

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Second Session — Fifteenth Legislature
26th Day

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Hon. D.V. Heald (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw to your attention, and to the attention of all hon. members, the presence in the Speaker's gallery of eighteen grade seven and eight students from the McLean School in the Lumsden constituency. These students are seated in the Speaker's gallery and are accompanied by their principal, Mrs. Mildred Hall, and by the driver, Mr. Stuart Wass. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that you would want me to extend the best wishes of all hon. members, and your best wishes, to these students who are here today, for a most pleasant, enjoyable and instructive afternoon.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. G.T. Snyder (Moose Jaw City): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with I would like to draw to your attention a group of students, some 42 of them, in the east gallery from the William Grayson School in Moose Jaw. They are accompanied by two teachers, Mrs. May and Mr. Olafson. I am sure that all members will be anxious to prove to them that our conduct is more temperate and more refined than that of our parliamentary counterparts in Ottawa. I hope that all members will join with me in extending to them the wish for a very pleasant afternoon and a safe trip home.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J.E. Brockelbank (Saskatoon City): — Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to introduce to this chamber two groups of students from the city of Saskatoon that are here today. They are in the Speaker's gallery. They are a group of approximately 33 students from Mayfair School in the northwest corner of Saskatoon, and I believe they are escorted by Mr. Gordon Taylor. In the west gallery I believe we now have a group of students accompanied by Mr. Brown from Princess Alexandria School in Saskatoon. I am sure it is the hope of the entire assembly that these students will have an informative day in the democratic process as it operates here in this chamber. We all wish them a safe journey home as well.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. A.E. Blakeney (Regina West): — Mr. Speaker, I would like on your behalf, and on behalf of other hon. members to extend a greeting to a group of students in the Speaker's gallery, from the Regent Park School in Regina. There are about 38 of them. They have been engaged in a tour of the Legislative Building during the past hour. They were due to arrive at the building about 1:35 p.m. but I suppose in accordance with the usual custom they were early and I missed them at the door. I know that all hon. members will wish to

March 15, 1966

extend to them our best wishes for an enjoyable afternoon, one which will be helpful to them in their studies.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

CORRECTION OF NEWSPAPER REPORT

Mr. A. Mitchell (Bengough): — Before the Orders of the Day, Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of privilege. I am reported in the Moose Jaw Times, and the Prince Albert Herald, and I have reason to believe I have also been quoted on radio and news broadcasts, as having said that I suggested that a further four per cent tax on aviation gasoline be imposed. Mr. Speaker, I have the records of my address in the legislature. I did not make that statement. What I advocated was that the present four per cent tax on aviation gas be applied towards the cost of building airstrips along highways.

ANNOUNCEMENT FROM ELECTORAL OFFICE

Mr. Speaker: — Before the Orders of the Day, I beg to inform the assembly that the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly has received from the Chief Electoral Officer, a certificate of the following election and return, that is of Alex Mitchell, Esquire, as member for the constituency of Bengough.

CORRECTION OF ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS AND ORDERS OF THE DAY

Mr. A.E. Blakeney (Regina West): — Mr. Speaker, before Orders of the Day, I wonder if I might call the attention of the house to what I take to be a small error in our routine proceedings and Orders of the Day, more particularly on page 11, the listing of bills for Committee of the Whole. One of the bills listed is An Act Respecting Interprovincial Steel and Pipe Corporation Limited. I believe it is correct to say that was not given second reading, but I think it stands under adjourned debates.

Mr. Speaker: — Yes, well, we hadn't got around to government orders you will note. We might as well make the correction now anyway rather than waiting until we get there, if we do. But under Committee of the Whole you see Bill no. 59, An Act to amend the Liquor Act, which is also no. 3 under adjourned debates. It belongs under adjourned debates and does not belong under Committee of the Whole. The same applies to no. 50, item no. 9, bill no. 50, under Committee of the Whole. It belongs under adjourned debates. So I make that correction. I make this statement now in order to correct the Order Paper. I was going to do it when we got around to that order.

STATEMENT RE LABOUR MANAGEMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE

Hon. L.P. Coderre (Minister of Labour): — Mr. Speaker, before Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I would like to draw the attention of this house that the Labour Management Review Committee which was established for the purpose of studying the Trade Union Act yesterday afternoon delivered its report to me as Minister of Labour. As members of this house well know, the government in the last session was proposing to bring in labour legislation. Upon request of the trade

unions and people interested, the government decided to establish this committee. It was established by an Order in Council on July 27th, 1965. The committee published advertisements in the newspapers, circulated throughout the province, requesting submissions and giving notifications of sittings. Some 25 briefs were presented before the committee. The committee has also received letters expressing support and opposition to some of the briefs. Under the able chairmanship of Mr. E.C. Leslie, Q.C. the committee approached the task of making recommendations for amendments to the act. Their observations were, first, that the committee was of the opinion that so far as was possible, labor negotiations should be left to management and trade unions to carry on with as little interference from the outside as possible. I quote:

It is an expression in statutory form of the Liberals' view that given the necessary protection of rights by law men should be free to work out their own affairs with government interference as little as possible.

In this respect the Saskatchewan act stands in marked contrast to other Canadian labor legislation. Where the process of collective bargaining is hedged with a multitude of restrictions, where governments presume the right to interfere in the process and subject the parties to advice and suggestion . . .

Mr. J.H. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Point of order, Mr. Speaker, is the member introducing a bill? He is certainly producing argument and initiating a debate. I don't think this kind of statement is in order.

Mr. Speaker: — Well, I take it, the Minister is making a statement to the house on some commission or another that is reporting. If I follow the thread of the argument correctly probably . . .

Mr. W.G. Davies (Moose Jaw City): — On the point of order, Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Speaker: — . . . as is customary when ministerial statements are being made, I think it has been the custom of this house and other houses to accord to some member in the opposition the privilege of a question or a comment, whatever the nature may be.

Mr. Coderre: — The second important consideration the committee kept in mind was to give maximum protection and freedom to the individual worker. The aim of the committee was to endeavor to see that the individual employee had his rights protected so far as is possible to ensure the continuance of these rights. I am sure the committee has arrived at its amendments after various and serious consideration. I have the most profound admiration and respect for every man on this committee. I am sure that all matters brought to the committee's attention were thoroughly considered and I am sure that items brought to them were not accepted or rejected until every argument had been sympathetically reviewed.

A proposed draft legislation will be tabled herewith. It is to be noted that many of these amendments were unanimous. The amendments for which unanimity could not be achieved represent the consensus of the committee members' views. In addition to the proposed amendments, the committee does make two further proposals.

March 15, 1966

One is that the construction industry craft unions representing construction workers face exceptional problems in the field of labor relations as they do in other areas. It is suggested that the government give further consideration to the various problems facing this industry. It is also suggested that the regulations of the Labour Relations Board need substantial revisions.

In addition to the brief explanation that I have given, Mr. Speaker, the letter from the committee to me is also being tabled, and signed respectively by the following, Mr. E.C. Leslie, Q.C., Mr. Robert Pearce, Q.C., and Messrs. A.G. Stewart, Grismer, William Leonard, Ken Busch, William Gilbey and Robert Lindberg. It is gratifying, indeed, that all members of the committee signed the report. In tabling this report I wish to draw the attention of this house to the fact that this does not necessarily represent the government's position in the matter. I herewith table the report, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Davies: — Mr. Speaker, before the minister takes his seat I believe he indicated the other day that there would be nothing done in legislation by the government that did not accord with the opinion of the committee. Is this the opinion of the government still?

Mr. Coderre: — This is under review by the government and will be dealt with shortly.

QUESTION RE AUDITORIUM REGINA AND SASKATOON

Mr. M.P. Pederson (Arm River): — Mr. Speaker, before Orders of the Day, I wonder if I could direct a question to the Minister for Public Works (Mr. Gardiner). In view of the very serious situation that both cities of Regina and Saskatoon face in the costs of building their auditorium, could the minister inform the house if the recent trip to Ottawa by Mr. Justice MacPherson was in connection with attempting to obtain some additional aid from the federal government. If so, could he tell us what degree of success he met in his trip?

Hon. J.W. Gardiner (Minister of Public Works): — I am afraid that the hon. member is perhaps closer to Judge MacPherson than I am. Perhaps he could find out what the gentleman learned when he was in Ottawa.

QUESTION RE TRADE UNION ACT

Mr. W.S. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, directed to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre), did I understand him to say that they would be presenting amendments to the various acts in this session.

Mr. Coderre: — I indicated a moment ago the report is under study by the government and will be dealt with accordingly.

Mr. Davies: — I wonder if I may be permitted one more question. While he was making his statement he made

some remarks about the act contradicting the general rule that relations should be left between trade unions and employers. Was this a statement of the committee or was it the minister's own statement and belief?

Mr. Coderre: — The release in this respect, Mr. Speaker, was made up of general excerpts from the report.

Mr. Davies: — What I asked, Mr. Speaker, was this a statement of the committee or a statement of the minister.

STATEMENT RE FARM, WATER AND SEWER PROJECTS IN SASKATCHEWAN

Hon. D. McFarlane (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, before Orders of the Day are proceeded with I am sure that all hon. members of the legislature will be very pleased to know that because of recommendations and requests made to the federal government by the Department of Agriculture, the federal government now has notified the province of Saskatchewan that a sum of \$228,000 will be received towards the farm, water and sewer projects in Saskatchewan. ARDA will now be sharing that project.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

MOTION RE ABOLITION OF SENATE

STATEMENT BY MR. SPEAKER

Mr. Speaker: — On Friday last, when the hon. member for Saskatoon (Mr. Nicholson) was speaking to his Motion no. 18, a point of order was raised by the hon. Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Cuelenaere) to the effect that Motion no. 18 covered much the same ground as Motion no. 10 already moved by the hon. member for Regina West (Mr. Blakeney), and debate on which the assembly had adjourned. Therefore, he argued, Motion no. 18 was out of order.

I agree with the hon. Minister of Natural Resources that the relevant citation is to be found in Erskine May's Parliamentary Practice (17th Edition, page 399) where it is stated:

A motion must not anticipate a matter already appointed for consideration by the house, whether it be a bill, a resolution or an adjourned motion.

The question, therefore, arises as to whether these two motions are in substantially the same terms and whether the second motion is out of order under the rule governing anticipation.

The adjourned Motion no. 10 deals in three sections with the proposed repatriation of the Canadian Constitution by expressing approval for its future amendment in Canada by Canadians; indicating disapproval of certain proposals for the accomplishment of this end; and suggesting a certain course of action which should be followed in regard thereto.

Motion no. 18 in essence simply proposes the immediate abolition of the Canadian Senate.

March 15, 1966

In arriving at a conclusion I have read and considered the British North America Act and also the federal government's White Paper of February, 1965, entitled "Amendment of the Constitution of Canada". It appears to me that the Canadian Senate is sufficiently enshrined both in the British North America Act and also in the White Paper as to make the motion regarding its abolition sufficiently relevant to have been moved as an amendment to the resolution pertaining to our constitution.

I also think that if motion no. 18 had been embodied in Motion no. 10 as one of its several sections, as it well might have been, it would have been in order for members to request the Speaker to divide the motion before putting it to a vote. Such action is permissible when part of a motion is sufficiently separate in order that the sense of the house can be taken on each part separately, for the purpose of a resolution is to allow for a clear and distinct expression of opinion by the members on a definite subject and some could very well seek the repatriation of the constitution while not desiring the abolition of the Senate and vice versa.

Thus these two motions are sufficiently related for them to be combined into a single motion, but if this had been done they would still be sufficiently distinct to qualify for separation before a vote were taken.

The criterion that two motions should be "substantially the same" before one can be ruled out because it anticipates the other is an important one. The chair has to have in mind that if a motion in broad and general terms were to exclude motions on narrower topics which might be thought to fall within its scope, private member's rights could be seriously infringed and their privileges and freedoms improperly curtailed.

For all these reasons, I find Motion no. 18 to be in order.

RESOLUTIONS

MOTION RE ABOLITION OF SENATE

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

That this assembly believes that, in order to implement the fundamental principles of democracy, the laws of Canada should be made by the elected representatives of the people, and to this end the assembly urges the government of Canada to take immediate steps to bring about the abolition of the Senate so that for the second century of our history the Parliament of Canada will consist of the Queen and the House of Commons.

He said: Mr. Speaker, first I must thank you for your ruling. I appreciate very much the thoughtful work you have done over the weekend. May I repeat again that I hope there will be a free vote on this particular resolution. I realize from time to time when there are proposals that might be popular with backbenchers they can't very well support motions from this side of the house without indicating want of confidence in the government. I hope that the members across the way will appreciate the fact that the Premier and I held and expressed similar views on this question some years ago. The fact that this resolution, if carried, would

save the hard-pressed taxpayers of Canada \$2,800,000 in the next fiscal year will make a very strong appeal to the Premier of Saskatchewan.

I had just mentioned on Thursday night that our forefathers one hundred years ago as well as the lawmakers in the United Kingdom saw to it that the BNA Act would provide that the Parliament of Canada should consist on an elected House of Commons, an appointed Senate and the Queen. They did not consider at that time that in the colony the commoners would be able to make laws which would be in the public interest.

The achievements of Canadians during these ten decades should establish our right for the future to have the Parliament of Canada consist of the Queen and the House of Commons. The descendants of those who were here in 1867, and those who have come here from the four corners of the world, have demonstrated that they can run the affairs of municipal government very well without having a group appointed for life who are not accountable to anyone to veto every decision made by local government. The provinces, with the exception of Quebec, have abolished the counterpart of the Senate in the provinces. In Quebec, Premier Lesage seems determined to give the people of this province the privileges other Canadians have in provincial affairs. New Zealand under a Conservative government and Norway in recent years, have abolished their second house.

While this resolution was placed on the Order Paper right after the announcement of the appointment of Senator Argue, I have advocated the abolition of the Senate for many, many years. The comments made by leading Liberals who knew Mr. Argue and newspapers which have supported Mr. Pearson at times, suggested that now would be a good time to give the people of Canada a Centennial present worth more than \$2,800,000 a year and a constitution in keeping with the needs of 1967.

The Saskatoon Star Phoenix on February 26, in an editorial said:

If some of us had any lingering doubts about the uselessness of the Canadian Senate, they should have been swept away for all time by Thursday's appointments by Prime Minister Pearson. Of all the appointments all but one have to be considered a favors or rewards to party workers.

The exception mentioned in the editorial is Dr. Norman A. MacKenzie, former president of the University of B.C. It should be noted the Dr. MacKenzie was not on hand to be sworn in with the party faithfuls who were being rewarded on March 1st. As far as I have been able to read, Dr. MacKenzie hasn't been sworn in yet. I knew Dr. MacKenzie years ago when we were both undergraduates. Dr. MacKenzie was one of the bright young people who after World War I took a very active part in student affairs. I had the good fortune to represent Canada at an International Student Conference at which Dr. MacKenzie had represented our country the previous year. He made a tremendous impression, and I would be greatly disappointed if Dr. MacKenzie at this stage, after waiting since the 1st of March, decides that he would accept the reward. Anyway, I haven't read of his being sworn in.

On March 5th the Star Phoenix had a Canadian Press story from Calgary as follows:

March 15, 1966

A Calgary Liberal has accused Prime Minister Pearson of making the Canadian Senate a political joke.

G. Alex Jupp, executive member of the Calgary North Federal Liberal Association and vice president of the Calgary Bowness Liberal Association criticized recent Senate appointments.

Mr. Jupp told a service club luncheon: "There has been no Prime Minister who has been as guilty as Mr. Pearson in making the Upper Chamber the political joke it is today." He termed the Senate "a political garbage can, a depository for those left over whose credentials could only be called "shabby".

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Jupp must have been reading the speeches that Senator Argue made some years ago, for these are like the words that Mr. Argue used on the hustings.

An editorial in the Star Phoenix the same day, March 5th, made reference to the statement made by Don Olah of Weyburn, vice president of the Assiniboia Federal Liberal Association. Hon. members should note that Assiniboia is the constituency where Mr. Argue has resided for most of his life, and where he was unsuccessful in the last two general elections.

Mr. Olah said he was stunned by the Argue appointment and suggested that, in the future interests of the Liberal party and the people of Canada, the Prime Minister through his blundering decisions has no alternative but to resign. It is true that the president of the Association disassociated himself with the views of Mr. Olah, and called a meeting of the executive for March 13, to decide what to do about the Olah statement. I haven't seen in the press since Sunday what decision, if any, was made by the Assiniboia executive. The vice president who had, I presume, been associated with Mr. Argue just last November, expressed some very strong views.

The Star Phoenix in discussing the dilemma for the Assiniboia Association notes that Mr. Argue some years ago had some uncomplimentary things to say about the Liberal's choice of Mr. Pearson as their national leader. Canada's largest morning daily paper, Toronto Globe and Mail on February 26th, just a couple of days after the announcement of the new senators, carried a large cartoon on the editorial page, underneath the cartoon you find "For what shall it profit a man". There was a very good likeness of Mr. Argue as he might appear ten years from now with cane, gold watch chain, cigars in vest pocket, weighing a good deal more than at present. In the background are seen his former friends, Tommy Douglas and Stanley Knowles. In case hon. members have forgotten the rest of the verse which I am sure they learned when they were very young, it is: "For what shall it profit a man, if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul".

Hon. members who saw "This Hour Has Seven Days" will recall that both Keith Davey and Hazen Argue agreed to appear on this popular program. However, at the very last hour the pressure of work made it impossible for them to appear in person. However, two members of the Ottawa Press Gallery who knew the two new Senators very well, spoke for them. George Bain really took off Hazen exceptionally well. Although the producers of this bright program do a tremendous amount of research for each program they are wrong in one detail regarding the new Senators' pensions, which is to be \$9,000 per year, not \$8,000. When Senator Argue

reaches 75, his pension will be \$9,000, not \$8,000 as "This Hour Has Seven Days" suggested.

