

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Second Session — Fifteenth Legislature
35th Day

Monday, March 28, 1966.

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

WELCOME TO VISITORS

Mr. E. Whelan (Regina North): — Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to welcome to the Assembly on your behalf and on behalf of all members a group of about 90 grade seven and eight students from St. Patrick's School in north-west Regina. Their teachers, Mr. Terry, Mr. Goulet and Mr. Cantor are with them in the east gallery. This is a special project for these alert young people. Members, I am sure, join me in expressing the wish that their stay with us this afternoon will be pleasant, memorable and informative.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. A. Mitchell (Bengough): — Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce to you and the members of this Assembly a group seated in the west gallery. They are 65 grade eight students from the Assiniboia Public School, one of the largest schools in our Bengough constituency. Mr. Speaker, one of these students this afternoon is Bernie Asbell, son of the late member of this legislature. These young people are accompanied here today by their teachers, Mrs. Kwasnik, Mrs. Cowan, Mr. Kramer, and Mr. Smith, and their bus drivers, Mr. Walter Saddlemeyer and Mr. Sam Batty. They have already toured the RCMP buildings, enjoyed a tour of the Legislative Building, and have had lunch in the cafeteria. I am sure you all join with me in welcoming these visitors here today and wish them an interesting and enjoyable visit, and, after their visit to the Museum, a safe journey home.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. F. K. Radloff (Nipawin): — Mr. Speaker, members of the legislature, I would like to bring to your attention a fine group of business people and their wives from the town of Nipawin. They are seated in the speaker's gallery. There are some 37 people in the group and included amongst this group is the President of the Chamber, Mr. William Mason, and His Worship, the mayor of Nipawin, Mr. Watson and the former President, Mr. Jackson, who was a leader of the group last year. Also included amongst this group is my lovely wife, Ina. She is down to see that I earn part of the pay that I am getting from the legislature.

On behalf of all present I would like to extend a welcome to this group and wish them a most interesting and informative day and wish them a safe journey home.

Mr. W. S. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, through you and for all the members I would like to extend a welcome to a group of students in the Speaker's gallery from the Composite High School at Delisle. Delisle, as a number of members will know, is a town situated south and west of Saskatoon. It is almost but not quite

March 28, 1966

over looking beautiful Pike Lake in that part of the province. The name will be very familiar as a community to particularly those in the group who have been sports followers throughout the years. Whether one mentions hockey or baseball or curling, the name of Delisle is one very frequently mentioned throughout the province and many other parts of Canada. Since it is a composite school the young people who are with us today are drawn from a considerable area around the town. Some of them I imagine will come from the constituency of my hon. friend from Rosetown (Mr. Loken) as well. It is good to have the opportunity to wish them well and hope that they have an interesting and worthwhile visit here. If my French was not equally bad as the Attorney General's (Mr. Heald) I would say something to them in French, but in the meantime it is good to have them here and we wish them a safe journey home.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

WELCOME TO MOOSE JAW HOCKEY CLUB

Mr. G. T. Snyder (Moose Jaw): — Mr. Speaker, I think it might be appropriate to draw to the attention of the members the fact that the Moose Jaw Kinsmen's Hockey Club was successful in capturing the Midget Double A Championship as a result of a victory over Saskatoon Nutana yesterday. I would add that this is the first time since the year 1936 that Moose Jaw has had this honour. I think it might be fitting also at this time for me to draw to the attention of the hon. members the fact that the coach of that particular hockey club is one Mr. Colin Thatcher. I think members on this side of the House would want to acknowledge this and to draw a conclusion, perhaps, contrary to a previous impression held. I am sure they will recognize now that there is indeed some ability in the family.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

REPORT ON SASKATCHEWAN SAVINGS BONDS

Mr. A. Mitchell (Bengough): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I wonder if the Premier or Provincial Treasurer, would give us a report with respect to the results of the no. 6 Saskatchewan Savings Bonds?

Hon. W. Ross Thatcher (Premier): — I will be pleased to do that tomorrow, I am sorry I don't have it with me.

ANNOUNCEMENT RE TECHNICAL PROJECTS APPROVED BY FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Hon. G. J. Trapp (Minister of Education): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to announce to the House that four more technical and vocational high school projects have been approved by the federal government. These projects are at Lloydminster, Melfort, Saskatoon and Swift Current. The total value of the projects, without equipment, is more than \$11,850,000. If you add to these four projects the Yorkton and Regina projects which are under construction at the present time, the buildings alone will represent \$17,185,000. This will mean that six technical-vocational projects are underway. Others throughout the province are in various stages of planning at the present time.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — I would like to say that the same projects were underway a year ago as I recall it. The Minister of Education (Mr. Trapp) some weeks ago indicated that he would be able to distribute to the members information with respect to the distribution of the 1966 school grants. It being close to estimate time I wonder what progress has been made in this.

Mr. Trapp: — I could not say for certain, it might be delivered this afternoon, but I would hope tomorrow. I just talked to the members of the branch and they are nearly ready, and I hope to give this to the members.

SECOND READINGS

Hon. G. J. Trapp (Minister of Education) moved second reading of **Bill No. 46 — An Act to amend The Free Text Books Act.**

He said: The provision of free texts for grade nine in the province of Saskatchewan in the fall of 1966 is a history-making event. The granting of free texts to elementary students had its beginning in the year 1909, according to the public Accounts of that year, \$12,275.16 being provided for this purpose. Public Accounts of 1915 showed \$16,455.15 for the provision of Alexandra readers to the schools in Saskatchewan. From time to time other texts were added to the free elementary text list. At present nearly all elementary authorized texts are free to students, the exceptions being Science texts in grades five to eight and certain authorized work-books. However, provision of free texts to high school students has been delayed until the present. So as I say, this is an important occasion because it marks the beginning of a new trend in free textbooks. It marks the first time that a high school grade in Saskatchewan will receive free texts.

What is more, I am certain it is the intention of the present government to continue to enlarge this program so that before long all high school students will be provided with free texts. You are aware, Mr. Speaker, that the Liberals during the 1964 campaign promised free high school texts. With the passing of the Bill we are taking the first steps in fulfilment of the promise to provide free high school texts. It is the purpose of the Bill to provide free texts to all Saskatchewan grade nine students this year. The supplying of textbooks to high school students has been a goal that has been talked about for a good many years. In fact twenty-three years ago the present opposition was seeking a mandate and committed itself to this goal. In a radio broadcast on February 16, 1943, the then Leader of the CCF, Mr. Douglas, is reported in the Saskatchewan commonwealth of march 10, 1943, page 8, to have said the following in respect to free texts and I quote:

A second step which a CCF government would take to provide a greater measure of equal educational opportunities for all would be to provide free texts and supplies throughout our school system. Rural people should not be hindered or barred from gaining an education because he or she cannot buy books and supplies necessary to attend school. A CCF government would, therefore, take steps to make these available to all school children in

March 28, 1966

Saskatchewan.

