canada, perhaps, they are a minority so far as the Scotch and the Irish groups are concerned. Still for all that I think the race has made a great contribution.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Davies: — Yesterday, I think we saw some of the eloquence that can be displayed by the Welsh race when the financial critic (Mr. Blakeney) rose to discuss the budget.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

ADJOURNED DEBATES

BUDGET DEBATE

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Thatcher (Provincial Treasurer) that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair, and the amendment thereto by Mr. Blakeney (Regina West).

Hon. J. W. Gardiner (Minister of Public Works): — Mr. Speaker, in my opening remarks, I would like to add a word to that which was expressed by the member from Moose Jaw (Mr. Davies) in extending best wishes to all those of Welsh ancestry, not only in this House but throughout this province on this St. David's Day.

I would like to say that during the past year I know that many of us had the opportunity of hearing the Welsh choir. We enjoyed the singing ability of the Welsh people when they were here in Regina. I am quite certain that some of the hon. members were able to take that in and were able to enjoy the fine singing on that occasion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gardiner: — I think from my knowledge of the Welsh people that singing comes almost naturally. I'm not sure if the hon. member from Moose Jaw (Mr. Davies) or the hon. member from Regina West (Mr. Blakeney) has that great ability or not, but I know that one of the traditional parts of the fame of the Welsh people is in their singing and in their music.

Mr. Speaker, when I adjourned the debate last evening, I had been speaking about the amendment that had been moved by the financial critic of the opposition yesterday afternoon. I had been pointing out that in the words of the amendment practically every part of it was taken care of in the Budget or in the Throne Speech that was prepared for this House and for this session of the legislature.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

I pointed out that in the last two years of Liberal government the tax position in this province had been improved to such an extent that every person in Saskatchewan had received tax reductions since the election of the Liberal government in 1964.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gardiner: — My friend the official critic (Mr. Blakeney) yesterday tried to indicate that those less favorable in this province had been forgotten by the government of the day. I proceeded to indicate to him that almost every tax reduction that had been made in the last two years had been as important, if not more important, to those on low incomes in our province than to those with ability to pay. In referring to the tax reductions I think I should just refresh in the minds of members of this House, Mr. Speaker, the record of the government in the past two years.

Last year in our session, a reduction of one per cent of the education and health tax, the abolition of the mineral tax on farmers' land, and, of course, the right to use purple gas in farm trucks, each one of these measures affected farmers and every individual in this province, whether of low income or high income. Then we come to the budget that we are considering in this session we find the Home-owner grant. Here again the greatest advantage is going to go to the low-income group. I know having lived in a smaller community that most of our homes in our small urban centers run around the \$100 taxes on their home property. I can say here that a 50 per cent reduction for our low-income people in this province, and for many of those in cities of at least 25 per cent reduction in their property taxes, will be received by the people of this province in a very favourable light. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I would remind you that the people of Bengough only a few days ago gave the answer to the opposition and congratulated this government on its actions in the last two years by re-electing a Liberal member in the person of Mr. Mitchell.

There has been a great deal said about taxes in this debate, particular by the official critic of the opposition and I would just like to indicate to him and to the people of the province through this legislature that in the last two years there has been a gross decrease in taxes amounting to \$24,000,000, while on budget account there has been only an increase in taxes of some \$4,000,000, making a net decrease in taxes in the last two years of \$20,000,000 to the people of this province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gardiner: — When it comes to priorities, which has been another suggestion made by the opposition, I think anyone in looking at this budget and looking in the budget of a year ago, will find that the priorities are placed exactly where the opposition critic states they should be placed. I think for this reason, Mr. Speaker, I do not know how any member on the opposition side of the House can stand up, speak against this budget, and then vote against it.

Particularly in the field of highways, I want to say here there is no more important problem facing the people of our province than in providing good transportation media for all areas of the province of Saskatchewan. During the last two years the new Liberal government has spent on highways \$25,000,000 more than was collected in gasoline and car license fees in this

March 1, 1966

province. What happened in the years before? During the last ten years of the CCF government, that government had paid \$20,000,000 less on highway construction and improvement than they had received in taxes through gasoline and car license fees. Mr. Speaker, I think this indicates how the government of the day is accepting its responsibility and is placing these priorities and expenditures of the government of the day in the proper places. I call on members of the opposition to join with government members in endorsing this type of handling of money of the people of this province.

The major efforts of the government to provide these services and at the same time reduce taxation, have been first to implement a program which would bring to this province industries of all kinds, in order to provide a broader tax base under which we can carry on the operation of government in this province. Secondly, the government has insisted that in the fields of administration and government costs that every step be taken at the administrative level to save dollars and provide more efficient government. In both these fields our government under the leadership of the Premier and Provincial Treasurer, has led the way in Canada during the last two years. I think it is worthwhile at this time to take note of the record of the former CCF government and the present Liberal government in keeping promises. I well remember the many promises made in the 1944 election, because I took time out to attend at least one CCF meeting held during that campaign in this province. As well we have on file newspapers and the literature of the CCF party on which they had placed their promises at that time. Among the major promises were the following:

- (1) They would do away with the education tax.
- (2) They would accept full responsibility for education.
- (3) They would provide full hospital, medical, nursing, dental, optical, and all health services without charge to the people of this province.

Let's look at the promises. Promise no. 1, the education tax was increased to five per cent, not abolished. Promise no. 2, with regard to accepting full responsibility for education, after twenty years of CCF government they were still only accepting 40 per cent of the operating costs of our schools in this province. Promise no. 3, hospital, medical, and all other services, it took almost a full 20 years of CCF government to put in more than one of the promises with regard to health services and that one was not without charge.

Again, how did the CCF propose to pay for these commitments? We can take either the statements of their leader, T. C. Douglas, or the CCF program for Saskatchewan, as reported in the Saskatchewan Commonwealth. These were the main ways in which such a program was to be financed. One, it could press for federal aid for increased old age pensions, education and health services. This is the only promise to my knowledge that the CCF ever attempted to carry out. Whenever they got into difficulties they certainly were good at crying to Ottawa. Two, it could and surely would save money by the elimination of graft and inefficiency in the public service. I think that many of us know the record of the high escalating cost of public service during the 20 years of CCF administration. Three, it could refuse to pay the high interest charges currently levied to service the provincial debt. To my knowledge in the 20 years that the CCF was in office they never did refuse to pay the high interest charges that were levied to

service the provincial debt of our province. Four, a CCF government could obtain revenue from the wholesale distribution of petroleum products. Here again, no effort was ever made, to my knowledge, to go into the business of the wholesale distribution of petroleum products. Five, a CCF government could obtain revenue from the further development of electrical distribution. Well, I think from the information we have received in this session, we know that they lost money through electrical distribution during the years they were in office and didn't make it. Six, the CCF government could obtain revenue from the wholesale distribution of other commodities, say, food and machinery along the lines indicated for petroleum products. Well, again, to my knowledge the CCF government did not go into distribution of such commodities during their 20 years in office. Of course, the last one, a CCF government could raise money from the development of natural resources. The only thing they did, Mr. Speaker, was to chase out any who desired to develop the natural resources of this province, which, of course, resulted in great losses to the treasury of the province of Saskatchewan.

Let us place this record of promises not kept alongside the record of the present Liberal government under Premier Ross Thatcher, with regard to its promises.

First, the reduction of the sales tax which took place in the first budget. Second, tax free gasoline in farm trucks, authorized in the first session. Three, mineral tax on farmlands to be abolished. Payment of mineral tax on farm lands ended December 31st, 1964. Four, steps will be taken to reduce property tax; Home-owner grants of \$50 brought before the legislature in this budget. Just one of the many measures that have been taken in the last two years to relieve the property owner of the heavy weight of taxation. Five, the list of sales tax exemptions would be increased, 24 items in the first budget, 15 items in the second budget. Six, \$175,000,000 four-year highway program to be launched. With only the continuation of expenditure at the level suggested in this budget, that plank in the Liberal platform will be completed well before the next election. Seven, more financial help to be given to municipalities. In the present budget, assistance for snow clearance, assistance for grid road maintenance, and for extending and improving grid and municipal roads are contained. As well, in the 1965 year, the highway department took into the highway system approximately 400 miles of grid road. Eight, to provide free text books for all students in elementary and high schools. This year we are taking the first step, as I mentioned earlier, by providing free text books to grade nine students. Nine, to maintain and improve working conditions and wages. Last year the minimum wage was increased; this year further increases are contemplated. Ten, to newlywed couples exemption from the sales tax on the first \$1,000 purchases for household goods. This promise was carried out February 19th, 1965. Eleven, to review and improve the entire program of health and welfare services. Time will not permit me to review this promise but I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that the government is well on its way to fulfilling this promise. Twelve, to introduce legislation settling Saskatchewan's time problem. A Bill is being presented in this session. Thirteen, to sharply increase financial aid to education. In the first year the Liberal government spent \$11,000,000 more on education than was spent in any single year by the CCF. In 1966 and in the budget that is now before us, the government will spend \$23,000,000 more than was ever spent by the CCF-NDP in a twelve-month period.

This is the record of achievement and accomplishment of

March 1, 1966

Liberalism in less than two years, set beside the record or un-kept promises of T. C. Douglas in 1944.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gardiner: — One of the government's savings, Mr. Speaker, that I referred to a moment ago, has been in the field of the handling of the automobiles used by public servants in this province. One government saving has resulted from the creation of the Central Vehicle Agency, to look after the handling of the government vehicle fleet, with the exception of construction vehicles, Saskatchewan Power and Saskatchewan Telephone service trucks and heavy trucks which are still handled by the agency concerned. Central Vehicle Agency handles all passenger cars, station wagons, special purpose and light trucks, up to the one-ton size. The savings have resulted from four actions: reductions by the government car fleet by 415 cars, a change in personal driving regulations by employees, and a pooling of the departmental pool cars into one central agency, and fourthly, eventual savings in administration costs. Projected annual savings for the second year of the program will be some \$658,000.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gardiner: — Of course, it is hoped that as the program continues that further savings will result. We can look forward to eventual savings to the public by the establishment of a Central Vehicle Agency to approach \$1,000,000 a year. Former public criticism of the use of government cars for personal use will no longer be valid as regulations have been put into effect and will be enforced which will make certain that anyone using government vehicles for personal use is paying a reasonable share of the costs for this purpose. A Central Vehicle Agency will be operating under the Department of Public Works, and its operation will go into effect on a 100 per cent basis on April 1st of this year.

During the 1965-66 fiscal year, the main activities of the Department of Public Works have centred around:

1. Providing space for the various departments and agencies. This includes maintaining and operating a large number of government buildings and making arrangements for rented accommodation.
2. Supplying furniture and furnishings.
3. Providing architectural and other technical services.
4. Operating the mail and messenger service for government departments and agencies in the city of Regina.
5. Carrying out a program of capital construction.

I would first like to review briefly those activities falling under ordinary appropriation. My department's ordinary appropriation for the fiscal year 1965-66 amounted to \$3,688,330. When we take off grants to the Western Development Museum, Pion-Era, and the Saskatchewan share of the joint exhibition pavilion for the 1967 World Exhibition, all of which amount to \$155,000, we have a net of \$3,533,330 for the Department of Public Works. As nearly as we can forecast we expect to be very close at the end of the fiscal year to meeting this budget.

The provision of space in government service divides into two categories, namely, that which is provided in government buildings and that which is provided in rented quarters. The department has either partial or complete responsibility for the maintenance and operation of some 115 government-owned buildings. These vary in size from a few hundred square feet to several hundred thousand square feet. Roughly, one-half of the net ordinary budget is required for the maintenance and operation of these buildings. The maintenance and repair program for the year amounts to approximately \$318,000. This program is aimed at keeping in an acceptable state of repair the thousands of electrical, mechanical, architectural, and structural components of our buildings. In addition it includes a certain amount of small improvement and renovation work. The work is being carried out with the department's own trade staff and with private contractors and sub-contractors. The program is reasonably well advanced and we expect to complete most of it by the end of the fiscal year. The main objective is to keep the buildings in sound structural and mechanical condition and we believe the maintenance and repair program will achieve this objective.

With respect to building operation it is our desire to maintain the services at an acceptable level, and within this framework to achieve optimum economy in operation. Towards this end gradual but steady progress is being made.

I would like to make a few comments about contract cleaning. From April 1st, 1965, contract cleaning has been implemented in the government buildings in the city of Regina, the Land Titles Building, the office building at 1739 Cornwall Street, and the Health Building. On April 1st, 1965, about half of the area in each of the technical institutes in Moose Jaw and Saskatoon were put under contract cleaning. In all five buildings, approximately 358,000 square feet are being contract cleaned. The department's standard contract contains a clause by which cleaning can be suspended in areas that are temporarily out of use. In the technical institute at Saskatoon and Moose Jaw, substantial areas are not used during the summer periods. The suspension of cleaning in these areas alone has produced in the current fiscal year savings of approximately \$6,200. Based on experience to date, I am pleased to say that we have found contract cleaning to be quite satisfactory. There is no reason to believe that this method is not an improvement, efficiency-wise and economically. However, we will be in a better position to judge after four years' experience.

I would like at this point to compliment the trade and care-taking staff of my department for the fine work they are doing in building maintenance and operation. Equally, I express my appreciation to the contractors and their staff for the excellent work and co-operation they have given to me and the staff of my department.

The Legislative Building continues to be one of the major tourist attractions in the city of Regina. In the current fiscal year, from April 1st to the middle of February, some 58,000 tourists have visited the building. It is expected that by the end of the fiscal year the number will rise to about 65,000. This is about 3,000 above the number for the fiscal year 1964-65. The Dome on the Legislative Building encouraged some 35,000 people to make the long trek upwards. I am sure that anyone who has gone up to the Dome will agree that the experience is worthwhile. Although I will be speaking about this in greater detail later, I can say that plans are being formulated that when implemented will result in the visit to the Dome being even more rewarding.

March 1, 1966

To provide the visiting public with better service the department contracted with Wascana Centre Authority last May to provide guides in the Legislative Building. These young ladies are well trained, knowledgeable, courteous, and helpful. They have provided a high standard of service. I have no hesitation in saying that I have received a great many compliments on the excellence of the guide service in the Legislative Building.

The second category into which the function of providing space divides is that of rented accommodation. When the government owned buildings are inadequate to house government departments and agencies, it becomes necessary to rent. As of April 1st, 1965 there were about 110 leases for rented quarters distributed over 49 urban communities in the province. In addition a large number of short-term rentals are required for halls to accommodate special court sittings in various locations in the province. We are endeavouring to utilize wherever possible surplus space in buildings owned by Crown corporations. This arrangement has the advantage of providing considerable flexibility for the Department of Public Works and at the same time producing revenue for the Crown corporation. Three floors of the new Saskatchewan Government Telephone building in Regina are now occupied by government agencies. The old Saskatchewan Government Telephone building in Regina is now partially occupied by government agencies and further moves into this building will be executed in the near future. Our staff is looking into the possibility of utilizing surplus space in the Saskatchewan Government Telephone building in Moose Jaw. In Saskatoon, the Government Telephone building, the Saskatchewan Transportation Company building, and the Saskatchewan Power Corporation building are now being used to provide accommodation for agencies. In addition to the arrangements made with respect to Crown corporation buildings, a number of leases have been executed with suppliers in the private sector. The most important changes that have occurred during the 1965-66 fiscal year are: government agencies in the Flin Flon-Creighton area have been consolidated in one rented building; the Health Region in Humboldt has been moved from the location in a former residence to good standard office quarters in a rented building in the downtown area; several scattered agencies in Swift Current have been placed in rented accommodation close to the business district; the Department of Highways district office at Yorkton has been consolidated in one location in rented premises; the agriculture representative who was previously located in Maidstone was moved to Lloydminster and has been provided with good quality office space there. In the overall these changes constitute further progress in the direction of providing government departments and agencies with good quality accommodation. In addition, further improvements are planned and the plans will be implemented as soon as my staff have examined all the information and ironed out all the details.

The second main activity of the Department of Public Works is that of supplying furniture and furnishings. This activity consists of the supply of standard manufactured furniture items, such as desks, tables, chairs, filing cabinets and so on, the supply of rugs, drapes, pictures, and similar items and the repair of these items where it is economical to do so. As close as we can estimate we will finish the current fiscal year within the budget amount of roughly \$142,000.

Included in the budget for furniture and furnishings in 1965-66 was provisions for the remainder of the pictures of former Lieutenant Governors, former Premiers and the present Premier of the province. The portraits were painted by Mr. John M. Alfson

during the summer and early fall of 1965. We now have portraits of each Lieutenant Governor and each Premier who has been in office since the province of Saskatchewan was formed. The five portraits in question are now framed and are in secure storage. I have had the opportunity to view them at various stages while they were being painted and also to see the completed work. I can assure you they are very attractive.

The third main activity is the provision of architectural and technical services. Aside from the work that is required in connection with the capital program, extensive services are provided to other government departments and agencies. The services range from the investigation of small building problems and allied engineering problems to complete design, tendering and supervision of construction of entire buildings. The Department of Education for schools in the north, the Department of Natural Resources for buildings in provincial parks, and the Department of Public Health are the main users of our services.

I would like to spend a few moments on the subject of small community hospitals. A design for a small hospital has been developed jointly by the staffs of the Department of Public Works and the Department of Public Health. The design is flexible in that the overall size can be easily varied to provide eight, ten or twelve bed units. In addition a good deal of flexibility is possible for the interior arrangement of rooms. The typical facilities in one of these small hospitals consist of wards for the accommodation of patients, laboratory and X-ray facilities and dressing rooms associated therewith. Nursery, doctor's office and examination room, a paediatrics room, an isolation room, a case room, a room for emergency treatment, kitchen and dining rooms, reception and nurses station and spaces for waiting area, washroom, storage and utility purposes. Two of these hospitals are now under construction in the province and a third will be put out to tender in the near future. I believe that this is an excellent example whereby co-operation between two departments makes it possible for the government to assist in bringing to the people of the province a much needed facility.

The fourth main activity of the department involves operating a mail and messenger service for the various departments and agencies in the city of Regina. The budget for this service amounted to \$44,660, and as nearly as we are now able to estimate we shall end the fiscal year within the budgeted amount. The preliminary findings of the Johnson Commission reveal that over the years a number of mail and messenger services had been set up and were being run by various departments of government parallel with the service being provided by the Department of Public Works. In the fiscal year 1964-65 my staff carried out a careful study of the problem, made recommendations and discussed these with the various users. The recommendations involved adjustment of mail truck route schedules and some alteration of procedures. The recommendations were implemented in early April, 1965. As a result of these changes the mail services being operated by other departments have been substantially eliminated. This has been accomplished with no increase in staff and no increase in the number of vehicles being used by the Public Works mail and messenger operation. I might mention here that for the fiscal year 1966-67 all of the postage will be paid under the Public Works vote. This arrangement will eliminate a tremendous amount of bookkeeping and accounting work being done by departmental mail clerks and by your own staff in keeping track of the cost of postage so that it can be billed back to the various users.

March 1, 1966

The 1966-67 ordinary budget provides for a level of activities approximately equal to that of 1965-66. A sub-vote structure has been ordered to reflect more accurately the administrative units of the department to provide a grouping of buildings that more closely reflects the major use being made of them with more closely identified specific activities. As is sometimes the case in classification some compromises are necessary. For example, it was found desirable to place in one group all the buildings in Wascana Centre. A small number of buildings that did not logically fall in any of the other classes have been placed under the heading, Miscellaneous Buildings, when the sub-vote, Taxes, Assessments, Insurance and Licenses, has been adopted to collect a small number of items paid by the Department of Public Works which do not seem to logically fall in any other sub-vote. The change will cause some difficulties in examining the estimates for 1966-67 but the process will be much easier a year from now.

I would like to turn now to the capital estimates. The capital estimates are structured to reflect the major purposes of the expenditure. I will take the items in the order in which they are shown in the printed estimates.

The Department of Education, the Saskatchewan Technical Institute at Saskatoon - \$405,000 was provided in the current fiscal year for a start on an extension to the Saskatchewan Technical Institute at Saskatoon. It had been the intention to proceed with a moderate-sized addition as stage one project and follow some time later with a second addition, as stage two. Some careful evaluation of needs indicated the desirability of proceeding with both stage one and stage two. While there appears to have been some lost time I am confident that the additional time spent on planning will result in a better facility and, in addition, may achieve some economy. The addition to be constructed will be about the same size as the present building and will provide for a large number and variety of classrooms, shops and like facilities. We estimate that the addition will cost in the order of \$4,000,000. Tenders will be called as soon as the design has been completed, likely in late spring or early summer. The \$2,600,000 in the 1966-67 estimates is for that part of the work that is estimated to be done in the fiscal year. However, the contractor's progress on the building will determine the precise expenditure. The federal government will be paying 75 per cent of the cost of this addition.

The Repair Depot at North Battleford will be one of the other larger items in our capital budget. This will be a new building which will provide services not only for the Department of Highways but also for the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. We are hoping that in this expenditure and by combining two departments of government we can bring about economies.

Natural Resources is a very small expenditure this year.

Public Health, the Saskatchewan Training School at Moose Jaw — many serious faults have been found in the original construction that was done at this particular site, so within the next year we hope to correct these faults.