Now, the \$8,000 figure is available for the Senators to bail out now if they want to, but those who were appointed, from now on, get a pension of \$9,000 at 75. Unless they resign at 75 and qualify for this \$8,000 per year there is no provision for their widows. However, if he does resign the Senator would be entitled to, or rather the Senator's widow would be entitled to a pension of some \$266 as long as she lives, or until she marries again. However, if a Senator marries after he is 75 and retires his young widow does not qualify for any annuity at the taxpayers' expense.

But Senator Argue would retire at 75 on \$9,000, that is assuming that living costs do not increase during the next thirty years. If they increase, of course, the indemnity and pensions for Senators would be increased. During the last 25 years the indemnities plus expenses have climbed from \$4,000 a year to \$18,000 for members of the House of Commons and from \$4,000 to \$15,000 for Senators. I imagine that the lawmakers will strive to keep this sort of spread between their remuneration and the income of the average citizen.

I have had a chance to do some more reading over the weekend. In my tabulation I did last week I overlooked that when a Senator reaches 65 he will be eligible for the Old Age Security Pension. A 45 year old person living in Saskatchewan should he get the nod to the Senate, would receive \$15,000 a year for 30 years which would be \$450,000. Then assuming he lives to be 85, which is quite a young age for a Senator, he would have \$9,000 a year for 10 years, that would be \$90,000. Then he would have his Old Age Security, I tabulated this at \$75 per month. Mr. Pearson rejected the idea of \$100 a month. I am sure it will be up to \$100 before very long but I calculated at no change, \$75 a month, and by the time he would be 65 he would have qualified, that is another \$18,000. Then the taxpayers contribute toward this pension of \$9,000 a year. Taxpayers would contribute \$720 a year for 30 years and so add on \$21,600. Then there is air travel. A Senator can't go to Ottawa and back more than once a week but he could go once a week. Of course, you wouldn't expect a Senator to travel anything but first class. Assuming he would make 25 trips a year at a cost of \$225 for the mileage from home to the nearest airport for 30 years. This runs up to \$168,750. Then there is free transportation on the railways anywhere in Canada for the Senator and his family, free franking privileges which are sizeable and free long distance telephone to and from Ottawa. Without putting any dollar value on the free franking, free telephone, or the free travel on the railways, the actual disbursement that the taxpayers could have would be \$748,350. If you included these other fringe benefits I mentioned, this would be well over three-quarters of a million dollars.

Senator Gratton O'Leary when he was younger, some 20 years before he was summoned to the Senate, had an interesting comment to make about the Senate. This quote is found in the Financial Post of February 28, 1942. Said Gratton O'Leary:

The Senatorship isn't a job. It's a title. Also, it's a blessing. A stroke of good fate. Something like drawing a royal straight flush in the biggest pot of the evening. Or winning the Calcutta sweep. That's why we think it wrong to think of a Senatorship as a job and wrong to think of the Senate as a place where people are

March 15, 1966

supposed to work. Pensions aren't given for work.

Then, a very well known Liberal writer, Bruce Hutchinson, in the "Unknown Country" wrote:

The Senate has become a refuge and reward of old party servants, each party filling up the vacancies of death with its friends and rarely on a basis of ability.

As a Senate criticises but does not seriously interfere the Canadian people generally regard it with amusement, tolerance, or contempt. And while governments have frequently promised to reform it, nothing is done. The genial old gentlemen who populate the snug, red velvet chamber, live on undisturbed, meeting for a few weeks in the year, bumbling and grumbling about the government, making a few good speeches and drawing an annual indemnity for less than any other citizens of Canada.

This was from Dawson's "The Government of Canada". On page 330 of the same book, it is noted that on at least two different occasions, Canada had the distinction of having the oldest legislator in the world. In 1905, when Senator Wark died in his 102nd year, he was the oldest lawmaker in the entire world. Again when Senator Dessaulles died in his 103rd year he set a new record. Again we find in Dawson's book:

Senator Dessaulles, dead at St. Hyacinthe, who held a seat in the Senate of Canada since 1907 had a remarkable record. So far as is recalled by those around the Senate since he was there, he never once participated in any debate or gave an expression to an opinion but he followed the discussions closely and was there when the decision bells rang. He was a kindly old man, held by all parties in venerable respect because of his great age.

I have the greatest respect for the people of Canada who were trying to get \$100 a month but the Prime Minister who votes of the people's money nearly \$750,000 for one Hazen Argue and turns down \$100 a month for the people who have built this country, it is clear what the Liberals think of our senior citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I should mention that after the first edition of "The Government of Canada" was published, some research was done and it was established that Senator Dessaulles spoke on two occasions. He spoke when he was first elected in 1907 to deny that his appointment came from a corrupt bargain. Again 23 years later he also spoke to thank the Senators for presenting his portrait on the occasion of his 100th birthday.

I remember the first year I was in Ottawa; I was talking to one of the western Senators who was quite a congenial travelling companion. He travelled back and forth on the train. He was very active at 80. We were waiting for the Governor General to drive up to open parliament this particular day when a large limousine came along with a chauffeur, and a very feeble old man got out. The 80 year old Senator said, "Do you know how old this Senator is? He's over 90. I hope when I get as old as that, I'll have enough sense to stay home rather than to come out so that people will laugh at me". And the Senator said, "Did you ever hear about Senator Dessaulles?" No, I hadn't heard about him. Well, as he told it, "Sir Wilfred was in the position back in 1907 when there was a good deal of competition for Senate vacancies". It isn't surprising that, when there are only six vacancies

in Saskatchewan ever, there is a good deal of competition to get this sort of deal. "There were two important factions and Sir Wilfred didn't want to antagonize either so he said, 'I'm going to appoint Senator Dessaulles who is 79. He's always been very poorly. He won't live long. So in the meantime we expect these two warring groups to settle their differences'. But Senator Dessaulles outlived Sir Wilfred. The man that's 79 and didn't have long to live, established a world record as far as I know; he lived on into his 103rd year".

Well, Mr. Speaker, with quotations such as I have mentioned, Senator Argue really had quite an interesting time out in the country. Again and again he quoted the remarks of the newspaper wits that the Senate was a home for the aged, refuge for old warriors and so forth.

I was interested in finding in my reading that as early as 1875, members of the House of Commons, Canada, felt that it had been a mistake to provide for a Senate and so on pages 399 to 406 of Hansard for March of that year there was a carefully prepared motion and a speech delivered by Mr. Mills of the Commons. He was followed by Mr. Decosmos, an MP, who said he did not believe the Senate as at present constituted was worth the money the country paid for it and he was of the opinion that the proper course to pursue was to abolish it altogether. Mr. Speaker, that was in 1875, more than 90 years ago. He instanced the case of the North German Confederation where legislation was successfully conducted with one chamber. He also noted the fact that in North Germany, universal suffrage prevailed. I must admit, of course, that Mr. Decosmos did not rally much support to abolish the Senate but he did provoke quite a lively discussion.

Mr. Wallace of South Norfolk considered senatorships were the rewards of merit similar to the creation of peerages in England:

Take away from the Crown the right to appoint to the Senate and what means remained by which the Sovereign could recompense a Canadian subject for his service to his country. Titles were not in accordance with the genius or spirit of this people; and this right taken away, nothing was left.

However, after an extended debate the following resolution was carried by a majority of 77 to 74, and the resolution read:

That the present mode of constituting the Senate is inconsistent with the federal principle in our system of government, makes the Senate alike independent of the people and the Crown, and is in other material respects defective, and that our Constitution ought to be so amended as to confer on each province the power of selecting its own Senators, and to define the mode of their selection.

Mr. Cochran who was on the losing side of the vote noted that there were 70 members absent or almost one third. There was only a majority of three that were in favor of the motion. He also noted that none of the government members expressed an opinion. This indicates how early in Canadian history there was an attempt to abolish or drastically change Canada's Senate.

I would like to skip some 51 years and come to the last time the Senate rejected a major piece of legislation passed by the Commons. I refer to 1926 when Canada's first Old Age Pensions

March 15, 1966

Bill, after passing the House of Commons unanimously, was rejected by the Senate by a majority of 45-21. It should be explained that there was a large Conservative majority in the Senate at that time.

Sir George Foster, expressing the thinking of those who resisted the introduction of the Old Age Pension legislation as reported in the Senate Hansard of June 8, 1926, said:

Then there is no distinction or discrimination in the bill between the man who is reputable and industrious and honest, and has been so all his life, and the man who has been a wastrel and a spendthrift . . .

I look with a great deal of anxiety upon the gradual innovations that the State is making in the way of doles upon the primal duty of the family, and that next duty of society or the municipality, and then of the province, is to look after its people.

Senator McMeans explained how the legislation happened to come before the Commons and the Senate and on page 167 of Senate Hansard for that year, you will find Senator McMeans' speech as follows:

This bill was introduced into the other house (House of Commons, of course) at the request of two members of the House of Commons . . .

I understand that after the last election we had what was known in this country as a Group Government, and the majority was very close, exceedingly so. At one time it was only two votes, and if those two members of the Labour party had changed their minds or had not received the consideration to which they thought they were entitled the position of the government would have been very uncertain.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, that the two Labour members mentioned were Messrs. Woodsworth and Heaps of Winnipeg. Both King and Meighen were anxious to have these two votes, for whichever party these two Labour members supported, that party would form a government. Mr. Woodsworth was offered the Ministry of Labour in the King administration but he declined on the grounds that he did not want anything for himself. Mr. Woodsworth said that he and Heaps would support whichever government would introduce Old Age Pensions and unemployment insurance. Mr. King agreed to introduce Old Age Pensions immediately, unemployment insurance eventually. Mr. Meighen would not make any commitment. So the two Labour Members of Parliament supported King and subsequently the legislation passed the Commons unanimously and as I indicated was turned down by the Senate. Mr. Woodsworth wished to have Mr. King's undertaking in writing. The Prime Minister obliged and we have in our federal headquarters in Ottawa the letter from King to Woodsworth stating that if he was able to form a government he would introduce Old Age Pensions immediately.

Mr. King was defeated later that year and as an election issue Liberals declared that if the Senate killed the Old Age Pension legislation again, they would go to the country for a mandate to abolish the Senate. When the Old Age Pension legislation was introduced in 1926, it passed both houses and became law.

A few years later when the Beauharnois scandal was uncovered

there was another wave of public indignation which could not be satisfied by anything less than the abolition of the Senate.

In Maclean's for September 9, 1961, there is a feature story by Ralph Allen, a former Saskatchewan boy, now managing editor of the Toronto Star, who became one of Canada's ablest war reporters during the Second World War. Here is what we find in Ralph Allen's article. The big heading in Maclean's:

The year the government sold the St. Lawrence River to the Beauharnois Power Company, rights to harness the white water on the St. Lawrence River were almost priceless but not quite. The exact price, in fact was \$700,000 for the Liberal War Chest, a raft of personal bribes to Senators and fixers and a couple of fat partnerships. It was the most barefaced public steal in more than fifty years.

Maclean's, across these two pages, carried pictures of "The Plot and the Cast" the politicians who played football with power rights worth millions and the first MP to tackle them. The first picture is of . . .

Hon. J.W. Gardiner (Minister of Public Works): — On a point of order, I would just like to ask what the hon. member is reading from. I don't mind in a major debate such as the Budget Debate or the Throne Speech, listening to a written report, but I certainly do not think that in a debate of this nature the member should get up and waste our time reading from long manuscripts things that he hasn't accorded. He accords the odd thing to someone else but who wrote the rest of it. That's what we want to know and we want to know if the member, after all the years of service he has had, can't get up and make a speech without reading the kind of tripe he is reading into the record of this house. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to enforce in this case the rule about reading speeches.

Mr. J.H. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Mr. Speaker, on the point of order raised by the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Gardiner). I would point out to you, Sir, that this question of wasting of time in the legislature is really a matter of opinion. What I consider to be wasting time, the member for Melville might consider to be very useful and vice versa. Freedom of speech means that each member has the right to express his opinion on these subjects and he should be free to do so. One speech, you spoke on this debate . . . Yes, you did.

Mr. R.A. Walker (Hanley): — Mr. Speaker, I want to say something about the point of order. The hon. member suggests that there is a difference, a distinction between the rights accorded to members in one debate or in another debate or as between members who are ministers and members who are not. If the hon. member or if Your Honour rules the other side of the house or if there is any difference in the rules as between this debate and some other debate, I would like to see that rule quoted. The hon. Minister who just sat down (Mr. Gardiner) was one of the grossest offenders against this rule in this house and I want to make it perfectly clear, Mr. Speaker, that if it is a rule that no member can read from his notes while he is delivering a speech, then the rule applies equally to all members of the house on all occasions.

March 15, 1966

Mr. Speaker: — Well, I think the rule against reading speeches is pretty well known and I think it has been just as universally broken as it has been known. Now, for members reading from a speech or if he is reading a quotation he has to say from whence the quotation came, what the quotation is. Whether he is reading his speech or not I think probably the reason for speeches not being read is pretty well known. The member is not supposed to produce ideas in the house which are other than his own. But I say again that thing has been about as much acknowledged in the breach as it has in anything else. We had a debate on this last year about reading speeches and I think more speeches have been read in the house this year than were read last year. Certainly if members are going to read then they are going to. But if the member is going to quote from anything than he is going to have to say what he is quoting from.

Mr. Nicholson: — Mr. Speaker, I had already given my authority and I might say that the purpose of having my notes is to save time. I already announced that I was quoting from Ralph Allen in Maclean's Magazine of September 9th, 1961, but I have saved the members of the house some time by condensing the article. If the minister would like to have more information, I will be glad to oblige. Mr. Allen was the editor of Maclean's when this article appeared. He is a very distinguished Saskatchewan boy of whom we are all proud. This is from his now famous book "Ordeal by Fire". The section on the Senate should be read by every member of this house. Here is a picture of Robert Gardiner, the United Farmer MP from Alberta who . . .

An Hon. Member: — No relation to the minister.

Mr. Nicholson: — No, but it was he that broke the scandal . . .

An Hon. Member: — We got that cleared up.

Mr. Nicholson: — . . . and he charged that Beauharnois was a \$30,000,000 swindle and he proved it to the satisfaction of every Canadian.

The next picture is of R.O. Sweezy, who admitted that he gave \$700,000 to the campaign funds of the Liberal party. The next one is of J. Alderie Raymond, a brother of Senator Raymond who was asked to line up support for the Beauharnois scandal. This Senator picketed \$500,000. Senator Andrew Haydon, too sick to attend the hearings, national organizer of the Liberals, admitted that he had collected \$500,000 for himself. Members can read Maclean's. It's all here in Maclean's.

Mr. A.E. Blakeney: — Don't be rash.

Mr. Nicholson: — And the next picture is of Senator W.L. MacDougald. The committee learned that he helped gouge \$1,000,000 for himself. As I said, Mr. Speaker, in Canada during this time there was a lot of support for the abolition of the Senate and I think the present time would be a good time to revive the campaign.

I take full responsibility for having written every word that is here. It isn't original. I am quoting extensively from the authorities like Maclean's, Blair Fraser, MacGregor Dawson.

Sweezy admitted that he had given \$700,000 to Liberal campaign funds. The Maclean's story indicates that Senator MacDougald

like Hazen Argue was a Senator at 45, but because of this scandal he did resign. The others didn't.

Shortly before the general election in those days MacKenzie King went to Bermuda with Senator Hayden, the treasurer of the Liberal party and the Senator who by then had become a multi-millionaire, Senator MacDougald. When they were leaving their hotel on their return, Senator MacDougald, generous soul that he was, picked up the bill for all three. MacKenzie King's face was red when in the hearing a voucher turned up for \$852.32 which had been paid by Beauharnois to Senator MacDougald for providing entertainment for the Prime Minister of Canada during a Caribbean holiday. However, Canadians are long suffering souls and this scandal was soon forgotten and the Senate was safe again for a while.

In asking hon. members to support this resolution, I am not suggesting that there are not now nor have been many outstanding Canadians who found their way into the Senate. But I am sorry for them. I was in the House of Commons with many of them. Men like Senators Croll and Roebuck are a credit to any assembly of honorable men. Both Croll and Roebuck were members of the Hepburn cabinet in Ontario in the 30's and resigned because of principle. Later they were elected to the House of Commons and were regarded by members of all parties as outstanding men. I'm sorry that they have gone to the Senate. They and others have strived to create and present a better image of the Senate. But I am convinced that the trials and errors during almost 100 years should convince most Canadians that the Senate should be abolished.

I am familiar with the arguments raised when it has been proposed in the House of Commons that this change in our Constitution be made. Even as recently as April 6, 1964, John Diefenbaker and the Conservatives tried to prevent the Stanley Knowles Bill to abolish the Senate from being read for the first time. A vote was forced which rarely happens on the first reading, but the house decided that the bill should be given first reading. I am convinced that some day the Senate of Canada will be abolished and I cannot think of a better time to start than now. As we reach our 100th birthday, we must ask ourselves: Are we really a democracy? Do we believe that the laws of a country should be made only by those who are elected by the people?

We are passing a great many bills here this session. If I make a mistake and oppose a good measure or vote for legislation which is not in the public interest, the people of Saskatoon in due course will call me to task and take me home and send somebody else here, if in their opinion I have not served the public interest.

But Senators can conspire against the citizens and rob the people of \$30,000,000 and report to no one. There was no action taken against Senator MacDougald but he decided that with all the money he had it wasn't worth continuing as a Senator.

It is sometimes argued, in fact it is put up as the last argument for the retention of a non-elected Second Chamber in our Parliament, that this was part of the original arrangement and was provided as a protection of minorities, particularly as a protection for the provinces of this country as such.

The answer to that is to ask what has the Senate ever done to protect the rights of the minorities. What has the Senate done to protect any minorities in this country except the minority that was mentioned by John A., the rich. The rich were always in the

March 15, 1966

minority, and they should have their protection. Any protection which has been provided has been given by parliament as a whole, through legislation from the House of Commons or by the courts.