This was twenty-three years ago. One year later, when again there was a report in the Saskatchewan Commonwealth on March 17, 1944, page 5, under the caption:

The CCF Program for Saskatchewan — Know What You Are Voting For. Free Text Books and Supplies.

A CCF government will remove this obstacle to educational opportunities by providing free textbooks and supplies throughout the school system.

Well, again I want to remind members of this House these were statements made some twenty-three years ago, and I want to remind the people of this province that after twenty years in office the CCF failed to keep this promise.

Some of our friends opposite will no doubt mention that they instituted a rental program, but I want to say that at no time had even one-quarter of the students availed themselves of rented text books through this program. Nor can it be said by any stretch of the imagination that the rental program was a free text program. It wasn't free to the students or to the boards, but it did represent a cost to both the boards and the students. The growth of the rental program has been disappointing, to say the least. The present Bill to provide free texts to grade nine students will provide boards with grants to purchase the texts. Our purpose in providing grants to boards is to give a measure of flexibility to school systems in providing texts. Free texts will mean much to the students and to the teachers. The student will be able to start the school year with his full complement of texts the first day. The teacher will be able to start the year's work knowing that all the students in the class have their texts. Furthermore, it will be a great saving to parents. A full set for the four-year period is valued at \$130 to \$150; this will be a great saving to large families.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize that this is a history-making event in the field of Saskatchewan education. It marks the beginning of free textbooks to high school students. This first step will provide free texts for grade nine students who are Saskatchewan residents. This will mean free texts to private high schools as well as to all other high schools. It will mean free texts to private high schools which do not qualify for high school grants. We do not want to discriminate against any Saskatchewan grade nine student.

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave of the Assembly to move second reading of this Bill.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. D. W. Michayluk (Redberry): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak to this Bill I am both surprised and amazed at some of the statements made by the Minister of Education (Mr. Trapp). He stated that nothing was done in the past 20 years with respect to free textbooks in the province of Saskatchewan.

He may be correct in saying that no provision was made in providing text books at the high school level, however, if the Minister of Education and the present government are to implement their 1964 election pledge, it will take some while to do so. Two years have gone by with provision for one high school

grade; that is grade nine. The minister knows full well that provision was made for free textbooks for grades one to eight, at the elementary level.

The minister should be in a position as a schoolteacher to know what changes in education took place in the Province of Saskatchewan in the past twenty years. I heard the minister make a comment this afternoon that he had been teaching since 1928, or thereabouts. The hon. minister is aware of the progress that has been made with regard to educational facilities such as plant, equipment and teaching aids. Mr. Minister you are aware of the opportunities that were made to our students in Saskatchewan during this period. You are no doubt aware of the centralization in rural areas together with improvements in broadening the scope of courses available, libraries etc. The use of television, radio, film strips, record players. All these have been made available to practically all the schools in the province. For the present Minister of Education to get up, Mr. Speaker, and refer to what Mr. T. C. Douglas said in 1943, and what was not done is not in accordance with fact. The minister knows full well that strides have been made in rural Saskatchewan since the election of a CCF government in 1944. I am glad that the present government is doing something for grade nine but the greatest progress in education for the welfare of those to be educated in the province of Saskatchewan was made in the last 20 years under the CCF. Provision of free texts to grade nine is just another addition to the improvements that have taken place in the Province of Saskatchewan. I take exception, Mr. Speaker, to the minister's remarks, as he knows full well the progress that has been accomplished in the past 20 years. The setting up of our composite schools was a stride forward together with the building of the technical institutes in the Province of Saskatchewan. Now if it wasn't for this new minister we would have had more technical schools by now. It will require three or four years before anything is done by this minister in respect to providing for increased enrolments in these schools. Only last week mention was made that it will be 1967 before more students will be able to enrol for technical training.

I will agree, Mr. Speaker, that providing for free textbooks for grade nine is a step forward, but to say that nothing was done in the past 20 years is certainly most incorrect.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. G. T. Snyder (Moose Jaw City): — I want to comment only briefly with respect to the Bill which is under consideration at this particular moment. I was rather interested in the remarks of the minister when he stood in his place and moved second reading of this Bill. I think everyone is aware of the value of a school book rental program and the provision of free text books at the various levels, but one thing that I am concerned about, and concerned about deeply, Mr. Speaker, is the large number of rumours which have been emanating from the public schools in recent weeks to the effect that the grade seven mathematics text is not being supplied to all students. I think this is something that must be regarded as an innovation since the present Liberal administration took office in May of 1964, because my information is that prior to that time text books were supplied for all of the school children when the text books were changed in order to update the curriculum in our public schools.

My information is, Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Minister, that in

the public schools in Moose Jaw, at least in some of these public schools, only one-third of the grade seven new mathematics books are being supplied and that it will be a matter of two more years before the grade seven young people will be supplied completely with the new math. This is a matter of concern to Home and School Groups, and also to interested parents who are concerned that their youngsters who are in the remaining two-thirds are not receiving the right kind of basic instruction because of the lack of this new textbook for grade seven math. So, I think the minister will probably want, before he closes comings with respect to the present program of supplying free textbooks at the elementary level. I would hope that the minister would take action to correct this particular problem that is in existence in the city of Moose Jaw; and I would expect it is in existence in other areas of the province also.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mrs. Marjorie Cooper (Regina West): — Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a word or two. I was going to bring up the same point the hon. member from Moose Jaw (Mr. Snyder) did, because I have had calls from parents about this very thing, and not having a sufficient number of text books in grade seven to deal with the new math. I know that one principal had to send work around to students that certain students would have to have extra classes because they would have to learn the new math. One group is being taught the new mathematics, the other group is not being taught the new math because textbooks were not available.

I don't know the explanation for this, but I have had parents call me. The other thing I wanted to say is that I do agree that parents will welcome this Bill. They will welcome getting these textbooks. May I just say a word of caution here. I have had several teachers speak to me about this and they do not a little worry, a little fear, that by this method we may perpetuate school books for a long time after they have outlived their usefulness. There is a great body of new knowledge all the time in the field of education; there are new approaches to education which need a different type of text book to teach this new approach and they are a little concerned for fear the people cannot be prepared to change books when they should be changed. This is a real concern among teachers. I think it is something the department can deal with. Teachers are a little afraid that the department or the school unit, to save money, might buy perhaps a cheaper book rather than a better book. I am sure the government doesn't want this to happen, but I think they should be alerted to this possibility and ease the mind of those teachers who are a little bit concerned that this could happen.