I might say that one of the most important expenditures, I believe, that will be seen in the capital expenditure of my department has to do with the Legislative Building. Of the sum shown for the Legislative Building \$65,000 is required to complete the contract of the installation of the refrigeration plant which will provide air conditioning to the Legislative Buildings. The

remaining \$500,000 is for a start on a program of interior renovations. Because of the importance of this program I will take a few minutes to go into detail about it. The Department of Public Works has engaged a competent Regina architect, Mr. Clifford Wiens, to study the building and prepare recommendations concerning the renovations. Initial studies indicate that for purposes of considering renovations, spaces in the building can be divided into two categories. One, those which are used mainly by the public and secondly, those which are used for carrying out the work of government. The importance of the building to the public generally leads us to concentrate first on the public area. It is the intent that the renovations be approached through a spirit of restoration. The designer must maintain a deep respect for the building as a building of its period. Within this context it is proposed that renovations will consist of the following:

1. Improvement of floor and wall materials in the corridors. Careful observation will reveal that the foyer, main stairway, rotunda and a few other areas were constructed with materials of high quality in both appearance and fact. In the corridors leading away from the central area compromises were made to reduce construction costs. Compare the cracked terrazzo and the plaster and wood finishes in the corridors with the marble finishes in the central area.
2. Construction of exhibit space on the first floor and basement floor directly below the rotunda.
3. Construction of modern washrooms for public and staff.
4. Improvement in the direction and intensity of lighting in the foyer, main stairway, rotunda and corridors. Careful attention will be paid to the character of light fixtures.
5. Improvement in the floors, walls and ceiling of the basement. Major surgery is required to bring the basement up to a level reasonably compatible with the remainder of the building.
6. Possible changes in stringers, risers, and balustrades in stairwells.
7. Construction of a multi-level observation in the exhibit area in the tower space above the rotunda.

These are some of the possibilities that we are going to face in the next few years with regard to the renovation of this, which, I believe all of us feel, is the most important public building that we have in our province. I am sure that our citizens would have us maintain it in a manner which would be proper and also have it restored in a manner in which we could all continue to have the pride in it that we have had since it was constructed and the people have had since it was finished and opened in 1911.

Mr. Speaker, because of the time element I am just going to say now that I will not support the amendment that was made by the critic for the opposition, and I will support the budget.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. B. D. Gallagher (Yorkton): — Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand here this afternoon the last five budget speeches delivered by the last four Provincial Treasurers of the former CCF government. Four of them were delivered by three people sitting on your left and one of them by

March 1, 1966

their now departed friend, Clarence Fines. I would recommend them as light reading to the members of the opposition on some cold wintry night, and I didn't say enlightened reading. What a difference, Mr. Speaker, from the speech that was delivered Friday last, by the now Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Thatcher) in his second budget.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gallagher: — My first words, Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on the Motion of Supply must be to express my feeling that the budget that was brought down the other day and the Budget Speech reflect the attitude of this government as to how provincial government responsibility should be carried out. Before I comment on what remarks the financial critic had to make yesterday afternoon I would like to say that although I would like to have 75 minutes of air time — which I cannot have — it would not take 75 minutes to destroy the argument that he tried to build excusing the members who sit to your left for voting against the 1966 budget. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the financial critic in his remarks yesterday afternoon, as is the case with every Socialist speaker, inside or outside of this House, is trying to build up a case to make the people of this province believe that the government of Saskatchewan has set out to destroy all the institutions and the programs that may or may not have been built in this province over the last 20 years. Mr. Speaker, I think that all governments, even the Socialists, try by the implementation of their policies to do what they think is best for their province or their country. The only difference is that some governments think that some particular thing is not the best or it may be the best thing for the people, while another government may differ in this particular opinion. Then again, even when the aims of political parties are the same — and here is where the Liberal party differs from the people to your left, Mr. Speaker, - we believe that the things that are best for the people can be obtained in a different method than our Socialists think. I noted that one of the first remarks that was made by the financial critic last Friday afternoon when he rose to speak after the Provincial Treasurer had delivered the Budget Speech, was that he said there was a great risk in foreign borrowing because of the danger of the change in the dollar exchange. I might remind my friend, Mr. Speaker, that he is partly right when he says this. But it is only too bad that he hadn't told his old friend, Clarence Fines, this fact during the years that he was Provincial Treasurer of this province when he borrowed hundreds of millions of dollars to finance the Saskatchewan Power Corporation when the Canadian dollar was at a premium, now to be paid back with a cheaper Canadian dollar.

The financial critic went on to say that U.S. or foreign borrowing was always NDP policy as long as it did not mean foreign ownership. Well, Mr. Speaker, this sounds just about as brilliant as most Socialist economists' statements sound. On one hand it's alright for the government to borrow 80 or 90 per cent of the value of the Power Corporation and pay back interest to the American coupon clippers, but it's not alright to have those same people risk their capital in a company that would develop our resources and provide jobs for our people. This sounds to me just about like Socialist reasoning. They will say anything that is anti-American, thinking that it might be popular out in the country and win them a few friends or a few votes. I notice that not too long ago where one, Mr. Harding, - I am sure they all know him, - where it was suggested that he was going to lead a group of NDP youths to protest American foreign policy in Vietnam.

He was going to lead these youths on a march to Ottawa some time later this spring. Now surely, Mr. Speaker, these people could find something better to do than to criticise the government of the United States or to dictate foreign policy to a power that has spent literally billions of dollars to protect the free world from the spread of communism.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gallagher: — I would like to turn for a few moments now, Mr. Speaker, to a few comparisons of what this budget is doing in the way of giving services to the people of this province as compared to what our friends in the opposition, who have been doing all the criticizing, were able to do or promised to do in their last year of office. Taking from their estimates of 1964-65, which was the last budget presented by the member for Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank) when they were last in office, and the estimates of 1966-67 which were brought down here the other day, I would like to go over just a few figures from some of the departments. For example in agriculture, the capital spending under conservation and development, 1964-65, \$2,704,000 in the estimates; 1966-67, two years after that government was defeated, \$4,577,000 or just about double. The Family Farm Improvement Branch, \$595,000 two years ago under the Socialists, \$735,000 today under the Liberals. The total for the department up from \$10,076,000 to \$12,353,000 or about a 25 per cent increase. I notice that he didn't say anything the other day when he was speaking, - I am referring to the Regina West member (Mr. Blakeney) — about the Department of Mineral Resources and some of its spending. Take for example, the \$600,000 that's going to be voted for mineral exploration incentives. What did they spend two years ago, nothing. He didn't say too much about the \$7,000,000 increase in the Department of Health.

He did have something to say about the Department of Education and the spending in that department. Well, in 1964-65, in grants to schools, the last CCF government two years ago asked for a vote of \$42,040,000. In this present budget we are asking to spend \$59,410,000 or an increase of 40 per cent. In technical and trade training, two years ago \$2,250,000; this year \$3,750,000, up 65 per cent; university spending up 25 per cent; the total for the Department of Education \$58,000,000 to \$79,000,000 today, an increase of 36 per cent in just two years, Mr. Speaker.

As for highway spending, as the member for Melville (Mr. Gardiner) has already indicated, there has been a great increase in highway spending in the last two years. And it was about time we had an increase. Just in the maintenance of our public highway system, two years ago the Socialists were going to spend \$7,342,000 if they could have remained the government. This year we will be spending \$9,588,000 just for the maintenance of our public highways. The total of ordinary expenditures up 30 per cent, \$10,032,000 two years ago, \$13,518,000 today. The total capital expenditure in the last year of the CCF government \$16,838,000 as compared to \$34,899,000 in the present budget. I believe as the Provincial Treasurer said the other afternoon probably this will be increased before the end of the fiscal year, up just about 100 per cent from two years ago. The total for highways \$26,000,000 was two years ago under the Socialists, \$47,500,000 today in our second year of government.

I would like to turn for a moment to the Department of Municipal Affairs. This is something, Mr. Speaker, that I have advocated ever since I came into this House. I believe that we should

March 1, 1966

have over the past 15 or 20 years been helping local government more than what we were doing. At long last we have a government that recognizes its responsibility in helping local government. For example, take grants for re-gravelling market grid roads; it didn't just happen that this was a need for local government in this particular year; this has existed for the last four or five years, up 25 per cent from \$480,000 two years ago to \$600,000 in this fiscal year. The grants for maintenance of grid roads are \$1,000,000. How much did you vote for this? Nothing, absolutely nothing.

Equalization grants, Mr. Speaker, two years ago were \$600,000 under the Socialists, today \$2,000,000 a 233 per cent of an increase in our second year of office. Besides this, Mr. Speaker, there is an item in the Department of Municipal Affairs of \$8,000,000 for Home-owner grants to the people of this province. We have long advocated that property taxes were too high in this province. This is the first time in the last 20 years that the government has taken concrete steps to try and help the property owner from the ever-increasing property tax-load that he has been burdened with. The total for the Department of Municipal Affairs, without the Home-owner grant, was increased from \$6,900,000 two years ago to \$7,568,000 this year and with the grant an increase of more than double what it was two years ago. So you will see, Mr. Speaker, that this Liberal government has not set out to destroy all the institutions of government and good programs that were started before we came to office. We are doing more than any Socialist government ever did in the field of education, in the field of health, in highway building, for mineral resource development, for agriculture, for help to the municipalities and school boards. Practically every worthwhile project that the former government might have started when they were in office, we have continued and expanded since we came into office.

I said earlier in my remarks, Mr. Speaker, that all governments try by the implementation of their policies to do what they think is best for their people. The Liberal party differs in their objective from the Socialists in that we believe the government should create a climate wherein men and women can enjoy a decent standard of living and to a great degree work out their own security. We believe in a social program that takes care of their own security. We believe in a social program that takes care of the unfortunate, the sick, or the underprivileged. Unlike the Socialists, we don't think the individual's future should be carved out by a state planner. That, Mr. Speaker, is why the Socialist government was defeated two years ago and that is why they weren't able to win the Bengough by-election just a couple of weeks ago, because the people of this province have decided that they had their chance for 20 years. Instead of providing what they promised they would be able to for their people in this province, they kept this province behind the rest of this country. Governments just can't produce shoes, or boxes, or bricks, or tan hides, or make woollen blankets as well as individuals can. Mr. Speaker, I said a year ago, speaking in the budget debate, that the first Liberal budget was a budget of promise and a budget of hope. Today, Mr. Speaker, that promise is becoming a reality and the hope has turned into help. Our province is developing, our economy is booming. As long last local governments, both municipal and school governments, are getting badly needed increased assistance and the taxpayer for the first time in 20 years is seeing a ray of light in the way of reduced taxation. This Liberal government's main aims are these, first a reduction in taxation and secondly, the development of our forests, our mineral and oil deposits, along with the much needed industrialization of this

province. All this adds up to more jobs for Saskatchewan people, more goods produced for export from this province, more money for the government of the province to spend on essential services and a richer future for our people.

I see, Mr. Speaker, that my time is up on air. I certainly would like to have made a few comments more on what has been said by the opposition critic (Mr. Blakeney). I will vote against the amendment and support the main motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. E. Whelan (Regina North): — Mr. Speaker, since I spoke in an earlier debate, the hon. member for Bengough (Mr. Mitchell) has taken his seat. I wish to congratulate him and to say that he is representing a good constituency inhabited by hospitable and industrious people. I hope that he makes a good contribution to this House.

Mr. Speaker, the budget contained no surprises. The government is in the happy position of having inherited a surplus. It is riding on the crest of an inflation period in the Canadian economy. There was a good crop, the potash industry which has been in the planning stage for ten years is continuing to expand. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, when one considers the attitude of the government towards the opposition members and its attitude toward people, particularly those who are in need, and its attitude toward the assets we own, this is an ineffective and inefficient government. Let us look at the record in regard to democratic responsibilities of members. Why is there nothing new in the budget? Well, Mr. Speaker, each program that is included in the lengthy pages of this contradictory document has been announced two or three times, either at provincial-municipal conferences or through the press office of the Premier. Whether you want to talk about telephone expansion, grants to municipalities, the sale of Saskair, the battle between the government and Lloydminster, time and time again the public of Saskatchewan have been advised through the press, long before members of the legislature knew anything about the details involved. This is a performance, Mr. Speaker, of contempt. This is a performance of insolence, unparalleled in the history of this province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan: — Mr. Speaker, insurance rates were announced in the Toronto Globe and Mail. Weeks later they are announced in this House. Insurance rates on homes in this province have risen in some instances as much as 50 per cent but there is no reference to this in the budget, Mr. Speaker. In exactly the same way items that the government would like to brag about are in the pages of the budget. Items that are not politically helpful are carefully hidden, as is the case also with their press releases.

Mr. Speaker, let me set out where I think the government has shirked its responsibilities. For years the legislative broadcasts have been carried from this legislature. The series has in the past consisted of 1,500 minutes or 25 hours broadcasting from this chamber. This year the government has not budgeted for the full time, broadcasts are curtailed with lengthy gaps breaking the continuity of the legislative coverage. Mr. Speaker, citizens anxious to hear the proceedings have been unable to follow the hit-and-miss schedule. It is unfortunate that they are being denied this democratic privilege.

March 1, 1966

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan: — Mr. Speaker, all the information we are supposed to get, as I said earlier, is released through the press. When questions are asked in the House they are seldom answered satisfactorily. Too many times replies are flip, incomplete, or just propaganda, as was exhibited when the question was asked regarding the much bragged about 30 new industries. They talked about these 30 industries for months. Surely they can name them. These are their 30 industries, they should know what they are talking about. Why do they publish a propaganda brief when they are asked for specific information? This is the flip, irresponsible attitude they have regarding the activities of the government.

When a legislative committee met during the past summer and fall, Mr. Speaker, an interim brief was prepared and tabled in this House. Weeks ago when it was tabled the press received a copy and big black headlines ran in the local daily. Mr. Speaker, not one member on this side of the House received a completed copy of the report until yesterday. When the McLeod Royal Commission submitted its report on taxation, one of the most carefully documented and one of the most complete works on taxation in the history of this province, editorial writers, commentators, every organ of the news media had a copy of it, but not members of the opposition. It was only when I wrote a pointed letter to the Premier that I received without comment a copy of the McLeod Royal Commission Report. The government seems to consider the press more important than the elected members, who have been sent by their constituents to carry on the business of this province.

Mr. Speaker, a Youth Committee was set up. It met the length and breadth of the province, the Budget Speech says. We have a Bill coming along regarding youth. It's been on the order paper for some time. This committee compiled information, information that is valuable to members particularly when considering the Bill. I am sure that the Committee came to certain conclusions that were most helpful. It made certain recommendations, but the report of this Committee was denied to members of the legislature until yesterday. Surely the expenditure of funds to work on the problems of youth justifies having the findings in the hands of every member of this House prior to the introduction of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, statements have been made about the number of Bills that are to be brought in. Up until now Bills have been short in many instances, a few words in length, a few sentences. Up until now they have been housekeeping Bills, more like caretaker legislation, as if the government did not expect to be in office very long. They are rewriting old legislation with a few changes, a word here, a word there, in an old Bill, some forty Bills, much of it legislation written to collaborate with federal legislation. When you consider its publicity releases, Mr. Speaker, its failure to submit reports and its weak, unbelievably short legislative programs submitted thus far one can only come to one conclusion, this government opposite is not exhibiting leadership.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan: — Mr. Speaker, in the most glowing terms and in the most exaggerated fashion the story of a vast population expansion, the fast expansion in population, in manufacturing, in industrial development, has been told by the hon. members in the government;

this all led me to believe that no one would ever be in need in this province and that the budget would be at least \$100,000,000 more than it is. Imagine my surprise when I asked the question on the order paper, "How much is the payment for each infant foster child per month?" The magnificent sum from this affluent government with its approximately \$25,000,000 surplus that foster mothers receive for the care of babies under the government's plan is \$1.40 per day. That is \$42 per month. Incidentally, the Premier's allowance has been increased to \$50 per day.

Mr. Thatcher: — No. No.

Mr. Whelan: — The allowance is \$42 for 30 days to a mother who looks after an infant baby 24 hours per day.

An Hon. Member: — A baby doesn't drink as much.

Mr. Whelan: — Now this was presented to us as a tremendous increase. It was presented to us as a tremendous increase over the payments made by the previous government. The previous government paid \$1.20 a day but they paid for the baby's formula at 31 cents a day or a total payment of \$1.51 per day. This is a story that everyone who is concerned for the care of babies in foster homes and everyone in this assembly should know.

In its efforts to balance the books and present the picture of a government that is not going to allow for any cheating or any excessive expenditures in the welfare field, it raised this allowance to \$1.40 from \$1.20 but it said to the foster mothers, "Now you pay for the formula". This was in effect, a reduction of 11 cents to save money for you and me, the taxpayers. They took 11 cents from the mothers who look after these infant wards of the Crown. There was an uproar and I quote from a foster parent who had written me and for whom I took up the battle. Mr. Speaker, I take full responsibility for the letter. It's dated in Regina, Saskatchewan, June 11, 1965, and I quote from the letter:

I would like to take a few minutes of your time to liberally plead for help which is urgently needed by many families here in Saskatchewan. This is in the field of social welfare concerning specifically the foster parents' rates.

Previously we were paid \$1.20 per 24-hour days and special formulas such as SMA or Enfalac were provided for the infants. Now we are paid \$1.40 per day and must provide the special formula out of this big increase. The only hidden catch is that the special milk costs 31 cents a tin per day. The net result is we now receive \$1.09 per day.

Another change has also been instituted. Previously the rate was increased from \$1.20 to \$1.50 per day for July and August but this will no longer apply. Ironically we had firmly planned on taking two infants this summer during the high pay period as the money is needed.

Sir, I ask you to consider this letter and study the cost sheet. When the costs are considered we are paid about four cents an hour. Tell me how much do these Liberal parents pay babysitters when they go out for the evening?

March 1, 1966

On behalf of all the foster parents in Saskatchewan who I believe will endorse this letter the immediate help of your party is requested. We have been told that many of the foster parents have also given up taking babies and also must do with less income.

Sincerely,

Graham Lough

Mr. Speaker, under pressure the government raised the allowance. They gave the foster parents a 16 per cent increase to \$1.40 per day but the foster mother still has to pay for the food. The allowance is at \$1.40. But it was presented to the public as an increase and there was an editorial patting the government on the back. Mr. Speaker, I quote that editorial, August 12, 1965, Regina Leader Post:

The first foster home increase in five years goes into effect in the province September 1st. Welfare Minister Boldt has announced that the government will now pay \$42 per month for children up to nine years.

I quote further in the editorial:

This demonstration of governmental recognition of the realities of rising costs involved in providing food and clothing for energetic and growing children is heartening. It is a most deserved and long overdue assistance coming to those who have opened their homes and their hearts to foster children. Significantly these homes have invariably been in the lower or middle-income groups and often have involved considerable sacrifice on the part of the foster parents and their own natural children to take others into the family circle.

I say this, Mr. Speaker, if we have to save money in this province and particularly after the fluent speeches bragging about the surplus, if we have to save it by chiselling mothers who care for a child at the rate of four cents an hour, then I suggest that this government's attitude towards those in need is callous and indifferent. With this huge surplus, the government buys a publicly owned aeroplane for the cabinet ministers. Mr. Speaker, they increased the Premier's out-of-the-province per diem from \$25 to \$50.

Mr. Willis: — Per day.

Mr. Whelan: — Per day. They pay legislative secretaries an extra \$2,000 a year but when it comes to foster mothers they chisel to the tune of 11 cents a day. Foster mothers who look after infants on behalf of all the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Thatcher: — Nonsense . . .

Mr. Whelan: — With the resources at our command, with our \$25,000,000 surplus, the attitude of this government toward the care of helpless infants makes Scrooge look like Santa Claus.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan: — Mr. Speaker, I should like

for a few moments to talk about page 56 of the estimates under welfare items for old age assistance and supplementary allowances. Mr. Speaker, during the past year and a half, over and over again, recipients of supplemental allowances have been called in and their supplemental allowance payment reduced. I have said to myself, "What is the attitude of the Liberal government toward these people in need?" Mr. Speaker, I think I have found the answer in a newspaper clipping.

Now safely in the Senate and away from the wrath of the voters, stacked on the political shelf, the former deputy leader of this government opposite, placed on the record in Regina, December 6, 1965, an official attitude toward those on supplementary allowances when he said, and I quote:

I don't think this nation owes anyone a living. I don't care how old they are.

An Hon. Member: — Senator McDonald.

Mr. Whelan: — I say this vote is not enough. I say that this vote should be increased if necessary to cover payments up to \$100 per month. Mr. Speaker, the former deputy Premier, now Senator McDonald, said that he does not support the idea of raising the old age pension payable over a time at the age of 65 years. Yes, I contend that members opposite are not interested, that they are ignoring the plight of senior citizens, that the senior citizens on supplemental allowance in Saskatchewan are inadequately clothed and fed.

As my colleague from Regina said yesterday in addition there is the story of those who are in mental homes, private homes. These have been placed in private nursing homes and their relatives have been asked to pay higher rates to look after them. Many times relatives are elderly and unable to pay and some of the homes that they are placed in are most unsatisfactory. The complaints that are received in the city of Regina are not, I'm sure, without foundation.

Mr. Speaker, this is how they save the Department of Public Health money. This is how they save the Department of Welfare money. What a way to save money by cutting down allowances to foster mothers, by reducing supplemental allowances to old age pensioners, by unloading the public responsibility for the mentally ill on those less fortunate and often financially unable to pay.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn for a moment to just two examples of the government's attitude toward the assets of the people of Saskatchewan. The people of Saskatchewan, with their own money, have developed certain assets, in some instances to provide employment, in some instances to provide services, and in other instances to establish a yardstick of value. Unlike introducing American companies which are controlled by American directors and giving them access to our natural resources, these publicly owned corporations are managed and directed by Saskatchewan people and the capital is Saskatchewan money. The Saskatchewan Transportation Company supplies a bus service. Those of us in Regina city hear of constant negotiations for portions of the bus routes with companies. These rumours are so persistent that one cannot ignore them. What this amounts to over a long period time, if this trend continues, is curtailment of services to the people of this province.