Those opposed to the abolition of the Senate argue that we do not have the right to amend our Constitution in this particular. Under Section 91A of the B.N.A. Act parliament has the right to amend our Constitution with respect to matters exclusively federal. We have from time to time amended the Constitution as to the representation in the Commons among the provinces. Last year parliament passed an act to make provision for the retirement of the members of the Senate. Part one is as follows:

Amendment to the British North America Act. Section 29 of the B.N.A. Act is repealed and the following substituted therefore: 29 (1), 29 (2) require a Senator appointed after Royal Assent to retire at 75.

This bill was given second reading on May 18, last year and Royal Assent, on June 2nd. The provinces were not consulted. The parliament in London was not consulted. There are a few other authorities I would like to quote before I conclude. Grant Dexter says:

As it now exists and has existed since Confederation, the Senate is no more than a haven for party faithfuls. It is the most potent patronage in the gift of the Prime Minister.

In Professor R.H. MacKay's book on the unreformed Senate there are quite a number of very interesting quotes. One of them is:

The real reason why the Senate seems to be composed of nonentities, why it plays such a minor part in making public policy, is not the age of its members, not their quality, nor life appointments, nor partisanship, but the fact that in an age of democracy the present Senate is largely an anachronism.

Whatever its legal powers, it has thus no political authority, no mandate from the people as a whole, nor from the people organized by provinces, by municipalities, by any other political group. Senators can speak for nothing but themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to quote two very well-known authorities on the abolition of the Senate, the present Premier and Senator Argue. Sorry the Premier is not in his place at the moment. In the Leader Post of February 29 of this year, the main headline, of course, that day was "Two taxes up. Two taxes reduced", but above that on the first page there was a story about Argue who once urged abolition of the other place in a CP story from Ottawa by Ronald Lebel, which includes the following:

The angry young Socialist used to shock the Commons with cutting references to the Senate such as: "The best reform that can be brought about is the abolition of the other place". On May 27, 1948, he is reported in Hansard as saying: "I have heard it called an Old Man's Home, but when I hear of a salary of \$13,000 it seems to me to be a pretty good home".

That was some time ago. Again on March 24, 1953, Hansard reports

Mr. Argue as saying:

I support the position taken by the CCF, namely that the best reform that can be brought about is the abolition of the other place.

I have the greatest respect for the members of the other place. However, I think history will show that the other place has been famous mainly for delaying progressive legislation sent to it by this Chamber.

The other well-known authority on abolition of the Senate is none other than the Premier of Saskatchewan. In Hansard, May 31, 1954, page 525, one W. Ross Thatcher (Moose Jaw-Lake Centre) said:

There is one point in the debate this morning that strikes me very forcibly. I am very definitely in favour of the abolition of the Senate.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Nicholson: — And then Hansard, page 5335, June 27, 1955, one W. Ross Thatcher said:

I say again, I believe the Senate should be abolished.

I hope that the Premier's colleagues over there will permit a free vote so that the Premier will feel quite free . . .

An Hon. Member: — Not all . . .

Mr. Nicholson: — I beg your pardon? Well, there are probably other members across the way who do not share the Premier's views but I think that he should be given the right.

Mr. Speaker, I have in my hand the minutes of the proceedings of the Senate of Canada for Tuesday, 1st of March, 1966. This was the day that seven of the new Senators were introduced in the Senate. No mention is made of why Dr. MacKenzie and two other Senators were not there. Honorable members will note that although Senator Argue's name is first on the list, he was the last to be introduced. The hon. members who have known him for many years will be interested in what we read in the Senate minutes.

The hon. Hazen Argue was introduced between the hon. Senator Hugison and the hon. Senator McDonald, and having presented her Majesty's writ of summons, it was read by the Clerk Assistant as follows:

Canada,
Georges P. Vanier (C.S.)
Elizabeth the Second, by the Grace of God of the United Kingdom, Canada and Her other Realms and Territories, Queen Head of the Commonwealth, Defender of the Faith.

To our trusty and well-beloved Hazen Robert Argue of Kayville, in the province of Saskatchewan,

Greeting

Know you, that as well for especial trust and confidence We have manifested in you, as for the purpose of obtaining

March 15, 1966

your advice and assistance in all weighty and arduous affairs which may the state and defence of Canada concern, We have thought fit to summon you to the Senate of Canada; and we do Command you, that all difficulties and excuses whatsoever laying aside, you be and appear for the purposes aforesaid in the Senate of Canada at all times whensoever and wheresoever Our Parliament may be in Canada convoked and holden, and this you are in no wise to omit.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, We have caused these Our Letters to be made Patent and the Great Seal of Canada to be hereunto affixed.

Witness. Our Right Trusty and Well-beloved Counsellor, General Georges P. Vanier, a member of Our Most Honourable Privy Counsel, Companion of Our Most Distinguished Service Order upon whom We have conferred Our Military Cross and Our Canadian Forces Decoration, Governor General and Commander-in-Chief of Canada.

This was at our government house in the city of Ottawa this 24th day of February in the year of Our Lord, 1966, in the 15th year of our reign by command of Judy LaMarsh, Secretary of State of Canada, ordered that the said writ be placed upon the journals.

The hon. Senator Argue came to the table and took the oath prescribed by law which was administered by the Clerk of the Senate, the Commissioner appointed for that purpose, and took his seat as a member of the Senate. The hon. Speaker informed the Senate that the hon. Senator Argue had made and ascribed the declaration of qualification required of him by the British North America Act, 1867, in the presence of the Clerk of the Senate, the Commissioner appointed to receive and witness the said declaration. The minutes of the proceedings are found in the library if the members are ever interested. The names of the Senators who attend are printed each day in the minutes of the proceedings. This day was March 1st and of course, Mr. Argue was there that day to be sworn in. He was there the next day on the 2nd, but he was not there on the 3rd. He was not there on the 4th, and he was not there, oh, then they had a long weekend. The Senate met on Friday that week. Usually the Senate meets at 8 p.m. on Tuesdays until 10 o'clock. They meet on Wednesday from 3 to 6, on Thursday from 3 to 6, and they call it a week. But on this particular week they met on Friday. When they met at 8 o'clock on the 8th, Mr. Argue wasn't there. He wasn't there on the 9th. He wasn't there on the 10th. Hon. members might be interested in knowing the sort of deal Senators do have. They must be there one day every two years.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Nicholson: — Mr. Argue has two days in and if he doesn't turn up for another two years he probably will not be missed by anyone and certainly no one in Saskatchewan will care very much when he is there, what he does there. On the day that Senator Argue was introduced, there were introductions of the six other Senators. Then Senator Pouliot, who is a very interesting person, delivered the major speech of the day. He didn't make any reference to his association with Senator Argue some years ago when they were both members of the Commons. He did tell about some of the remarkable people in the Senate. After they had brought in resolutions regarding divorces — there were 112 divorce resolutions — they called it a day. As hon. members know, there are two provinces where

the only way divorces can be secured is by having an Act of Parliament. Previously both the Commons and the Senate had to deal with these divorce applications but the Senate is able to process them now. This particular day there were a great many divorce applications. These Senate resolutions are dealt with in block. They had a very brief day and they called it a week. I should say that Senator McDonald has had a perfect record of attendance these particular days, but as I said, the Senate normally meets on a Tuesday at 8 o'clock p.m. — 8 to 10, and then on Wednesday and again on Thursday. I happen to have the Senate Hansard for the year 1926. This was the year when the first Old Age Pension Bill was killed. Quite a few members spoke with a good deal of feeling on this particular subject. The Conservatives were going to vote against it so they felt they had to speak out to explain how they were voting. The Senate met on January 7th and 8th and then on the 12th, 13th and 14th of that month. Then they adjourned until the 16th of February and after one day they adjourned until the 6th of April. In April they met five days, ten in May, 18 in June, and one in July — a total of 40 days in the year. If a member is away for two years without a doctor's certificate he can be struck off the list. I just recall the one case all the years I was in Ottawa where it was brought to the attention of the Senate that one of their colleagues had not appeared for two years and he was struck off the list. This one was a multi-millionaire.

Mr. Speaker, it is my guess that history will prove that never in the past 99 years has anyone been appointed to the Senate whose main qualifications were that he betrayed the thousands of hard-working people who trusted him and elected him to be the youngest member ever elected to the Canadian parliament twenty-one years ago. History will explain why Prime Minister Pearson considered the price for betrayal should be over \$700,000 of the taxpayers' money, instead of the 30 pieces of silver.

It is significant that no one on the government side has referred to this unfortunate event in Canadian history. Senator Argue intimated he had received congratulations from the Premier of Saskatchewan and cabinet ministers. However, no cabinet minister has admitted congratulating the Senator and I will be surprised if in the course of this debate hon. members opposite will say that this has been a good thing.

At no time in our history did the people have a chance to vote in Canada, in the provinces, in the municipalities, to find out if the people wanted a Senate. This year the government of Canada is asking the hard-pressed taxpayers of Canada to raise \$2,800,000 to maintain a Senate which in my view, and I hope the view of this assembly, should be abolished. I trust that members of this assembly will support this resolution so it can be forwarded to Ottawa to indicate that Premier Thatcher has a majority who share his views of former years that the Senate should be abolished.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. J.M. Cuelenaere (Minister of Natural Resources): — Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to speak at any length on this debate. I believe it isn't necessary. We have just heard a very spirited attack on the institution of the Senate and I think that this is not the first time. I think that the question of the abolition or the retention of the Senate has been the subject of debate in Canada for a long time.

This afternoon, Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to get into an argument on the merits or the demerits of the Senate. I am prepared to concede that there is a very good argument on both sides, and I am prepared to concede that there is a good argument in support of the abolition of the Senate. On the other hand there are arguments in favor of retaining the Senate as part of our institutions. I think what is most unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, is that today and in the course of the debates in this assembly this year, we did not hear and we were not favored with an objective debate on the subject of the abolition of the Senate. What we heard, Mr. Speaker, was a presentation, punctuated by highly politically biased attacks, bitter attacks, personal attacks on certain individuals, living and dead, and references to past scandals. It appears, Mr. Speaker, that the subject of the abolition of the Senate hasn't been debated in this house as far as I am aware of, at any time in the past. No one has ever made any reference to it. But it has cropped up this year. It appears that because one who in the exercise of his free right in a democratic society left the ranks of the opposition and joined the ranks of another party, has been made a Senator, the opposition now want to attack the entire institution of the Senate. I think it most unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, that we should debate such an important subject as this in the atmosphere of rancor and personal vindictiveness on the part of an individual.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cuelenaere: — You know, Mr. Speaker, among other things it has been discussed on the basis of the monetary benefit which one individual may over a period of something like 30 years be entitled to as a result of being appointed to the Senate.

I don't know whether the hon. senior member from Saskatoon (Mr. Nicholson) — I see that in Saskatoon, the junior member got the preference in the seats — sees himself in the unfortunate position that he can't get an appointment to the Senate, proceeded to attack the entire institution of the Senate because of the benefit that one individual would get over a period of 30 years. Mr. Speaker, at no time did he refer to or have any regard to the contribution which that particular individual may make to the Senate or to the public life of Canada in the future. It may very well be that looking in retrospect after this particular individual has served for some time in the upper house that the people of Canada will have been well served and that the money will have been well spent.

However, this is all a matter of conjecture as to what he will do, and I think that he should be judged not in the circumstances under which he was appointed but upon his performance from now on.

The hon. member (Mr. Nicholson) when he was speaking, referred in a great spirit of hilarity to the fact that certain members had been in the Senate until they were 90 and 100 and 103 and I think he went up to 105 and so on. Of course, it is very, very easy to be very hilarious and to be very funny about elderly people. I think the hon. member, with complete lack of disrespect to old age in general and to the Senators in particular, attacked these individuals. However, this was one of the weaknesses of the Senate in the past and this was recognized that people ought not to be appointed for life. We all know now that the provisions of the appointment of Senators to the Senate for life have been changed and there has been an amendment requiring compulsory

retirement at the age of 75.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that this afternoon we heard the most inconsistent argument that I have ever heard in my experience either as a lawyer or in any form of debate. We have before us another resolution which I have referred to once before and I am not going to debate it, but here it clearly says that they want the house, and this is a motion by the opposition which says "that this house" and I want to read it:

that this house expresses the opinion that provisions to amend the Constitution of Canada should not be finally determined without the widest possible consultation and debate so as to permit the opinions of all interested groups and individuals to be solicited and obtained.

Now, that is a very, very clear expression of what the hon. members opposite want this house to do. On the other hand, we have a resolution that we are debating which demands the immediate abolition of the Senate which, of course, demands and requires the Constitutional amendment, the very subject that is being discussed under this previous motion. When the hon. member was speaking on this other resolution, it is most interesting to refer to what he said. Do you know that he was advocating — this is the hon. member for Regina West (Mr. Blakeney) — that this whole matter of Constitutional amendment be referred to a Senate committee. This is pertinent and very pertinent to this debate because here on the one hand they asked us to go on record as advocating the immediate abolition of the Senate and yet the hon. member would want this most important subject of Constitutional amendment referred to a committee of the Senate because he does . . .

Mr. I.C. Nollet (Cutknife): — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is referring to comments made by the hon. member for Regina West (Mr. Blakeney) in the previous debate. He has no right to refer to another debate. It's another subject entirely. Let him stick to the subject that is before the assembly.

Mr. Cuelenaere: — Mr. Speaker, I think that this is most germane to this resolution because how can we be inconsistent, we cannot have an inconsistent debate. I tried to prove earlier that these two resolutions were inconsistent and I still say they are. They are asking this house to adopt inconsistent measures because this is what he said speaking in the house on March 10. He said:

Certainly we have had many precedents of Senate hearings which have been public in the sense that the briefs by interested parties have been submitted to the Senate, and I see no reason why a Senate committee could not go from coast to coast in Canada if Royal Commissions of various kinds can go to the furthest corners of Canada.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cuelenaere: — And he says:

Certainly if there is any subject on which it is more important that a consensus of the views of Canadian citizens . . .

Mr. W.S. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition): — On a point of order, Mr.

March 15, 1966

Speaker. It seems to me that the member is definitely out of order at this point. He is reading from the records of another debate. He is definitely out of order.

An Hon. Member: — You . . .

Mr. A.E. Blakeney (Regina West): — Not in this session. Well let the Speaker decide if we may, on the point of order then.

Mr. Speaker: — Citation 149 from Beauchesne is as follows:

Besides the provisions contained in Standing Order 35 it has been sanctioned by usage both in England and in Canada, that a member, while speaking, must not refer to any debate in the same session on any question not then under discussion.

Further from Erskine May, he states that:

Reference to debates of the current session is to be discouraged even if such reference is not irrelevant, as it tends to reopen matters already decided.

Of course, the other debate isn't already decided.

The same result is often obtained by indirect methods.

Mr. Cuelenaere: — Mr. Speaker, I won't pursue the matter any further. All that I can say is that if there is any subject on which it is more important that the views of the Canadian citizens be sought, any subject more important than the Constitution of our country, I am unable to call it to mind. Mr. Speaker, this is a statement that was made. Now, as I was saying a moment ago, the Senate has obviously some functions and some of the functions or some of the possible functions, have been referred to.

Mr. Speaker, again in the form of inconsistency and this was not referred to in the former debate by the member from Regina West (Mr. Blakeney), you know, the hon. member feels very incensed that the Fulton-Favreau formula was adopted by this . . .

Mr. Nollet: — Point of order again. The hon. member is again repeating the same error he made before. He is not following the rules of procedure in this house.

Hon. D.V. Heald (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. All the member started to say was the Fulton-Favreau formula. Is the member for Cutknife saying that he cannot use those words? He wasn't taking the words out of a speech.

Mr. Nollet: — He was referring to what the hon. member for Regina West said in a previous debate, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — Well, certainly I would think that the reference to the Fulton-Favreau formula was germane both to the amendment to the Constitution and the debate in regard to the Senate which we are discussing now. I just got through an hour ago indicating to the

house that the Senate was enshrined both in the British North America Act and the Fulton-Favreau formula and also in the White Paper. I would think that reference to either one or all three of them was certainly in order.

Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, on your point of order, I fully agree with it. But the point I want to make is that he refereed to the statements made by the hon. member for Regina West (Mr. Blakeney) in connection therewith.

Mr. Heald: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. He said just the reverse. He said he wasn't quoting from the speech of the hon. member for Regina West in as previous debate. He started to talk about the Fulton-Favreau formula and the member for Cutknife (Mr. Nollet) immediately rose in his place and objected.

Mr. Speaker: — The hon. member is perfectly entitled to quote from the Fulton-Favreau formula as much as he pleases.

Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, my ears were open and the hon. member referred to a statement made by the hon. member for Regina West in connection with the Fulton-Favreau formula.

Mr. Speaker: — I tried to tell hon. members that it was rather hard to distinguish between the two subjects in this debate when I was ruling on the admissibility of this motion. The Senate of Canada and its institution are enshrined in the Constitution of Canada in the White Paper and in the Fulton-Favreau formula and all those that are germane to this debate and to the other one. Now, the mere fact that something is germane to the other debate doesn't make it out of order in this one and vice versa surely.

Mr. Cuelenaere: — Mr. Speaker, I will not make any reference whatsoever to any of the remarks that were made in any previous debates in this house at this session or in the other session. But I am going to point out that there is a considerable body of opinion in opposition to the Fulton-Favreau formula and by a strange coincidence it is now revealed that one little legislative council, the only one remaining in Canada, in the province of Quebec, as it so happened, turned out to be the one body who appears to have blocked the final adoption of the Fulton-Favreau formula. And the hon. member from Hanley (Mr. Walker) says they saved it. Now, this is the inconsistency that I am trying to point out, that the opposition in this debate has placed the house, by these two resolutions, in a very awkward position. On the one hand they wish to set aside as unacceptable the formula and on the other hand they want to abolish the Senate. I am only trying to point out in one case a body equivalent to the senate has served a purpose, a purpose that they themselves want to achieve. And Mr. Speaker, I am going to quote from the Ottawa Citizen of February 1st, 1965 and this is what it says:

Although the Union Nationale is the minority in the legislative assembly it has a majority of the seats in the legislative council. On the assumption that the legislative council will refuse to approve the Favreau Bill, Premier Lesage has introduced a bill in the legislative assembly to limit the upper house's veto.