Mr. Trapp: — To answer briefly some of the questions put by hon. members, I want to say first, regarding the grade seven math, there has been no change in policy providing texts in grade seven math. I shall find the answer to the problem because I did not know this; it did not come to my attention.

You cannot deny, however, that 23 years ago these promises were made by your leader. I must also say to the hon. lady member from Regina West (Mrs. Cooper), that I think I can dispel her fears on this. I think it is a real fear that a book may be kept longer than it is useful, but we hope to supply enough

money that would renew the text books, the board could renew them every three years approximately, which would certainly give enough flexibility and change.

I want to say to the first speaker as to progress. I was not discussing progress in education as a whole. I want you to remember that progress was made throughout Canada, not only in Saskatchewan, in the last twenty years. I want to say also, I think, that members were surprised and a bit disappointed that the Liberals were first in introducing free texts in high schools, and were instead attempting very seriously, with very little avail, I thought, to find a few red herrings and drag them over the path. I ask you seriously, "Are you against high school texts for grade nine?"

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

Hon. W. Ross Thatcher (Premier) moved second reading of **Bill No. 81 — An Act to amend The Education and Health Tax Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, a major change in the proposed legislation is to alter the exemption section of the Act, to authorize the changes which were announced in the Budget Speech. This Act will increase the number of farm items which will be exempt from the Education and Health Tax Act. Thirteen additional items will be exempt from the sales tax effective April 1st. Most of the exemptions were requested by farm groups. One of the items which I mentioned in the Budget Speech will be of interest to all farmers, the exemption of snow plough attachments from the Education and Health Tax Act. In the two years that this government has been in office we have now removed, or will have removed, a total of 37 farm items from the sales tax.

The other major change in the section is to remove the exemption from the sales tax on the following related cleansing materials: ammonia, bleaches, blueing, chloride of lime and so on. The reason for removing this exemption is to obtain revenue, but also to eliminate the many administrative problems of interpretation and enforcement encountered by the Taxation Branch and the vendors. More and more new products are coming into the market. A growing problem has been encountered in distinguishing between related products which are exempt and products which are taxable. At present there is a thin arbitrary line between soaps and cleansers on the one hand, and cosmetics, cleaning compounds, and chemicals on the other. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, since I brought in the budget I have had a number of merchants 'phone me and say they have been collecting tax all along, they thought the products were already included.

Professor John Due who is a recognized expert in the sales tax field presented a special report to the former government in 1961 on the Saskatchewan Education Tax. I wish to quote his arguments in support of his strong recommendation to eliminate the exemptions on soaps and cleansing agents, and I quote:

The present exemption of soap and other cleansing agents and matches is completely unjustified. Expenditures on these items are of minor importance in the household budget and the total tax borne by the average lower income tax family on these items does not warrant the provision of exemption. The exemption is difficult to operate satisfactorily because of the constant development of new products in these fields and the difficulties

of interpreting the lines between exempt and taxable items. These articles were initially exempted not as a matter of social policy, but in an attempt to free all other items in addition to food handled by the typical grocery store. In the great changes in retail merchandising in the last two decades, not only do virtually all grocery stores carry other taxable items, but these exempt items are handled by numerous vendors in other than grocery stores.

As stressed earlier, successful operation of a retail sales Act requires that exemption be confined to a relatively small number of major categories of consumer expenditures, constituting significant elements in the household budgets of the lower income groups. Food and medicine fulfil this requirement; soap and related items do not.

Mr. Speaker, we endorse Professor Due's recommendations. In fact of all the provinces that impose a sales tax only Quebec and Saskatchewan exempt soaps and cleaning agents from the tax. There is no rationale for exempting soaps and cleansing agents from the tax. If, as the opposition claims, these items are basic household necessities it is strange that they did not also exempt from the tax other related so-called basic necessities of life including waxes, polishes, mops, scouring pads, pans, dish cloths, towels, shaving cream, and so on.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that a good deal of the revenue which the government will receive in the future years will come from commercial enterprises rather than from the households.

Now the other proposed amendments to the Act are based on recommendation of the Attorney General's Department to assist the Taxation Branch to assess and collect outstanding sales tax liability. Certain weaknesses in the present Act involving the issuing of registered notices and third party demands will be corrected. The Taxation Branch has encountered difficulty in certain investigations and inspections because of the limitation of section 26 of the present Act. The proposed section was taken from the Saskatchewan Income Tax Act, and the Ontario Retail Sales Tax Act. It is designed to cover most possible contingencies arising out of investigation. In practice actually there will be no changes in procedure, but the new section will assist the Taxation Branch in cases where difficulties are encountered by the vendor. More specifically, the new section will permit the branch to obtain records such as financial statements, documented supporting sales, or purchases which may not relate specifically to the Education and Health Acts, but nevertheless facilitate the assessment of sales tax liability. Also the proposed section will authorize the branch to audit records and documents of companies which transact business with the vendor who is being assessed for outstanding sales tax liabilities.

With those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I beg leave of the Assembly to move second reading of this Bill.

Mr. W. S. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, it seemed to me that the Premier was less than his usual eloquent and emphatic best in moving this particular amendment. I can expect that some of that may be due to so some slight disability which has been bothering him and all of us will hope that this is soon cured and long gone.

Some of the restraint, however, may have been also due, of course to the fact that it is never too pleasant a task to have to introduce tax increases. Separated from all the other words that the Premier used this afternoon, that is of course what he was doing, the introduction of a tax increase.

I found it interesting to note that he should say during his comments that the government supports the recommendations of Professor Due. If this is the case then we may expect more services and goods to be included under the sales tax in the years that are to come, because Professor Due, as I recall it, had a list which extended much beyond the increasing of taxes on soaps and cleansing agents to which we have reference in this particular Bill.

Mr. Speaker, the Bill itself does provide for those exemptions which have been spelled out. It provides for the imposition of the sales tax on a number of items to which reference has been made. But the importance of the amendments is not just in the fact that this is a new tax on soap and related materials. Part of the significance of this particular amendment is that it is one of rather numerous added changes in taxes and in other costs — some made during this current session, some during the last session of the legislature, some before the last session of the legislature, some during the period between the two sessions. All part of the significance of this one more increase in taxes.