March 1, 1966

Mr. Speaker, the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office has been a godsend to the people of this province. They kept rates in this province 30 per cent or more below rates to the east or the west of us. It saved the people of Saskatchewan millions of dollars. Last week after initially raising the rates, when they were first elected, they raised the rates 20 per cent. The minister in charge of the SGIO stood in his place and said that the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office had the largest profits in the history of the company. This ordinarily would suggest a decrease, or this would have suggested a lowering of the rates. This should have established a valuable yardstick in the insurance rates for this province. But what happened? Another 20 per cent increase in Regina, rates now up 40 per cent and in some towns 50 per cent and on farms and in some areas a much higher increase. In addition, some of the best parts of the insurance contract have been taken out. The deductible has been changed. The yardstick is gone. The members opposite have sold out to the private insurance companies.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan: — Now that the rates of private insurance companies will be in some instances lower, the next song and dance you will hear is that there is no need for government insurance. “Look at the rates”, they will say. “There is no need for government insurance”.

Some of them may say that salaries caused the rates to go up. The profits last year were the highest in the history of the company. They could have increased salaries out of the profits this year, certainly without another increase in rates. The influence of their friends in the private insurance companies dictated the rates that every person in this province who owns property will now have to pay. The minister says that the staff wrote the rates, but I say the hand that guided the pen was the hand of the private insurance companies.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan: — None of us should be surprised. The history of the Liberal party in Canada has been a sell-out to their friends. Time and time again valuable assets have been sold that belong to the people of this nation. Let's name a few. The multi-million dollar Beauharnois scandal; the fantastic Trans-Canada pipeline episode; the sale of the coal mine at Estevan for \$1; the sale of a fertilizer plant at Calgary for \$1; and the most recent sale of Saskair. The sale of assets that belong to the people and they are so brazen about it that they should put it in their party platform so that they will be able to include it under the item “Promises kept”.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan: — Mr. Speaker, I have given this House evidence why I think those in this government are not fulfilling its function; first, because of its attitude toward its responsibility to members of the legislature; second, its attitude to people such as foster mothers, pensioners, and the mentally ill; and third, its attitude toward the assets that belong to the people of Saskatchewan.

Now, I should like to turn for a moment, if I may, to the desperate situation that is facing taxpayers and consumers in the city of Regina. Looking at the budget, Mr. Speaker, and having in mind the increase in the cost of education in Regina, one can only conclude that school grants allocated to urban area will not meet the mill rate increases. It seems obvious that taxpayers in Regina, for instance, will be called upon to pay a two or three mill increase to cover the increased cost of education. In Regina a count of the students, a quick look at the grant and at the cost of expansion and additions of added teachers, increased debt charges show that the school grants are inadequate to meet the need.

I wonder if I could turn for a moment to roads, arterial roads within urban areas. A return tabled in this House recently shows that the citizens of Regina received \$211,900 to build urban arterial roads last year. Mr. Speaker, this is hopelessly inadequate and taxpayers of Regina can expect another round of tax increases as a result. It should be noted that before they get the \$211,900 in Regina they have to put up \$211,900. When you consider that the cities pay an average of \$30 per capita in gasoline tax it is no wonder that we are asking for a larger grant to help with the construction of arterial roads. It is no wonder that citizens of Regina feel that connector roads joining highway no. 1 and no. 6, and highways no. 1 and no. 11 should be paid for entirely at the expense of the province and should be made a part of the highway system. Mr. Speaker, the \$500,000 for urban areas, for collector roads, and I'm using the word in the budget now, the descriptive phrase is collector roads, is inadequate to meet this need and is being offered too late at this date to make plans for the coming year. Mr. Speaker, with the extra one per cent increase in gasoline tax and with the desperate tax situation that exists on property in the cities, especially for those with a fixed or limited income, and even after allowing for some relief that is contained in the budget, it would have been reasonable to have given at least half of the increased one per cent of the gasoline tax to the urban centres, in addition to the \$500,000 for collector roads mentioned in the budget.

Mr. Speaker, the Budget Speech says property taxes are too high. I agree.

Mr. J. H. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — They are going higher.

Mr. Whelan: — And yet, Mr. Speaker, the budget provides little for connector roads and an inadequate portion of the gasoline tax, nothing for health grants for urban centres.

Mr. Speaker, one of the problems we have in Regina at the present time is the high cost of law enforcement. I think this applies in all the cities in the province of Saskatchewan. A good portion of the work, that is done in the law enforcement field is for provincial law enforcement. The city of Regina, for instance, provides a court and staff. There should be a complete examination of this cost and a new division made between the province and the city. I certainly hope that the Attorney General (Mr. Heald) will use his good offices in this area.

Hon. D. V. Heald (Attorney General): — . . . talk about it now.

Mr. Whelan: — I understand that the Department of Municipal Affairs has hired one man to do research on urban problems. I'm sorry the

March 1, 1966

minister is not in his seat. One research person to deal with the problems of 65 per cent of the people of the province. Certainly I hope that the government does not think that this one person can look after the urban problems of Saskatchewan. In Regina recently we had an engineers report calling for changes. It was expensive. It was lengthy. I'm not sure about the objective of the study but if the proper research facilities were available a team of qualified people from the Department of Municipal Affairs could do periodic surveys of this kind. This type of team should be readily available, not only to the city of Regina but to all of the cities in the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, many times materials needed for the construction of roads and sidewalks in urban areas have to be tested and checked. A branch in the Department of Municipal Affairs could study materials used by urban municipalities and rural municipalities as well. This branch could be most useful, helpful and practical. The whole field of assessment, of law enforcement and technical advice regarding administration are areas where a proper urban section of the Department of Municipal Affairs could provide information, information that would be neutral, expert, and of practical assistance to urban centres.

Mr. Speaker, with the short work week and the need for recreational facilities, I'm not talking about recreational facilities that are 60 miles away at Katepwa but close to the cities, more money should be spent on recreational facilities without adding to the cost of property taxes.

Mr. Speaker, because of the government's attitude toward the Assembly, providing information to the press before they give it to elected members, because of their callous treatment of infants and senior citizens, that is of those in need, because of the give-away of Saskatchewan assets, because of the refusal to consider these items in their budget, Mr. Speaker, I will support the amendment. I will not support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. D. Boldt (Minister of Social Welfare): — Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Whelan: —Certainly.

Mr. Boldt: — I understood him to say that there were some communities where the insurance rates had gone up 40 to 50 per cent. Could he identify these communities?

Mr. Whelan: — I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if he looks carefully at his own rate list he will find the . . .

Mr. Boldt: — Well, you don't know.

Mr. Whelan: — I'm not talking about the recent increase. I'm talking about the increase since you people took over government insurance . . .

Mr. Boldt: — You name them then.

Mr. Whelan: — It's 40 per cent for instance

in the city of Regina.

Mr. Boldt: — Mr. Speaker, I asked him whether he could identify these communities and he knows it isn't true.

An Hon. Member: — He said Regina.

Mr. D. W. Michayluk (Redberry): — Mr. Speaker, zone one includes Regina; the city of Saskatoon and all the major cities are in zone one and the increase has been exactly 40 per cent.

Mr. Boldt: — This is not true. Absolutely not true.

An Hon. Member: — That's another A B C D story.

Mr. Whelan: — Just in Regina, the increase without considering the deductible is 40 per cent. When you consider the deductible, it's more.

Mr. Boldt: — Socialistic arithmetic.

Mr. Speaker: — Order. Order. Order.

Hon. D. McFarlane (Minister of Agriculture): — His wife wrote his speech again.

An Hon. Member: — You don't know what you're talking about

Mr. Speaker: — The question has been asked. The question has been answered. Next to bat.

Mr. R. H. Wooff (Turtleford): — Mr. Speaker, at the opening of my remarks I would like to add my word of congratulations and welcome to the new members and to those who have been elevated to a higher position.

I would first like to turn for a moment to my own constituency. As the Minister of Highways (Mr. Grant) is doubtless fully aware the contracts that were announced with the usual fanfare last season are only about half completed. However, we do appreciate the mileage of highway that is completed and we do, Mr. Speaker, make allowance for the near flood conditions that existed last June. I wrote to the Minister of Highways early last fall expressing the hope that dust free mileage on highway no. 26 and 23 in Turtleford constituency might be extended in 1966. Again may I express the hope that that one dream will become a reality.

I would also like once again to remind the minister of the need to rebuild highway no. 24 between Leoville and Spiritwood. Again I notice in the budget that emphasis have been placed upon parks and recreational centres. I would be remiss if I did not once again draw to the attention of the government the need for better road facilities into Chitek Lake which is a developing centre and for road connection from that general area through to Green Lake and Meadow Lake areas. Such a road, Mr. Speaker, would

March 1, 1966

be a great boost to our much talked-of tourist traffic. This would serve a tremendous area even as far south as the city of Saskatoon.

I am still very much interested in the bridge promised by both the Premier and the Minister of Highways to span the North Saskatchewan River. According to some of the statements I remember, construction should at least have been under way. I have searched the budget in vain for even the word bridge. I hope it is to be found even though buried in some of the other estimates. So far, Mr. Speaker, it has moved up and down the river like a phantom in a nightly mist. I'm most fearful that it may be something like the Arab's tent that I used to read of in the schoolbooks that quietly folded up and disappeared with the mist of the morning.

The last two years, Mr. Speaker, have been the windiest in Saskatchewan's political history.

Hon. L. P. Coderre (Minister of Labour): — You're adding more wind to it.

Mr. Wooff: — The winds of administration have blown the press around the province like the autumn winds of Shelley's Ode to a West Wind. They have mounted the other waves of radio and T. V. in an unending stream. They have blown soft, like the voice of the lover, to their special friends. They have blown like the shrieking hurricane to those in disfavour. But above all, Mr. Speaker, they have blown continuously with all the noise and dust of uncontrollable winds.

I was delighted, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier did not disappoint us but manfully rose to the occasion in his double role of Premier and Provincial Treasurer and delivered himself of the same old address based on the same old text "You Socialists, the last twenty years". He stood up with a Socialist pulp mill in his right hand and a Socialist heavy water plant squeezed dry in his left hand with a Socialist opposition against whom he thundered. I have been intrigued, Mr. Speaker, by this repetition from government members of the last 20 years. I have often wondered just how it felt to have been on the wrong side of every major progressive issue for the period of 20 years. Only those who were being well paid, I submit, Mr. Speaker, to do so could stick with such a proposition.

The Liberal party under various leaders asked for 20 years for everything that has made Saskatchewan outstanding. The Liberal party fought hospitalization, the right, Mr. Speaker, of all to use that service regardless of their ability to pay. The Liberals fought the best car insurance in the wide, wide world, the insurance that made it possible to pick up victims off our highway, take them to hospital without quibbling about who was going to pay the costs. The Liberal fought the larger school unit, that educational facility that has brought equality of educational opportunity nearer to fruition. The Liberal party fought free cancer treatment. The Liberal party fought the free treatment of the mentally ill. The Liberal party fought publicly owned power that has been both the life and the delight of Saskatchewan people. The Liberal party fought publicly distributed gas which has served thousands of homes that private distributors would not have touched. The Liberal party has fought the South

Saskatchewan dam with all its potential for power, for irrigation, for water conservation and for the recreational facilities that it will finally support. The Liberal party, Mr. Speaker, fought the grid road system, the most popular rural municipal program ever offered to the municipalities of Saskatchewan. The Liberal party even fought the steel mill, IPSCO. I admit, Mr. Speaker, that it was done with a kind of a tickle in the throat but nevertheless it was done. The Liberal party fought the cement plant. Last but not least, Mr. Speaker, the Liberal party under the leadership of the present Premier fought medicare almost to the point of defiance of law and order itself.

Just think for a moment, Mr. Speaker, what tomorrow would look like and feel like, if all the services that I have mentioned which the Liberals opposed one by one all down this magical twenty years that they talk about, were lost overnight. They have helped to keep qualified doctors out of hospitals. They have taken the democratic rights from whole sectors of our citizens. They have once again spread fear abroad in the land equalled only when the Liberals were in power 20 years ago and every member sitting across the floor, Mr. Speaker, has had a hand in this dark record. Despite what the hon. member for Yorkton (Mr. Gallagher) said this afternoon, I still don't trust a fox in a chicken coop. I believe it was the member for Prince Albert, the hon. Minister of Public Health (Mr. Steuart) who a few days ago suggested that the opposition was asleep last year. I'm not going to argue the point, Mr. Speaker, but I would like to remind the hon. gentleman of a certain evening last session when the decorum of this House would have been much better with the government asleep than half awake. I have in my hand, Mr. Speaker, returns no. 64 and 65. They are returns which purport to be an answer to a question I asked a year ago when I requested that the correspondence, which passed between the Liberal government of the province of Saskatchewan and the Liberal government at Ottawa, relative to the drop in the price of wheat, should be tabled.

Just incidentally, this drop in the price of wheat is going to cost the farmers of the prairies over \$50,000,000. When I listened to the hon. Minister of Finance the other evening on TV trying to make a \$50,000,000 go \$70,000,000 disaster in wheat prices look like a bonanza without ever one backward look at the Liberal promise of \$2 per bushel wheat, I felt like a sucker on the line. But to get back to this return, Mr. Speaker, after dodging the question, then giving vague oral answers it became very evident that there was no correspondence. The return reads the substance of the representation made by the Premier and the Minister of Agriculture to the Minister of Trade and Commerce by telephone with respect to the drop in durum wheat prices which occurred in the latter part of November, 1964. The other one reads exactly the same only it was spring wheat and it was January 22, 1965.

The \$64 question, Mr. Speaker, is "When did the telephone conversation take place?" When these same questions were asked in the House of Commons of the Ministers mentioned in these two returns, it was evident they knew nothing either of correspondence or telephone calls prior to my question appearing on the Order Paper in this legislature.

The Premier rose one day in indignation about questions that took so many of the staff so many days to answer. I suppose up to a point he was right. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if he would like to elaborate on these. If he would like to tell us about the number of staff that it took for 365 days of research to run this

March 1, 1966

telephone call down and to give a one word answer re correspondence. Nil. I have heard the word dignity mouthed quite nicely by some government members during this session, coupled in a vague sort of way with social welfare and public health.

Just before leaving home to come down to the session, I was approached by a neighbour whose stepfather had been in and out of the provincial hospital at Battleford once or twice. This old gentleman was 93 years of age and for the most part was quite normal. He was happy, contented, and was a distance from home with community friends and family who could visit him. Without the sanction of his relatives or even notification, Mr. Speaker, this man was picked up and taken to Saskatoon, another 100 miles farther from home and placed in Delhaven Home on 4th Avenue, Saskatoon. When the stepson who was just ready to leave home and go and visit him in North Battleford got the letter, he was thunderstruck. He and another neighbour finally went to Saskatoon to see the old gentleman. They walked into Delhaven. There was nobody in the office and the door was unlocked. They asked to see the old gentleman and were taken upstairs. The upper floor was searched and there was no stepfather. The ground floor was searched and there was no stepfather. They finally found the old gentleman in the basement. And as his stepson said, "He could just as easily have walked out through that empty office at the front door and been killed on the street." He was in very bad condition both mentally and physically, disturbed by being picked up without a friend or relative with him and moved to Saskatoon. He was upset so badly physically that Delhaven said that, if it continued, they couldn't even look after him because the staff wouldn't care for that type of patient. This is one isolated case that I would like to bring to the notice of the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Steuart). When this pioneer citizen was found, as I said a moment ago, he was both mentally and physically so disturbed that his stepson had a very difficult time to communicate with him or to even comfort the old gentleman.

I would now like to turn for just a moment to social welfare. I have a constituent who a few months ago was comfortably off and at least had a minimum standard of living. She lost her husband who had the old age pension, supplementary allowance, and the medical services that go with it. She lost her lifelong partner. She lost her husband's pension. She lost the supplementary and the medical. When the social decision sheet was shown me, department figures proved that this lady needed \$90 a month. I can show the minister the sheet. There's no way of calculating the figure at the bottom. She was being given \$65 — this was what the inspector told the secretary of the town was the figure. After I took up the case and I bypassed the inspector, this lady is now getting nearer the figure that the department in the upper lines of the decision sheet said that she should get.

Well, Mr. Speaker, she is not an isolated case by any means. It just happens that she was one that had somebody that could fight for her. There are others who have not. This, Mr. Speaker, doesn't save her dignity at all. It was the almighty dollar sign first and last. Why should there be these attempts such as I have already drawn to your attention, to browbeat and to withhold from the widow, the helpless and the infirm?

Ill fares the land, to hastening ills a prey
Where wealth accumulates, and men decay.

I want to turn for a moment to taxes. There is a lot being said in this legislature about taxes. There is quite a lot being

said this afternoon and I'm not going to weary the House with a lot of statistics. The plain unadulterated truth, Mr. Speaker, so far as our area is concerned is that we're paying more taxes regardless of cuts than we ever did in our life before. There is something that has been said two or three times about the cut on mineral taxes. But the people that have talked about the cuts on mineral taxes have said nothing about the increase on grazing rentals. Roughly, Mr. Speaker, they bounce one another out and in the areas where farmers won their mineral rights this leaves them pretty much in the same position that they were before. But in areas like my own, where the farmers do not own the mineral rights, where they belong to the Hudson Bay Company and the CPR company and the Crown, the increase in rentals is a direct increase in the production costs and equals a tax any day. Now, in 1966 our area is faced with a tremendous outlay for dial telephones and there seems to be no way out and no further delay possible.

One year ago in this House, speaking on the government's Indian program, I wished them well and I was very sincere about it. I hoped the program would be such in policy and administration that it would raise the living standards of our native people and redeem the white man in the eyes of our Indian brothers and increase their confidence in democratic government. There is a matter I am forced to bring to the attention of this House with regrets. I refer, Mr. Speaker, to a resolution that was drawn to my attention by the Indian people themselves in this booklet "The Federation of Saskatchewan Indians' Annual Conference", Valley Centre, Fort Qu'Appelle, Saskatchewan, February 9th, 10th, and 11th, 1965, page 32, resolution 6.5:

Whereas the provincial Liberal program for the Saskatchewan Indians promised extensions to Indian reserves, therefore be it resolved: . . .

They made application for an extension. When I asked them how they came along with it, because I was alarmed when I saw it when they told me about it, they said the answer that they got was that all election promises could not be fulfilled. I would just like to say this about it, Mr. Speaker. This is the kind of thing that is regrettable. There is nothing that will destroy any hope of success quicker and more thoroughly than this kind of double dealing with our Indian people. If it hadn't been that the resolution was there in black and white I would not have brought this matter up.

I have a letter from a friend here that works amongst the Indian people every week. There is a paragraph I want to read for the House, not because I am blaming the government for this condition at all. After all our Indian people are under federal jurisdiction. But I think that we all should know some of the conditions that do exist and he says:

I believe I discovered about the worst condition yet over on the Sault Reserve. Ten people living in a pole-roofed shack about 9 by 12, dirt floor, one bed, four flannelette sheets, four blankets, one youngster covered with measles, no cook stove, one small slightly battered and drunk-looking tin heater, six weeks old baby, family allowance cut off because they don't send their children to school. Boy, what a mess.

This is not something that happened so many years ago, Mr. Speaker. These are conditions that exist at this moment while we are

March 1, 1966

discussing these problems in the legislature.

I would like to turn for one moment to car insurance because I believe that this is one of the very important problems that are facing the driving public today. I would like to plead with the government for the preservation of our compulsory car insurance scheme, that it hold the price line against the private companies on behalf of the people. I just want to read a paragraph from a letter of a friend who now lives in Calgary. He is one of these people who left the province:

Our car insurance here is from \$60 to \$75 higher than yours in Saskatchewan.

This is before the minister brought his last figures into the House.

My niece in Edmonton got a new Rambler classic 770, two-door, which is just a medium-sized car and it costs her \$156 for full coverage.

The second year I was here our car was smashed by a drunken driver. We had no insurance, repairs cost me \$800. I was without the car for six weeks. I had to sue him first and get judgment against him, then sue the government to get payment from the Unsatisfied Judgments Fund, which we all pay an extra dollar into every year when we purchase our license, which costs \$15 plus the \$1. My lawyer's fees were \$300, for which the government pays half, leaving me with \$650. It ended up with \$100 more than the account which left me \$550. The best part of it all is they did not pay me for sixteen months.

I plead to the minister in charge of our Government Insurance to keep the private insurance companies at bay on behalf of the public.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wooff: — I have in my clipping file, Mr. Speaker, a page from the Free Press Prairie Farmer, under the date of April 28th, 1965. There is an article, "Funds for Clearing Land":

Agricultural Minister A. H. McDonald says . . .

I am bringing this to the attention of the government because I haven't been able to find anything in the budget which suggests that they are going to implement Mr. McDonald's suggestion.

Mr. McDonald says:

The Saskatchewan Government is considering a program to make funds available for clearing, breaking and seeding land privately owned by farmers. McDonald at an interview at Regina recently said the proposed move would be a new concept using federal -provincial funds under the Agricultural Rehabilitation and Development Act.

This, he said, would be a radical departure from past procedure which allowed such programs to be applied only to land owned by the Crown, although the land might have been leased to private individuals.

“Although this is only in the preliminary stages of thinking, what we are looking at is some method whereby the millions of acres of potentially cultivatable land in Saskatchewan, now covered with trees and brush could be cleared and put to use”, Mr. McDonald said.

He said he saw the program helping to alleviate the problem associated with ARDA, showing farmers how the plan could help them as individuals rather than groups and as one way to bypass the problem of more and more land to build an ex-farmers forever trying to purchase economic units.

I think there is a misprint in the lines here.

There are literally thousands of farms along the eastern borders of Saskatchewan that could be made into economic units by the simple measure of clearing brush from the land.

McDonald said the program could also help alleviate the problem of farmers moving off the land because under present conditions they could not afford to undertake an expensive clearing program of their holdings.

He said he could foresee a program whereby farmers undertook the actual clearing work while the federal and provincial governments looked after the administrative details.