March 15, 1966

The Ottawa Citizen of March 5th, 1965, approximately a month later, says this:

The council, however, amended the bill on third reading to provide for retention of its veto in constitutional matters.

The Ottawa Journal of March 25th, 1965:

This amendment is unacceptable to Premier Lesage and he is now prepared to appeal to the Queen to limit the powers of the council.

And then the Globe and Mail of April 10th, 1965:

It is possible, of course, that Premier Lesage is using the threat of this veto bill as a means of coercing the council into agreeing, among other things, to the Favreau bill.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is again pointing out to the inconsistency of the argument that has been brought forth in this debate by the proponent of this resolution.

Of course, it cannot be said that the Senate or any Senate body or the House of Lords or any comparable body has never performed any real service for the country. Mr. Speaker, I am not saying to what extent it has or has not. As I said at the outset there is argument on both sides. I admit that it is easy to point out failings and I think that if someone were to take individual days, individual acts, and individual things that have been done by the House of Commons on the same basis as the argument we heard this afternoon, we could argue pretty strongly that the House of Commons should be abolished because sometimes its performance is not up to scratch neither. I think we have seen something of that kind of performance going on lately by some of the members in the house of Commons. So I submit that we did not hear any argument this afternoon that was really germane to the resolution that was proposed. It was without a doubt the weakest possible argument that I ever heard for the retention or the abolition of anything, let alone an institution such as the Senate. When you have to rely on personal vindictiveness and attacks on individuals you have pretty poor ground to stand on. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that maybe there is just little bit of jealousy involved over there. It looks to me, Mr. Speaker, that the opposition feels that because some of the old parties occasionally sent their members to the Senate, their supporters should have a place to go to also. In their case, of course, they can't send them to the Senate so they send them to Florida and Bermuda and those kinds of places. I often wonder whether anybody has added up what some of their members have cost the country and how much they cost Saskatchewan. I don't know how much they cost Saskatchewan, but I am saying when you have to figure out how much benefit a person is going to get, one wonders whether anybody has added up some of the benefits that other people have derived.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I propose that we should not decide today on the question of whether or not we should abolish the Senate. It seems to me that this is a federal matter; it rests within the powers of the government of Canada and I think that we should have debated this particular subject under part three of another debate. I think that we should, Mr. Speaker, refer this entire matter to the widest possible public discussion. People say this is not a

matter which should be discussed by the average individual. I think that the abolition of the Senate is a subject that could be every bit as much discussed by the average individual as some of the other matters and other constitutional amendments that are proposed or that have been proposed. Just to show that there is public interest in this matter I am going to refer to an article and I think it is a fairly good little article. I must admire the young person who wrote it. I am sure I don't know him. I have never met him. This is out of an issue of the Saskatoon Star Phoenix of Wednesday, March 9th, 1966, and it's called "Youthful Editorial — Function of the Senate". There is a heading on this:

These youth editorials are intended to give young people a chance to express their views and adults a chance to read them. The writers are grade XII students and their views are their own.

This article was written by a young grade XII student and I want to give him credit. It is written by Bruce Thordarson of Aden-Bouman Collegiate in Saskatoon. It is very interesting. It says, and I am only going to read parts of it:

With the recent Senate appointment of men such as Hazen Argue and Harry Hayes, public attention has once more been focused on the Upper House. Calls for its abolition have been renewed as observers point to its lack of action, its few actual powers and the fact that appointments are made by the Prime Minister almost solely as political rewards for faithful party members.

No it goes on:

Admittedly, this method of choosing Senators is unfortunate, it should be changed. On the whole, however, the Senate plays a definite and important role in our government. It is not as has been suggested "the entering gate to coming extinction" for a politician. Instead it is a body in which much useful, although not colourful, work is done — work which must definitely merit the existence of the Senate in our system of government.

It was given the job of advising and checking legislation, of conducting investigation, and of introducing private bills of legislation.

Just last month a comprehensive report on the ageing was released providing a most acceptable answer to the problem of old age pensions. Work such as this carried out by experienced politicians, often prepared the way for direct legislative action either in the Senate or in the House of Commons.

The it goes on:

Sir John A. MacDonald once said that the Senate represents the sober second thought in legislation. In other words, the Senators in a position of independence and political security are able to criticize freely and are not influenced by the turmoil and excitement that often grips the elected M.P.s.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member (Mr. Nicholson) referred a moment ago to the fact that, he pointed out that on one occasion the Senate had turned down the first Old Age Pension bill. It is

March 15, 1966

agreed that it did on the first occasion turn down that bill. At that time — I have read the history of it — it was pointed out that the country was not ready, economically, for that. We know that maybe it had a basis for that because even now Tommy Douglas is apparently using the same argument in the House of Commons in answer to Dr. Brand and we all know what he had to say; namely, that they had to delay medicare in Saskatchewan because they had to wait for the economy of the province, until the economy of the province had sufficiently grown in order to introduce that type of legislation.

This article then goes on to say, Mr. Speaker, that:

Ever since Confederation, the Senate has played a vital role in preventing the passage of unwise legislation. In 1912 it refused to pass a bill that would have precluded the formation of a Canadian navy and the serious consequences that would have followed from that; in 1961, it rejected a bill declaring vacant the position of the governor of the Bank of Canada, and thereby brought the 'Coyne Crisis' to an end; in 1961, it prevented the passage of the questionable Customs Tariff Bill.

Then it goes on:

Undoubtedly the Upper House has many faults, but it is encouraging to note that some of these flaws are being eliminated. For example, Senators can no longer find refuge in the Senate until they die, but now must retire at 75.

It goes on to point out:

In general, then the Upper House is one of the many instruments that enable our parliamentary system of government to flourish. It is by no means the most important, but it is certainly not the least important of these instruments either. The Senate most definitely plays a significant role in the management of the affairs of our country; it is not a body that should be abolished.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have quoted from this article not necessarily to fully adopt all the views of this one lad, but to indicate to the house that there is public interest in this matter and as a basis for the amendment, which Mr. Speaker, I beg leave of the assembly to move, seconded by the hon. member for Kerrobert-Kindersley (Mr. Howes):

That all the words after the word "assembly" in line 4 be left out and that the words 'believes that the abolition of the Senate should not be finally determined without the widest possible public consultation and debate so as to permit the opinions of all interested groups and individuals to be solicited and obtained.

Mr. Speaker: — The Question comes up whether or not this amendment is in order. Somewhat the same questions arise in this case that arose in regard to the other and I would like the house to allow me to reserve my ruling of admissibility of the amendment.

Will the house agree to my reserving my ruling on the admissibility of the amendment?

Mr. Cuelenaere: — Would you permit debate on

the admissibility of the amendment, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: — On a point of order.

Mr. Cuelenaere: — Yes.

Mr. Speaker: — I can certainly, whichever my hon. members want.

Mr. Cuelenaere: — Mr. Speaker, on the point of order on which you reserved your decision as to whether it is admissible, I suggest that the amendment is clearly admissible because it starts off, — the Resolution before the house reads:

That this assembly believes that, in order to implement . . .

and so on. The amendment is completely relevant to the subject because it says:

That the matter of the abolition of the Senate, being an amendment to the Constitution . . .

should be dealt with in another way. The motion asks for "immediate steps" to bring about the abolition of the Senate. This only provides an alternative way or a discussion and I submit, Mr. Speaker, that if this amendment is not relevant, that you must also immediately consider the relevancy of the other motion that is before this assembly, because the other motion pretends to even go further. It pretends to override or, in effect, rescind a motion previously passed, which this doesn't do, to the effect that a certain thing is unacceptable and that the procedure to amend must be adopted as suggested in this motion. So, I submit, that if this amendment is out of order, some part of the other motion must also be considered. All that the amendment does is offer an alternative method for discussion or a method to abolish the Senate. I submit, that the proposed amendment is clearly and without a doubt in order.

Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, again he referred to a matter on which you had already made a ruling. Apparently the Speaker, in his judgment, has made a ruling now. He wants to take this matter under consideration. It also spoiled a good and proper speech from me, Mr. Speaker. I think you are right that you should.

Debate adjourned.

MOTION: DISCONTINUANCE OF AIR SERVICE

Mr. B.D. Gallagher (Yorkton) moved, seconded by Hon. J.W. Gardiner (Minister of Public Works):

That this assembly regrets the decision to discontinue the services of TransAir on the prairie route and urges the government of Canada to take such action as would ensure adequate air services on the routes affected.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I certainly won't detain the house as long as the last resolution has. I might say that this resolution demands a certain amount of urgency as there is a strong possibility that as the resolution states, air service is going to be curtailed in parts of this province. I would hope that this

afternoon we will be able to deal with this resolution and get it off the Order Paper.

There are several reasons why I moved this resolution, Mr. Speaker. First of all, the city of Yorkton, which is in the constituency which I have the honor to represent, is the hub of an area with a population of about 150,000 people in a radius of about 75 miles. It is also, as you are quite aware, the centre of the potash industry, the world's largest potash mine is in the area, within 40 air miles of the city of Yorkton. As well as the potash industry, Mr. Speaker, there are many associated industries and of course, in the last four or five years the city of Yorkton has had many new industries develop. Further to that, Mr. Speaker, in the city of Yorkton we have absolutely no rail transportation for passengers. We did at one time have CNR service to Regina and north, and CPR service to Saskatoon and Winnipeg. We have neither of these any more and although we have a good network of highways through the city, if the air service is discontinued we have no transportation for passengers other than highway transportation on our buses and by private cars. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I am moving this motion.

As well as this, after the agreement between TransAir and Air Canada and should Yorkton lose air service, it is going to mean that this one city is going to be one of the few cities in Canada that does not have air service for its mail. I think this means quite a bit, Mr. Speaker, in a business community of this size. Of course, this is not only for the city of Yorkton, but it is for the surrounding area as well. Some several years ago, Mr. Speaker, and for the last four or five years, I might add, there has been about \$280,000 spent by the federal government for facilities at the Yorkton airport and for the past short time we have had Viscount aircraft landing at the Yorkton airport. So any argument that Viscount aircraft cannot land there is certainly not a valid argument. Mr. Speaker, with the expenditure by the federal government of the sum of \$280,000 in the past few years and with a project on right now that was started last year, that was budgeted for last year and still not completed, I would think the federal government realizes that we are in a position where we must have air transportation.

I know that there are people who might argue that because of the passenger traffic that is coming in and out of that area and on that particular run it is not economically possible to keep an air service on the run. While I don't question this fact, Mr. Speaker, that the operation of it maybe is questionable, although I would like to see Viscount service in and out of Yorkton to Winnipeg particularly, maybe it would be better, more feasible and certainly more economical to the carrier that is giving the service to use a smaller aircraft. But we have been getting this Viscount service and I know that it costs more to operate Viscount aircraft than a smaller aircraft. But I do think, Mr. Speaker, the government of Canada should, in its position as the party responsible for transportation and communications for all of this country, have the responsibility to do one of two things. I ought to mention here, Mr. Speaker, that after TransAir made the agreement with Air Canada and the Air Transport Board to give the service that they did on the run from Yorkton east and Yorkton west, they have had to compete with four daily flights that Air Canada has from Winnipeg to Saskatoon non-stop. It seems a little bit ridiculous, Mr. Speaker, that Air Canada should fly over the city of Yorkton to Saskatoon non-stop on four different occasions every day while another carrier is expected to make a profit or be able to give the service to Yorkton, stop and then go on to Saskatoon.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I think there should be one of two things done. Either one of these flights that Air Canada is now taking through to Saskatoon from Winnipeg should be given to TransAir, or if not, I think that the government of Canada should subsidize TransAir to the extent that they can continue service.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that I have said about all I intend to say on this particular resolution and I would hope that all members of the house would support this. I might mention the fact that it is just about two or three weeks ago that some statistics were released relating to the growth of different cities in western Canada. I noticed that the city of Yorkton in my constituency percentage-wise was the fastest growing city in the prairie provinces. I noticed that the city of Saskatoon was probably a faster growing city, but for the size of the city, the city of Yorkton has grown faster in the past year than any of the other cities in the prairie provinces. Certainly there is a danger of the city of Yorkton losing this particular service. It is a lot harder to reinstate the service after it is lost than it is to hold on to the service we have.

Mr. R.A. Walker (Hanley): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to say just a few words about this resolution and to compliment the member for Yorkton (Mr. Gallagher) in having brought the matter forward. I am not sure that the resolution fully and adequately sets out the possibility, but at least, unless some better wording comes along, I will feel constrained to support the resolution in its present form. I probably can claim, Mr. Speaker, the right to speak on this resolution as probably the best customer of TransAir in the whole house since I use it almost every day. The air service connecting the cities of Saskatchewan is, I believe, not getting the support and the patronage which it merits. I suppose one cannot very well say to a company which is losing money that they must continue the service without subsidy. If no subsidy is forthcoming and the company is losing heavily, not much can be done about it, I suggest, but to discontinue the service. Or, I suggest a better alternative, to modify the service to alter the type of service so that it will better commend itself to the travelling public of Saskatchewan.

What the member for Yorkton has said is undoubtedly true. The rail service has practically disappeared in intra-provincial transportation. If you want to go from one part of Saskatchewan to another part you are almost precluded from using rail service now and highways represent the only real alternative. But I submit, that this province ought to have more to offer air companies than most places. First of all, we have an unequalled climate so far as flight is concerned. It is very rare that weather interferes with flying conditions in Saskatchewan. We also have large distances separating our concentrations of population and these large distances naturally militate against the ordinary surface modes of transportation and reflect in favor of some rapid transit system like air services.

So, we have these two distinct advantages which aren't found elsewhere. I was rather surprised to see a statistic this morning about the relationship between fares charged and volume of traffic. This statistic which was reported I believe in this month's issue of Consumers' Report, show that a 20 per cent reduction in fares results in a phenomenal increase in the volume of traffic, I think a 70 per cent increase in the volume of traffic over a very short period of time. I think, perhaps, this might be a factor. I notice that from Saskatoon to Regina the

March 15, 1966

fare is \$10. While that is a little higher, while that is almost twice as high as the rail or bus fare, I suggest that the company would be better off with 25 passengers at \$7.50 than with the usual one or two at \$10. This might be one solution, an attempt to arrive at a more acceptable fare level. I suggest that other possibilities might be considered in trying to revamp the service in order to put it on a profitable basis.

I rather doubt whether on short, on 45 minute or one hour trips, we need as high speed an aircraft as a Viscount, because I think it makes very little difference whether one can fly from Saskatoon to Regina in 40 minutes or whether it takes 55 minutes; anything under an hour between Saskatoon and Regina is quite acceptable. The difference between 40 minutes and 55 minutes is quite immaterial if significant economies can be achieved by a smaller or slower flying aircraft. I think this will have to be looked at by some company and by the Transport Board.

Now, of course, Mr. Speaker, I get as much cheer as any man out of the company of a stewardess on an airline, but I think that this is a service which could well be dispensed with in these short flights. I think that I can get along without my cup of coffee for 40 minutes, and while I would naturally be sorry to lose the scenery I certainly wouldn't miss the cup of coffee. This, I think, is something which is really a frill that we don't need to have in local air service from connecting Saskatchewan cities.

What I think probably is the most important factor of all in determining the rate of use made by air service is frequency of service. At the present time there are two flights each day from Saskatoon. I don't know what the situation is in Yorkton, but I think it is one a day. I submit, that this very seriously eliminates potential customers, because if a man at Yorkton wishes to go to Regina he is considering whether or not to go by air; or suppose he is considering going to Saskatoon, he may have to go one day and go back the next, or he may have to go first thing in the morning and not get back until late at night. Well, there are so many ways. You can drive your car, you can have the use of it when you get to your destination, but the attractiveness of air transport is largely lost if you have to take the whole day to go from Regina to Saskatoon and come back again.

It seems to me that air transport is more valuable to people who want to make a quick trip and be back quickly than to people who are prepared to go and stay all day. For example, air service from Saskatoon to Regina, coming down in the morning and going back at night offers no real advantage to the customer except a little more convenience and comfort perhaps than to take his car or the railiner. Because if you are going to take all day, flying down in the morning and flying back at night represents no time saving at all. But where you have to go and return speedily, the air service offers a real dividend in terms of time saved.

For example, it seems to me that people who, like in my own case, when there is no committee meeting that I am on, can afford to miss the forenoon sessions here, can work in my office until five after twelve and be down here at five after one, and go back in the evening. This represents a doubling up of a person's time, and you couldn't do that by any other mode of transportation. You couldn't get down here by train or car and still have a full half day in the one city and a full half day in the other city.

I am not saying that shorter departure and arrival times are

the answer but more frequent service would provide a vast increase in my opinion in the patronage. You can't have more frequent service unless you have a large increase in the patronage. Now, the answer seems to me to be more frequent service. It may be that when we in Saskatoon have an auditorium and Regina doesn't, and we have important dramatic events occurring in our city, it should be possible for someone to leave Regina after dinner in the evening and be there in time for the performance and be back home in time for a goodnight cocktail before going to bed.

It seems to me that if air service is going to be popular, it is going to have to give that kind of service that people can leave home at noon and be back in time for supper and still have two or three hours to do business in the other city. This, of course, requires a vast increase in patronage.

I must regret, Mr. Speaker, and deplore emphatically that this government has put itself out of a position where it could do something practical about this problem. All the members will recall that two or three years ago when TransAir was given the franchise to serve these points in Saskatchewan, the Saskatchewan crown corporation made an application to provide this service and the Saskatchewan crown corporation bid was rejected in favor of a bid of TransAir. At that time it was intended to provide service largely north and south by this crown corporation, but TransAir came into the picture and presumably because they were able to offer connections of Winnipeg they were also given the nod by the Air Transport Board.