All of this, Mr. Speaker, done by a government whose pledge was not to increase taxes, whose pledge rather was to reduce taxes, not just provincial taxes but local government taxes as well. It is correct to say that at no time did the members of the government or political party that sits opposite suggest that there would be any new taxes, any added taxes, or any added increased costs. To the extent — and it is considerable — that there have been such additions and alterations, the people of Saskatchewan have, of course, been misled. It's significant to note that within recent months they have been misled. Prior to the Bengough by-election we were told of tax cuts and added services, but it was a carefully kept state secret until after that by-election that we would also have increased taxes such as that on gasoline and diesel fuel and that one with which we deal today. It's of interest to note that the increases on the gas tax are certainly more than twice the reductions which have been made available in the budget this year.

But in addition to the fact of this being one more tax increase, there is, I submit, some further significance which should be looked at, at this time. That significance is that more and more we can see clearly the pattern for financing its program of the government which now sits opposite. That pattern is a regressive pattern. More and more clearly we can see the philosophy of the Liberal government with regard to financing essential services. More and more the philosophy of the Liberals with respect to public services generally is revealed to the public view. We see increasingly a disproportionate distribution of the sharing of costs of public service and this disproportionate sharing being increased rather than being reduced.

This pattern then, Mr. Speaker, and what it portends for the future, deserve to be recognized and need to be emphasized on the occasion of this one more tax increase by the government that sits opposite. This has been a pattern of shifting, of ignoring ability to pay as a desirable criterion for deciding who pays how much taxes. It has been a pattern of adding to the

costs of those who deserve relief from tax loads while providing relief from tax costs for those who deserve it less. It demonstrates a philosophy which disputes the elementary facts that, once we accept certain services as a public responsibility, then we ought to recognize the right of each person to equal access to these services. And equal access, Mr. Speaker, must mean access after having paid a comparable share according to one's financial ability to share the cost of these services.

Since many of the changes in costs and the tax increases have violated too many valid and valuable principles, then this latest increase in taxes ought to be opposed. These principles which have been violated include access to the services with the same degree of effort on the part of all people. They include payment related to the ability to pay. They include also the effect on the economy of what is left after taxes. We need to recognize this kind of unfortunate and uneconomic and unfair pattern in the tax increases and the cost changes imposed by the government opposite. I know we are not dealing in this Bill with a large amount of money. Even so, may I suggest that this amount which we are dealing with of added cost to the Saskatchewan people has been very grossly understated in the remarks about what the added costs in this new tax will mean. If one considers the family expenditures for soaps and detergents and related products used in homes and used commercially, one is easily convinced that the money involved is at least five times as great as any government statement has suggested. Even after we deduct the amounts for the very minimum relief provided in the tax changes, I suggest that \$500,000 of increased revenue available to the government is more accurate than the figure of \$100,000 which has been used. This cost, I say again, has been understated. It has been understated to a greater extent even than the claimed savings from purple gas has been overstated by the members who sit opposite. I doubt very much with regard to that saving, if the government can in fact demonstrate that it is half as much as it has claimed.

Mr. Speaker, earlier I said that this latest increase was important for one reason, because it should be considered along with other increases in taxes and in charges which have been imposed by the government of the day. Let me just go back over some of those increases which have been so imposed during the last two years or less. First in 1964, we found an increase in the cost of fire insurance on homes, an increase which has not as yet been justified but which has been imposed in order to help to pay for some of the services which the members opposite claim credit.

In 1965 there was an added tax on tobacco. In 1965 grazing leases were increased; some of them doubled and some more. In 1965 there were increased costs to some patients in some geriatric centres.

Coming to 1966, once again more increased fire insurance costs. Since the government is planning to use more revenue from this source to pay the day-to-day running costs of the government (and the budget estimates make that claim) then this is properly in the nature of a tax. Since the increases in 1964 in fire insurance rates and again in 1966, since they make it easier for other companies to increase premiums, the added cost of this decision on the part of the government is in the quantity of

millions of dollars.

Take 1965 and 1966, consider how much has been added in property taxes because of lack of action on the part of government opposite. How much was added because last year the decision was to restrict the increase in school grants to some seven per cent as compared to some 14 per cent the year before? How much is going to be added this year? We don't know. School trustees all over the province are still confused with respect to what school grants will be. And between the Minister of Education (Mr. Trapp) and the Premier (Mr. Thatcher) there have been at least four different policy statements made in a period of some three months' time about distribution of school grants. I doubt very much that either the Minister or the Premier knows as yet how this is going to be distributed. We don't know what the effect is going to be on property taxes this year.

In 1966 we are told again and we know now that drivers' licenses for young drivers between the ages of 16 to 24 are being increased. This again is in a sense a new and an added tax. It matters nought whether these young people are good drivers or poor drivers. It matters nought whether they are trained or untrained. They are all condemned to pay an extra two dollars by the decisions of the government which sits opposite. They are all in effect being accused of being equally bad risks.

Let's turn to 1966 more specifically. The increase of one cent a gallon on gasoline and diesel fuel which was put before the house just recently — \$2,200,000 added tax touch in that. In 1966, just last week, an added land tax to finance hospitals, principle good agreed, but nevertheless to many people at least an added tax of some \$300,000 extent. In 1966, now we are faced with a new tax on soaps and detergents. We add four per cent to the cost of the soap, the cost of the package, the premium in the box, the cost of interminable advertising and all the gimmicking that goes on.

I want particularly, Mr. Speaker, to note in my remarks the pattern of financing that is revealed. Look at some of those taxes which have been changed with respect to providing health services in the Province of Saskatchewan. Members will know that the surcharge of one per cent levied with respect to income tax has been moved. Members will know also that some three-quarters of Saskatchewan families will gain less than one cent a day as a result of this. Members may know that some 80,000 Saskatchewan people will get no benefit at all. Let me add once more an example which I believe has been mentioned previously. A married couple with three children with \$4,000 a year income will benefit from this tax reduction to the extent of about \$1.25 a year. A married couple with three children and \$20,000 income will benefit to the extent of \$64. In other words, Mr. Speaker, the family with five times the income gets also 50 times the benefit. This is Liberal philosophy I presume. But in addition to this tax being used to support health services, the premiums paid for medical care and hospitalisation tax are also used for this purpose. We will remember that each family pays \$20 a year more now than it paid previously. Let's add together the changes which have resulted from the change in income tax and the changes which result from the change in the medical care and hospitalisation premium. When we do this we find that the family with \$20,000 income that I have been talking about, gets a combined benefit of some \$44 a year. But the family with \$4,000 income is worse off to the extent of \$38.75 per year. In other words, Mr. Speaker, as a result of those changes a family with \$20,000 income will

March 28, 1966

contribute \$44 a year less toward paying medical and hospital bills than before, but the family with \$4,000 income will pay \$38.75 more as a result of policies of the government that sits opposite. This way, I submit, we get a look at Liberal tax policy. This way we get a look at their philosophy with regard to meeting the costs of essential services. Old people, young people, farm people, urban people, low income families in particular do not benefit as they should do when conditions in the province are such as they are.