“In addition”, he said, “there was a possibility the province could undertake some kind of grant program whereby farmers were provided a grant for clearing and a further grant for putting the cleared land into grass rather than crops.”

A program of clearing and breaking on deeded land would not only provide more crop land but help build up the fodder supply while contributing to the growth of the livestock industry in general in the province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the government when they are going to implement this program or if they are going to, and if not, why not? I would like to urge the government to implement its promise also with regard to adding drugs to our health services. This, Mr. Speaker, would lift a tremendous burden from the senior citizen group. I have searched the budget in vain for anything pertaining to the fulfilment of that drug promise. I have searched in vain for any hint of the implementation of this suggestion of the former Minister of Agriculture. Maybe he is going to administer it from the Senate. I am not sure.

In closing Mr. Speaker, may I once again urge upon the government the necessity of fulfilling this promise in regard to adding drugs to our health services. Mr. Speaker, I cannot support the budget with the blanks in it as I have so far found. I shall support the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. G. F. Loken (Rosetown): — Mr. Speaker, first I would like to welcome the hon. member from Moosomin (Mr. Gardner) and the hon. member from Bengough (Mr. Mitchell) to this Assembly and sincerely congratu-

March 1, 1966

late these members on their victories in the recent by-elections. I would also like to congratulate the Premier on his presentation of the budget and also on the budget that he presented. I know it will be well accepted by the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, while much has been said in recent weeks of the leaps and bounds in Saskatchewan's industrialization, I would like to draw to your attention what I might term unsung heroes and to this race to broaden the economy of our province. I am referring to the gas system in the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. I know that natural gas plays a very important part in our growing industrial scene. I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, the Saskatchewan Power Corporation recently underwent considerable re-organization. The first change effectively separated the electrical and the gas utilities within the Corporation and placed each under its own management. May I be permitted to say that this change was long overdue. When natural gas was first introduced in a major way to Saskatchewan in 1951, it was placed under control of the SPC as one of its operational departments. Under the recent change the gas system has been given a chance to develop in its own way and, I believe, in a way that will be to the benefit of the province as a whole. Gas and electricity are two very different businesses with different problems that need different approaches to bring about their solutions. I would point out, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. member from Moose Jaw that splitting these two systems was a move to produce greater efficiency, not the beginning of a move to sell either the gas or the electrical utility.

Mr. G. T. Snyder (Moose Jaw City): — Mr. Speaker, I have not yet spoken on the budget to date. I spoke on the Throne Speech but I have not had the honour to speak on the debate yet.

Mr. Loken: — I would remind the Socialists that it was the Liberals who started the Power Corporation and we will make it work. Mr. Speaker, I would contend that we have already seen one effect of letting the gas people of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation run their own business. We have seen this effect in the Rosthern-Duck Lake area. Under the previous system, and under the previous regulations and policies the SPC had virtually run out of places to which it could pipe its natural gas unless that area could expect a major industrial development, or unless the corporation was prepared to lose considerable sums of money. While, as I have said, the industrial picture is brightening, it is unrealistic to expect a giant industrialization enterprise to develop in each and every community in our province. It is also unrealistic to expect the Power Corporation to extend its pipeline to distribute gas to a community if by doing so it will only add to the debt of the system. The Board of Directors of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation and the management people of the gas system have rightly contended that natural gas should be made available to every community, if it can be economically brought under the system. By that, Mr. Speaker, I do not mean economically according to the arbitrary guide lines of the old system, but economically according to whether gas can be as cheap or cheaper than other forms of heating fuel. I see no reason to deny the people of Rosthern, or the people of Duck Lake, or the people of other communities the right to receive the benefits of natural gas heating in their homes and in their places of business, just because they do not fit into the general pattern. The gas people of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation have just finished a sign-up campaign in the Duck Lake-Rosthern area. The results I think speak for themselves. The local residents were told frankly that gas was

going to cost them more at the outset than it is presently sold in communities of their size that are already in the gas system. There was no attempt to cover up. They were told the rate would reflect the cost of taking gas to their community and if they wanted it on those terms they could have it. Before the campaign was over, Mr. Speaker, more than 780 residents in those communities have asked to be allowed to get natural gas for themselves, far exceeding the expectations of those who proposed the plan and far exceeding the minimum number required to make the plan a success. But this is not the story as far as other communities are concerned. It is not the end of the story as far as the gas people of the SPC are concerned. Experience has shown that bringing natural gas to an area adds greatly to the development of the community. The people of these new gas communities have been told that the gas rates will be about even with those of the rest of the province when this expected development makes itself felt or within five years whichever is the sooner. As far as the rest of the province is concerned this experiment in the Rosthern-Duck Lake area is just a beginning. Other communities who apparently cannot have gas because it's uneconomical will get the chance to be included in the gas system. The criterion will be not, "Do you fit into a predetermined pattern but can we bring you gas economically in the true sense of the word? Will gas be competitive with other fluids? If the answer is yes, then we will see what we can do to help you get it". As far as my constituents are concerned we more than welcome this change in attitude. The people of Outlook are sure that gas can be piped to them picking up neighbour communities on the way and be delivered at a competitive price. I am sure that the SPC are now working on a proper study and that it will confirm the beliefs of the people of Outlook. I don't know when the SPC can undertake to deliver gas to the people of Outlook area or how much it is going to cost, but I am sure that with a real businesslike approach to the problem, the people of Outlook will not have to wait another 13 years before seeing gas brought to their homes by the SPC. Mr. Speaker, I contend that this is running the gas system in a businesslike manner. I would like to present another example of the benefits of having two utilities within the Corporation under their own managements.

In 1964, when plans for the winter had been completed, it was found that gas supplies were entirely inadequate. In the November and December period in 1964 alone, the Saskatchewan Power Corporation was forced to curtail gas supplies to more than 300 industrial customers for a period of between six and 30 days. The same pattern had to be followed in the early part of 1965 when the weather became bad. Off went the industrial customers while gas was conserved for the household until the weather improved and the supply became again available. In 1965 the gas people of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation worked hard to improve the supply arrangements. Gathering systems were enlarged and the Corporation undertook a larger drilling program than ever to be carried out on the Corporation-owned gas fields. A total of 208 miles of major pipelines were added to the transmission system and the development of underground storage cavern at Prudhomme, near Saskatoon was accelerated. New supplies were contracted for, Mr. Speaker. This is not the time to bring the details of the 1965 stewardship of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation but I think that it is the proper time to note that, apart from two occasions, which had nothing to do with the supply, which were caused by accidents beyond the control of SPC, not one industrial or commercial gas customer of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation has had to shut down operations for lack of supplies of gas. This is in spite of the fact that the system was originally designed to

March 1, 1966

curtail gas supplies to the large customers in the event of bad weather. This record was achieved in spite of the fact of sales of gas to all consumers has risen more than 18 per cent over the previous year.

Mr. Speaker, I think there is one other action in the re-organized gas system of SPC that bears mention at this time. It has often been said in the past that each new potash mine requires energy supplies equal to a community of some 20,000 people. I have no doubt that each new major industry also requires a large amount of gas and electricity so that it can easily be seen that the present pace of Saskatchewan's industrialization has presented the Saskatchewan Power Corporation with supply problems of a healthy magnitude. To the best of my knowledge three potash mines will require gas in the near future and more of them in the not so distant future. Several other industries will also be requiring gas. All these new industries will increase employment in Saskatchewan and all these new industries must be served with their gas requirements.

The Saskatchewan Power Corporation has not waited for the supply problem to be critical before taking action. It has gone out into the market and called for long-term supply of gas needs. We have all read of the agreement made by SPC and Trans Canada Pipeline Company last year. This agreement calls for delivery of some two hundred billion cubic feet of gas at a firm price during the next ten years and a total seven hundred and fifty billion cubic feet of gas to be delivered over a 25-year period. This agreement did not only bring additional supplies to SPC, but has given the corporation the opportunity of making firm commitments to new industrial customers for a period of up to ten years. That is, I contend, another example of the Saskatchewan Corporation acting in businesslike manner, as we have a right to expect and demand that it should do. Of course, these examples I have given are just a beginning. All the habits, the rules and the practices of the SPC are not going to be changed over night. The Board of Directors and the Management of SPC are embarked upon an efficiency program which I am sure will be to the benefit of all of us. They have set themselves targets that would have seemed impossible two years ago, targets that will ensure that SPC plays its part in the future development of our province.

Mr. Speaker, I will not support the amendment but I will support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. H. D. Link (Saskatoon City): — Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to participate in this debate, and to once again speak as a representative for the constituency of Saskatoon.

Saskatoon has grown tremendously in the past year. I believe it is fair to say that this growth has taken place in spite of the present Liberal regime in office, not because of it. I shall have more to say about this later.

Mr. Speaker, before I discuss the budget, I would like to comment on an article which appeared in the Leader Post on November 25th, 1965. According to this article, the Premier was named Saskatchewan Salesman of the Year. I have been a salesman all my life, and I am still employed as a salesman. During all these years I have tried to serve my clients to the best of my ability. Never at any time in the past 30 years did I expect

that as a salesman I had to give merchandise away. This, I suggest, would not be selling. The fact that this award was made for giving away either our natural resources or selling our Crown corporations at a fraction of what they are worth, does not constitute salesmanship. For the first time in my life therefore, I believe I would seriously consider some other occupation in order to disassociate myself from this award.

I said at the beginning that Saskatoon had enjoyed a good year. It could have been a better year I suggest had the present regime kept its promise to expand vocational training. Although we heard a lot about education during the last provincial election, the facilities in regard to vocational training in Saskatoon have not increased one iota since the Saskatchewan Liberals were elected in 1964. What do we find after two years of Liberal administration regarding extending technical school facilities in Saskatoon? Of the almost \$2,000,000 provided for extending technical school facilities by the CCF government in 1964-65, how much was spent in Saskatoon? Nothing, absolutely nothing. How much was spent in the current year? Well, the Liberals did much better, they spent \$10. This, Mr. Speaker, from a government that prior to the election of 1964 had gone up and down this province telling the people what they would do for the education of our children. What utter rubbish! I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that this present government if left in office will do irreparable harm to the youth of this province in the way they deal with educational matters. I say, Mr. Speaker, that the present government is no more concerned with the youth of Saskatchewan than were their predecessors of some 22 years ago. This government I maintain is more interested in selling our natural resources and Crown corporations than they are in the youth of this province.

I notice that in the budget the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Thatcher) has allocated some funds for the extension of the facilities at the Saskatchewan Technical Institute in Saskatoon. I am pleased to see that the government intends to do something in the coming year that they so miserably failed to do last year. I must confess however, Mr. Speaker, that Liberal promises have been broken so often in the past that I am sure I may be forgiven if I don't sound too enthusiastic as yet. The proof of the pudding is in the eating and I am going to be very interested to see what is in the eating and I am going to be very interested to see what happens in the next 12 months. Whatever is done, a whole year has been lost. This budget certainly gives me very little hope to feel optimistic about the future of education in this province. This budget leaves much to be desired, Mr. Speaker, I regret that the present Liberal regime, not only is prepared to neglect our natural resources, they are prepared to neglect that which is even more important — our human resources, the youth of this province. Mr. Speaker, if this is the best budget the Liberals can produce at a time when the economy is buoyant, when crop conditions have been favourable, when the province has been booming, then I suggest we are in real trouble. What kind of a budget would they present us with if there was a slow down in our economy? Saskatoon, Mr. Speaker, in spite of the fact that a new campus is in operation in Regina, is, and will continue to be an educational centre in Saskatchewan for a long time to come, or should I perhaps say that it will continue to be an educational centre provided that the people of Saskatchewan in the next general election in this province elect a government that has an interest in education.

Mr. Speaker, I see that \$3,000,000 has been allocated to school boards to reduce local taxation rates. Many people in Saskatchewan will recall that the leader of the Liberal party in a speech at the recent provincial-municipal conference, stated that "millions of additional dollars" would be made available this

March 1, 1966

year to school boards, this money to be used to reduce local taxation rates. This money has been referred to subsequently as "tax reduction grants" or "incentive grants". This statement by the Premier placed school trustees in a quandary, because the criteria that would be used to decide which boards would receive grants and which would not, has not been made clear. The Premier has been reported as saying,

We would favour, at this point, a program which would make these additional funds available to those school units which make the strongest effort to control or reduce the mill rate. Only in that way, we feel, can we be assured these additional grants will be passed on in real savings to property owners.

Mr. Speaker, where does this put the school trustees? In order to be eligible for a "tax reduction grant" is the government going to compare the proposed expenditures of the various school boards in 1966 with expenditures in recent years? If cost increases are within an "acceptable range" they may receive the grant. Mr. Speaker, what is an acceptable range? Who knows? Does the Premier? Certainly I doubt whether the school boards do, Mr. Speaker, how does a school board know what to do to be eligible for this grant? If the boards hold the school mill rate steady, perhaps they will qualify for this grant which would be used to reduce the mill rate. If the board raises their expenditures one per cent it might still get it. If it raises expenditures two per cent, will it get the grant? Perhaps. If it raises its expenditures three per cent, what happens? Who knows? Perhaps the Premier does. It is very doubtful if the Minister of Education (Mr. Trapp) knows. Mr. Speaker, I suspect that the government will represent these "millions of additional dollars" as being a contribution to education in Saskatchewan. Let's face it. The money will certainly reduce the tax rate in a number of localities but it will not contribute to education. Mr. Speaker, if anything it will hold education back. Any school board can tailor its budget to hold the mill rate steady, or even reduce it. All they have to do is simply shave down the cost per pupil by shaving the cost of instruction, cost of transportation, plant operation and administration. The boards, I presume, Mr. Speaker, could decrease their payrolls by hiring a greater proportion of teachers who have teaching certificates in the class one and two category, and not hire the better qualified and more expensive class three, four and five teachers. They could do this, and perhaps get the grant, but what happens then to our educational system? I venture to say that many new and worthwhile projects that were planned for this year will be shelved. A board may well say, "We planned to set up a number of library rooms in our school district in 1966, but the cost may put us out of the running for a tax reduction grant, so we decided to wait". I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that by putting school boards in the position of playing guessing games as to how they may qualify for a grant, the Premier is hindering school boards in this province from carrying out their duties properly.

Surely the duty of a school board does not merely consist of holding the mill rates at a minimum. It is surely also the duty of a school board to provide the best educational system that is possible. This frequently means expanding facilities and the whole educational program which may well lead to an increase in the mill rate. Surely, Mr. Speaker, school boards should be free to make their decisions without having an axe swinging over their heads.

Mr. Speaker, if the Premier wants to use “these millions of dollars” to lower the school mill rate, why did he not tell the school boards on what basis they could qualify for this money, and thus do away with this guessing game? I submit, Mr. Speaker, that education in this province, instead of advancing has been hindered by the present Liberal regime. I said at the beginning of my remarks, that Saskatoon expanded during the past year. I feel confident that if our school boards and our university received the kind of support and co-operation from the provincial government that they were led to expect, even greater strides forward would have been made by the city I represent in this legislature.

I would also be interested to know what this government is doing about kindergartens. Many parents in Saskatchewan and certainly in my constituency feel that this is a very necessary and desirable part of a child’s education. As a matter of fact I believe a former Liberal MLA who is now on the school board in Saskatoon is fighting hard for kindergartens. I find myself in agreement with this gentleman and would urge the Minister of Education (Mr. Trapp) to take the necessary steps to see that kindergartens be established in Saskatchewan.

While speaking of education, let me mention another instance where the present government has failed in keeping up our educational facilities. I am referring to our University Hospital. I say this, realizing that some of the members opposite may say this is a matter for the Department of Health. This is, of course, partly true. However, I maintain that the University Hospital was also meant to be a place to train people, in other words an educational institution as well as a hospital. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that when this hospital was planned and built it was a first class institution. I am afraid unless the plans made by the former Socialist government are carried out soon, this will become a second rate hospital in comparison to new schools. If this happens less people will be educated and trained.

I notice, Mr. Speaker, that the government has budgeted \$100,000 for the planning of a proposed extension and renovation of this hospital. I wonder if this will supply us with the extra facilities that are required. We need a service wing, mental health facilities, rooms for the rehabilitation of the chronically ill. We need close to 100 psychiatric beds. With this kind of expansion, together with some beds at City Hospital and St. Paul’s Hospital, it would be possible to treat all those requiring psychiatric treatment in Saskatoon, and it would therefore not be necessary for any patients to go to North Battleford.

There are rumours that some expansion is planned for the sixth floor of the University Hospital. This, I suggest, will not begin to meet the requirements that I have mentioned. Maybe the government is planning to use a few more “cubby holes” in the basement. This is no solution either. What we need is a bold and imaginative plan of expansion that will supply the facilities that are so urgently required, not only for the present, but also for the years ahead.

We also require a paediatric wing at this hospital. Unfortunately so far it appears that the Liberals are prepared to try and save some money at the expense of our children. Mr. Speaker, if ever a government practised false economy this is it.

The Premier mentioned something about the money that the

March 1, 1966

people of Saskatoon had saved when a private fire insurance firm put in a bid which was less than the SGIO on a certain school in Saskatoon. I'm always delighted when we can save some money. I believe the amount of money we would save, on this insurance premium amounted to \$10,600. This is indeed very commendable. What he did not mention, Mr. Speaker, was the fact that while we supposedly saved \$10,600 on insurance, the Minister of Social Welfare had withheld some \$48,000 from the city with regard to social aid. You can see, Mr. Speaker, that instead of the good people of Saskatoon saving \$10,600 under a Liberal regime, it has actually cost them \$37,400.

An Hon. Member: — Good business.

Mr. Link: — It seems that the present Minister of Social Welfare (Mr. Boldt) simply bolts from one blunder to another in his department.

Mr. Speaker, here is just another case where the Liberals have dealt in a highhanded manner with the people of my constituency. The manner in which the minister has dealt with the social aid problem in Saskatoon is nothing short of harassment. In spite of the fact that the mayor is a defeated Liberal candidate, as is one of the alderman, there appears to be little, if any communication between the city council and the provincial government. Mr. Speaker, I believe the staff that is handling social welfare in Saskatoon are dedicated and competent people. Why then does the minister insist on picking on my constituency to harass these people? Could it be he is doing this because the former Minister of Social Welfare happens to be a CCF MLA for Saskatoon? There seems to be no other reasonable explanation for his attitude.

I note with interest that once again the Liberals are planning to open more liquor outlets in the province. At the moment I do not intend to discuss the merits of this plan. I would, however, like to bring to the attention of the House the fact that during the last session of the legislature I asked the government to consider the establishment of an alcoholic research centre in Saskatoon. I believe even our teetotaler Minister of Social Welfare would agree that liquor will continue to be used in Saskatchewan. Assuming that this will be the case, all I'm saying is that something should also be done in order to cope with the problems that are created by those who unfortunately become alcoholics. Mr. Speaker, what has the government done? Nothing! A group of people in Saskatoon are trying to do something about this problem. It is true that some of the staff at the University Hospital are conducting some research. However, the need now is not just for research but some actual facilities. Mr. Speaker, I understand that even six beds would make it possible for some 200 patients to be treated every year. The cost per day per bed would perhaps amount to \$12. Let us suppose that this treatment would help 50 per cent of these patients. Then surely this expenditure would be justified. I'm very dubious, Mr. Speaker, whether the \$36,500 allocated for a Bureau of Alcoholism is going to even scratch the surface of this problem, let alone provide the facilities I have just mentioned.

During the last session of the legislature, Mr. Speaker, I also asked the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Gardiner) to consider the establishment of a provincial office building in Saskatoon. This kind of building would hopefully incorporate all or most of the provincial government offices that are now spread all over

the city. If the provincial government is indeed sincere in saving the taxpayers money and indeed if it believes in business efficiency, then it seems to me that this is a reasonable suggestion. However, I regret very much that a year later there seems to be no sign of Saskatoon being considered for this kind of building. One wonders whether the fact that the citizens of Saskatoon elected four CCF MLAs instead of Liberals has some bearing on this reluctance to establish this building. I sincerely hope that this is not the case.

I would like, Mr. Speaker, to talk for a few minutes about the tourist industry. The Liberals tell us that they are not satisfied with the advances made in this industry since they assumed office. I agree. However, if they are so disturbed about the tourist industry why do I find nothing in the budget regarding a grant for the relocation of the Western Development Museum? Here indeed is one of the greatest tourist attractions in Saskatchewan. Here again the present government has shown a pitiful lack of leadership. We in Saskatoon for some years have been pleased and proud to have as one of our major tourist attractions, the Western Development Museum and Pion-Era show. For months and months a controversy has raged over whether this museum should be moved to a new location and what kind of financial support might be made available to it by the provincial government. The matter of whether the museum and Pion-Era remain in operation in Saskatoon is of vital importance to all the citizens of my constituency. It seems utterly ridiculous to me that here again the dawdling and uncertainty of what is going to happen to this museum should be harassing the people. Mr. Speaker, I suggest one of the reasons we are in danger of losing the museum and Pion-Era is the fact that the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Gardiner) is a member of the museum board. Surely here is a case of the minister trying to be both judge and jury. I submit that in order to try and bring a solution to the whole problem the minister should remove himself from this board in order that he might be in a position to deal with the Pion-Era board, the museum board, and the city council, and in this way be in a position to represent and look after the affairs of his department without finding himself in the impossible position of being on one board, while this board finds itself in disagreement with another board, namely Pion-Era.