Now, if TransAir bows out of the picture, I don't know whether there is anybody coming in. This is what is worrying my friend from Yorkton (Mr. Gallagher) and it worries anybody who is interested in maintaining air service in Saskatchewan. But if this government had not sold out this important crown corporation, practically gave it away as they did, this government would be in a position now to direct their own crown corporation to make an application to get into the breach and provide some satisfactory service to the people of Saskatchewan. They have thrown away this opportunity at the behest of the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) who I presume was the prime instigator of this along with the Premier. Having thrown away this important and valuable resource, I now suggest that it comes rather feebly and rather weakly, and rather ineffectually, from a backbencher on the other side to come up and deplore the fact that we are going to be without services when something could have been done about it if the government had had the vision, the sense to keep itself in a position where something could have been done about it.

I don't know whether the minister from Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart) can have a little conference with his friends to whom he gave this company and persuade them that they should make an application to serve these Saskatchewan cities.

As a result of this short-sighted ill-advised policy, we not only stand the prospect of losing the service which my friend from Yorkton has deplored but we stand the loss of the revenue which an air service owned by the people of Saskatchewan could earn. We set our province back because of this blundering ineptitude of my friends opposite.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I shall certainly support the motion as a sorry last resort in the hope that it will influence someone. But I can't see any of my hon. friend's, from Prince Albert, hard-bitten, buccaneer types reading the resolution and saying, "You know

March 15, 1966

this is too bad. The legislators in Regina are deploring this loss of service. Maybe we should get in and pitch in and do something to bail the people of Saskatchewan out of their difficulty". It isn't very effective, it isn't very promising as a solution, but at least as far as it goes I shall be glad to support it personally. I don't speak for any other members on this side of the house in regard to it, but that is my view, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. A.R. Guy (Athabasca): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words on this resolution also since TransAir has made application to the Air Transport Board to drop its Prince Albert-Saskatoon-Regina run also. There are several reasons why this, of course, is not acceptable,. First of all in this day and age it is inconceivable that Saskatchewan's three largest cities should not have regular air service between them. Secondly, we have — I'm sorry if I am putting Prince Albert in third place, we know that it is only going to be a matter of a year or two and it will not only take over third but probably second, after Saskatoon — a regular service from Prince Albert to La Ronge, Uranium City, and other northern Saskatchewan points, so it is absolutely necessary to have connections with Saskatoon, Regina and points east, west and south.

The third reason is that at the present time developments taking place in northern Saskatchewan since the Liberal government was elected, particularly in the fields of forestry, mining, tourism around Prince Albert and the northern areas, again demand that we have a regular air service. Tourists, mining officials, forestry officials, have limited time and great distances to travel from eastern Canada and south of the border. The distances are great and the only way they can do it is through air transportation. So air transportation for Prince Albert as a link to the other cities of Saskatchewan is certainly a must.

Now, it is true when TransAir took over this route they lowered their fares, they changed their schedule and they tried to put it on a paying basis. Unfortunately, these changes were not successful and it was not a profitable run. I'm afraid I can't agree with the member from Hanley (Mr. Walker), who is shedding some more crocodile tears over the sale of Saskair. They tried it and couldn't get rid of it; we were successful. He said that we were losing the revenues from a Saskatchewan-owned company if they took over such a run. I might remind him that more important than that we are keeping away from the huge losses that Saskair had in northern Saskatchewan which, no doubt, through their inefficiency would have been much greater operating in the southern part of the province.

Certainly, if TransAir as a free enterprise company couldn't make a go of it, Saskair would have had far less success. I suggest that there are some companies who perhaps would adopt a more flexible program and I think that flexibility is the key to this problem. I don't think that TransAir was flexible enough. When a DC3 was not a paying vehicle on this run, they went into a Viscount, which, of course, did not appear very practical. They did not run on weekends with the result that a person going north and south on Friday had to come back either by train or bus, with the result that if you are going to have to go by bus one way, or train, you buy a return ticket and you use bus or train both ways.

I do feel that a run between Prince Albert, Saskatoon and

Regina could be successful if several conditions could be followed. First of all, smaller planes must be utilized in relationship to the passenger load. Fares must compete or very nearly compete with the buses and trains. After all when you are using an air service you have to overcome one or two weaknesses. You have to overcome the fact that usually you are a considerable distance from the city when you land, you have to take a taxi in and out from the airport; secondly you have the inconvenience of not having your car when you arrive in the city. In most cases the bus terminals and train terminals are downtown; you can immediately use the city transport system for getting around the city. So to overcome these weaknesses, therefore, it has to be even more attractive. Another important condition is seven days a week service. If they are going to provide service it must be available every day of the week. And as far as we are concerned in northern Saskatchewan we would hope that anyone taking over the service would make a better attempt to connect the flight going and coming from the south with the flights that are going and coming from northern Saskatchewan.

Therefore, I would hope that the Board of Transport Commissioners would take steps to see that Prince Albert and northern Saskatchewan will be serviced by regular air routes. If TransAir is not able to do it, some other carrier will take it over and make a success of it. I am, therefore, very pleased to support the motion of the member for Yorkton (Mr. Gallagher).

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. W.S. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, may I rise to say a few words to give general support and endorsement from those on this side to the resolution which is before us. I might just add, however, that it is rather interesting to hear the member from Yorkton (Mr. Gallagher) and the member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy) who has just taken his seat, these two most ardent apostles of the gospel of free enterprise, pointing out to us that free enterprise has failed and is unable to do the job and that the public, either by authority or action, must take steps to save the community and province the services. Even more serious, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, is what the whole situation the member from Yorkton describes, does mean. This, of course, is a symptom of what has happened because of a fragmentation of our transportation systems generally. It is a symptom of what happens when such services as these are determined entirely on the basis of a balanced sheet. I can accept the fact that the private enterprise company must have a favourable balance sheet but I do submit that what this does do is to prove that the decisions on transportation are too important and vital to be left on the generally speaking private enterprise measuring-sticks.

What we need, of course, is something which many of us on this side have called for on many occasions; that is, a rationalization of our whole transportation system, including air, and including rail, so that the goods which Canadians produce and which they move, can be moved to the best advantage of all so that the people who move about our province can also have the means of moving around as they ought to be able to move.

We must have systems which are based on the fact that communities deserve recognition, not just the dollars that may go in or out of those particular communities. I submit, that the resolution, of course, won't solve all of that; it can be useful in terms of the present emergency as the member from Yorkton calls

March 15, 1966

the transportation situation in Yorkton. I wish it could have gone much further but under the circumstances we support this as it stands for this particular situation.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. M.P. Pederson (Arm River): — Mr. Speaker, I am not going to say too much on this resolution except to point out another area in which I believe there has been a tremendous effect on companies, such as TransAir, having difficulty in making these runs that they have been carrying out unprofitably.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that it is fair to say that we in this province, perhaps more than in any province, are in the backwash insofar as air transportation is concerned. The indication of this, I think, is in the fact that the recent announcements by Trans Canada Airlines, or Air Canada as it is now known, to inaugurate new flights of DC9's, that completely by-pass Saskatchewan, ignoring the fact that we have a very high volume of air traffic out of our two major cities in particular. I think that this is a symptom that has worked to our detriment in this province. When we have to two major cities with only second string aircraft, as it were, using the facilities there, there is a gradual lessening in understanding of air transport. I believe that the situation cannot be cured until we are placed in a position of being on an equal basis with other provinces to the east and to the west of us, insofar as the provision of facilities by Air Canada is concerned.

I think that people by and large tend to forget that there is air transport between our major cities and rely on the ground transports that are available and are well advertised. I am not suggesting that Air Canada could in fact take over these runs as subsidiary routes, but I do think that some consideration should be given to let Saskatchewan have a degree of equality with the other provinces. This would help get people in the mood for flying more than they have been in the past. I encounter all sorts of people who travel on trains and so on. When we discuss this problem they tell me that they have completely forgotten that there is an airline running between Saskatoon and Regina; some even profess to have never heard of it. I think that this is the basic problem. You cannot expect, as has been suggested by other members, that TransAir or any other company is going to operate continually in the red. But in order to prevent this happening we have to get at the symptoms of the problem. I believe that the symptoms lie in the fact, or stem from the fact, that we are not air-minded as other people in Canada are. Part of this, of course, comes from the treatment I believe that we have been accorded by Air Canada. I would hope that when this resolution, if it is passed, and I have reason to believe that it will be, is brought to the attention of the federal government that this particular suggestion would also be followed, that Air Canada be encouraged to include Saskatchewan, and its major points in particular, on their new schedules insofar as a jet service is concerned. Because I believe that this will focus more attention on air travel and consequently give the smaller carriers who are servicing the smaller cities a better chance for a profit, and, therefore, a better chance to offer better service.

I will support this resolution.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. D.G. Steuart (Minister of Health): — Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this resolution. I would first just like to make a comment or two on the speech from the hon. member from Hanley (Mr. Walker). You know, when I sat listening to his speech, I thought to myself, well this is one of the few times that I can sit here and agree with him. He talked about any company that took on this airline . . .

Mr. Walker: — Where did I go wrong?

Mr. Steuart: — . . . this airline used a little imagination, showing a little free enterprise competitive spirit and maybe putting on services that would more suit the needs of the people. I thought that finally at long last I am hearing this man speak for more than two minutes and agreeing with him, but I found out, of course, he can't open his mouth without shoving one or both of his big feet in. I just happen to have it here, an editorial. Since he did raise it — he brought my name into it and raised the situation by dragging in the sale we made of Saskair — I would, Mr. Speaker, just like to quote so the house can recognize and realize when the hon. member from Hanley (Mr. Walker) makes some of these comments the type of individual he is and the type of speeches he does make. I quote:

Eric Knowles (former editor of the Saskatoon Star Phoenix) in an editorial on the radio station in Saskatoon on Wednesday, March 9th says:

Robert Walker, MLA for Hanley was guest speaker when John E. Brockelbank, Saskatoon MLA was nominated as CCF-NDP candidate for the Mayfair constituency, one of the five Saskatoon ridings.

He goes on to say:

In the line of my work I read many of his speeches throughout the year and I believe he tops all legislative members of every political stripe when it comes to bitterness against the opposition. In his case the Liberals have been the opposition all the years the CCF-NDP were in power.

So far Mr. Walker's speech was not so good but he topped all his previous efforts by gross exaggeration. He said integrity in government was a major question in Saskatchewan since the Liberals came to power, and that for the first time people living outside the province looked upon the administration as they looked upon Huey Long's government in Louisiana. The comparison is so ridiculous, so far-fetched, that he is insulting every Canadian . . .

An Hon. Member: — You were there?

Mr. Steuart: — Just as much as when he got up and blabbered away, or you when you get up, I am sure, nothing, except to show the integrity and the type of individual that . . .

Mr. E. Kramer (The Battlefords): — You're blabbering, I'll accept that . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Would the member keep his remarks to air travel and the motion.

Mr. Steuart: — I'm relating to one air travel problem, Mr. Speaker, and I will be finished. I just wanted to read that into the records to show the type of individual, when he rises and when he speaks, and goes on later to drag in the sale of the Saskair, sold to my "buccaneer friends", as he called them. He said a profitable Saskatchewan enterprise was being sold. Well, if you closed your big mouth in this brawl you might learn something but I doubt it, because you have had all these years and you haven't learned anything yet. It has been proven beyond a shadow of a doubt by the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) the minister in charge of Saskair and the man who guided through the sale of this losing crown corporation. The crown corporation was losing money. It was sold at a profit and sold at a much better price than was ever, or could ever have been obtained by the opposition, the former Socialist government.

Mr. Speaker, to say that if we had retained this losing crown corporation we would have been able to do something about the present situation is, of course, utterly ridiculous. I agree that we should appeal to the Air Transport Board and the government at Ottawa to subsidize this route if it has to be subsidized. This position of the Liberal party and the Liberal government is very clear. We say that if free enterprise can do it then let free enterprise do it; but if you have a sore finger like you have in this case the answer of the Socialists is cut off the whole hand, socialize the entire industry. Well, we say that if you have a little problem here the government can subsidize it. The city of Prince Albert is growing so rapidly that this subsidy won't be necessary for any length of time, Mr. Speaker. So, I would support this idea that we do appeal to the government in Ottawa, that it is necessary to subsidize this airline to keep it going and that they should do this. I also think at the same time, Mr. Speaker, they should demand that any company that takes over this charter show more imagination than has been shown in the past. They don't need aircraft of the size they put on these last runs. When they did have smaller aircraft they didn't use their time schedules. They weren't the ones that were ideally suited for the travel of people back and forth from points like Prince Albert, or Saskatoon, Regina, or indeed Yorkton, to Saskatoon or Regina.

I am very pleased that this resolution was brought in by the member for Yorkton (Mr. Gallagher). I am pleased to support it, and I hope that the house can forget that the Socialists had to drag in their pet peeve about us getting rid of that crown corporation. I hope that all members will support this resolution so that we can send it to Ottawa as unanimous from this house.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. W.A. Robbins (Saskatoon City): — Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say a few brief words on this resolution. I had a bit to say a year ago with regard to TransAir when they got these routes. Quite frankly we know that there are severe problems in regard to the Prairie Milk Run, as it is referred to, and I believe that the public of the prairie provinces require reasonable assurance of reasonable air service on regional routes connecting prairie cities. I believe, and my colleagues would be in general agreement with me when I say that we would much prefer that this service be supplied by a publicly

owned corporation in preference to private carriers who obviously would have to have subsidies. These private carriers would require subsidies in order to continue the service on the Prince Albert-Saskatoon-Regina-Yorkton-Brandon-Winnipeg routes. I think it is quite clear that if we are to have reasonable air service on these routes that some action must be taken by Ottawa. I would agree with the hon. member from Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart) although very often I won't agree with him, and I hope that the assembly will unanimously agree to this resolution.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. A.E. Blakeney (Regina West): — Mr. Speaker, I was simply going to add a brief word to the comments already made. I was a little bit depressed to hear the comments of the Minister of Public Health (Mr. Steuart) indicating that in his view air carriage should be by private carriers unless it could be shown that they can't operate efficiently. I want to advise the house that I support the idea of Air Canada continuing to operate and I am sorry to hear the indication from the government benches that they would not support this type of public air transport.

Mr. Steuart: — That is awfully silly . . .

Mr. Blakeney: — Well, I thought it was awfully silly when it was said by the member for Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart) but I listened with a good deal of care and there is no doubt about what he said. He believes that when air carriage can be done by private carriers it should be, and when it can't be done this way by private carriers than the next preference is by private carriers with government subsidies . . .

Mr. Steuart: — I wish he would repeat it right. I will tell him exactly what I said. I said when a job can be done, or service can be rendered by private enterprise, let them render it. If it fails, if they can't do it, then let the government move in and help render service, and this is probably the case with Air Canada.

Mr. Blakeney: — I think there is no question from what he said that if Canadian Pacific Airlines could take over all of Air Canada he would approve it. There is no use in him trying now to qualify these very clear words which he previously said. But the point I wanted to raise was that I took the view some years ago that the way to handle the Prairie Milk Runs was to have a local carrier — and at that time it was Saskatchewan Government Airways. That was the proposal, but if it was going to be a private carrier, I don't particularly object to that — but my proposal at that time was that our carrier, Saskatchewan Government Airways, operate a two engine turbo-prop aircraft from Regina to Saskatoon to Prince Albert and on to Uranium City and back again. This, it was acknowledged, would require a small subsidy. The proposal also was that if the circumstances warranted it, Yorkton ought to be served, Yorkton, Brandon and Winnipeg. It seem to me that two engine turbo-prop is the largest type of aircraft which is economically justifiable on that route and that the attempts to operate old aircraft like DC3's or four engine turbo-props like Viscounts are doomed to failure, even if you get the Viscounts for nothing as TransAir did. Essentially I agree with the point that was made earlier in the debate that somehow we have got to tailor

a relatively inexpensive service, offer it to the people with as much frequency as we possibly can and ask the federal government for the, hopefully, relatively modest subsidy which would be required. This is the way we ought to attack this problem I think that we cannot reasonably ask the federal government to subsidize Viscount service between Yorkton and Regina, with all deference to the member from Yorkton (Mr. Gallagher). And I think he would agree with that. Somehow we have got to offer service with a smaller aircraft or offer a less expensive service, pare it to the reasonable minimum and then put up the strongest case we can for some federal assistance. I think that there will be a wide measure of agreement with what I am saying. I think it is thoroughly consistent with the member's resolution and I will be supporting the resolution of the member for Yorkton (Mr. Gallagher).

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. J.W. Gardiner (Minister of Public Works): — Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say a word with regard to this resolution which was moved by the member for Yorkton (Mr. Gallagher) and, of course, involves the transportation system generally in western Canada and particularly our own province. I want to state here that I think one of the basic premises behind the resolution or that should be behind the resolution is the fact that air service is a growing system of communication and transportation. It is not something that perhaps is dying, it is not something that is old fashioned, it is something new, it is something that is being developed in our nation and other nations throughout the world. It is a developing thing. And I think this more than anything else should be one of the arguments that we should be putting forward to the government at this time. Saskatchewan, relatively speaking, over the years has been sparsely populated, has not had the industry that other parts of Canada had. Now when industry is moving into our province, when we are getting the potash industry which was established in the vicinity of the Yorkton area and is establishing in great numbers in the Saskatoon area, I don't think there is any question in the minds of anyone in this house that these areas in the province of Saskatchewan are going to develop, they are going to grow. In a few years from now and I hope even earlier than that, we are going to see develop in these two areas of our province a much larger population, a much greater business area which can make use of transportation such as we are speaking of today. I don't think anyone could prove that there is anything wrong with a central government in our country at this time when we are in a developing stage here in our province, and air transport is also in a developing stage, giving assistance to ensure that areas of our province that require this type of service will receive it today and tomorrow as well. I am quite certain that in the words of the member from Yorkton (Mr. Gallagher) that the area that he represents, and the area that is represented by the members here from the city of Saskatoon, and I am quite certain also from our capital city of Regina, and also the city of Prince Albert with the new pulp mill development, in the next few years we are going to see a much greater population growth in these areas of our province, a much greater concentration of population. We are going to see the need for transportation to the north part of our province to a much greater extent than we have seen in the past. So I think that we could rightfully go to the central government which I am prepared to say has responsibility and has accepted in the past, responsibility for transportation in Canada generally, and say that there should be assistance to make certain that a growing area of this country of

ours is provided with a service that is equal to that in other parts of Canada. I don't see anything wrong with this. I don't see anything against the principle because it is a provision of a service which the people in this particular area of Canada should have. It is a service which should be assisted by our federal authorities. I want to say there that I am very pleased to be able to take part in this debate and to support the resolution to ask the government of Canada to take action to see that this very important service is continued in our province until the time when these developments take place so that this service will take care of itself, and I think this is coming.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. W.J. Berezowsky (Cumberland): — Mr. Speaker, much of what I wanted to say has been said by the other members but I would like to say that after listening to the hon. member who just sat down (Mr. Gardiner) and listening to the member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy) and other members opposite, it ill behooves them to say now, to the Dominion government, in this resolution, which I am going to support, Mr. Speaker, that the government should give subsidies because companies can't make money. Yet when this same government operated their own established service, Saskair, it refused to subsidize this company with a few thousand dollars. They gave it away and are now paying a company to take it over. It's a very poor example that this government has set. Now they approach the Dominion government and ask for what they refused to do when they had an opportunity to do it, to subsidize their own service. I will support the motion and I hope in good time that we will have the kind of service, whether subsidized or not, that will serve the community of Prince Albert which is close to where I live and other communities hon. members have mentioned.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to.