Turning more specifically to the tax itself. It is as we know a new tax — a new tax on soaps, detergents and other cleansing items. It's a tax on toilet soap, it's a tax on laundry soap, it's a tax on detergents. If one added these up according to the definition of taxes used by the government I'm sure there are 15 or 20 new taxes involved in this one little package.

There are going to be a number of reactions through the province, Mr. Speaker. I think of the teachers for example, who used to, in kindergarten and other small classes, teach youngsters the art of cleanliness by singing, "This is the way we wash our hands, wash our hands, wash our hands". Now they will be able to sing as they do it, "This is the way we pay our taxes, pay our taxes, pay our taxes". As they are teaching them how to keep their clothes clean, they will be able to sing not only, "this is the way we wash our clothes, wash our clothes, wash our clothes", they will be able to sing, "This is the way we pay our taxes, pay our taxes, pay our taxes".

An Hon. Member: — You're out of tune.

Mr. Lloyd: — Every home, every housewife is faced with a very considerable number of increased costs these days. We made reference to bread costs going up. We know that interest costs on homes have gone up. School taxes have gone up. Gasoline taxes have gone up. Medical and hospital premiums have gone up. And a host of other charges have been increased and taxes increased and levied because of the decisions arising out of the philosophy of the government that sits opposite. Much of this has happened this year, Mr. Speaker, the year when we have to begin with, some \$15,000,000 or \$20,000,000 more from the federal government than we had last year, the year in which they saw fit to confiscate the funds of the Public Administration Fund of some \$1,000,000, the year in which they propose to confiscate another \$2,000,000 that was set aside for student aid in the province. All of these things done and now an increase of four per cent on the cost of soap. Mr. Speaker, no adequate reasons have as yet been given for this added impost. The amount of the added tax, I submit, has been grossly underestimated. The purpose and the fairness of taxation plans are further violated by this proposal. The pattern of taxation according to ability to pay is again and further violated. This adds a tax for many who do not deserve to have to pay such an added tax, Mr. Speaker. For all of these reasons the Bill does not deserve support in this legislation. Those of us on this side of the House will not support it.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — I draw 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. The member for Regina West.

Mrs. Marjorie Cooper (Regina West): — I don't want to add much because I think the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) covered our position very clearly. But I do think that on behalf of the housewives of this province I should make a very vigorous protest particularly on this matter of tax on soap and detergents.

As the members of this legislature know, the cost of living has been rising at an alarming rate. Butter is up. Bread is up. Meat is up. Canned goods are up. Everything you look at is up, including the price of soap and detergents, even without this added four per cent tax. I'm sure no housewife in Saskatchewan, realizing that there was a \$26,000,000 surplus, that this is a very buoyant year again next year, will find it possible to understand why the hon. Premier would put in what was called properly "this dirty tax".

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mrs. Cooper: — One thing I am sure, the hon. Premier doesn't do the family shopping. I don't think he probably has any idea of the price of soap. But people with large families do have an idea of the price of soap and this four per cent is going to make considerable difference. It will be harder on the people with low income. It will be harder on the people with small children. And it will be harder on the people with large families. I think the priorities here are entirely wrong. I can see no excuse whatsoever and I don't think the housewives of this province can find any excuse whatsoever for the imposition of this four per cent on soaps and detergents. I am sure you will find a lot of vocal protest among the housewives, fair protest, deserved protest against this very unnecessary, most unnecessary, inexcusable additional four per cent, to something that is a basic necessity just as much as food is. It's a basic necessity. Families must have it. Families need it and there was no reason whatsoever why this tax was imposed.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. A. E. Blakeney (Regina West): — Mr. Speaker, I just want to add a few words to the words already addressed to the House with respect to this tax. As has already been indicated, the tax does three things. It imposes a tax on soaps, detergents and cleansing agents generally, it gives some tax remission on a series of minor items such as cow trainers and horse harness, and it introduces a new and harsh inspection and investigation procedure.

Reference has already been made to the fact that no reasonable justification for the introduction of this tax can be made, and certainly none has been made in this House by the member for Morse, the hon. Premier. At a time of buoyancy in our economy from coast to coast, at a time when taxes on the well-to-do can be reduced and have been reduced, at this time the Saskatchewan government chooses to impose a tax on what is undoubtedly a necessity of life.

Now what possible justification could there be for this action? The Premier was honest enough to admit that the desire for revenue was a justification, was one of the reasons why it was done. He put forward some idea that there was some administrative reasons for it, but I for my part, am not aware of any

overpowering administrative difficulties. I recall no particular problems with respect to this area of administration during the period that I was Provincial Treasurer. I admit that my stay at the Treasury Department was short and I may not have been acquainted with all of the intricacies of tax collection. But I think that I would have heard of the problem if it was a serious one. I heard of other problems having to do with the collection of sales taxes and problems surrounding the definition of particular exemptions. So I think we really have to conclude that the reason is less administrative than it is fiscal; that the reason is that the Provincial Treasurer wants to raise some more money; and that he has picked this spot to raise it. As my colleague, the gracious lady member from Regina West (Mrs. Cooper) has indicated there could be few places where it would be more unjustified to raise taxes. It has already been pointed out that there has been what amounts to an assault on the housewives' pocketbook in the last few months on a whole series of fronts. There have been sharp increases in the price of meat, milk, break, now butter because of action of the federal go, gasoline because of the action of the Premier opposite. I am not saying that all of these are unjustified. Many of the increases in prices are probably fully justified. The producers of the product no doubt deserve a higher price and it is just unfortunate that all of these price increases have to come at one time. But in these circumstances, can there be any justification for increasing the price of a household necessity when the object is not to provide more money for the producer but to provide more money for the Premier?

These increases are beginning to pinch. If you people opposite haven't had representations from your constituents asking you to do something about the cost of living, I have, and I have had a good number. I don't know really what they expect me to do about the price of bread or milk or meat, but I certainly want to do everything I can to see that their household dollar goes as far as it possibly can. One of the things I can do is to object to tax increases on household necessities unless there is a very good reason for it. And no very good reason has been put forward.