Mr. Speaker, the citizens of Saskatoon, irrespective of their political affiliations are fed up with this long, drawn-out hassle. I would even go so far as to suggest to the minister that the best thing that could happen, if it is in his power to do so, is to dismiss the present board and start with a completely new one which, I am convinced, could resolve this problem in a matter of days. I am dismayed that here again the government has shown no leadership. Mr. Speaker, all the people of my constituency are vitally interested in the future of Pion-Era and the Western Development Museum. Why then doesn't the minister give some leadership? Mr. Speaker, all unless something is done within a very short time we may well be faced with losing this museum which was established through the sweat and toil and dedication of a great number of Saskatchewan citizens. They were CCFers, Liberals and Tories. Surely here is something that we in Saskatoon, I believe, would all support. I say to the Minister of Public Works unless he is prepared to do something about this situation real soon it may well be too late. And they talk about the tourist industry. Rubbish!

Mr. Speaker, the former CCF government had promised my constituency \$2,000,000 to help with the construction of an auditorium.

March 1, 1966

What did the tourist-loving Liberals do? They immediately slashed this amount, that we had been promised, by \$750,000. Here again if they mean what they say they would not have cut this grant. If is, of course, true that the proposed auditorium would be used more by Saskatonians and people from surrounding areas than by tourists. However, I submit, it would not harm the tourist industry to have a good auditorium in our city. In fact I am quite sure it would help. While I am talking about the auditorium, Mr. Speaker, I am sure you have all heard that the cost of the proposed building has, according to the latest information I have, reached the figure of some \$7,000,000. This is about \$3,000,000 more than had been estimated.

It is quite obvious to most people that unless the cost can be pared it will be impossible for the city to go ahead with this project. Mr. Speaker, I do not profess to know how this serious discrepancy has come about. I do know that an auditorium would be a very desirable thing to have. I believe that in this day and age an auditorium is not a luxury but rather like so many other things, a necessary part of a modern society. The present Liberal government has indicated that they are in favour of raising the cultural level of the people of Saskatchewan. If the government is sincere in this belief, then I can only assume that they will be willing to discuss the possibility of increasing their grant in order that an auditorium can be built. I'm not suggesting that the final cost should be \$7,000,000. I do believe that some discussion and consideration must be given to this project and everything possible should be done to see that it is proceeded with.

I would be extremely disappointed if I thought that the provincial and federal governments were not prepared to see that this auditorium was built, for the sake of a slight increase in grants. Here again is a case where the federal government could have been of assistance by removing the 11 per cent federal tax on building material. Of course, the Saskatchewan Liberals never mention this sort of thing.

Mr. Speaker, there is much more that one could say about this project. For instance, I can imagine how delighted the people of Saskatoon were when they heard that the four per cent education tax had been removed from turkey saddles and farrowing crates! However, Mr. Speaker, I am quite sure these people would have gladly foregone the saving on these two items, and not had the four per cent added to soaps and detergents. It so happens my constituents buy more of the latter.

Mr. Speaker, from these remarks I am sure it must have become apparent that I do not intend to supply this budget.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mrs. Marjorie Cooper (Regina West): — Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to add my word on welcome to the new members in the House and I hope they will enjoy their stay here. I would also like to welcome our acting Clerk, Mr. Bradshaw. We are very glad to have him with us. We are awfully sorry about the kind of weather we gave you but we can assure you that this kind of winter in Saskatchewan is most unusual.

Hon. D. G. Steuart (Minister of Public Health): — It happens every year.

Mrs. Cooper: — I would like to congratulate the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Thatcher) on his eloquent political speech, in which we found in bits and pieces the proposed budget for 1966. You know when he has a captive audience the Premier can never resist the temptation to make a political speech. It's a well-known fact, of course, that the hon. Premier is given to exaggeration but surely you can carry exaggeration too far. I think, he went much too far when he addressed you, Mr. Speaker, as Mr. Socialist.

Mr. I. H. MacDougall (Souris-Estevan): — He saw the light.

Mrs. Cooper: — I also thought that the hon. Premier was slipping a little bit because I didn't find anywhere in this budget any mention of that truly private enterprise venture, the pulp mill.

Now, I would like to congratulate my colleague, the MLA for Regina West (Mr. Blakeney) on his very brilliant reply to the budget.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mrs. Cooper: — I'm sure by the time he finishes exposing the weaknesses even government members over there will have very grave doubts about supporting that budget.

I seem to notice a pattern or a trend in Liberal budgets. Whenever they cut taxes in one area it's accompanied by tax increases in other areas.

Mr. W. J. Berezowsky (Cumberland): — Twice as much.

Mrs. Cooper: — Last year the one-cent reduction on sales tax was offset by a large increase in the hospital and medical tax premiums, as well as numerous other increases. This year a slight reduction in the provincial surtax on incomes — that is slight for some and quite a bit for others — was accompanied by a one cent increase in the gas tax and the imposition of a tax on soaps and detergents. Now why, I would like to ask Mr. Premier, why he had to put in that mean little tax for the housewives? Detergents are much too high now. You know there is already an 11 per cent sales tax on detergents and with the cost of living going up the way it is, the cost of food, the cost of everything, surely the housewife didn't need to have that extra tax on soap. Detergents are a household necessity. They are like food. And of course, the larger family you have the more soap you use. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that when the budget comes in next year we won't find that the hon. Premier has placed the sales tax on food. Certainly we do notice a sort of priority in this budget as has already been mentioned, tax decreases most favourable to higher incomes, tax increases for those least able to pay. But I mustn't forget, Mr. Speaker, that the Provincial Treasurer allowed some new exceptions from sales tax, harness for horses, and turkey saddles. Now, Mr. Speaker, I had some difficulty finding what turkey saddles were. Somehow no one seemed either able or anxious to explain. However, Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Premier, I am not criticising this tax exemption, anything for the protection of the female of the species is O.K. by me.

March 1, 1966

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mrs. Cooper: — The Provincial Treasurer stated and I quote:

In preparing the 1966 budget I have kept several factors in mind.

And he lists first the election promises made by the Liberal party in the last election. Yet, Mr. Speaker, I see nothing in this budget about the extension of drug benefits under the medical plan or the elimination of tax on children's clothing. It's just going to cost more to wash them. Of course, there was very little comfort to the urban municipalities in this budget. They are certainly getting the short end of the stick and I wonder why, Mr. Speaker. Home-owner grants are mentioned. Here I think we need a little clarification, Mr. Speaker. In the Budget Speech and I'll quote, the Premier said:

In the current year we shall commence paying a direct grant to homeowners both rural and urban, which in most cases will amount to \$50. This grant will be paid to Saskatchewan residents who live in their own homes six months or more and who have paid their current tax.

Well, the question I wanted to ask is this. If the homeowner is away seven months or more and leaves the house vacant or rents it, but he is still responsible for the full taxes, will he receive the grant? Secondly, what does the premier mean by "homeowners who have paid their current taxes?" Does he mean only those who have paid all their taxes, Mr. Speaker? If an emergency arises, sickness or unemployment or a major expense in renovating a home and consequently the owner may not be able to pay his full tax that year, would the grant be withheld from these people in circumstances where they would be most in need of money?

If the Home-owner grants are paid then the money should be sent, Mr. Speaker, directly to the municipality to be applied as tax credit to all homeowners. This is the fairest method. But if the Premier feels that he might lose some political advantage by this method instead of sending cheques to individuals, could he not insist that municipalities make a notation on all tax receipts, "\$50 tax credit included with the compliments of Mr. Thatcher".

I share the view of my colleagues that any such grants should go to householders, not merely to homeowners. Renters are also taxpayers. One of the major factors in determining the amount of rent that is going to be charged, whether it's an apartment or a single dwelling, is the amount of tax on that dwelling. Renters are indeed taxpayers and they deserve equal consideration.

Now, the previous speaker said something about incentive grants and so did our budget critic. And I am also very much concerned about this business of incentive grants, about the fact that they may harm our educational system, may do irreparable harm to it. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, if incentive grants are to be given over and above the normal grants they should go to school units, to school districts who have the greatest number of highly qualified teachers, to schools that provide excellent libraries and good equipment for teaching science and so on, schools that have an enriched opportunity for their students. These should be the ones to receive incentive grants. It seems to me, the present proposal of the government is an incentive to save

rather than an incentive to educate. Additional grants to only those schools who reduce or hold the present mill rate is the wrong answer.

Mr. Speaker, I have been hearing rumours up and down the corridors and out in the hustings that there might be an election this spring, but since Bengough these rumours have quieted down. But after listening to this budget, Mr. Speaker, I'm quite convinced there is going to be no election this year.

And now, Mr. Speaker, before I start on the next part of my address, could we call it 5:30?

The Assembly recess until 7:30 p.m. o'clock.

Mrs. Cooper: — Before you called it 5:30, Mr. Speaker, I had made certain criticisms of the budget. I would like to direct my remarks now to the Minister of Public Health (Mr. Steuart). I hope he will be in his seat before I have finished; the Minister of Social Welfare (Mr. Boldt), I also hope he will be here; and the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Heald) and he is here.

The hon. Attorney General (Mr. Heald) a few days ago gave the people on this side of the House a very fatherly lecture. I almost said grandfatherly, but he is much too young for that. Now, he didn't like our criticism and suggested that we be constructive, that we give constructive suggestions. Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what I intend to do tonight. I believe I have constructive suggestions for all three of the ministers I mentioned, but Mr. Speaker, may I ask that government members and particularly ministers, when we do make constructive suggestions that they do listen to these suggestions and act on at least some of them and not reject them out of hand simply because they come from this side of the House.

Turning first to matters of Public Health. The base hospital — what do I say about the base hospital? I've had a lot to say over the years in this House about a base hospital. I had hoped it would be half built by now. The government has had two years and more to get started on this base hospital and as I say I had hoped it would be well under way. I was awfully pleased to see that there is an item in the budget of \$400,000 and I sincerely hope it will be spent . . .

Mrs. Thatcher: — Not on the building.

Mrs. Cooper: — Not on the building, says the hon. Premier. This is what I'm afraid of. Surely all the planning could have been done before now. I was hoping I would be invited to a sod-turning ceremony this spring or in the fall but I am afraid my hopes are pretty badly dimmed. I am sorry about this because it is very badly needed and I can see no excuse or no reason why we haven't got under way with this project.

Now, I did welcome the announcement of the hon. Minister of Public Health (Mr. Steuart) that he has set up a committee to investigate the discharge and resettlement of the patients in our mental hospitals. This is a matter about which I have been very much concerned, Mr. Speaker, and I know there is widespread concern throughout the province. I have received numerous complaints about unsatisfactory living accommodation in which many of these

March 1, 1966

people have been placed, about lack of proper supervision and adequate follow-up of discharged patients to see if they are properly looked after. Now, Mr. Speaker, these discharged patients are among those least able to stand up for themselves and it's difficult for them to find ways of voicing their complaints so that they will be taken seriously. I had intended urging the minister to set up an independent investigating committee. I had planned to relate in detail several cases reported to me in support of this request, cases in addition to the ones that have already been brought up in this House. But now that a committee has been appointed to examine the situation and to investigate complaints in a much more thorough manner than I could do, it won't be necessary that I repeat these complaints. I certainly do wish to commend the minister on his action in this matter.

I know the minister won't want too large a committee of this kind because it's hard to get them together. If he would consider two further names, I have two names to suggest. One is Dr. Heal of Moose Jaw. Now, Dr. Heal served on the committee on ageing and long-term illness and made a very fine contribution to that committee. They studied not only the physical illnesses but the mental illnesses of senior citizens. I do believe he could make a very valuable contribution in the light of his experience to this committee. The other name is Mrs. R. J. Davidson, who has been most active in the field of mental health over the years. She has done a marvellous job. She has spent years in helping organize and keeping active a visiting committee to mental hospitals. She is active now in the White Cross Centres. She has a great knowledge of the subject and I do believe that she would be a valuable addition to this committee.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am aware that the theory is that patients should be released from hospitals as soon as possible and integrated into the community where they can get back to more normal living, rather than spending too long in an institution. In principle I certainly agree with this approach but, Mr. Speaker, the success of such a program depends on the availability of suitable living accommodation and proper supervision and follow-up after the patient is discharged. Unless suitable homes can be found, just sending them into a home without proper supervision, without any kind of rehabilitation program with inadequate inspection and follow-up by trained psychiatric social workers, this is dangerous. It is, I feel, a rather inhumane procedure and apt to make a former patient regress rather than progress. Now, in all fairness, Mr. Speaker, I realize that it's difficult to find suitable homes with people who are understanding and capable of handling the situation, people who not only can provide good food and housing but who are willing to help their guest to find social contacts and generally assist in their rehabilitation process. This I understand, Mr. Speaker, but unless and until such homes can be found, I feel that it is wrong to discharge patients from the hospital where they have the help of trained workers, where there is occupational therapy, proper recreation rooms, good libraries and adequate sanitary facilities.

I have congratulated the Minister of Public Health (Mr. Steuart) — I see he has arrived — on setting up an investigating committee on mental health. Now, I am glad to see that the minister has appointed two ladies to this committee. In this type of investigation I believe that women may see situations and problems that a man may overlook. The terms of reference for this committee seem quite wide but there are one or two things I hope the Minister of Public Health will clarify. Will this investigation include only those patients who are under the direct respon-

sibility of the Psychiatric Services Branch of the Department? My understanding is that the placement of discharged patients is the responsibility of the government. But when the ex-patient has been placed in the community or the municipality they then become the responsibility of the municipality and the government has no further responsibility. If I am right about this, in the interest of good health, good mental health, I would hope that the living conditions of these people will be included in the investigation.

Another matter I suggest that the minister look into is this. Until fairly recently there was a volunteer committee of ladies who went weekly to visit the Weyburn Hospital. They talked to the patients, they organized birthday parties, Christmas events, entertained with sing songs, did many useful things and they were welcomed with great enthusiasm by the patients. I feel they did a wonderful job, Mr. Speaker, and they deserve the highest commendation for their efforts. This program of voluntary visitation was advocated by Dr. Osmond and Dr. McKerracher and others interested in the work. I attended the first meeting when this program was advocated by the doctors. I assisted in some small way, at least, in the formation of this group. Now this volunteer service is discouraged by the authorities and as far as Regina is concerned it has been discontinued. There may be a good reason why this happened, but if there is, Mr. Speaker, I am unaware of it.

Another matter brought to my attention, which I think I should mention, refers to the policy of placing patients in private nursing homes, some of them still quite ill. I believe the government did receive a resolution from the Council of Women protesting this practice. The feeling expressed to me was that it is not good to house the mentally ill with the mentally alert. Now the minister may feel that this shouldn't cause concern but whether it should or not, it does, Mr. Speaker. It is very disturbing and very depressing to the mentally alert. The presence of a number of patients whose behaviour may not be quite normal frightens other people. It makes them nervous, and they can have no peace of mind. I had two cases reported to me where a person, an elderly person, was physically attacked by a mentally disturbed person. I know you will all agree that this would be upsetting. Under such circumstances many people would leave if they could but because of lack of alternative accommodation they have no place to go. This points up the need for more homes to provide nursing care for our senior citizens. People are living longer and the need for such homes is growing rapidly. I am told, Mr. Speaker, that some discharged patients because no other accommodation is available, are forced to go into nursing homes where the rates range from \$200 up to even \$400 a month. Now some of these people may have estates that can afford this rate but at \$200, \$300, or \$400 a month, a small estate would soon be wiped out and when these people become destitute what is their future, Mr. Speaker? This financial worry alone is not very conducive to good mental health. Before I leave this subject I would like to pay a tribute to the Canadian Mental Health Association for their work in establishing White Cross Centres in some areas in the province where discharged patients can make social contacts, have healthy recreation and someone to help them with their problems. A large number of volunteers help with these programs and they are to be commended for their efforts. But we need more of these centres, Mr. Speaker. There are many requests for the extension of these services. The Mental Health Association just doesn't have enough funds to provide more centres and extend their work. These centres are entirely run on voluntary contributions and it is a struggle to keep up the centres they now have. May I suggest

March 1, 1966

to the Minister of Public Health (Mr. Steuart) that a generous grant be given to the Mental Health Association to assist them in extending and maintaining these valuable works.

One more thing, Mr. Speaker, I believe this should be directed to the Minister of Social Welfare (Mr. Boldt). I understand there was a study made of the needs of emotionally disturbed children. As far as I know this report has never been released. May I ask if this report has been received? I have been told that it was some time ago and, if it was, why has it not been released? When Embury House was closed and the criticism was at its height, the Minister of Social Welfare publicly stated that Embury House was unsuitable, that he was going to build a much better place in Moose Jaw for disturbed children. This promise has never been kept. It has come to my notice, Mr. Speaker, that one cottage of the Yorkton Hospital is not being used. Could this be used for the mentally and emotionally disturbed children? If so it could be used without added capital cost and perhaps at no greater expense than is now being incurred by the department. I would ask the minister if he would look into the possibility of this suggestion. By the way I did notice an answer to a question and one of the members on this side spoke about it today — how much was paid for different age groups of emotionally disturbed children in Saskatchewan's foster homes, and the answer there is up to nine years, \$1.40 a day; ten to fifteen, \$1.55 a day; sixteen to twenty-one, \$1.70 a day. There is a notation that in certain very extreme cases a little more can be paid but it seems to me that this is unreasonably low in this day and age with the cost of living . . .

Mr. Boldt: — The same as the Socialists.

Mrs. Cooper: — The cost of living has gone up since. How could you expect good homes at this rate? I did notice this also that when they are sent out of the province you have to pay \$13.98 and up to \$22. I hope that you will look at this and revise this.

And now I come to the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Heald), and I have some constructive advice for him.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mrs. Cooper: — He's clapping so I hope that means that he is going to agree with everything I suggest. I would like to ask the Attorney General one question. Couldn't some better method be devised than presently exists to assist deserted wives when court orders for maintenance of the family are disregarded by deserting husbands. A wife trying to manage alone with children to look after has enough worry and emotional problems to contend with without having to face the added worries of the financial difficulties that occur when the money that she has the legal right to expect is not forthcoming. I went into this matter in the legislature a few years ago, Mr. Speaker. At that time I suggested that the responsibility for seeing that maintenance orders as ordered by the court are complied with should not be placed on the wife, but they should be enforced by an officer appointed by the court whose duty it would be to follow up these orders and see that the money is paid to the wife. But since that time, Mr. Speaker, I came across a very penetrating article in the September, 1965, issue of *Chatelaine Magazine* by Molly Gillan. I don't know whether the Attorney General has read it or not. It is entitled "How The Family Court Fails Canadian Wives". The situations that she

describes deal mainly with Ontario but it might well have been Saskatchewan she was talking about for very much the same situation exists here. No one has the correct figure of the number of deserted wives in Canada. Estimates place it about 80,000 but it could be much higher. In this article she suggests that it is high time that the government and society took a hard look at the system under which society tries to help wives and children in distress. I would say, Mr. Speaker, that it is long past time. Now she cites several cases of difficulties wives experience in collecting money owed by their husbands. One wife says.

I spent four years trying to get things settled through Family Court. It is a waste of time. Family Court is nothing but a men's club who protect their own and let the wives manage as best they can.

Too many women in the same plight tell the same story. It is reasonably easy to get a court order against a husband; it is another thing altogether to get action on that order. Now she gives many examples, I am not going to cite them all, but I will cite one or two because I have recommendations to make and I will cite them in support of these recommendations. One wife whose payments stopped had to wait ten weeks to get a hearing and then was awarded only half the money because the judge accepted the husband's word that he couldn't pay more. "The court worries more about husbands than children", she says. "My husband spends money on women and liquor but the court tells me you can't get blood out of a stone". You hear the argument that if you force payment of a maintenance order a man won't work or he'll skip town if he is pressed too hard. "We must be realistic. If a man earns \$60, he will need at least \$40 for himself because without a wife to get his meals it costs more." Well, Mr. Speaker, what about the wife who has to get her meals and has a number of children to raise, often on a very low salary. And, Mr. Speaker, a wife who is independent and doesn't want to go on social aid is often in a worse position than one who gives up and relies entirely on social aid. If she takes a job she has to hire someone to look after her children. If she receives the money owed by her husband with her own work she may be able to manage, with difficulty. But if that money from the husband doesn't arrive she is in real trouble.

One more case only, I am going to cite and that is the case that she calls in this article, the case of Margo and Peter. They were divorced in 1958. The wife was given custody of the children and \$120 a month maintenance. In the first two years she received just about half of what she was supposed to get. Then the husband moved to British Columbia and the payments stopped altogether. Years of delay and frustration followed, sometimes gaps between letters from one government to another, jurisdiction would be as long as six weeks. It took 19 months to get results. For instance, September 6th, 1961 British Columbia report to Ontario that the provincial order issued in 1960 has finally been confirmed. Margo could now expect to get the money. In the following two years she received exactly \$137. By this time arrears had reached \$6,700 and the husband declared he couldn't pay, but somehow or other that husband found the money to hire a lawyer who discovered a loophole in the law. Since the Supreme Court Order for the divorce preceded the Family Court Order he argues the latter had no validity. The judge agreed, promptly overruled his own order and disallowed the judgment. Margo was just where she had started. She realized she would have been better to accept Mother's Allowance. At least then she would have had free medical and dental care for her children. "Why", Margo asked, "did he get away with it?" We hear the argument that this kind of man is irresponsible

March 1, 1966

anyway, what's the use of jailing him. He can't work in jail. The woman gets no money and his support falls on the taxpayer. But, Mr. Speaker, the cost incurred by years of time spent between lawyers and provincial departments is not small either. The writer of the article says this, "Let's equate two cases": A man marries a young stenographer who earns say \$70 a week. When he later deserts her she has five children. His wife can't go back to her job, she has forgotten her shorthand, and besides who would care for the children, so she goes to Family Court for help. Now the husband can think of dozens of excuses why he can't work or can't pay. Often the court won't push him, the psychiatrist says he's disturbed, emotionally upset and quite often by now he is living in common-law with another woman and has a couple more children, so the legal wife and children are pushed into the welfare field. "Now", she says, "look at another case". A man gets a ticket for speeding. If he doesn't pay he's brought into court and all the judge has to decide is whether or not he is going too fast. No psychiatrist finds him disturbed. \$14 or 14 days if he can't pay. He does the 14 days at the expense of the taxpayer. "Where" she asks, "is your sense of values?"