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

SPEAKER'S RULING ON MOTION RE ABOLITION OF THE SENATE

Mr. Speaker: — I promised at my earliest opportunity to rule on the admissibility of the amendment to the motion of the member for Saskatoon city (Mr. Nicholson).

In ruling on the proposed amendment of the hon. Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Cuelenaere) to the Motion re. Abolition of the Senate, standing in the name of the hon. member from Saskatoon City, I wish to draw the attention of the house to the following quotation found on page 414 of Erskine May's Parliamentary Practices:

The object of an amendment may be either to modify a question in such a way as to increase its acceptability or to present to the house a different proposition as an alternative to the original question.

And further on page 416:

The fundamental rule that a debate must be relevant to a question necessarily involves the rule that every amendment must be relevant to the question on which the amendment is proposed.

March 15, 1966

Exactly the same fundamental arguments regarding the admissibility of the motion apply with equal validity to the admissibility of the amendment. The clinching argument which tipped the scale in both cases was the need for the Chair to preserve the rights, freedoms and privileges of members.

I rule the amendment is in order and inasmuch as this is an alternative proposition all the words after "that" being struck out, the debate will continue concurrently on the amendment and the motion.

On motion of Mr. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition) debate adjourned.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

MOTION: RAIL LINE ABANDONMENT

The assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. B.D. Gallagher (Yorkton):

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

and the proposed amendment thereto moved by Mr. Wooff (Turtleford):

That all the words from the word "urges" in the first line, to the word "full" in the third line be left out and the following words substituted therefore:

"the federal government to establish a Rail Rationalization Authority at the earliest possible date, with".

Mr. J.A. Pepper (Weyburn): — Mr. Speaker,, I wish to direct my remarks in supporting this amendment chiefly to point out the effects that rationalization could have and to show what rail line abandonment would do and has done to the social life of the communities affected. In seconding the amendment to the resolution of my colleague, the member from Turtleford (Mr. Wooff), while I feel that it doesn't take anything from the original motion but it does specify the importance of it. It does this by asking for an establishment of a Rail Rationalization Authority by the federal government at the earliest possible date. I feel this is important, Mr. Speaker, because why should we delay any longer than absolutely necessary any precautionary measures that might be prepared and brought forward to protect our people in this province or in Canada from having their train services curtailed whether it be the hauling of passengers, freight or any other commodity. Why should we have it disrupted or curtailed to any further extent than what it already has been. We know from experience in the past where a rail line has been abandoned that it not only creates added expenditures to the farming people compelling them to haul their grain and their livestock greater distances in order to market them but to me, Mr. Speaker, it is also the first step and I might add it plays a very important part in the breaking up of what has been a long-established community. The farmer because of the rail line abandonment has to haul his grain to larger centres. This requires

better roads, better trucks, all meaning added expenditure. Not only that but while he is there at these larger centres he purchases groceries, clothing and other farming necessities. The result is, Mr. Speaker, that pretty soon your hometown or your local town merchants find it very impossible to carry on, their business is decreasing and they are forced to fold up. This is only one example of what happens when rail line abandonment takes place.

In the early days of our country, our people planned their homestead and their locations as close to railroads as they could locate because they knew that railways played a very important part and factor in the success of their venture. Towns and community centres were well planned and established along these railway lines. School districts were organized, stores were built, implement dealers located, garages and other places of business were there to serve the adjacent area. I might add these places patronized the railways right along. Also the churches of all denominations were built, community centres were located. These all were planned and established because of the one main factor, the railway line first being there. I also feel, Mr. Speaker, that with the great encouraging possibilities for marketing our grain in the future that we cannot afford to allow abandonment of our present railways. We must have close access and provision to get this grain to market and to get it rolling to our grain terminals without delay so that we can hold the markets that our Wheat Board has obtained. So, Mr. Speaker, until other facilities are provided that would give us the same or better opportunities to market our grain, I feel we must keep what provisions we have. I realize that it is perhaps our railway's privilege to abandon and withdraw its services to any area where it finds it feasible to do so and believes it to be uneconomical to operate, but I also believe that our railway companies have an obligation to fulfil to our people and that they must consider and realize this obligation. They have had good patronage from our people in the past; they were given land and royalties which have proven to be of great value to the railway companies to date. They are able to secure many dollars of wealth through these holdings which they now have and which have been made available to them by the pioneering and the opening up of our country and the development of industry by our government. These have proven a great asset to the railway company.

Mr. Speaker, I have dealt with the people who will be affected more or less indirectly with rail line abandonment but there are the people who are affected directly. Those are the employees of the railway company that are serving with these lines and have established homes within the areas which might be abandoned. These people as in the past stand a very great risk of being laid off their work. Was an alternative supplied to them? At an age which they cannot afford to retire, many are unqualified to step into any other profession. These people, after the services that they have rendered to the railway company, deserve a much greater consideration than this, Mr. Speaker.

One of the most recent cancellation or abandonment in our railway system is the CPR Transcontinental, the Dominion. I think, Mr. Speaker, that I am safe in saying that the CPR has been planning for some time to get out of the passenger train service and to become more involved in a more lucrative operation. While it is curtailing more rail passenger service, it is pressing for more air routes. In other words, their attitude is let the public utilities perform the services that are more marginal and give to them the operations or to let them perform the services that are

March 15, 1966

profitable. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that our CPR received over \$100,000,000 and close to 44,000,000 acres of land, plus mineral rights and in return gave the promise to supply Canadian people with adequate transportation facilities. It seems to me that the CPR has milked its rail operation but it maintains that it can no longer afford to operate transcontinental trains. To me, Mr. Speaker, their only test and their only interest is cost, and the company's obligations to the public have long been forgotten.

Mr. Speaker, I have tried to point out why I think it is so important to establish a Rail Rationalization Authority by the federal government and to do so at the very earliest possible date.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. I.C. Nollet (Cutknife): — Mr. Speaker, on this whole matter of rail line abandonment and rationalization, it is necessary to cover considerable scope regarding this entire subject so I will briefly go back and place before the hon. members some background material and recount some of the steps that resulted in the application of railways for massive abandonment. We all recall that as a result of price de-control shortly after World War II, costs of everything began to rise. The steel companies at that time raised the price of steel by \$6 a ton and have added on to this cost ever since. In other words, we had inflation. Because of these inflationary trends, since 1948 some 12 freight rate increases were allowed by the Board of Transport commissioners amounting in all to a 157 per cent increase in freight rates. When it became apparent that freight rate increases could not go on indefinitely because the farmers and the public could stand no further increases, a Royal Commission was set up on May 13th, 1959, with broad and comprehensive terms of reference including a study of freight rates.

Loss of rural employment in the past 32 years dropped from 63 per cent to 9.7 per cent which clearly indicated that the agricultural industry could bear no further freight rate increases. May I point out that the Saskatchewan government early on set up a special agency which opposed every freight rate increase which took place since 1948, but to little avail. Finally freight rates were frozen in 1959 and a \$20,000,000 subsidy to reduce the 17 per cent freight rate increase allowed in 1958. This permitted a reduction to a 10 per cent rate increase. Rates were finally frozen in 1959 at a nine per cent further increase. The first hearing of the Royal Commission held in Saskatchewan took place in Regina, February 12th, 13th and 15th in 1960. Certain departments of the provincial government and other organizations made submissions. The first report of the Commission was made in 1961 and the second report early in 1962. The Commission recommended de-regulation of the railway by setting minimum and maximum rate levels, thus eliminating direct appeals to the Board of Transport Commissioners. We still do not know what the minimum and maximum rates are. We do know, however, that the Royal Commission said that 8,600 miles of rail lines in Canada were uneconomic and possibly subject to abandonment over a period of 15 years.

The railways were expected to begin abandonment within five years. In the interval a subsidy of \$1,500 per mile was proposed amounting to \$13,000,000 annually on lines for which the railways might apply for abandonment. This was obviously granted to make railway abandonment easy for the railroads over a period of time and to make abandonment more palatable to the public. The CPR had already applied. Over 3,000 miles under this plan were slated

for abandonment in Saskatchewan and that's a lot of railway. The CPR had then already applied for 81 miles of abandonment and indicated that over 1,100 miles of low density lines were under consideration for abandonment because these lines carry less than 100,000 net tons per mile of track per year. This particularly applies to grain. It appears therefore, that the sum total of the Royal Commission's recommendation was massive rail line abandonment. The word rationalization has been given many connotations. In this connection a statement attributed to Mr. E. Sinclair, CPR counsel, is most interesting when he blandly indicated that rationalization means abandonment or an increase in the Crow's Nest rates. This was a challenge thrown down by the counsel for the CPR on behalf of this Railway Company. The entire matter of rail line abandonment is emphasized sharply now by the current failure of the CPR to fulfil scheduled wheat shipment to export positions to meet Canada's contracted wheat sale agreements. The abandonment of passenger service is also associated with the CPR's concept of rail restriction and abandonment generally. Many now openly express the opinion that the CPR wants to rid itself entirely of the responsibility of providing rail service regardless of the fact that in the original agreement of 1881 with the government of Canada huge land grants with mineral rights were acquired by the CPR. This amounted to some 44,000,000 acres. I wish to draw to your attention, Mr. Speaker, that this is equal to the total cultivated acreage of farmland in Saskatchewan, plus \$106,000,000 cash as a generous public bonus to build and operate railways to the benefit of the Canadian economy. It is, therefore, high time that any new federal government authority must insist that the CPR live up to its moral and legal obligations to provide rail services — even though certain branch lines and other services may show a loss — by taking into consideration the revenue from all alienated resources acquired as a free gift by the CPR, the 1897 Crow's Nest Pass agreement, and the added and growing freight revenues from potash soon to be equal to some 350,000,000 bushels of wheat, all of which will be hauled for \$6 a ton more than the equivalent rate for moving a ton of wheat. This is a very remunerative new source of revenue to the railways but not too much has been said about it.

It is clear, Mr. Speaker, that the CPR has an insatiable appetite for profit even though it means wholesale rail line abandonment while still making profits from its free-gift resource revenue. The CPR has apparently managed to convince the federal government and the board of Transport Commissioners and others that revenue from its other resource enterprises should not be taken into consideration when rail line abandonment and maintenance of other rail services are under consideration. With this contention we certainly cannot agree. I, therefore, trust that any proposed new rail line authority will include revenue from these resources before permitting any unjustified rail abandonment or other services. For example, Mr. Speaker, in an article appearing in the Leader Post, February 15th, it was stated that Consolidated Mining and Smelting Company of Canada of Trail, B.C. showed net earnings of \$53,000,000 or \$3.18 per share compared to \$39,500,000 and \$2.37 per share in 1964. The previous years were 1964 and 1965 as at February 15th. This covers operations after consolidation with wholly owned subsidiaries including growing revenues from the Pine Point mines. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to recall any decision made by the Board of Transport Commissioners that went against the CPR, like the some 12 freight rate increases that I mentioned, which amounted to an increase of 157 per cent. In short, we have lost all the battles to date to this giant private enterprise company which seems to now dominate the government of Canada to the exclusion of the public good of Canada.

March 15, 1966

If the CPR continues in its dominant purpose of ignoring its responsibilities as a beneficial national transportation enterprise, exclusively, in favor of its moneymaking subsidiaries then it should be nationalized. This is the considered opinion of farm organizations. I mention here not only the Farmers' Union but also the Canadian Federation of Agriculture which certainly is not noted for making extravagant requests and is quite conservative in its viewpoints. The Canadian Federation of Agriculture has called for the nationalization of the CPR. This, Mr. Speaker, is the considered opinion of not only farm organizations. More people are inclining their thoughts in this direction, including Mr. Green, the federal Minister of Agriculture, who feels that the CPR should hand back the oil wells, mines and other profitable enterprises which were free gifts from the nation. In support of this, Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer to various press clippings to make my point that people in high places, people affiliated with different political parties, are looking more and more with apprehension at the way things are drifting. Mr. Green, for example, when he was out west provoked certain comments in regard to his statements. I have here an editorial which appeared in the Leader Post of January 15th, 1966, in which it says in referring to Mr. Green:

He accused the railways of placing profit before service and in his criticism he was particularly scathing in his reference to the Canadian Pacific which now is allegedly drawing profits from mineral rights, mines and other gifts from the nation for providing transcontinental rail service.

He goes on:

When it was pointed out the railways claimed the Crow's Nest Pass rates covering export grain were hopelessly inadequate because they were based on an 1897 agreement, Mr. Green suggested that if the CPR is not prepared to move grain at this rate, it should hand back the oil wells, the mines and other profitable enterprises which have been free gifts from the nation.

To examine some further quotes, this editorial appeared in the Western Producer:

Mr. Green referred to the almost invaluable rights, land, minerals and other amenities given to the CPR at the time it was built. These amenities were handed over in consideration of the fact that the railway's profit position would be limited because the railway would be required to perform a public duty.

And a further comment when referring to the need for a reintroduction of a railway bill which will effectively tackle this whole sorry business of branch line abandonment:

Mr. Pickersgill's previous effort, Bill C120, quietly abandoned at the end of 1964, and not heard of since, was a complete fiasco as far as the users of branch lines were concerned.

Some further quotes again referring to Mr. Green. This comes from the Western Producer with the heading, "New Minister Raps Policies of Railways" and here the writer says:

Mr. Green found it incredible that a shortage of boxcars

developed. He said we might as well be back in the Stone Age. He said he had no sympathy with the CPR's claim that it's a matter of economics, that the company is in business to make profits. He said that when the CPR was given this monopoly 100 years ago, it undertook certain public duties that are as binding today as they were then.

I wish the hon. members would keep these statements in mind because I do hope to propose an amendment which I hope will get some support in this house.

When he was asked about the railway's claim that they lose money hauling grain under the Crow's Nest Pass agreement he said again that if the CPR's lands and mineral rights were returned to the crown there would be sufficient earnings from royalties to subsidize the handling of grain. With this we all agree. These are well established facts and are beyond argument.

I have a further comment here in an editorial written in the Leader Post under date of January 29th, which quotes Mr. Manning of all people, this dedicated private enterprise Premier in the rich province of Alberta — it came rather strangely from him but certainly he was another one that was inclined to the view that either this company give up some of these resources or in the alternative the government take over and nationalize this rail system taking sufficient from these resources to do the kind of job that the CPR was expected to do under its agreement. Mr. Manning is quoted as saying:

The CPR isn't losing money as a company, it has lots of other activities including mining and oil interests.

Mr. Manning should speak with authority on that subject because a good many of the CPR's remunerative resources are in the province of Alberta and more particularly in the North West Territories. He goes on:

The railway's method of financing is to break each division into its own department. Not many companies can run that way. You must be prepared to operate something making no money or very little and pay for them from other branches of the operation.

And a further one, here is a quotation from Mr. Fulton who is very much perturbed about the abandonment of the Dominion; it runs through Mr. Fulton's riding in Kamloops. He said:

The CPR was making enormous profits out of the land grants and mineral rights it had been given by parliament as public policy. The company derived an advantage, a preferred position out of the public domain. Mr. Fulton said the CPR is under an obligation to make a return to Canada even, as it claimed, it was operating services at a loss.

A few further comments and these are quite interesting and enlightening coming from Conservative Members of Parliament. One, Clifford Smallwood MP for Battle River-Camrose, said:

The CPR had been handed a fortune in land and other benefits in 1881 to build railways and provide perpetual and efficient service. They were given the goose that laid the golden egg. Now that they have got the golden egg, they have tried to give the government back the goose. Apparently the attitude of the CPR was that efficiency

March 15, 1966

meant profitability. This attitude was being upheld by the Commission who ruled last year that the CPR could scrap the Dominion.

These are the real interesting quotes. Again this is an article appearing in the Leader Post, February 23rd under the heading, "Report Going Down the Drain". This is contributed to a Conservative Member of Parliament who said:

As the Conservatives are not officially Socialists their views are perhaps more startling. "The CPR", charged Mr. Smallwood, the member for Battle River-Camrose, "hopes that it will be taken over. I am one hundred per cent convinced that that is the CPR's motive. I am a long way from being a Socialist, thank heaven, but if that is the game the CPR intends to play in cutting down on every service to the Canadian people, then the time has come for the government to take over not only the operation of the railway but the operation of all its enterprises. If we are to be given back the goose we also want the golden egg."

And I could quote other similar references made by other members of the house of all political stripes including Social Crediters. Mr. Thompson said pretty much the same thing.