At times such as this the government should not be imposing any new burden on the housewife especially when the object is primarily to raise revenues. I am sure that this \$100,000 that the Premier speaks of could be raised somewhat easier. I have some suggestions along this line myself. I think that the Premier's mode of transport could be amended somewhat. We could do away with the private aircraft . . .

Mr. E. Kramer (The Battlefords): — Sell the aeroplane.

Mr. Blakeney: — The cost of the aircraft and its running cost for one year would provide this \$100,000. I would have thought that this was a rather better way to deal with the province's finances than to impose extra taxes on the housewife. I don't think that the housewives will look very kindly on the fact that they are financing a private aircraft for the cabinet ministers of Saskatchewan. I don't for one moment suggest that the Ministers of the Crown should not travel by air. I do, however, think that there are perfectly good private enterprise charter aircraft available which could be made available for members of the cabinet when their duties call them elsewhere.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. A. Guy (Athabasca): — Still have to pay for it.

Mr. Blakeney: — Yes, indeed, but not at that price. Not at that price.

However, there was one particular point I wanted to raise. This is primarily the reason for my entry into this debate. That is to express a protest about the provisions of the new section 26. This is by no means an innocuous section. The old section 26, and, Mr. Speaker, I am not dealing with the minutiae of this but only with the principle involved, provided that an officer of the department — note that, an officer — when given a written instruction — and note that, a written instruction — could enter premises and conduct audits and generally pursue the interests of the Crown in collecting taxes. I have no quarrel with that. Many taxpayers don't pay their taxes very willingly and I know that governments have to adopt reasonably stringent measures in collecting taxes. But what changes have been made, Mr. Speaker? Now, the person who will enter the premises of the retailer, or any other person for that matter, need not be an officer of the department; it can be anyone. He need not have any written authority, but can be operating on some verbal authority. And with this very tenuous authority he will have the widest possible powers. Among other things he can force people to give him reasonable assistance in going through their books. He can force them to answer all questions which he puts to them under oath and in writing, if he insists on it. Mr. Speaker, if there ever were any rights against self incrimination in this province, they are certainly being eliminated post haste by members opposite in putting forward this legislation. The Provincial Treasurer, in pursuit of information, is free to write to banks, trust companies, anywhere else and on his say so get all the information which a business man may have ledged with them. That may be necessary but I would ask hon. members to consider it carefully.

The citizen who seeks to object if some person off the street comes in and says, "I have authority from the minister to go through your books, to make you answer questions under oath, to make you answer in writing", the citizen who seeks to object, is running a grave risk because, "no person shall hinder or molest any person doing anything that he is authorized to do under the Act, notwithstanding any other law to the contrary." Notwithstanding any other law to the contrary! Consider the position of a retailer. A man comes in, says he represents the department — he doesn't have to be an officer of the department anymore. He may never have seen the fellow before. The fellow says he represents the minister. The retailer asks for his authority and he says he doesn't have any in writing, but he asserts this. The retailer says, "Out, Mac, until you come back with some written authority". This retailer is breaching section 7, subsection 7 because he is not permitted to hinder or molest this person off the street, notwithstanding any other law to the contrary. And in case anything was overlooked or omitted in bestowing powers on these people who now don't need to have written authority, the Bill ends up by saying that the person authorized to make the inquiry — I point out again, the person need not be an officer and he need not be authorized in writing — shall have all the powers under The Public Inquiries Act, all the powers of a judge to carry on under the Public Inquiries Act just as if he were carrying out a royal commission.

I say that these powers are stringent. They are more stringent than is necessary to enforce the provisions of the Act.

March 28, 1966

It may be alleged that these were in The Income Tax Act of Saskatchewan. All I can say with respect to The Income Tax Act of Saskatchewan, - and I say it with a bit of shame but nonetheless with the confidence that all of you will understand, - the provisions of The Income Tax Act of Saskatchewan were dictated to us by the government of Canada. We were not able to change these provisions without giving up our rights under the tax collection agreement. This is true whatever the member for Shellbrook may say . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — . . . and when he questions it he simply indicates that he doesn't understand these agreements. All I can say is that we had to put in our Act the same powers that the federal government has in its Income Tax Act because the people who were investigating would be the same people.

Hon. D. V. Heald (Attorney General): — . . . you brought it in this House.

Mr. Blakeney: — We brought it into this House because we felt and still feel that on balance it was better to put these onerous clauses on the statute book and get the benefit of the federal tax collection agreement than set up a great bureaucracy to collect our own tax. And I still say that on balance that was a good idea. But when we don't have to do that, when we don't have to comply with these specific requirements of the federal government, I say we ought not to put these provisions on the statute book.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — I say with every deference that it impresses me not to say that those provisions came from the government of Ontario. This same government is the one which some little time ago lost an Attorney General because he was going to introduce what was popularly called the Police State Bill. Their fine sensitivity for civil rights has never impressed me, not in this area anyway. So I say that where we don't have to introduce some provision like this, I would respectfully suggest to hon. members opposite that they ought to look at it very carefully.

It is necessary to say that the person who does the investigation should not have written authority? Isn't it reasonable for a retailer to be able to say, "Show me your authority if you are going to do an audit?" Isn't it reasonable to say that it ought to be an officer of the Department or some other person authorized in writing by the minister? Is it reasonable to say that this retailer, who may be about to be charged, must answer questions under oath? And it is reasonable to say that the retailer who asks some pretty reasonable questions such as "Where is your written authority?", is contravening the Act?

Now, I am not here to suggest that taxes can be raised without giving some pretty broad powers to collectors, but I suggest that the powers here are excessive, that the zeal of the administrators has carried them one step too far. The department has a very good group of administrators. I'm not quarrelling with them. I would respectfully suggest that the government ought to review this section so that it could be considered more fully by this

House in committee.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I say that I object to the collection provisions because I think they are over-stringent and I object most heartily to the imposition of the soap tax which is, as my colleague has said, a dirty tax.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. E. Kramer (The Battlefords): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few brief words again on this tax increase. As I have said before on some of these other new tax increases that have been introduced this session and last session, this government seems to be obsessed with the idea of carrying on this tax vendetta against those who are least able to pay it. Here is again another shining example of another imposition on the poor.