Now, all provinces have provisions for imprisonment as a last resort against a husband's failure to pay. Most of them have authority to garnishee wages. Courts don't hesitate to garnishee for commercial debt. A garnishee for family support should have legal priority over all other garnishees. Under a maintenance order payments are due when the order is made but if the husband is in another province the wife must wait until the order has been sent through the proper channels to the jurisdiction where he now lives, the case has been heard, and the order confirmed and the confirmation received back in wife's jurisdiction. This takes considerable time. Then if the husband gets in default or ceases payments the wife must wait until the payments are overdue before she can lay a default charge. In the meantime she has to go on welfare and then perhaps only a token sum will come in. The difficulty, Mr. Speaker, seems to be administrative delay which causes great hardship and emotional stress to the family and in the reluctance of the court to enforce the orders they make. "One difficulty seems to be the difference between law and justice", says the writer in this article. Our laws were made away back by people of substance to protect that substance. It's an old saying that our courts are courts of law, not justice. A Family Court Enforcement Branch could be set up to follow all maintenance orders instead of forcing the wife to do her own policing. Another suggestion that I feel has real merit is this one, and I hope the Attorney General will note this particularly, the suggestion is that the Welfare Department could set up a fund from which a deserted family could immediately draw an adequate living allowance. The department would then undertake the full burden of charging, tracing and prosecuting a delinquent husband who would now owe the province instead of the wife. Miss Gillan reports that a move towards placing part of the burden on the province was taken in Ontario, when a special investigating unit was set up in 1961 by the Department of Social Welfare to relieve the desertion case drain on the Welfare fund. The unit claims 40 to 50 per cent success in tracing down and getting payments from vanished husbands. This kind of program, Mr. Speaker, removing the burden to the impersonal and powerful agency of a government department should be adopted by all provinces, not only as a saving to taxpayers but out of concern for the suffering family. Another improvement suggested and with which I agree would be the appointment of a Crown Prosecutor as in criminal cases. A Crown Prosecutor could present a much more coherent case for a woman whose emotional state may make her

bitter and make her give an hysterical performance and lose the court's sympathy. And what is more, Mr. Speaker, unless the wife is fully familiar with her husband's financial affairs she may receive less than her husband can afford. A good lawyer as a prosecutor would be better able to sort out the husband's assets. These suggestions, Mr. Speaker, may at first seem like a rather radical departure, but the more you look at them, the more sensible and practical they appear, and in particular the one referring to the Social Welfare Department. If a deserting husband fails to meet his legal obligations most wives have to resort to social aid and the taxpayers pay anyway. Now, the Attorney General may find a better solution than I have advocated. If he can, well and good, but certainly in this day and age deserted wives deserve a better deal. The responsibility and expense of enforcing maintenance orders should not be on the shoulders of the wife. I hope the Attorney General will give this matter serious and active consideration and bring in legislation at the next session of the legislature to remedy this injustice.

And now, Mr. Speaker, I think you will judge from my earlier remarks in my address that I will support the amendment but I will not support the budget.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. D. W. Michayluk (Redberry): — After listening to the lady member for the city of Regina I was heartily encouraged by the remark that she made during the course of her address. I would just like the ministers to whom she made specific reference to make note of what she has tried to convey to the government.

I think I will follow the usual procedure, Mr. Speaker, in conveying congratulations and welcomes to some of the members of this legislature. To begin, I would like to welcome the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly, Mr. Bradshaw, who, I understand, is on loan to us from the House of Commons or the Mother of parliaments from England. I hope that his stay with us will be a happy one and that he will take back to England the happy memories of the proceedings of this legislature and some valuable memories of some of the things that have taken place during his stay here.

I would also like to welcome to this legislature the two new members. The very fact that they are here is no fault of mine. I didn't try to keep them out or get them in, but I want to congratulate them on their victories. I am sure that they will be worthy representatives for the constituencies that they have been elected to serve.

Several days ago, Mr. Speaker, I rose in my place when the report was brought down of the Broadcast Committee. At that time, Mr. Speaker, I was somewhat perturbed, as were many of the people in this province, no doubt, that the government has rearranged and discontinued broadcasting the proceedings from this legislature in an orderly manner to which the listeners have been accustomed in the past. Since the election of the Liberal government, Mr. Speaker, in 1964, people were uncertain whether or not these broadcasts would be continued. I am of the opinion that the government is not very anxious to broadcast the criticisms which the members of the opposition have to offer in respect to the policies of the monopoly, free enterprise, Liberal government. To support my contention may I make reference to a press release from the Saskatoon Star Phoenix of March 6th, 1965, and I quote: The title is "Legislature on the Air may end".

March 1, 1966

Daily 75-minute radio broadcasts carrying part of the debates in the Saskatchewan legislature ended Friday for the session and possibly for good. Paid for by the province, the broadcasts were carried over ten of the province's radio stations each afternoon between 2:45 and 4 o'clock. One of the legislature's committees had a single responsibility of allocating speaking times during the airtime of the various parties represented in the Assembly. This had traditionally been done on a proportional basis roughly to correspond to the membership in the Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, the next several statements are not difficult to assess and the reason for their appearing in this release. I quote again:

Many of the legislature have privately deplored the practice, stating that all the legislature's business had been keyed to the broadcast hour.

Well, Mr. Speaker, if this is the only explanation that the members of the government or the press whose reporters are on hand during the entire session, can provide, I am amazed. Surely it is not correct to assume, Sir, that all the working business is keyed to the Throne Speech and the Budget Debate. Most of the work is done in committee which is not broadcast. To say that the 1,500 minutes of the proceedings in debate out of a two months session disrupts, or in some manner keys up the business of the legislature, is not in my estimation in accordance with the facts. It is a fact that the government does not want, and is somewhat reluctant to continue broadcasting the proceedings as stated by the hon. Minister of Public Health in the press release and I quote:

House Leader, Dave Steuart, said afterward in the corridor outside the Assembly that the broadcasts may be dropped another year.

During the sessions since 1960, Mr. Speaker, during which I have sat in this legislature, never have I heard from the Liberal opposition during the five sessions from 1960 to 1964 that they were not in favour of continuing radio broadcasts of the legislative proceedings. However, on many occasions the members of the radio committee, together with members of the opposition, argued and protested bitterly for more radio time which they claimed was not apportioned justly. Time and time again, Mr. Speaker, speaker after speaker on the Liberal side of the House rose, demanded and requested more and more radio time. Why? Why the change in attitude, Mr. Speaker, at this time? Why the discontinuance of the broadcasts to which the Saskatchewan people have been accustomed over the past 21 years? The only logical conclusion which the members on this side of the House may arrive at is that the government is reluctant to afford the people of Saskatchewan the facts as presented by the present opposition with respect to what is going on in this province under a Liberal government.

Mr. Speaker, I challenge the Premier, and the deputy premier, the hon. Minister of Public Health, to drop the legislative broadcasts and then make an honest explanation to the people of Saskatchewan for this move. No doubt, Mr. Speaker, they would have an explanation similar to the one I quoted several moments ago, but since their election they have made statements that were proven to be false. Statements which were made they were unable

to support, statements that were taken out of context, statements that they have picked up in the wastepaper basket, statements made by responsible ministers of the Crown that could not and will never be proven. However, Mr. Speaker, they expect and would like the Saskatchewan people to believe them.

May I, Mr. Speaker, with your permission make reference to one such statement during the session of a year ago, and reported in Hansard, on page 745. The hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) during the course of his remarks made reference to a supposed mysterious automobile which he had located on the legislative grounds, may I quote in part:

Shortly after taking office as Minister of Labour, I wanted to familiarize myself with the layout of the grounds, so I got into my car and drove around the grounds and lo and behold, I go in the parking lot and I find a 1962 Ford with a 1962 license on it, with approximately 3,000 to 4,000 miles on it.

An Hon. Member: — You didn't give us the number of the license.

Mr. Michayluk: —

The policies of the former administration, Mr. Speaker, were so clear-cut that they had lost a car. Did the hon. Deputy Leader of the Opposition know what was happening? Did they have so many cars that they did not know what had happened with them? This is a terrific indictment on the previous administration. They had so many cars that they did not even know where they were or what was happening to them.

And he states further:

I understand that some of them have been found even in California. Shame!

Well, of course, Mr. Speaker, in March 1965 edition of the Liberal propaganda sheet, Saskatchewan Liberal, appears this release under the title "The Lost Ford". The Saskatchewan Liberal believed what the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) said, "The Lost Ford".

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Michayluk: — Just hold it, just hold it for a while, Mr. Speaker. This is what the Saskatchewan Liberal released after the statements were made in this legislature by the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre). I quote:

So well did the former government husband the property placed in its trust that it managed to lose, of all things, a brand new automobile in 1962. Labour Minister Coderre told the Saskatchewan legislature that after he was appointed to the cabinet he made a tour of the legislative grounds. During the tour he discovered again a 1962 car, complete with 1962 license plates. On checking he found that it was written off by the previous government as lost. Mr. Coderre said he understood some other government cars had been found as far away as California.

March 1, 1966

On March 9th, Mr. Speaker, and the hon. members of this House will recall, I placed a motion for return no. 102 on the Order Paper of the Legislative Assembly for a return showing (1) the year, the make, the model, the serial number, and the 1962 license number of the car which was reported to be found on the legislative grounds by the Hon. Lionel Coderre (Minister of Labour)? (2) The disposition of the car? On April 9th, precisely a month later of the same year a copy of Sessional Paper no. 161, the Provincial Secretary, the hon. member for Lumsden (Mr. Heald) provided the answer to my two simple questions, Mr. Speaker. What were the answers, Mr. Speaker? The department does not have this information. Would the hon. minister then, the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) at this session please advise us where did he get the information that the government had written off the car as lost. We, on this side, Mr. Speaker, would appreciate an explanation, or an answer. Where did he check and where did he find out that the government had then written off the car as lost? Mr. Speaker, I am certain that the hon. members of this House will agree that the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) during his supposed tour of the legislative grounds had hallucinations in respect to the lost automobile.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Michayluk: — Might I suggest, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) that statements of this kind are not becoming to any member of this Assembly. They are so much more repugnant when made by a responsible minister of the Crown. Pure fabrication.

Turning to the supposed automobile that was discovered in California, may I suggest to the Minister of Labour that he could inform Mr. Lucien Rivard when he is free that he can get in the car to return to Montreal.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Michayluk: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a few moments to refer to tax reductions. The taxpayers of Saskatchewan are beginning to realize that they are paying more for taxes and services now than they ever did under a CCF government and many of the services have been cut. Each tax decrease the government has made has been offset when increased somewhere else. To begin with, medicare and hospital premiums were increased \$20 per family. Grazing lease fees are double what they were under the CCF. Insufficient increase in school and municipal grants has raised property taxes as high as seven mills in some instances. They suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the incentive grants, as proposed by the government and the Minister of Education (Mr. Trapp) will aid in holding the tax level down. Fees for marriage, divorce, births, and death certificates have more than doubled. All smokers — and we have very few on this side — but all smokers in Saskatchewan will recall that the tax on tobacco has doubled from five to ten per cent. Government insurance rates have been increased, with a further increase of over 30 per cent on all dwellings to go into effect on April 1st of this year. I will deal with that further in my remarks, Mr. Speaker.

Automobile drivers will have to pay more for their 1966 car licenses, and for the last model cars the increase is over ten per cent. Red and blue license holders will pay double for their licenses. The 16 — 24 age group will pay an additional \$2 for the

operator's license. Lo and behold at a time when the revenues of the province are in a healthy state of buoyancy, at a time when the Provincial Treasurer is promising rebates to a maximum of \$50 to homeowners, the farmers who only a year ago were allowed the use of purple gas in farm trucks are now being asked to make up for this concession by paying another extra cent of gasoline tax for gas to be used in automobiles.

An Hon. Member: — Can't win. Not with the Liberals.

Mr. Michayluk: — Mr. Speaker, this hide-and-see game of give-away, take-away that the Premier and Provincial Treasurer is playing with the Saskatchewan taxpayer is catching up to him. From his remarks, more is to come that is no more inviting or tempting. Oh yes, Mr. Speaker, but he has become generous, he has exempt turkey saddles, whatever they are, and harnesses for horses from the four per cent sales tax. Lucky Saskatchewan farmers and agricultural industry. I very much suspect that these exemptions were made under great pressure from the present Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane). Horse harnesses, as you know, Mr. Speaker, have become as obsolete in the agricultural industry as the steam engine and the Red River cart.

Would the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) please note that there will now be peace in the family because they will not pay harness tax. But Mamma, boy, oh boy, did she get a break? Every kitchen and household necessity is subject to a four per cent sales tax. Can you conceive, Sir, how pleased and delighted the housewives will be when they discover that the Provincial Treasurer and Premier who has been promising tax concessions and tax relief has now added an additional four per cent tax to these helpful commodities that are a necessity in every household and kitchen in the province, Mr. Speaker, toilet and laundry soap, flakes and powders, lye, laundry starch, cleansing power, chloride of lime, bleaching, including ammonia. This, Mr. Speaker, to use Anthony's words from Shakespeare was the most unkindest cut of all.

An Hon. Member: — People are going to be pretty dirty.

Mr. Michayluk: — Only a year ago married couples were exempt for \$1,000 worth of furniture, in other words, Mr. Speaker, people in the government were encouraging young people to get married to get a tax rebate. Now they are going to get more tax out of them. The Provincial Treasurer and government who would on one hand give tax concessions to oil companies by exempting royalties for companies if oil is discovered in and below the Devonian layer, are now going to sniff into the kitchen of the Saskatchewan housewives to extract an additional \$100,000 by taxing commodities which are necessary for best sanitation, cleanliness and in many cases the health of our people of the province. This is ample evidence, Sir, where this government places emphasis on need. Tax the housewife, and grant relief to the oil companies.

May I make a brief reference, Mr. Speaker, to the employees of some of our Crown corporations. I have on my desk, Mr. Speaker, a copy of the Prince Albert Herald, of Saturday, November 10th, 1962, I think the hon. Minister of Public Health (Mr. Steuart) remembers this issue of the Prince Albert Herald. There is

March 1, 1966

a full-page ad placed in this paper by the Prince Albert Provincial Liberal Association. At the bottom of the page it says, "Vote Dave Steuart". The top of this is under the title and I quote, Mr. Speaker:

The truth is. The truth is.

I presume he is referring to Liberal truth. One of the captions on this page refers to civil servants and Crown corporation employees and may I quote, Sir:

The CCF Socialist government has thrown a scare into these people as to the safety of their jobs if there is a change in government. The truth is a Liberal government guarantees the civil servants and Crown corporation employees:

1. The safety and security of their jobs.
2. The right to bargain collectively.
3. The right of freedom of political choice.

Further on in this caption, Mr. Speaker, is this:

The truth is that a Liberal government will take the political pressure off government employees and treat them as free independent individuals.

During this by-election, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Public Health (Mr. Steuart) who was a candidate in this by-election, made his stand clear in respect to the freedom of civil servants and Crown corporation employees as to their civil liberties and their freedom of political choice. The now Premier, Mr. Speaker, when he sat on this side of the House was rather vocal in defending the freedom of political choice for those who are in public service in this province. The Premier, Mr. Speaker, spoke to the delegates at the annual convention of the Saskatchewan Government Employees Association on Friday, May 22nd, the day his government was sworn into office. Here is one of the statements made by the Premier to the members of this association:

If high morale is to be present in the civil service and its topflight individuals are to remain in the civil service, politics must not be the governing factor, or indeed, the major factor in hiring personnel.

Further on in his address this is what the Premier said:

Civil servants have nothing to fear from the new government. Their jobs are secure and their political independence will be respected. I believe that the politics of a civil servant is his or her personal affair, so long as that politics is conducted on their own time.

These were the assurances made by the Premier of Saskatchewan to the Public Service Association and Crown corporation employees on May 22, 1964. Mr. Speaker, five months later on October 29th, 1964, appeared in the Saskatoon Star Phoenix under the title "Civil Service and Politics" and may I quote in part:

At a recent press conference, Industry Minister Herb Pinder said Saskatchewan civil servants have been asked to refrain from political activity on and off the job.

Mr. W. J. Berezowsky (Cumberland): — He is the new boss.

Mr. Michayluk: — Some weeks later an editorial in the Saskatoon Star Phoenix on January 21, 1966, under the title “Government and its Employees” stated:

Last week D. G. Steuart, the minister in charge of Saskatchewan Power Corporation issued a warning that the corporation would not accept, allow, or condone political activity in the political field by its employees. Such activities, the minister said, would result in dismissal.

An Hon. Member: — Who’s he?

Mr. Michayluk: — These arbitrary rulings, Mr. Speaker, by responsible ministers of the Crown are a threat and an outright repudiation of a solemn pledge made by the Premier that the exercise of the political rights of the public employee outside his working hours is his or her own business. Since the election of this government competent people and capable people have left Saskatchewan, like Dr. A. W. Johnson, former Deputy Provincial Treasurer in Saskatchewan; Dr. Meyer Brownstone, Deputy Minister of Municipal Affairs; Dr. Donald Tansley, the first chairman of the Saskatchewan Medical Care Insurance Commission; Mr. Wilf Churchman, former Deputy Minister of Natural Resources; Dr. Don Black who was Saskatchewan’s Deputy Minister of Industry and Information; Mr. Tommy Shoyama, who was Secretary of the Economic Advisory and Planning Board under former Premier Woodrow Lloyd; Mr. Charles Schwartz, former Executive Director of the Saskatchewan Crop Insurance Board is an economist with the Department of Trade and Commerce at Ottawa. Most of these people, Mr. Speaker, were in the employ of the Saskatchewan people under the CCF government . . .

Mr. A. R. Guy (Athabasca): — Cass-Beggs, you forgot him.

Mr. Michayluk: — . . . and most of them have left since the election of a Liberal government. Why did they leave Saskatchewan? These people are employed by federal and provincial governments with political stripes other than that of the CCF. The fact is, Sir, that they would not work for a government with their hands tied behind their backs.

Mr. R. A. Walker (Hanley): — Have to be a MLA to get a job now.

Mr. Berezowsky: — Pretty sad.

Mr. Michayluk: — In an article appearing in the Leader Post only a week ago under the title “Saskatchewan Hangs on Many Capital Doors” is this caption:

One thing is clear, if you want a job you’ll likely find one in Ottawa, and you will probably find the Saskatchewan immigrant living next door to you.

I was pleased, Mr. Speaker, when the Minister of Social Welfare (Mr. Boldt), who is also minister in charge of the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office, made an announcement the other day that earnings and gross profits of this Crown corporation were the largest in its history since its inception in 1945. I would have expected at that time to hear the minister announce rate reductions in respect to insurance in the province. I will

March 1, 1966

come to this aspect of insurance a little later in my remarks, Mr. Speaker. However, at this time I want to make reference to an article appearing in the Monetary Times of May, 1965, with a specific reference to car insurance in Saskatchewan. The title, Sir, is "Saskatchewan Insurance" and may I quote in parts:

Like auto insurance rates everywhere, Saskatchewan's have recently been boosted and the private companies are still looking in from the outside waiting for the government to make good an election promise.

Private companies, private insurance companies aren't getting a crack at the \$12,000,000 annual premiums paid by Saskatchewan motorists for compulsory government auto insurance at least for a year. The new Thatcher government is carrying on with the scheme except for raising rates for the 1965 motor license year. Premier Ross Thatcher hasn't forgotten his pre-election promise to retain compulsory insurance while drivers are free to buy their coverage either from the government or private companies. At least this is what he says. The government didn't have time to work out its plan. Also he noted there wasn't time to pass the necessary legislation to bring the new plan into effect on March 15, the date on which the new license plates went on sale. Some private insurance companies feel the new government is dragging its feet, fearful to make a fast move lest it alienate motorists among whom the compulsory scheme is popular.

The Premier, Mr. Speaker, speaking to the Insurance Agents Association of Saskatchewan in Saskatoon as reported in "The Spotlight" a publication of the Saskatchewan Government Insurance of October-November issue of 1965, made this statement:

The Premier added that the provincial government is examining the feasibility of throwing the auto insurance field open to competition. Insurance would remain compulsory and Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office would be required to stand on its own feet and compete with private industry.

Mr. Speaker, I will have a lot more to say on this subject later. At this time I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

RESOLUTIONS

MOTION: RE IRRIGATION IN BRODERICK AREA

The Order of the Day was called for the following motion to be moved by Mr. R. A. Walker (Hanley):

That the Select Standing Committee on Agriculture be instructed to inquire into all matters related to the government's proposal to construct works for irrigation in the Broderick area, and that the said committee be authorized to require the attendance of any person and the production of all relevant papers and documents.

Whereupon Mr. Speaker made the following statement:

Mr. Speaker: — There is a procedural problem here which I have given some consideration to in the supper hour.

I must draw the attention of the assembly to the fact that this afternoon the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) presented a Bill to provide for the establishment and development of the South Saskatchewan River Irrigation Project. As a result, the hon. member's motion regarding proposed government irrigation works in the Broderick area, itself a part of the South Saskatchewan River Irrigation Project, now appears to traverse the rule of anticipation.

Erskine May defines this rule as follows:

A motion must not be anticipated if it is contained in a more effective form of proceeding than the proceeding by which it is sought to be anticipated. (17th Edition, page 399).

Thus, a Bill is more effective than a motion, a substantive motion more effective than an amendment and so on. So, continues May:

A motion . . . is out of order if it anticipates a notice of motion for leave to bring in a Bill that includes the subject proposed to be dealt with by the motion.

Nor does the fact that the Bill has not been printed withdraw the motion from the operation of this rule.