No, Mr. Speaker, at the very least, if it should be decided by the government to nationalize the CPR because in the opinion of its officials it is not a paying proposition, then as part of any agreement in this regard the CPR might be given the choice of giving up either these resources or its transportation system. If the ownership of its transportation services alone is nationalized, then at the very least the land and mineral resources still under the control of the company should pay royalties to offset any disadvantages of operating this transportation system separate from the gift profits accruing from the land and mineral resources given to it under the original agreement. I should point this out too, particularly to hon. members opposite who are dedicated to the principles of private enterprise, I don't think it is proper, fair or reasonable that one private enterprise company should enjoy such a tremendous advantage over others, as a result of having had given to it 44,000,000 acres of land and other financial gifts, all of which are now returning to them huge profits and which are also receiving royalties from other companies, oil companies and mineral companies while developing CPR owned land. I don't think it's fair. It puts them almost in a position of a god in the midst of the entire free enterprise world. So I could argue if on that basis if on no other basis, but I am arguing here principally on the basis that the transportation system and its proper operation is essential to the whole economy of Canada. As I said the other day, this is a most essential factor in uniting this country solidly together.

We have been talking in a tedious vacuum about rail line abandonment and rail line rationalization for years. The only effective manner in which the rationalization of our railway transportation system can be achieved is by public ownership under a policy of serving the best interest of Canada as a whole without discrimination as presently exists. We passed a resolution not long ago in this legislature in which we complained about discriminatory freight rates, and this is a very real complaint that we have had with us for many years. If we are going to remove this discrimination, not only as it effects Saskatchewan, but other parts of Canada as well, I am firmly of the belief that the

nationalization of the rail transportation system is essential. This, Mr. Speaker, is certainly not any crazy Socialist dream. It is not a matter of philosophy at all; it's becoming a matter of urgent necessity. I can remember years ago when I first became interested in the farm movement, we were then calling for nationalization of the rail transportation system. This was in the early twenties. Here we are now in the year 1966 and instead of the whole problem of discrimination in freight rates having been improved it has become worse. Now, it has reached the point where they want to pull out branch line railway service entirely. I think this is a most ridiculous situation.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I am going, in support of my arguments, to refer to some of the statements made by the hon. members opposite in this debate. I think they pretty well support my contention for the amendment calling for nationalization. The hon. member for Yorkton (Mr. Gallagher) said that "if continued demands are" — if I am not exactly right the hon. members will correct me — I quote him as saying:

If continued demands for freight increase was to be stopped something different and drastic had to be done.

With this I agree, and it will have to go much farther than simply calling for an agency that's going to rationalize rail line abandonment. There is no manner in which we can expect that the word rationalization will safely prevent abandonment. Rationalization will not properly cover such things as running rights over the different roads and avoiding back hauls and all of these things. So, in reply to this drastic action demand, all I've got to say is let's go for nationalization on this.

The hon. member for Gravelbourg (Mr. Coderre) had some strong words to say:

We are fighting a small group of entrenched men who sought to obtain an abandonment decision, who seek to increase their own economic power at the expense of the public good.

This is a pretty strong statement coming from the hon. member from Gravelbourg and I think we ought to back it up. Let's do something. He says:

It's not losses but profits the CPR is worried about. Therefore, it should not be allowed to abandon rail lines. We must stand together.

With this I am in full agreement. Let's stand together and let's stand together in a positive way of finding the solution to the problem of rail line abandonment and the problem of properly rationalizing our transportation system.

The hon. member for Elrose (Mr. Leith) made remarks that appealed to me very greatly. He said Bill C120 was faulty. Well, we know it's faulty and it's practically a thing of the past. He mentioned that the cost of abandonment to local governments, taxes and assessments would be affected. Building higher standard roads would increase costs for municipalities. The cost of hauling grain also mentioned the gift assets owned by the CPR, the land, oil, gas and other minerals, including offshore rights, oyster beds, yes, even oyster beds.

Mr. W.S. Howes (Kerrobot-Kindersley): — For sure.

Mr. Nollet: — Yes, and he said also that when the CPR, which has ferrying service to Vancouver Island, discontinued the operations of the ferry service in the winter time, the private enterprise Social Credit government in British Columbia got its dander up and got into the ferry business itself. The hon. member for Elrose seemed to say that they were fully justified in doing so. (I am sorry, it should have been the member for Kerrobert-Kindersley, Mr. Howes). The government operated that service successfully and justifiably. I am suggesting now that we are in the position where we have got to face the necessity of asking our federal government to nationalize the CPR. Heaven knows we have given them enough, but they did not respond by providing proper service. They are now talking about rail line abandonment and I believe the time has come when we say to them, "Okay, we'll run the railways and run them as they ought to be run and we will take from you royalties as we do from other companies that are in the field of developing our natural resources". The hon. member from Kerrobert-Kindersley (Mr. Howes) also mentioned other possibilities, things that could be done, larger boxcars that operate much more inexpensively. He mentioned a saving of 13 to 14 per cent in this regard. He mentioned duplication of lines and that off-branch line costs should be investigated. He didn't mention, however, the back hauls that have been taking place in grain and the fact that if we could integrate these rail services by interchangeability, tremendous economies could be effected. May I suggest that this can only be done where the two lines are operated as one. So, I am asking the members of the house to support this amendment to the amendment and I, therefore, Mr. Speaker, beg leave of the assembly to move, seconded by the hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Snyder) that the amendment be amended by leaving out the word "establish" and inserting the words

Nationalize the Canadian Pacific Railway at a price arrived at after taking into consideration the profits made by the CPR by virtue of the cash, land and other resources granted to that company and that the federal government also establish . . .

Then the entire resolution, that is the resolution as amended as amended, as Mr. Speaker, would say, would read:

That this assembly urges the federal government to nationalize the Canadian Pacific Railway at a price arrived at after taking into consideration the profits made by the CPR by virtue of the cash, land and other resources granted to that company and that the federal government also establish a rail rationalization authority at the earliest possible date with full power to examine the services provided by all transportation media, and that no rail lines be abandoned before a proper assessment has been made of the effects of rail rationalization on the social and economic life of communities affected.

The sub-amendment was negatived on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 23

Messieurs

Lloyd
Cooper (Mrs.)
Wood

Willis
Nicholson
Kramer

Snyder
Brotten
Larson

Nollet
Walker
Brockelbank (Kelsey)
Blakeney
Davies
Thibault

Dewhurst
Berezowsky
Michayluk
Smishek
Link

Robbins
Pepper
Brockelbank (Saskatoon City)

NAYS — 29

Messieurs

Howes
McFarlane
Boldt
Cameron
Steuart
Gardiner (Melville)
Guy
Merchant (Mrs.)
Loken
MacDougall

Grant
Coderre
Bjarnason
Cuelenaere
McIsaac
MacDonald
Gallagher
Breker
Leith
Radloff

Romuld
Weatherald
MacLennan
Larochelle
Hooker
Coupland
Gardner (Moosomin)
Mitchell
Pederson

Amendment agreed to.

Motion, as amended, was agreed to.

MOTION: INCOME TAX EXEMPTION

The assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mrs. S. Merchant (Saskatoon City):

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

and the proposed amendment thereto moved by Mr. Breker (Humboldt):

That the following words be added at the end:

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

Mr. W.E. Smishek (Regina East): — Mr. Speaker, I understand that under the rules I must confine my remarks to the amendment. However, permit me, Mr. Speaker, to express my commendation to the lady member for Saskatoon (Mrs. Merchant) in bringing forward this resolution for the consideration of the assembly. I would also like to commend the hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Breker) for his amendment. I believe the amendment broadens, improves and strengthens the original motion. It recognizes the largest of costs applicable to the workers. This exemption would benefit almost every wage earner in the province. May I say that it was my intention to bring before this assembly a resolution similar to the one proposed but providing for a few more exemptions. However, the two members beat me to the punch. It really doesn't matter who brings a resolution of this nature for the consideration of the assembly. The important thing is that this assembly consider this type of proposal, pass it and exert as much pressure as possible on the

March 15, 1966

government of Canada to correct an injustice.

On checking the debates and proceedings from previous years, Mr. Speaker, I notice that you, Sir, in 1964 moved a resolution which enunciated the same principle as it embodied in the present resolution. Your resolution in 1964 received approval from members of both sides of the house. I would, therefore, hope that the amendment as proposed by the hon. member from Humboldt and ultimately a resolution with amendments will equally receive the unanimous approval of this legislature.

Organized labor, the Canadian Labor Congress, has urged the government of Canada to remove this and other discriminatory features of the income tax for a long time, but apparently the governments at Ottawa have not been influenced by the resolution that this assembly passed a couple of years ago any more than they have been influenced by the pressures exerted by organized labor. Liberals in Ottawa, as in Saskatchewan, seem to have three speeds when it comes to recognizing the needs of the workers, slow, dead slow, and stop.

It is my intention to move a further amendment to strengthen the resolution and the amendment. There are another equally important inequities that require correction. It seems to me that in endorsing this kind of resolution, Mr. Speaker, we should cover as broad an area as possible and urge correction of injustices where they exist rather than deal with them on a piecemeal basis.

The member from Humboldt (Mr. Breker) pointed out that the present legislation discriminates. Every other group in our society is in one form or another allowed to charge costs of travel to and from their place of work. Businessmen, professionals and others are allowed such exemptions from income tax. But wage earners do not have the same right. Members will recall that last year when we considered the bill which exempts purple gas from taxation, I urged that similar consideration be given to wage earners and that they should also be given the right to travel to and from on gasoline that is tax free. The Premier who is also the Provincial Treasurer did not see fit to extend the same right and privileges to the working people as he did to the farm population.

The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Gardiner) told us the other day that since the present administration took office there has been a tax relief of \$20,000,000 but as far as the wage earners are concerned they have not had any tax relief at the hands of the present administration, but in fact they have and continue to have an increased burden of taxation. For example, the medical and hospital tax was increased by \$20 to families and \$10 to individuals. Because the government has refused to recognize and meet the needs of rising education costs wage earners have had to pay larger taxes in the form of property taxes. Last week the government members approved a bill increasing the gasoline tax by one cent per gallon or seven per cent. The Minister of Social Welfare (Mr. Boldt) has told us that the automobile insurance will be up by 11 per cent. There will also be some slight increases in the cost of motor licenses. It will even cost the workers more money to stay clean these days. In view of this record the time is long overdue that the Liberal government and members on the other side of the house do express some concern about the wage earners and the need to give them some tax relief.

Significantly, however, Mr. Speaker, it is that the members opposite are going to Ottawa for a wage earners tax relief. Now

about the Provincial Treasurer recognizing on a provincial level, the plight of the workers rather than repeatedly increasing their taxes and particularly taxes which will increase the cost of transportation through increased gasoline tax, increased license plates, increased automobile insurance and so on. The Premier had an opportunity to show his good faith. He could have allowed a reduction in gasoline tax for workers using their automobiles to and from work. I suggest that the Premier instead struck a blow to the advocates of the present resolution by increasing the gasoline tax and thus increasing transportation costs to the workers.

In supporting the amendment, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that with increased industrialization and with increased urbanization the cost of transportation to workers is going to rise as they will have to travel longer distances to work and from work. We know that transportation costs provided by public services have also increased sharply in recent years. Individual bus fares in the city of Regina have increased to 20 cents per fare. Therefore, if the worker goes to work and comes home for lunch by way of public transportation he will spend approximately 80 cents per day. Considering that on the average there are close to 22 working days in a month, this means that he will spend over \$200 a year using public services. If he uses a car the cost on the average will be much greater depending on the distance he will have to travel. We know that those workers in the potash mine developments at Esterhazy, Belle Plaine, Allan and other areas have to travel as much as 50 miles to and from work and even more. Travelling these distances on a year round basis means a fairly large expenditure for transportation. We are also finding that with more industrial rationalization taking place and with small plants closing down and companies moving into larger cities, these developments too are creating an additional problem. For example, I know of workers who commute daily back and forth to Regina from Moose Jaw. The operations in Moose Jaw have closed down. The workers were given an opportunity to work in the city of Regina at their branches here. Because of the feeling of insecurity, the threat of automation, and the danger of their jobs disappearing in the future, they have not sold their homes in Moose Jaw and moved their families to the city of Regina. Therefore, they are commuting every day. Transportation cost in earning a living in these circumstances is extreme. It should be allowed as a proper income tax exemption. The proposals contained in the amendment are not a solution to the overall problem of taxation on low income groups, which are too high. There are many other expenditures that are essential to be exempt. What is really needed together with this proposal is a larger basic income tax exemption. With this amendment, Mr. Speaker, it would go a long way to relieve the problem. It is my intention to move an amendment which would also recognize the cost of repairs in the case of equipment and instruments used by workers. I know that the lady member from Saskatoon (Mrs. Merchant) did really intend to include this in the resolution. This was the principle that she did discuss initially. However, for no apparent reason this was omitted. I believe it is important that repair costs be added to the main resolution and that repair costs of tools be exempt from income tax. I would hope that she and her colleagues go along with this kind of change.

Mr. Speaker, there is a further important area that needs to be recognized, that is the exemptions of travel and living expenses incurred by persons who are required to live and work away from their normal place of residence; these should be recognized as a proper exemption. I know that these are problems that are arising more often. This should be an important principle for us to recognize.

March 15, 1966

The Premier made a good deal of noise when he announced last year the exemption of some 20 agricultural items and another 15 this year. The agricultural items which will be exempt from sales tax this year, I suggest, are quite insignificant. But in announcing them he introduced them with a good deal of gusto and force as if they were of great importance. It would seem to me that if our Premier wanted to show a sign of fairness he would have exempt from sales tax items used by wage earners in earning their everyday living; for example, such things as saws, planes, sanders, wrenches, sockets, micrometers, testing equipment and a host of other things that are required by carpenters, mechanics, and other in order to earn a living.

The lady member for Saskatoon (Mrs. Merchant) in her argument drew attention to the fact that professional people like doctors and dentists and others are able to get tax exemptions from instruments that they use. I believe she used the words that farmers can get exemptions for 1,001 things. Business people can get tax exemptions from sales promotions expenditures and expenditures that they even incur in entertainment, but workers are unable to get a single item exempt.

I checked with a mechanic friend of mine the other day as to the amount of tools that he is required to purchase in the performance of his work. He tells me that a mechanic cannot get by without an outlay of \$1,000 for tools, that is, provided he is limited to a certain line of work. A mechanic who does motor tune-ups, front end work, transmissions and all around work on automobiles, requires at least an expenditure of \$2,000 on tools. In his own case he has an investment in excess of \$2,500. He tells me that such items as torque wrenches cost a minimum of \$85 and the better ones \$200. The four per cent sales tax exemption would have meant a considerable saving to the workers. So while income tax exemptions from these items are important, we can also do something on a provincial scale and I commend that for the Premier's consideration.

I also feel, Mr. Speaker, that persons who will require to keep two homes, in such cases costs incurred in travel and living expenses, should also be exempt from income tax. Due to greater mobility of certain jobs and climatic conditions, many wage earners have to work far away from their normal place of residence. Some employers allow such costs to be charged to the company. In such cases they would not be subject to income tax exemption. But there are jobs and employers that do not allow such expenses. I can give an example of a person living part of the year in my constituency. His home is and his family live in Weyburn. Seven or eight months of the year he works in the city of Weyburn and during the period of four to five months of the year, in order to maintain his employment, he has to work in the city of Regina. He, therefore, maintains two homes during such a period. The expenses he incurs in providing living accommodation and meals for himself in the city of Regina during this four or five month period are not paid by his employer. He has to assume these costs himself. It is only fair that in such cases people should be allowed to charge such costs against income tax.

Mr. Speaker, when I talk about wage earners and workers I mean it in the broad sense. I know of teachers who live in the city of Regina and who teach 30 or 40 miles in the country and vice versa. Therefore, other professional groups should also be recognized. I would hope that the mover of the motion (Mrs. Merchant) and the hon. member who proposed the first amendment (Mr. Breker) did intend that these people be given the same kind of

rights. I am sure that they did. Therefore, there are many more examples of injustices that can be cited in respect to the Canadian Income Tax laws. I know that organized labor has made many representations to have these corrected. In closing, I would hope that the members will see fit to support the resolution, the amendment and the sub-amendment. Mr. Speaker, I would now beg leave of the assembly to move the following sub-amendment:

Amend by inserting the words "and repair" between the words "purchase of " in the second line of the motion and that the following words be added at the end of the amendment:

"and further this assembly urges the government of Canada to amend the Income Tax Act to permit exemption of travel and living expenses incurred by persons who are required to live and work away from their normal place of residence".

The sub-amendment is seconded by the hon. member from Saskatoon (Mr. Link), my seatmate.

Mr. Speaker: — Let me draw your attention to Citation 202, subsection two of Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms:

As the proposal of an amendment to an amendment originates a fresh subject for consideration, the new question thus created must to prevent confusion be disposed of by itself. An amendment, when undergoing alteration, is therefore treated throughout as if it were a substantive motion upon which an amendment has been moved. The original motion accordingly is laid aside; and the amendment becomes for the time a separate question to be dealt with, until its terms are settled.

The amendment to the amendment because it seeks to amend the motion is therefore out of order.

Mr. J.H. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Mr. Speaker, on that point of order, could you read us the proposed amendment please, the amendment to the amendment or the sub-amendment?

Mr. Speaker: — Probably it would be better if I start from the beginning and read the motion, the amendment and the sub-amendment, or the proposed sub-amendment.

It has been moved by the member from Saskatoon (Mrs. Merchant), seconded by the member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald):

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

That is the main motion, to which an amendment has been moved by the member for Humboldt (Mr. Breker), seconded by the member for Elrose (Mr. Leith) that the following words be added after the word "employment" in the fourth line:

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

March 15, 1966

To which a sub-amendment has been offered and I want to make it perfectly plain that I am not putting the sub-amendment to the house. I am merely reading it. It has been moved by the member for Regina East (Mr. Smishek), seconded by the member for Saskatoon (Mr. Link), that the main motion be amended by inserting the words "and repairs" between the words "purchase of" in the second line of the motion and the following words be added at the end of the amendment:

"and further this assembly urges the government of Canada to amend the Income Tax Act to permit exemption of travel and living expenses incurred by persons who are required to live and work away from their normal place of residence".