We see on the North American continent today and hear of the war on poverty by Lyndon Johnson. We even heard a murmur or two from the — it was a weak one I'll admit — Liberals at Ottawa. We thought that something might even be done there in their war on poverty but we haven't heard much, at least since they turned parliament into "True Confessions of 1966". And I don't expect that we will hear very much from them in this line. They are following the same line of Liberalism of "do nothing" and they continue to slide along and allow Canada, as the Liberals do in Saskatchewan, to drag the whole economy a little further down.

We have witnessed with this new tax-cutting government, this new government that was going to introduce new economies, the province dropping further and further into debt and further and further into more commitments of debt. And in order to bail them out, they have to invade the kitchen. They have to invade the nursery. They have to invade all these areas and place these taxes, once again, equally on the low-income groups as well as the high-income groups. Of course, when you talk about equality in this area it doesn't hurt the high income family a great deal to pay the extra impositions on soap, no more than it hurts the high income families to pay the one per cent extra income tax or the one per cent extra sales tax when they buy a new automobile. All these things have been done. The tax cuts have been for the rich, Mr. Speaker, and here is another example in this Bill. We heard the siren cry of low taxes before this government was elected. And we heard the other dries. We heard one cry especially that I am sure we will hear again, Mr. Speaker, as the mothers of this country are getting their dishpan hands by using the inferior brands of soap that we hear so much about. As they postpone the changing of that poor little tyke crying in the nursery for fear of running up the next soap bill, all the babies of the country will be crying. Do you know what they will be crying? Mr. Speaker, they will be crying, "it's time for a change".

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

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

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker, I shall not detain the House on this Bill, because there are not many new points which can be raised.

March 28, 1966

No government, of course, is particularly anxious to bring in tax increases. This change today proposes to put soaps and detergents into the category of goods which will have to pay the sales tax. At the same time it should not be overlooked that the Bill exempts 13 agriculture items from the sales tax. We estimate that the net amount to be collected will be in the neighbourhood of \$100,000. Mr. Speaker, . . .

An Hon. Member: — . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — Please sit down until I am through. Then if you want to ask a question I'll be glad to answer it.

Mr. Speaker, all this session we have listened to my hon. friends opposite say that we are not giving enough for technical schools. They suggested millions of dollars more. They say we are not giving enough for education. They suggested millions more. They said our highway program is inadequate. We should spend more. They suggested that our health program is too small, that our agriculture spending isn't sufficient. The hon. member for Regina East, the House big time spender, said we should be spending a lot more on auditoria. They said we should be spending more for drugs and so on.

Mr. Speaker, anyone but a Socialist knows that a government has no magic formula for creating money. We can spend any amount of money the people of Saskatchewan want us to. We believe our people want improved services, and the budget is providing about \$40,000,000 in improved services. The government does not try to kid the people that somebody isn't going to have to pay a portion of that expenditure.

I was rather surprised this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, to receive a lecture from the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) about taxes, because for 20 years his government bled the people of Saskatchewan white with new taxes. Six hundred completely new taxes, 650 increases. I watched the Leader of the Opposition about three years ago get up and raise the sales tax which he had promised to abolish, from three per cent up to five per cent. He said this is "togetherness". We are helping the people by doing this. Year after year and budget after budget, the Socialists did nothing but increase the tax level. Yet when we bring in this modest \$100,000 proposal this afternoon, they cry crocodile tears for the poor housewife. Why the Bill, Mr. Speaker, which my hon. friend the Minister of Education (Mr. Trapp) brought in this afternoon will save the family, the little man, \$600,000 alone, by free school books.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker, I am not going to make a political forecast today but I say this party will have 50 seats out of 59 when the next election is called. My hon. friends will almost be wiped out. And one of the reasons is their tax policy . . .

Mr. A. Thibault (Kinistino): — . . . bring it down.

Mr. Thatcher: — One of the reasons is because they taxed the people so onerously. I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Saskatchewan like the Liberal policies of tax reduction. Last year we reduced taxes \$12,000,000. This year we have reduced them net by

\$7,000,000. Wait till we bring the next budget down, then my hon. friends will really see action.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — Therefore, I won't give them any more than nine seats after the next election. They might have ten but I doubt it. They are a thing of the past, Mr. Speaker, in the Province of Saskatchewan. Down east there are a few people who think the Socialists may have some future. But anybody who knows them, anybody who has seen them in action, knows that they are a deal issue in western Canada.

My hon. friend the member for Regina West (Mr. Blakeney) raised a point that section 26 is arbitrary, I think he said it was far too severe, that we didn't need all the provisions. Some people in our department came to us and told us that in some cases the department is having trouble obtaining the merchant's books. We thought we were very safe in adopting a former CCF Act. Word for word what is in this Education Act, as has been pointed out, is the Income Tax Act that my hon. friends drafted in 1961. This hon. member for Regina West said, "Well, of course, the federal government drafted it". That may be, but my hon. friends passed it. They passed it in November, 1961 and our provision today, section 26, is copied word for word from that Act. I don't see how they can say it was all right in 1961 when they were the government, and object to the wording in 1966 when they are the opposition.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to beg leave of the Assembly to move second reading of this Bill.

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 29

Thatcher	Grant	Radloff
Howes	Coderre	Romuld
McFarlane	Bjarnason	Weatherald
Boldt	Trapp	MacLennan
Cameron	Cuelenaere	Larochelle
Heald	McIsaac	Hooker
Gardiner (Melville)	MacDonald	Coupland
Guy	Gallagher	Gardner (Moosomin)
Merchant (Mrs.)	Breker	Leith
Mitchell	Loken	

NAYS — 23

Lloyd	Whelan	Baker
Cooper (Mrs.)	Nicholson	Snyder
Wood	Kramer	Brotten
Nollet	Dewhurst	Larson
Brockelbank (Kelsey)	Berezowsky	Robbins
Blakeney	Michayluk	Pepper
Davies	Smishek	Pederson
Thibault	Link	

March 28, 1966

Mr. D. G. MacLennan (Last Mountain) moved second reading of **Bill No. 88 — An Act to amend The Liquor Licensing Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, this Bill amends the Liquor Licensing Act. The proposed changes are to provide for the sale of liquor in hotels through room service. This only applies to hotels that have licensed dining rooms. It also brings in a provision for licensing the Centennial Auditoria in Regina and in Saskatoon. Due to the physical layout of these auditoria it is necessary to provide for minors entering and remaining in the licensed area and to permit the sale of liquor to persons while standing. A licensee will be allowed to purchase liquor from a special liquor vendor under the proposed amendments.

Also this Bill proposes to permit the installation of coin-operated equipment for the playing of games, recorded music and other entertainment, other than live entertainment in beer parlours, beverage rooms, cocktail rooms and clubs.