The object of this rule, as recited in Erskine May, is to ensure that debate is concentrated on the most effective form of proceeding, which in this instance is the Bill. It may be of some help to the hon. member if I suggest to him that it would be open to him, if and when the Bill comes forward for second reading, to move the substance of this motion as a reasoned amendment at that stage. In its present form I find his motion out of order.

Mr. F. A. Dewhurst (Wadena): — On the Order Paper, Mr. Speaker, there is no motion before us. We just had notice of motion, there is no motion in the Order Paper pertaining to the Bill.

Mr. Speaker: — Well, I just got through quoting what Sir Erskine May had to say in regard thereto, and I will quote it again:

Thus a Bill is more effective than a motion, a substantive motion more effective than an amendments and so on.

The motion is out of order.

Mr. A. M. Nicholson (Saskatoon City): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, Order! An order is a motion for leave to bring in a Bill. That includes the subject proposed to be dealt with by the motion; nor does the fact that the Bill has not been printed withdraw the motion from the operation of the Bill, and Erskine May says all the way through, notice of motion. Now, I

March 1, 1966

understand the notice of motion has been given.

Mr. W. G. Davies (Moose Jaw City): — May I suggest to Your Honour that it has not yet been regularly moved and seconded. If the member stands the motion, then it can be dealt with as you suggest, following the introduction of the Bill. Would you agree with this?

Mr. Speaker: — No, the present motion as it stands at the present time, is, according to all the rules and authorities, out of order.

Mr. Walker: — I am perfectly happy to abide by Your Honour's ruling. I am aware of the fact that it will be debated and I intend to take advantage of Your Honour's ruling to see that it is debated. I am perfectly happy to abide by Your Honour's ruling.

Mr. J. H. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — For our information, Mr. Speaker, when was that notice of motion given about the Bill? Just today?

Mr. Speaker: — This I shall have to ask the Clerk.

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — I haven't seen it in any of our papers.

Mr. Speaker: — Yes, the Clerk informed me at suppertime that it was given this afternoon. This sent me to my books instead of to my supper, which didn't improve my temper.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Dewhurst: — On a point of order, I took from Erskine May that notice of motion is when it appears on our white paper that a member shall on such and such a day either move a motion, or ask a question, so that is the notice of motion. We have no notice of this kind.

Hon. D. McFarlane (Minister of Agriculture): — I would respectfully submit that you have given a decision. I hope that all members of the House will abide by your ruling.

Mr. Speaker: — Just a minute. He has raised another point of order. Now, the notice, I am informed, once it has been given orally in the House is notice of motion.

POINTS OF ORDER

Mr. R. A. Walker (Hanley): — Your Honour, I should like to address myself to the matter of the point of order raised during first reading of Bill No. 19, An Act Respecting the Credit Grantors Regulation Act, 1966.

Mr. Speaker: — I understand that members

wish to speak on the point of order in regard to this Bill. I would ask them very sincerely to contain themselves to the point of order. We can't debate the Bill. It is the point of order on the Bill, and I say this for the benefit of all members that might wish to speak to the point of order.

Mr. Walker: — Your Honour, the point of order is, I take it, not raised by any member of the Assembly but was really reserved by Your Honour when the Bill was introduced, since Your Honour hadn't had the opportunity to examine it. A caveat was attached to it at the time it was presented to the House.

I have since made some reference to the rules covering the procedures in the House, to try to give some assistance, whatever assistance I can in the ruling, and I think that the procedure is quite straightforward and I think the Bill is quite properly before the House and it is in order.

As I understand, Your Honour apprehends that it may contravene the rule by which when public funds are expended or appropriated, and this being done by a private member of the Assembly and not by a member of the cabinet, it cannot, of course, be recommended for the favourable consideration of the Assembly by His Honour the Lieutenant Governor. It is to that aspect that I will direct my remarks.

I refer, Your Honour, to section 243 of Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, 4th edition. It sets out what the prohibition is, it says:

All Bills providing for the payment of salaries or for any expenditure whatever out of the public funds of the Dominion, must be considered as resolutions in Committee of the Whole. And all such resolutions necessary to the introduction of a Bill must first obtain the recommendation of the Governor General.

Now, as I understand it, our procedure here is the same. The Parliament Act of Great Britain, which governs the practice in this case, says as follows:

A Money Bill means a Public Bill which, in the opinion of the speaker of the House of Commons, contains only provisions dealing with all or any of the following subjects, namely, the imposition, repeal, remission, alteration or regulation of taxation; the imposition for the payment of debt or other financial purposes of charges on the Consolidated Fund, or on money provided by Parliament, or the variation or repeal of any such charges; supply; the appropriation, receipt, custody issue, or audit of accounts of public money; the rating or guarantee of any loan or the repayment thereof; or subordinate matters incidental to those subjects or any of them.

Now, I submit, Your Honour, that this Bill does not in any way attach or affect, or appropriate any public monies. The very most that can be said about this Bill and its effect upon public money is that some servants of the Crown, who are paid out of public money, will acquire some additional duties as a result of the passage of this Bill. I suggest that this is far beyond the wording of the Parliament Act or beyond the contemplation of the Act because, as the Premier pointed out a few minutes ago, every time we ask a question, we impose some duties or burden upon government

March 1, 1966

officials. If the Premier is right about this, that this imposes duties upon public officials then, of course, it would be contrary to this Act, or to the rules of this House for any member except a minister of the Crown to make a motion for a return of information because some typist is going to have to type out the return. I submit that that would be a strained construction of the sense of the Act and of the rule, to say that that represents an expenditure of public money.

Now, the precedents are not plentiful in this area. I have gone back fifteen or twenty years and I haven't found a precedent on all fours with this, where it was challenged and where it was held to be either out of order or in order.

There are some Bills that have been introduced that have been quite different. In fact, I recall Mr. Loptson, the former member for Saltcoats, moved, asking the province to provide storage facilities for surplus grain. It was then that he moved a motion calling for \$2 wheat at that time, and that was held to be out of order, and I think rightly so as it involved the expenditure of public funds. But I can't find any case where there has been an issue where it has been argued that it was out of order, and where a ruling has been given, or where it has been argued that it was in order and a ruling has been given.

There were a number of instances which I can refer to Your Honour where similar legislation to the one which I propose here was held to be in order. It did not require the fiat of the Lieutenant Governor before being introduced.

The one which I call to mind, which is most similar to my Bill, is the Cemeteries Act, which provided that the Securities Commission would have the duty of examining into any, the opening of any, new cemetery and the sale of shares, and the sale of cemetery plots. That Act is very similar to the one which I propose to introduce. It imposed extra duties on an existing public agency, namely the Securities Commission, and required the Securities Commission to issue licenses, to examine into financial statement, to — well, I will give Your Honour the citation — 1955, chapter 31, An Act respecting Cemeteries. It is a complete Act, it is a whole Act, it goes into 62 sections, and it defines the Commission as being the Saskatchewan Securities Commission and it says in summary: That a cemetery shall not be established or enlarged until the approval of the commission has been obtained. Every application for such approval shall be made in writing upon a form provided by the commission. The commission will provide the forms, the land to be used, and so on, together with such other information as the commission may require and this commission shall determine where the cemetery is to be situated. It shall require the name and address of the applicant to be set out and shall publish regulations governing the sale of plots.

This Bill was introduced on the advice of the Attorney General's Department at that time, without any recommendation or fiat of His Honour the Lieutenant Governor. The introduction of first reading was on March 21st, 1955, Bill No. 68, An Act respecting Cemeteries, page 97 of the Journals of that year.

Now, I realize that we have since come a long way in this House in observance of rules. I would just give Your Honour one more citation that occurred in 1965, and that is Chapter two of the Statutes of 1965, An Act respecting the Department of Industry and Commerce. There again we had an already existing establishment. This Act was passed to give this staff certain duties. The

Act said, - section four, - the staff of the department shall consist of a Deputy Minister, to be called the Deputy Minister of the Department of Industry and Commerce and such other employees as required for the proper conduct of the business of the department. This was a presently existing staff of officials and it gave them a lot of duties here summarized from section five: Their duty will be to promote the industrial, commercial and economic development of Saskatchewan. They will provide assistance to industries, they will co-operate with municipalities, they will undertake to assist in research and investigations with respect to matters relating to the economic development of Saskatchewan. They will encourage the development of trade. This Bill, No. 19, was introduced on Tuesday, February 9th, and it was introduced without any recommendation from the Lieutenant Governor, and Your Honour accepted it in that form.

Now, I acknowledge that it wasn't complained against. It wasn't protested, and so Your Honour perhaps didn't make any special finding of law on it; but, at least, it was passed, it was approved by this House. I submit that there are many other instances where Bills that do not call for any original or new expenditure have been accepted here by this House.

I wouldn't want to transgress Your Honour's prohibition against discussing the terms of the Bill. I will just say this that the Bill simply does provide for certain additional functions or duties by existing staff. The Bill doesn't call for the payment of any expense accounts, the payment of any salaries; it doesn't call even for the necessity for new staff. The existing staff up there in the Provincial Secretary's Department have handled registrations of the partnership Act. Then when we came along and passed additional legislation, when we passed The Real Estate Agents' Licensing Act, for example, they just took that as an extra duty. As a matter of fact that Act was passed in 1954-55 and the staff was actually reduced after that Act was passed, so that it cannot be said that this extra duty necessarily implies any extra staff. Indeed, the Premier seems to find ways of getting more work out of existing staff and I am sure he could get this extra work out of this existing staff without any expenditure of public funds. Indeed, I am confident that he will come back here next year and show a reduction in the size of this staff as a result of this extra work.

But I say, Mr. Speaker, that this Bill nowhere provides for any additional staff. It merely provides for some additional duties for existing staff. As I have shown Your Honour we have in the past been in the habit of passing legislation of that kind without requiring any recommendation from His Honour, and, therefore, I submit that the Bill is in order, Your Honour, according to the precedents of this House.

Hon. D. V. Heald (Attorney General): — I would like to respectfully submit that Bill No. 19, An Act respecting Credit cannot be submitted to the legislature by a private member in view of section 41 of the Legislative Assembly Act, which reads as follows and I quote:

The Assembly shall not adopt or pass any vote, resolution, address or Bill, for the appropriation of any part of the public revenue, or of any tax or impost, for any purpose that has not been recommended for the Assembly by message of the Lieutenant Governor during the session in which

March 1, 1966

such vote, resolution, address or Bill, is proposed.

In my respectful submission, Mr. Speaker, the Bill as drafted necessarily involves the appropriation of part of the public revenue to carry out the duties given to the Deputy Provincial Secretary by sections three and four of the Bill. Section two of the Bill makes the Deputy Provincial Secretary the Registrar of Credit, and section four imposes very extensive duties on the Registrar of Credit. I would like to just read sub-sections (a) to (e) of section four of the Bill. These are the duties imposed by the Bill on the Deputy Provincial Secretary.

- (a) Exercise general supervision over credit grantors and over the business of credit granting in the province;
- (b) Conduct studies, inquiries and surveys for the purpose of obtaining information respecting:
 - 1. credit grantors in the province;
 - 2. the methods and practices used by credit grantors who carry on business in the province;
 - 3. and keeping himself informed of developments or changes in the business of credit granting in the province;
- (c) Consult with and co-operate with credit grantors and other interested persons and organizations to assist in the attainment of the purposes of this Act;
- (d) Disseminate information respecting the methods of obtaining or granting credit, the practices of credit grantors, the costs of loans, the facilities available for obtaining loans or credit, and such other information as he considers desirable for the purpose of informing the public in respect of such matters;
- (e) Perform such other duties as may be prescribed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is my contention that these duties could not possibly be carried out by an official who is already Deputy Provincial Secretary, Superintendent of Insurance, and Registrar of Companies, as well as being in charge of the Cemeteries Act, the Direct Sellers Act, the Partnership Act, and other Acts. As a matter of fact, I consulted with the Deputy Provincial Secretary and asked him for an opinion of what the added costs would be, if any, to administer this type of Act, and I have an estimate from him that it would cost \$20,000.

Mr. Walker: — Your Honour, on a point of order, is it proper for my learned friend to bring in expert evidence from his staff, because I can consult with them too, and I would like to consult with several people and quote them. I think the hon. minister has got to express his own opinion, not the opinion of his staff.

Mr. Heald: — Well, I am quite prepared to state that this is my own opinion, but after all, Mr. Speaker, the Deputy Provincial Secretary is the man charged under this Act with being Registrar of Credit, and he is pretty knowledgeable, Mr. Speaker. I am quite prepared to accept his statement when he says it would cost at least \$20,000 in the first year to administer this Act.

The Bill provides for the Registrar having all the powers, privileges and immunities of a Commissioner appointed under the Public Inquiries Act.

Incidentally, the Public Inquiries Act does not provide for any immunity so I don't know what is meant by this provision. Sub-sections one and two of section five of The Public Inquiries Act and this has been made to apply to this Act by this section, sub-sections one and two of section five of The Public Inquiries Act provide as follows: S.R.S.S. Chapter 19, 1965. Section five, sub-section one:

The Commissioner, if thereunto authorized by the Lieutenant Governor in Council, may engage the services of such accountants, engineers, technical advisers, or other experts, clerks, reporters and assistants as they deem necessary or advisable, and also the services of counsel to aid and assist the commissioners in the inquiry.

And sub-section two of that section of the Public Inquiries Act says:

The Commissioners may authorize and depute any such accountants, engineers, technical advisers, or other experts, or any other qualified persons, to inquire into any matter within the scope of the commission.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I submit this means that Bill No. 19, the Bill before us, has the effect of authorizing the Lieutenant Governor in Council to authorize the Registrar to hire whatever staff he deems necessary to carry out the wide duties given to him. This clearly shows, I suggest, that the Bill requires the appropriation of part of the public revenue. Section six of the Bill 19 permits the Registrar to authorize persons to make inspections, which again shows that the Bill is intended to authorize the appointment of a staff to carry out the duties given to the Deputy Provincial Secretary.

Sub-section four of section seven appears to indicate that the hon. member for Hanley (Mr. Walker) who seeks to introduce the Bill realizes that the Bill could not provide for anything requiring expenditure of public funds. Sub-section four of the Bill provides, and I quote:

Subject to sub-section three, an Advisory Council appointed under this Act shall consist of such number of persons as the Lieutenant Governor in Council determines, and the persons so appointed shall receive no remuneration for their services.

Now, it would seem, Mr. Speaker, that a Provincial Advisory Council as is contemplated in this section could, at least, reasonably expect to receive out-of-pocket expenses out of the Consolidated Fund even if they are not given a per diem, but there is no provision here at all. The member has, of course, been very careful to delete that from the Act that he copied as a model, The Nova Scotia Act, and I am going to have more to say about that in a minute.

Section 10 provides that the Lieutenant Governor in Council may make regulations. In itself it provides for total regulation of credit transactions and loan transactions prescribing all forms

March 1, 1966

used in the business and all forms and agreements to be approved by the Registrar. Advertising is to be regulated, and the credit grantors' records are to be in the form prescribed.

I suggest that this again, because it involved regulations, and the drafting of regulations alone would require extensive research, this, again, involves the expenditure of public funds.

Mr. Speaker, I am advised that in Nova Scotia, and I accept the responsibility for this statement too, where this Bill was passed or almost an identical replica of this Bill was passed a year ago, they haven't got the Act working yet. They haven't got the regulations set and they have had five people working on it for twelve months. So surely this is clear evidence of the fact that there is a great expenditure of public funds.

Mr. Walker: — No competent staff.

Mr. Heald: — Oh, I think they are pretty competent in Nova Scotia too. Incidentally, I would point out in passing, I am glad to see the member from Regina West (Mr. Blakeney) was here to hear that. I am sure he will agree that the people in Nova Scotia are quite competent too to draft Bills and Acts the same as we are here.

Incidentally, I would point out that section 11 provides for an appeal from a decision of the Registrar to the District Court, but the Bill does not provide for the Registrar deciding any disputes between individuals.

Now, as I said earlier, Mr. Speaker, the Bill appears to have been drafted along the lines of the Nova Scotia Act respecting credit, which is chapter four of the 1965 Statutes in Nova Scotia. The Nova Scotia Act provides for the appointment of staff in sections six and seven. Of course, my hon. friend from Hanley (Mr. Walker) deleted sections six and seven from this Bill as he had to, to try and make it a private Bill. Section six in the Nova Scotia Bill says:

To assist the Registrar in performing his functions, there shall be appointed in accordance with The Civil Service Act, such auditors, accountants, inspectors, clerks and other persons as are necessary.

I cite that, Mr. Speaker, to indicate to you that any kind of Act like this that will work has to have this type of staff. This of course, is what this Bill contemplates through expenditure of public funds.

Section seven is the same kind of section. Section ten provides for regulations requiring credit grantors to be licensed and for the suspension and cancelling of licenses.

It is because of the licensing provisions that the Nova Scotia Act provided for an appeal through the Registrar of Credit. This provision has been copied without regard to the fact that the licensing provisions are not contained in your Bill, Bill No. 19, and this in my submission, makes section 11 in your Bill meaningless. I think it . . .

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is debating the quality of the Bill. He is criticizing the Bill right now; he is not on the point of order at all.

Mr. Heald: — No, I'm trying to relate it to funds, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Walker: — Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, regarding the last three sections he has referred to, he has shown how I deleted certain sections in order to bring the Bill within the rules. Now, this is fine. I appreciate the support of the hon. member in asserting that the Bill is within the rules. But when he comes along to deal with sections which he says are meaningless, then I suggest this is a debate on the merits of the Bill, which Your Honour strictly enjoined us not to engage in and I think the hon. member will want to observe that rule.

Mr. Heald: — Well, I will be glad to observe that, I thought I was, but the last observation I wanted to make was that the draftsman of the Bill obviously omitted to mention any provision for staff and licensing, because he recognized that he could not introduce a Bill providing for either.

Section 13 states the purposes of the Act, which merely emphasizes the fact. I think it is interesting to look at section 13:

The purpose and intent of this Act are:

- (a) to ensure, as far as is possible, that persons borrowing or receiving credit from credit grantors shall be fully informed of all the terms and conditions upon which the lending or granting of credit is made;
- (b) to prevent concealed charges for loans and credit; and
- (c) to bring about equality of knowledge or opportunity for obtaining knowledge between lenders and borrowers while preserving the right of freedom of contract and the right of credit grantors to make fair and reasonable charges for money lent and credit granted.

Now, I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this section merely emphasizes the fact that a large staff would be required to make this Bill work, if it were passed. I think it is very clear, if you look at section 13, if every hon. member in this legislature looks at section 13, he will recognize the very large amount of work that would be required by the staff of this department and, of course, it involves large expenditures of public funds. For that reason I say that the Bill is out of order as being a private member's Bill.

Mr. A. E. Blakeney (Regina West): — Mr. Speaker, I simply want to comment briefly on some of the remarks of the Attorney General (Mr. Heald) because as I would view it, he has misconstrued the import of some of the provisions of the Bill. I say in passing that, even if section 11 is unnecessary and irrelevant, this is hardly a convincing argument to suggest that it is going to cause a substantial expenditure of public funds. If it is, in fact, inoperative, it could

March 1, 1966

not possibly involve the expenditure of public funds. With respect to his argument that section 13 will require the expenditure of any public funds, I think that a perusal of sections eight and nine will indicate that such is not the case.

It is true, as the Attorney General indicates, that portions of the Bill were copied from the Nova Scotia statute; it was used as a pattern. He also indicated almost all of the regulatory provisions, which are contained in the Nova Scotia statute were deleted and what is left is essentially a Disclosure Bill, a Bill which requires credit grantors to disclose to borrowers the provisions of the contracts. It is not unlike a Bill which says that all contracts should provide that the interest provision should be in red ink. This would not cost the Crown anything, but it would be designed to inform the borrower. Similarly, it seems clear that the people who are going to be fully informed are set out in sections eight and nine. The Bill proposes that the contracts which they are asked to sign shall set out certain facts for them. It is by no means necessary, or even particularly contemplated in the Bill, that Crown staff will be engaged in the informing of the borrowers.

It is true that the Lieutenant Governor may make regulations to provide for that, but even if this is not so — and that is up to the Lieutenant Governor — then the provisions of section 13 will be fully met by the provisions of sections eight and nine, which say that the borrower shall be informed, shall be protected against concealed charges and shall be enabled to have an equality of knowledge by reason of disclosures set out in eight and nine. I think that is the gravamen of the Bill, and I don't think that it involves any particular expenditure of Crown funds.

Mr. Speaker: — Anyone else wishing to rise on the point of order?

I thank hon. members for their very excellent submissions, and I will take the matter under advisement and consideration and endeavour to bring in a ruling at the first possible opportunity.

Again, I thank you for your opinions and I am sure they will be most helpful.

Perhaps while we are on the subject of second readings I will clean up the matter of another Bill on which I have placed a caveat. Hon. members will recall that when Bill No. 39, standing in the name of the hon. member for Biggar (Mr. Lloyd) was introduced by leave and read the first time, its further progress was made subject to the Speaker's caveat as to its being in order.

I have read the Bill and considered its contents and I find that the said Bill is in order.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

MOTION RE FREIGHT RATES

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Leith (Elrose):

That this Assembly urges the Government of Canada to take whatever action is required, to adjust the discriminatory freight rates, which presently exist against many industries in the Prairie region.

Mr. W. J. Berezowsky (Cumberland): — Mr. Speaker, in referring to this motion that was presented here the other day on freight equalization, all I can say is that a motion such as this is basically non-controversial. Mr. Speaker, everyone including boards and commissions which have sat have used the equalization principle as an argument on rates. In spite of the position that one takes there are definitely areas for argument that equalization of freight rates should be extended at this time into much broader areas of transportation costs.