Mr. J.H. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Mr. Speaker, I think your decision is correct because I know you cannot amend an amendment to the amendment; it can't also be an amendment to the motion. I agree with this but then it follows that once the amendment is dealt with this proposed sub-amendment could probably be in order.

Mr. Speaker: — I'll have to cross that bridge when I come to it.

Mr. W.G. Davies (Moose Jaw City): — Mr. Speaker, I think that the situation as it exists here is that the amendment to the amendment would have been in order had it not made reference at least in one part to the main motion. Half of it, as my friend from Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank) said is in order. I might suggest to you that that part that makes reference to the motion might be stricken out if your Honour would think that method was all right. If not, Mr. Speaker, I would . . .

Mr. Speaker: — It is not for the Chair to move hon. members' motions and amendments for them.

Mr. Davies: — All right, Mr. Speaker, I would beg leave to adjourn the debate.

The question being put on motion to adjourn the debate, it was negatived.

Hon. D.G. Steuart (Minister of Health): — We are not opposing adjournment of the debate because we think that the hon. member from Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank) had a suggestion. We are in favor of this proposed amendment, and I think once we have dealt with the amendment, the motion as amended can be then amended the way he wanted to and we can clear it up tonight.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether I can now move the amendment that I referred to you.

Mr. Speaker: — If I understand what the member is doing, he is moving his sub-amendment, which was out of order as a sub-amendment, he is now moving his amendment to the amended motion. It has been moved by the member for Regina East (Mr. Smishek), seconded by

the member from Saskatoon (Mr. Link) that the amendment as amended be amended by inserting the words "repair" and "purchase of" in the second line of the motion, and that the following words be added at the end of the amendment:

"and further this assembly urges the government of Canada to amend the Income Tax Act to permit exemption of travel and living expenses incurred by persons who are required to live and work away from their normal place of residence".

It is clearly amended. The debate continues on the amendment.

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Mr. Speaker, I am going to differ with your ruling there. Now, I know this looks foolish, but I would like to see it done properly. If you will read it carefully, Sir, you will find that the amendment now refers to an amendment. There is no amendment. There is only a motion before us, that the amend . . .

Mr. Speaker: — I said the motion as amended, we have amended this . . .

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — No, but later in the motion — I haven't got a copy of it here — but later in the member's motion, it says to add at the end of the amendment, and this puts it out of order. I think this is a case where we should adjourn the debate and write out the proper kind of an amendment.

Mr. Speaker: — Well, this is true, the member's point of order is well taken. I read the motion that the member had given to me as an amendment to the amendment. I just reeled it off the cuff and he is quite correct. Will somebody move the adjournment of the debate?

Mr. Davies: — Mr. Speaker, at this point, perhaps the house will agree to let me adjourn the debate and we can consider it.

Mr. Speaker: — Well, the member has had one adjournment motion voted down, he can't move another.

Mr. Davies: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, that was on the amendment, on another motion entirely.

Mr. Speaker: — Well, never mind. The member from Wadena (Mr. Dewhurst) is all ready to move it.

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

Debate adjourned.

MOTION: DISCLOSURE OF CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS

The assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion moved by Mr. J.E. Brockelbank (Saskatoon City):

That this assembly urges that legislation be laid before this assembly to provide that contributions to provincial

March 15, 1966

political parties, to candidates for office in provincial elections and to organizations participating in provincial elections be disclosed to the public, including contributions as follows: (a) all contributions by corporations; (b) all contributions by trade unions, trade associations and like bodies; and (c) all contributions by individuals over a specified figure per annum.

Mr. J.E. Brockelbank (Saskatoon City): — Mr. Speaker, in closing the debate on this particular resolution designed to disclose to the public the sources of all political funds, I feel that I can safely quote . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Are you closing the debate?

Mr. Brockelbank (Saskatoon City): — Yes.

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

Mr. G. Romuld (Canora): — Mr. Speaker, seeing I received applause before when I just moved a private member's bill, I thought I should get in on this one.

You know, I am quite intrigued by the sudden interest of the members opposite who now want to disclose all the donations that the political parties in Saskatchewan are going to receive. I think this could prove very embarrassing to members of the NDP party because I know that there are many NDP members that came to me before the last election and said, "Now, if you promise that you will not divulge this to any person in the constituency, we are willing to give a donation". They said, "We have had enough of this CCF outfit, but we don't like to come right out into the open". Now, Mr. Speaker, I know that many people, — I know that it applied in the constituency of Canora so I imagine it was going on elsewhere in the province of Saskatchewan, — were forced to pay into the CCF party when the CCF were in government. Many business people in the town of Preeceville, and other towns elsewhere in Canora constituency, were simply presented with a bill and they were told, "Now, you pay into the coffers of the CCF party or you may lose some business".

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romuld: — Now, if they want the evidence presented before the house, I had the privilege to talk to a man today who said he would not like to have his name mentioned. However, he said he would be prepared to bring his cancelled cheques here and he would swear on an affidavit that the only reason he had paid into it was that he was afraid after he had opened his business that he would lose the business because he would be boycotted. This went on and on all over. I, myself, one time was forced to buy a membership in a political party, and it was not the Liberals; it was the CCF and it was in 1951. Another man was working right beside me, a partsman in the garage where I worked. We were both presented with this little membership. If you look in the old files you probably will find my name in there. I don't like to boast about that. I had to admit that I was wrong.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romuld: — However, we were asked. They said, "We are not forcing you", but a little while after I was told it might be a little better to buy this because we could lose some business, because they were a few fairly good customers of ours that were voting CCF at that time. So we decided it was better to take this membership out in order to protect the little business we were getting from the CCF.

It was my privilege to travel through the province to quite some extent when I was working with an insurance company. How many hotel men told me that they were presented with this same type of bill. "Just give us a little donation, you know we control your business, we license you". Now, all of a sudden they want to know where our money is coming from. They were going to name the amounts high enough.

You know, it might be easier for them to do it because they know they are going to get a lot of money from the unions. They have forced these union members to pay into the CCF party, or the NDP party, or whatever party they are now; they are being forced by check-off dues. This is not a big amount each month, but every member is forced to do this. One more thing I believe they want to know is, that if they should by any remote chance, — because I don't think it will ever happen, — ever be the government again, here they would be able to go and pinpoint the civil servants that had paid into the Liberal party, and everyone of them would be fired the same as they were in 1944.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romuld: — In the last session, the Attorney General (Mr. Heald) tabled how many people, how many civil servants had been dismissed, how many had been fired, how many were transferred. And I think this is just what they are looking for in this resolution. Now, there would be no one that would be more interested than I would to know where they get all their money. They talk about the Liberals having money for campaigns. I want to tell you in the Canora constituency the CCF spent \$10 for every dollar I spent, and I still got 43 more votes.

Now, as much as I would like to support this resolution I find that I have to vote against it because I believe that I must protect the innocent people of the province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

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

Mr. Brockelbank (Saskatoon City): — Mr. Speaker, I am rather glad of that interruption. I think it will do more to put this resolution in a good light than anything else that has happened up to this point in the debate.

I was about to say, as Mr. Speaker put the question, that I would just like to quote a few more lines from the letter of Liberal Senator Charles G. Power to Rev. Dionne at Laval University.

March 15, 1966

Hon. D.G. Steuart (Minister of Health): — Is that a confession?

Mr. Brockelbank (Saskatoon City): — It may have been Chubby Powers' confession, I don't know.

I think the Political Expenditure Act of 1938 really deserves more study and consideration than has been given to it. At the time of its introduction it was greeted . . .

Hon. J.W. Gardiner (Minister of Public Works): — Mr. Speaker, I don't believe the speaker, in closing the debate, can bring new material into the debate or new arguments.

Mr. W.G. Davies (Moose Jaw City): — The member hasn't had even a chance to relate what he is going to say . . .

Mr. Gardiner (Melville): — He said it was new material.

Mr. Brockelbank (Saskatoon City): — Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, this is from the letter I quoted in the initial remarks on the debate.

Mr. Steuart: — It is a new part of the letter.

Mr. W.S. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition): — There is nothing to say that one can't say something different in rebuttal so long as it relates to something that has been said on the opposite side of the argument. That is what the member is proposing to do.

Mr. Brockelbank (Saskatoon City): — May I continue? Mr. Speaker, I know it is painful to the gentlemen to your right, but this is what the Senator had to say:

At the time of its introduction it was greeted with raucous and ribald laughter, as a lilywhite bill, and I rather suspect that its sponsorship by a hard-boiled politician did nothing to enhance its popularity.

The discussion that took place on this resolution the Thursday before last sort of brought to mind a Shakespearean soliloquy.

Mr. Steuart: — Is that one of the old Hansards you are quoting from?

Mr. Brockelbank (Saskatoon City): — One of yours . . .

Mr. Steuart: — One of the ones you have no use for?

Mr. Brockelbank (Saskatoon City): — And this particular, oh, there were some progressive ones. There was a particular Shakespearean soliloquy that sort of flitted across my mind as I was listening to the debate on the resolution from the other side of the house. I am sure you will

all recognize that particular soliloquy:

Tomorrow, and tomorrow, and tomorrow,
 Creeps in this petty pace from day to day
 To the last syllable of recorded time;
 and all our yesterdays have lighted fools
 The way to dusty death. Out, out, brief candle!
 Life's but a walking shadow: a poor player
 That struts and frets his hour upon the stage,
 And then is heard no more: it is a tale
 Told by an idiot, full of sound and fury,
 Signifying nothing.

In English literature, Mr. Speaker, Macbeth is realized as a tragedy, and I must say that the remarks of the hon. gentleman yesterday at the opening of the debate were tragic. The Liberal charges were plucked from thin air, as many charges of the member from Canora (Mr. Romuld) are, whereas our examples given in the debate were the result of judicial and legislative inquiry. I noticed when I was opening the debate I referred to the fact that the Canadian people were shocked and parliament was shocked to find that our political structures were being effectively infiltrated by money from the underworlds. I noticed audible sighs from the other side of the house. Just to reinforce those remarks I wanted to quote a recent disclosure, — this is with regard to a Montreal lawyer by the name of Lamontagne, who said that Denys had said this under oath:

Rivard now serving a 20 year prison term in the United States for narcotic offences was always a good friend of the party. He helped the party in the past and he might be needed to help it in the future elections.

Mr. Speaker, suppose for a moment that the reverse were true, suppose that the charges made by the members opposite had some substance in fact, suppose as the members opposite said we had our feet in the trough, suppose thousands of dollars from American Trade Unions were pouring into Canada in support of our party, suppose that brewery and liquor interest were being milked by our party. Mr. Speaker, here was the opportunity to put an end to that alleged practice.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank (Saskatoon City): — The members opposite would have seized the opportunity to expose our source of funds to the Saskatchewan public. What did they do, Mr. Speaker? They said the resolution was impractical, and couldn't be implemented. They said the resolution would regiment the individual contributor and would make his politics known to everyone so that he would be subjected to persecution. Mr. Speaker, everyone opposite had the opportunity to amend that resolution, to make it workable, to completely protect the identity of the individual, but none took that opportunity.

I will make no further . . .

Mr. Gardiner (Melville): — It is your resolution . . .

Mr. Brockelbank (Saskatoon City): — Yes, I expected that from the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Gardiner) but he has taken every opportunity when it was to his advantage to amend resolutions whether they were ours or not.

March 15, 1966

Mr. Gardiner (Melville): — I haven't.

Mr. Brockelbank (Saskatoon City): — People on your side of the house have, I must admit. I make no further remarks about the debate that has come on this resolution and I think the hon. members' arguments stand or fall on their merits. Never, when introducing this resolution, did I suggest to the exclusion of the other two parties that we were the virtuous ones. Never. On the contrary, I cited prominent Liberals and Conservatives in a most favourable light. Senator Power, Liberal; Senator Grossart, Conservative; James Scott, Liberal; Premier Lesage, Liberal. While I am speaking about the initial remarks, Mr. Speaker, I make no excuse nor did anyone on this side of the house for not bringing in this resolution 20 years ago or two years ago. I believe that one member of the cabinet on that side of the house referred to me as being naïve, and I must admit to being naïve about the chances of improving our democratic system, Mr. Speaker, rather than being proved cynical about our system. In closing I just want to refer to something that was on our desks, Mr. Speaker, a little card. It has the crest of Saskatchewan and a picture of the Legislative Building on the exterior, a picture of this chamber and a quotation in the corner. I think wrapped up in this quotation is the whole subject that I was trying to present to the legislature:

In a free country none govern except by consent of the governed.

and I thank the government for putting those on our individual desks.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The motion was negatived.

MOTION: RE SICKNESS AND ACCIDENT INSURANCE

The assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. W.G. Davies (Moose Jaw City):

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

Hon. L.P. Coderre (Minister of Labour): — Mr. Speaker, I have only about 45 seconds of this house's time, or I will take only 45 seconds. This resolution, Mr. Speaker, is another case of good principle, rendered inoperative by casual treatment and poor timing. The government, I assure you, Mr. Speaker, is fully conscious of the need to provide income protection for all in case of sickness or disability.

As you know, of course, a vast majority of cases are now covered by some plan or other. Many of these plans are available to the public at all times, but the programs that are suggested at this moment would require, Mr. Speaker, extensive consultation and co-operation with the federal government, with local

governments, and representatives of the various organizations, labour, farmers, professional people. When a new program like this is being considered, existing programs do require some adjustment to the new conditions that may arise. Universal income protection in case of sickness will likely require such consultation at the appropriate time. I submit, that it is the government's duty as well as its right to determine the most suitable form of consultation and study and the time when it can best be initiated with a real hope of success. Due to circumstances, mobility of work force and everything else, at this point it would not be expedient for the government to enter into this type of legislation. For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. W.S. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, just a few words that will be almost as brief as those of the hon. minister (Mr. Coderre) who has just taken his seat. It occurred to me that one thing he did, which perhaps he didn't intend to do was to give almost a complete statement of Liberal philosophy. "The principle is right but the time is wrong". This has been the sort of guiding principle of the Liberal party from time untold. However, leaving that aside for the moment, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that he has given a good argument for supporting the resolution, rather than for not supporting it.

He suggests that this is going to take a lot of time. He suggests this is going to mean consultation with the federal government, this is going to mean consultation with a great many other agents. What the resolution does, Mr. Speaker, is to ask this legislature to endorse the principle and then let the government get on with the business of considering the introduction of a plan which would mean doing the consultation which he has suggested is necessary. Every word he said argues in favor of him and others on that side of the house supporting the resolution, not voting against it.

This is a vote to support the principle and to ask the government to get on with the business of planning when to introduce it. If he is going to rely on the logic of his own argument then he is going to vote for the resolution rather than against it, as he said.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — I must advise the members the mover of the motion is about to close the debate. If anybody wishes to speak they must do so now.

Mr. W.G. Davies (Moose Jaw City): — Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to say any more than a few words; perhaps not much more than the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) a few minutes ago. I do think that I have never heard a more lame and lamentable argument against the resolution advanced than the one we heard from the Minister of Labour.

As the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) has said, almost every line that he uttered could be used as an argument for the resolution. The minister has said that the vast majority of the

March 15, 1966

people of the province are covered by some plan or another. My understanding is, Mr. Speaker, that the minister said that the vast majority of people were covered by some kind of plan. Some kind of plan means to me some plan or other, and I think there is a difference of opinion between us in that respect.

Now, I would challenge the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre), Mr. Speaker, to produce evidence that this is the case. I think he will find that even those that are covered by sick pay plans in industry and outside of it in Saskatchewan have the most meagre and most inadequate coverage. I say that he has absolutely no basis whatever, statistically or otherwise, for saying that the vast majority are covered by some kind of plan. There is no evidence; he has no statistics and he knows it. He has spoken about extensive consultation being necessary with the federal government and with local governments, and with farm labor, and co-operative organizations, Mr. Speaker, what is the matter with that? What is the matter with consultation by the government of this country in a serious matter of this sort? What is the matter with talking to the municipal organizations that also have an interest in this question? Certainly, there can be nothing the matter with talking to the farm people, the labor people and others who might have some interest in this very vital topic. What is the appropriate time for consultation? The minister argues that this is not the appropriate time. This kind of argument has been advanced on other social questions by the Liberal party at the national and at the provincial level for the past 50 years at least. The argument that the time is not expedient is the lamest argument that we have heard in the few words that we have had from the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre).

I have promised, Mr. Speaker, that I would not keep you long. We have had nothing from the government that in the slightest way disturbs the validity of this resolution. This resolution simply asks for consideration by the government of a plan by which both employed and self-employed persons and their families can be provided with income protection during periods of sickness or incapacity that are not now covered by existing programs. It's a question that can easily be settled. I say that if ever the time is expedient, the time is now.

The Premier, Wilful Wilbur, has come back amongst us again and raises the old question of "20 years". Well, I want to tell him that in the 20 years that we were in power in this province we proceeded progressively every year with some kind of social legislation.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Davies: — I say to my friend the Premier, just subside. Just sit back and I'll give him an opportunity now to stand up and be counted on how he votes for this resolution.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The motion was negatived on the following recorded division:

Yeas — 25
Messieurs

Lloyd
Cooper (Mrs.)
Wood
Nollet
Walker
Brockelbank (Kelsey)
Blakeney
Davies
Thibault

Willis
Whelan
Nicholson
Kramer
Dewhurst
Berezowsky
Michayluk
Smishek
Link

Snyder
Brotten
Larson
Robbins
Pepper
Brockelbank (Saskatoon City)
Pederson

Nays — 29
Messieurs

Thatcher
Howes
McFarlane
Boldt
Cameron
Steuart
Gardiner (Melville)
Guy
Merchant (Mrs.)
Loken

MacDougall
Grant
Coderre
Bjarnason
Cuelenaere
McIsaac
MacDonald
Gallagher
Breker
Leith

Radloff
Romuld
Weatherald
MacLennan
Larochelle
Hooker
Coupland
Gardner (Moosomin)
Mitchell

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