Presently, transportation here in Saskatchewan appears to be of vital importance to us particularly because the development in the pulp and paper operations for such industry as pulp mills and production of paper products and lumber. We must, of course, understand that we must transport both the raw products of the forest to the mills from some distance and also transport or ship out the finished product to distant points.

In Saskatchewan we have facilities somewhat comparable to other areas where pulp mills have been established. I think particularly of Manitoba and the mill at Hinton, Alberta. I think the problems are practically the same insofar as our products are concerned and those in these other two provinces. The only reason, I think that the mill in Manitoba and the Alberta can be carried on profitably as we hope will be the case in Saskatchewan, is due to subsidies which governments find necessary to extend in order to get rid of the disadvantage of the western mills as compared to those operating at the coast and in eastern Canada.

I would also like to point out that the problem of freight rates pertains also to iron ore, glass sands, products of hard rock mines and of course, of potash. I think, Mr. Speaker, that I could say that our problems began with the establishment of the first privately owned railways in Canada shortly after Confederation. The reason behind my statement is that there was definitely no freight policy in the early days. There were no defined principles in setting up freight rates so the way the rates were arrived at was by periodic negotiations between the carriers and the shippers. Mostly it was done on an experimental basis. As a result of these meetings, special agreements and arrangements were entered into from time to time and I guess the situation was well in hand. We have come a long way since then. We have found that our present freight rates do have some bearing on the principle of distance today. Yet when I look through some of the commission reports it seems to me that in some cases there is no apparent basis at all. We have today a number of classifications based on a formula of 100 and some of them are meaningless. I suppose if I were a lawyer like my learned friends who gave a very good dissertation a few minutes ago maybe I would be able to understand what went on in the commission's hearings.

However, may I say this that the first attempt to classify rates was in the year 1874 by the defunct Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. This was done in the field of commodities which were grouped in four classes at that time. Special classes and ratings were attached to agricultural products, to commodities such as lumber, and other primary products. Yet I think that the main principle behind the establishment of any freight rates in the early days as well as at the present time has been the free enterprise concept of charging whatever the market will bear. When I look at the transport commissioners report here it seems to bear out that contention. That is why I could not help but be amused at my free enterprise friends opposite who, when they

March 1, 1966

discussed this resolution, they condemned this principle in their speeches. I was wondering whether they shouldn't be sitting on this side of the House. Now, in spite of this, of course, in spite of this yardstick of monopoly enterprise as I see it, it must be admitted that as a result of the commission's hearings that some progress has been made in relief for shippers in western Canada. In 1897 an agreement was entered into with the Canadian Pacific Railway which is known as the Crow's Nest Pass Agreement. It was amended in 1925 and has given western producers some special advantages in the shipment of grain, coal and coke.

But this agreement, Mr. Speaker, was obtained at a tremendous cost to the country and to the province of Saskatchewan. To obtain this agreement millions of acres of Crown mineral rights were ceded to the railway company; originally it was some 55,000,000 acres, as I understand. But this was adjusted to 25,000,000 acres with all the mineral rights and surface rights transferred.

Some people I have been talking to fear that by pressing a resolution such as this that we may be endangering the Crow's Nest Pass Agreement. I don't know if there is any foundation in this kind of argument, but if there is we should be very careful that we make it very clear to the federal government when we are making our representations that this agreement must not be jeopardized in any way.

Mr. Speaker, transportation history indicates that many years of effort to achieve equalization culminated in the national freight rates as set out in section 336 of the Railway Act of March 1, 1955. The judges at that time considered commodity rates for the purpose of formulating long term and short-term policies, as I can understand it. This resulted in a judgement of September 18, 1957. At this time the MacPherson Commission said this and I quote:

That the evolution in Canadian freight rates must of course be tested in the light of experience. We are entering an uncharted field in the equalization rates.

Now, as late as 1957 this was the kind of an opinion that was held by commissioners. The board said at that time that there were various difficulties that had been cleared up but that two still remained. I would like to point this out to the legislature. One was a question of class rates by lake and rail routes; the second, rates between eastern and western Canada. This is where the most discrepancy lies. It has been contended by railways after these hearings that many former complaints disappeared, and that the class rates for western Canada were comparable to those in eastern Canada. I don't disagree with this at all. When I look at the tariffs here, I find there has been an equalization in the west; there has been some equalization in the east, but the difficulty is apparently between east and west traffic. This is the area of discrepancy.

Now, of course, railways must have revenue, Mr. Speaker. They have accordingly laid down freight rates arguments that freight charges must be based on profit, in other words, to consider operating costs and operating revenues. They have always tried to prove to the commissions that have heard them that their costs are very high and their revenues are very low. Of course, we the people, who are paying the shot, have always tried to prove to

the contrary. So the battle has been going on and is not at an end.

Now, of course, there are abiding and unchanging principles and factors in the determination of freight rates. When these factors and principles are decided upon, unfortunately or fortunately, they become permanent as far as we are concerned. We must have the most just deal.

I think I should point out in considering this motion that there are other factors involved which should decide how freight rates are to be set, be it equalized freight rates or other rates. One, is the other income of railways, for example, the CPR railway. I think that must be used as a yardstick as well. For example, we know that the railways have hotels, and they have properties. In addition, the CPR has extensive ownership in the mining fields and in oil. I think that all this should be taken into consideration. Apparently this income has not been taken into consideration when the rate structure was set up in 1957.

We are told that railways pay corporation tax but I find from research that railway companies pass the corporation tax on to the shippers or on to the people who use the railways. Therefore, they do not pay in essence any corporation tax, it is included in the freight rates. Now, as I pointed out we have had commissions trying to establish equalization. I pointed out that it was the MacPherson Commission — at least that is the latest I could find — and I would say this Commission did establish, as I said, something akin to equalization. I have found out in my research that 40 to 50 per cent of the freight comes under competitive rates and agreed charges. In particular this pertains to lumber and lumber products. I was very, very surprised to find out the attitude of the lumber companies in western Canada insofar as equalization was concerned. I intend to quote to the legislature some of the things that have been said. For example, in general I could say that they have said it is impracticable and undesirable to attempt to apply equalization commodity rates particularly to lumber and lumber products. It is true also that lumber interest in B.C. have been able to obtain rates adjustments comparable to the U.S. rates in Seattle, Montreal, or Toronto, and their problem has been negotiated to lumber producers' satisfaction.

Now, here are some quotes as to what lumber associations have said:

The Alberta Forest Products Association informed the Board that they were neither opposed to, nor in favour of equalization of freight rates in lumber. In respect of short-haul traffic, not exceeding 150 miles, the rates in eastern Canada are higher than the rates for similar distances in western Canada.

This was rather surprising to me because I thought this was a problem area. Then we have the Saskatchewan Timber Board and here is what the Saskatchewan Timber Board said:

Concern was expressed by the said Timber Board that equalization of lumber rates would result in increases in the existing short-hauls in western Canada. They admitted that there was a differential when you ship east, but they were concerned that if you raised the rates by equalization in eastern Canada, that would affect the short-hauls in western Canada.

March 1, 1966

I suppose the Timber Board was concerned with the short-hauls more than the long-hauls.

Then again you have the Canadian Lumbermen's Association saying:

That the said Association state they do not consider it is reasonably possible to equalize lumber freight rates.

This group said that eastern lumber companies could not stand any further increases in rates, and that cheaper transportation must be found.

Now, such are the reactions that came from British Columbia and Alberta Lumbermen's Associations and others. I was exceedingly surprised to find this attitude by lumber companies, because the products that I think the mover and seconder were thinking of were the same products I was thinking of, and it is lumber and pulp in particular. When we look at the rates charged, I'll just take one page, take the western rates, say from Saskatoon to British Columbia. We find the average relationship between Saskatchewan and British Columbia is 22.7 on the basis of the 100 per cent formula. You find from Alberta it is 23.3, very little more from Manitoba, 23.8. In other words, in the west there is not much differential in the freight rate structure between provinces on long hauls. But I do find that when I look at page 24, as between eastern scales and western scales. I hope I am right in my interpretation, Mr. Speaker. I find that on a 1,000-mile haul the average relationship in the eastern area is 18.9 whereas in the west it is 23, or nearly four points higher. I think this is where the difference as well as the difficulty lies.

As I pointed out it is not very easy for these commissions to not consider the problems of the railways. The point is this, if you raise the freight rates in the east, in order to bring about some kind of equalization, then the companies argue they would lose money; and if you lower the rates in the west, of course, they say the same thing happens. This I think is the problem area.

So, I have concluded that I am quite prepared to support this motion. But I have also concluded, Mr. Speaker, that what we need actually is not so much what is intended by this resolution, but more so, that we should have a national policy insofar as freight rates are concerned. There may have to be subsidies for certain parts of the country in such a policy, otherwise you will not have the kind of development that the country should have. I would like to point out that when you go back into history and read some of the statements that were made by statesmen in the last century we find they all had the idea that western Canada was an area that was supposed to provide primary products while eastern Canada and central Canada were to be the industrial section. Times have changed. At the present time we are trying to industrialize this part of Canada as well as hoping that industry will flourish in central and eastern and the west coast area. I suggest there must be a different kind of thinking. I think that what we need is a national policy under which neither the east will be hurt, nor the west will be hurt. There must be the kind of policy that will assist us in Saskatchewan to get the kind of freight rate structure that will make it possible for us to compete with eastern Canada.

I would like to point out that this has been done in the

United States. Under agreement or legislation, I don't know which, the Americans can ship pulp a distance of 2,000 miles at the same rate as for 200 miles, and I don't see why it can't be arranged the same in Canada. It is the same with iron ore. Iron can be moved in the United States longer distances and shorter distances at competitive rates. As a result all the United States where they have these resources are developing properly, but we in Canada cannot so compare. We cannot compete with the United States because they have these special rates, they have their iron close to their steel mills, in the Messabi Range for example, while we just have to pay considerably more freight for ore produced at the mine at Choiceland than the people who ship iron from the Messabi Range. As a matter of fact, I think that the people who produced iron at Steep Rock have some difficulty in competing with the Americans because of the special arrangements they have. Certainly the same thing holds true of pulp and pulp wood products produced in Canada.

I again want to repeat that I haven't had too much time to do more research, but from what I have found out, it seems to me that we could have further freight rate equalization. But it must be tied in somehow with a national policy which would provide regional subsidies. Though I think that the positive actions of our federal government in the past have been good, I think they must take action in the future to solve this overall freight problem.

If we are to get further essential concessions, then I think we must continue to make demands upon those in power who will have the prerogative to investigate, to call hearings and to make the necessary kind of decisions which will make it possible for us to compete, as I said, with other parts of Canada.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the government of Canada upon receipt of this resolution will understand our proposal and what we need. As I said before, the resolution itself as it is worded is somewhat inadequate because of some of the things that I have mentioned to this legislature but I think it merits the support of this legislature. I think that the senior government will understand what we need and then will turn it over to the committee, say on railways and canals, in order that some final recommendations can be obtained from this board by the government on which the federal government could act. If this is the intent of the motion, Mr. Speaker, than I would hope that every member of this House would give it full support.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. J. M. Cuelenaere (Minister of Natural Resources): — Mr. Speaker, this resolution which urges the government of Canada to take whatever action is required to adjust the discriminatory freight rates which presently exist against many industries in the prairie region is of considerable import and of considerable importance to Saskatchewan particularly at this time.

The discrimination which I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, amounts to almost an injustice exists with particular force against the products of the forest including pulp. Mr. Speaker, I intend later to deal with the subject with particular regard to the movement of pulp from Saskatchewan. At this time, I beg leave of the Assembly to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

March 1, 1966

MOTION: PRIVATE PENSION PLANS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Davies (Moose Jaw):

That this Assembly urges the government of Saskatchewan to consider as soon as possible the introduction of legislation and the adoption of any other necessary ways and means by which the interests and the welfare of employees affected by private pension plans can be fairly and reasonably protected; and that consideration be given specifically to changes that would provide that in the event of the termination of the employment of an employee, the amount of money to his credit in a private pension plan or like benefit, be vested in him through a deferred pension, or transferred to his credit in another plan, including one operating in a concern in which he subsequently accepted new employment, to the end that reward for service rendered and the principle of pension portability may be recognized and secured.

Hon. J. C. McIsaac (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — Mr. Speaker, this resolution, as moved by the hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Davies) brings up a matter that does deserve consideration, namely that of pension portability. The principle of pension portability is now generally recognized, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that it's safe to say that the Canada Pension Plan which went into effect at the beginning of this calendar year was perhaps mainly inspired by the conviction of the federal Liberal government that pension portability is an essential feature of a well-governed private enterprise economy. The Canada Pension Plan legislation is a major step forward.

The member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Davies) pointed out that it was only a base. While I don't entirely disagree with this, certainly it is a much broader base than we have ever had up to this point.

The weakness of the proposed resolution on the Order Paper, Mr. Speaker, lies actually in its wordiness and vagueness, as I see it. It is vague because the problem which it raises is quite complicated and requires a good deal of study. In the first place, as the mover of the resolution well knows, or he could well learn, many pension plan provisions such as this form the object of collective bargaining agreements. I believe that members would agree with me that it would be unwise and perhaps unfair if the government were to start to interfere with collective bargaining rights unless the need for such a drastic measure were demonstrated beyond reasonable doubt, and certainly not without much more prior study and consultation.

There are many cases in which provisions for vesting of pension rights are embodied, as I say, in existing bargaining agreements. There is no reason why similar provisions could not be included in new agreements and it is very likely, of course, that this will be the case regardless of what will happen to this proposed resolution. In this regard I have every confidence in the responsible unions and other similar employee groups as well as the many responsible businesses in this province that they will continue to promote the inclusion of such provisions in future agreements.

In discussion of the proposed resolution, the member from Moose Jaw quotes the case of the province of Ontario. The province of Ontario with a population of almost 7,000,000 people and a work force of something over 2,000,000 people is in quite a different position from Saskatchewan. In Ontario even, under the present plan that the member referred to, vesting is somewhat limited. Moreover in many cases there it is an internal problem in that people may move from Toronto to Windsor, or from Sudbury to Hamilton, or Ottawa to North Bay, and so on. In Saskatchewan, the number of people concerned is a good deal fewer. Quite often here when a man leaves, let us say, Winnipeg and comes to work in Regina, or he leaves Saskatoon and goes to Edmonton or goes to the coast, or goes to Winnipeg, he is working in other provinces. Certainly we in Regina if he does come here, cannot force his former employer in the other province to bring along his pension credits with him. I think that it's fairly obvious that such a situation cannot be adequately handled without a series of inter-provincial agreements. Universal portability is really a matter, I think, for the consideration of the federal authorities who are undoubtedly working on it. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the new department of manpower which was recently set up by the federal government plus the re-arrangement of a number of other departments is indicative of the emphasis that the federal government is giving to this and other similar problems.

Now, for these and similar reasons I would suggest to the mover of the resolution that he withdraw it at this time and leave it up to the government to determine the moment and the manner in which universal pension portability could be best achieved for the working people in our province. I suggest it is premature at this time to request legislation requiring the vesting of all pension plans.

Mr. W. A. Robbins (Saskatoon City): — I would like to say a few words with respect to portability of pensions and this particular resolution. I think it is one of the most vexing problems that participants in private pension plans have to deal with. A great deal has been said about the desirability of portability in pension plans, but some private pension plans, quite frankly, seem to drag their feet on the road to portability. I have always been at a complete loss to understand this kind of approach and this kind of thinking which I think are completely erroneous and wrong in relation to pension plans and pension problems.

One of the basic reasons why I personally supported the introduction and the institution of the Canada Pension Plan was my feeling that one could reasonably anticipate and conclude that it would be instrumental in hastening the day when complete portability of pensions might be achieved throughout the whole of the Canadian nation. Indeed I think it may be reasonably contended the Canadian Income Tax Law supports the view that payments to pension plans are in fact deferred wages and therefore should be completely portable from one employer to another.

One may reasonably ask questions with respect to this problem. As a pension administrator I am appalled to discover that in many cases where an employee leaves the employ of an employer member of our society and requests transfer of his pension funds from us to the administrator of his new pension plan that his new employer has in operation that the request is often refused. I find it inexcusable, Mr. Speaker, that one income tax approved pension plan refuses to accept the accumulated pension credits

March 1, 1966

and benefits of another income tax approved pension plan and thereby forces the employee to take a cash settlement subject to income tax deductions. I may say that we personally have always done our utmost to facilitate transfer but find in all too many cases new income tax approved pension plans will not accept such transfer.

The income tax authorities at the national level have designed regulations to facilitate transfer yet these efforts are on occasion stymied by administrators who should be vitally interested in facilitating transfer.

I think it should never be forgotten that the most valuable dollars in terms of a pension are the dollars that are accumulated in the earlier years. In the final analysis there are only three vital factors in determining the final pension that any person receives anywhere or at any time. Those are the contributions made by himself as a contributor to the plan, contributions made by his employer on his behalf, the time factor in relation to the period of service he gives with his employer and the earnings that are realized on those contributions. A person with a short period of service is not going to build a very adequate pension unless contributions are exceptionally large and there are certain controls in this regard, and I think quite rightly so, imposed by the income tax regulation at the national level. The only current exception to this rule as mentioned by the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McIsaac) is the Canada Pension Plan which obviously subsidizes older persons, specifically those who have contributed for ten years or less and secures such subsidy from the contributions of younger persons. Now, there is nothing particularly wrong with this because it is designed to provide a base pension for all Canadians.

Ironically the pension industry, which opposed a national pension plan in its initial stages, as did the Liberal party when it was first proposed in the 1957 and 1958 national election campaigns, are the very body that assured its initiation by the genuinely negative attitude to a real problem. The problems associated with pensions are not imaginary and those who fail to face up to them in our dynamically changing society are somewhat closely akin to the ostrich.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Davies) has mentioned the Ontario Pension Benefits Act and I believe the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs also made reference to this Act. I believe he made some comment of the fact that it only affected pension plans within the province of Ontario. This is an error. It is not true. It affects pension plans outside of Ontario and I sincerely hope that the government of this province will see fit to introduce uniform legislation in relation to control in terms of private pension plans similar to the Ontario Act. In fact, I am certain that I read sometime ago a newspaper item with respect to a conference attended I believe by representatives from the Saskatchewan government. The press reports relating to this pension conference indicated that there was a reasonable hope that there would be uniformity in this field. It is necessary that uniformity be attained in this field and I sincerely hope that the government will go along with this type of approach. The need to improve this phase of pensions is further emphasized by the fact that the Canada Pension Plan is designed to provide the base pension previously mentioned.

Perhaps a brief example will serve to help us to get some understanding of this particular problem. If you assume that you

have an individual who is on an annual income of \$4,800 per year throughout his working lifetime and if you assume that that working lifetime is a 35-year period, that individual would make approximately the maximum contributions to the Canada Pension Plan. He would however at the end of that period at age 65, assuming that he then retired and assuming also that he did then make application for his Canada Pension, receive a pension equal to 25 per cent of his average earnings of \$4,800, this individual would end up with a pension of \$1,200 per year. Now, it is also true that any other individual Canadian on the same average income of \$4,800 a year contributing to the Canada Pension Plan for a period of ten years only, would on attaining age 65 and making application for the Canada Pension receive identically the same pension of \$100 a month.

The most important factors in the Canada Pension Plan are probably not the base pension at all but the survivor's benefits and the disability benefits which will be applicable in February, 1968 and May, 1970 respectively, which are excellent, and will be of major benefit to the people of this country.

Mr. Speaker, as an administrator of a pension plan I have some realization of the problems that arise when a person suffers total disability at a relatively young age. I repeat again these factors in the Canada Pension Plan will be of major assistance to a goodly number of Canadians, the ones who most need this type of protection.

The hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Davies) mentioned that the Saskatchewan Civil Service Pension aims for a pension equal to 70 per cent of average pay as compared to the 25 per cent of average pay inherent in the Canada Pension Plan. Members, Mr. Speaker, may be interested to know that in our society using the identical \$4,800 average earning with the same 35 year period, that is your contribution factor on earnings and your time factor are identical, with the previous examples cited, the individual would end up with a pension of \$363 a month or pension in excess of 90 per cent of his average pay. This is achieved solely through the high earnings factor.

In spite of all these factors the majority of the Canadian people will not achieve reasonably adequate pensions in relation in their income unless vesting is speeded up and portability achieved and reasonable provision made to ensure that pension money is used for pensions. Mr. Speaker, not all persons perhaps will agree with me in this statement but I believe that this is a two-sided coin. I believe that any person earning \$5,000 per year and contributing \$200 for example of that amount to an approved pension plan with that contribution matched by his employer is in fact receiving a salary of \$5,200 a year. In other words, he has his \$5,000 salary, his employer makes an additional contribution to an income tax approved pension fund of \$200. Therefore the individual has in fact a salary of \$5,200 per annum, \$200 of which is deferred for pension. The reason being to make certain that this individual when he reaches normal retirement will have reasonably adequate income to meet his needs.

However, this is only valid, Mr. Speaker, if that \$200 does in fact become the property of the individual. This is where the necessity of early vesting and portability come in. Now, I know, I often hear criticisms in the pension industry that this means you turn over to people moneys for pensions which may be used for

March 1, 1966

something else. This is where the Pension Benefits Act of Ontario comes in. This is where it is a major factor in improving the probability that pension money is used in fact for the purpose intended, that is pension of people. Canadian tax law, as I previously said, supports the view that payments to a pension plan by employers are in fact deferred wages. However, they cannot possibly be considered deferred wages if they do not become the property of the individual for whom the contributions were made.

I am often requested to make observations with respect to pension plans and have in fact been called in, in a consultant capacity on occasion with respect to pensions. I might cite an example without giving out any confidences to illustrate exactly what does happen in the pension field. I am afraid far too many Canadian people do not realize the implication of this sort of thing.

Mr. Speaker, may I call it 10:00 o'clock and adjourn the debate?

Debate adjourned.

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