Under this Bill it is proposed to allow the son, daughter, wife or husband, under 21 years of age of an approved manager of a corporately owned hotel, to enter and remain in an outlet during the hours and on the days when the sale or consumption of liquor in that outlet is prohibited. This Bill will also provide for the allowance for the employment of a female who is of the age 21 years or more to serve liquor in a club. This Bill will also authorize the commission to issue dining room and cocktail room licenses in commercial aircraft not operated solely within the province.

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave of the Assembly to move second reading of this Bill.

Mrs. Marjorie Cooper (Regina West): — Mr. Speaker, looking over this Act it seems to me it's part of a familiar pattern, opening things as widely as you possibly can. There are some fairly significant changes in this Bill. There are some questions I would like to ask about the Bill. For instance, the question of liquor on aircraft that is flying across Canada. Certainly in any of the flights that I have taken there has never been liquor served in the aeroplane. I travel economy class. I don't know what happens in first class but I am wondering if Saskatchewan is going to be the first province to make this change. I see that you are planning for liquor outlets in the auditoria in Saskatoon and Regina. I don't know whether you hope to raise some of the additional money needed this way. I see that those under 21 are mentioned. I can understand them being able to come into the building but I think it's quite a significant change to suggest that they may remain in the cocktail bar and expect the innocent not to suspect that they won't drink. It seems to me that there are a great many things here. I want to know a little bit more about what games and sports are to be allowed. I don't mind Wurlitzers because, if most people react to them like I do, they will drive people out instead of letting them stay in these outlets.

I noticed over the television that they used the word slot machines. I don't know whether this is correct or not. I would doubt very much if you intend putting gambling slot machines in these places. If you do it's something we should look at.

But there are many questions. I would like to study the Bill a little longer. There are many questions I would like to

ask about it and so, Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

Hon. J. C. McIsaac (Minister of Municipal Affairs) moved second reading of Bill No. 36 — **An Act respecting Time.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, just before beginning to speak on this Act, the Time Act, I will ask one of the page boys to distribute maps which outline the areas in question.

In introducing this Bill to the legislature I think perhaps it is well to review, Mr. Speaker, some of the reasons why this question of time in various localities has become one of increasing concern in recent years.

At present in Saskatchewan, the question of changing the clock or more precisely that of setting business hours, is subject to change by local option vote in villages, towns and cities. Provisions are in the various Acts for this purpose. The RM Act and the LID Act contain no such provisions. I think perhaps this has been responsible for one of the most contentious issues of all. The rural people in the various areas have no say at the polls in deciding on the time adopted by the centre that they trade in, and quite likely also the same centre when their children attend school.

For the past number of years there has been a definite growing trend in this province toward centralization of services. Not only that, but people are now in the habit of travelling to several communities for services rather than to one particular centre as was the pattern in the earlier days in the province.

To add to the confusion and intensify the problem we have seen the almost complete conversion of the province into a system of larger school units. These various individual units found themselves encompassing a number of different urban communities, quite often with differing times as determined by local vote. Hence the unit boards began to set uniform times for school purposes in an effort to resolve an impractical situation. I know there are some MLAs on both sides of the House who are quite familiar with this situation of the parents going to work at one time and the school children attending school on another time. Obviously some solution is desirable and essential. A uniform time for the entire province for twelve months of the year would certainly be the most desirable solution. However the problem here, of course, is that residents on the east side, and residents on the west side of Saskatchewan will never agree as to what that time should be. There are perhaps other ways of settling it but upon closer examination and in view of the present trends that exist in the province they do not appear to be as sensible as the recommendations of this Bill.

Now, firstly where did the proposed plan come from upon which the legislation is based? And secondly, what does this Act propose? This Bill is a sincere effort to settle this time problem for the province based on the recommendations of a committee established, I believe, in 1962 to study the time problem in the province. This committee was comprised of representatives from the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities, the

Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association and the School Trustees Association. They have been meeting over the years and they recently submitted their recommendations to their respective associations within the last year or so and received general approval for them. I say general because obviously we will never have complete unanimous approval on this question of time.

The members of the committee I think have conducted an exhaustive study of the problem. Their submission takes into account the existing pattern of time in the province. It does provide the uniformity for at least six months of the year for the province. At the same time the adoption of this plan will cause a minimum of changes from present times used throughout the province. At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a word of very sincere thanks on behalf of this government and I'm sure members opposite, for the work that the Time Committee has done over the years on this question. Basically the Time Act will divide the province into an east and west half. The dividing line starting at the south end of the province runs along the west boundaries of school units no. 4 Borderland, no. 5 Assiniboia, no. 22 Moose Jaw, no. 31 Davidson, no. 41 Saskatoon East, Wakaw and Prince Albert. All of the city of Saskatoon is considered to be in the east half of the province. Northern Saskatchewan, that is everything north of the survey line, is divided into an east and a west half also, the dividing line being the third meridian. Eastern Saskatchewan and north-eastern Saskatchewan, in other words the whole east side, will be on central standard time throughout the year if this Bill is adopted.

North-western Saskatchewan on the top corner of your map will be on mountain standard time unless the people of that area vote otherwise. This is largely Uranium City. The Lloydminster School Unit area, the area immediately surrounding Lloydminster is on mountain standard time all year unless the people of that area vote otherwise. Now the time in the rest of western Saskatchewan, that is the great bulk of the settled area of the province, is on central standard time in the summer and mountain standard time in the winter, unless the people of an area vote otherwise. The west half of the province is broken down into what is known, for the purpose of the Bill, as time option areas. These areas are contained within the school unit boundaries and there are 24 of them in all. These time option areas are given the choice of having mountain standard time or central standard time during the winter months. The Lloydminster time option area has the opportunity of remaining on mountain standard time the year around or going to central standard time in the summer time, or if they wish go into central standard time the year around as well. The reason for this, of course, is that the Lloydminster time option area surrounds the city of Lloydminster and that city is on mountain standard time throughout the year, according to its charter which it can alter. Also their time is geared largely or to a great extent to the time observed in the province in Alberta. North-western Saskatchewan, again this is Uranium City, and possibly a few other areas, have the same choice as does the Lloydminster time option area, mountain standard time throughout the year; if they wish to vote for central standard time throughout the year they may; or central standard time in the summer time only. The reason for this is that daylight hours especially in Uranium City are pretty long in the summer and similarly quite short in the wintertime. Northwest Saskatchewan has no specified time option areas as does the rest of western Saskatchewan largely because there are no school unit areas as such in that area. The time option areas in that part of the province will, therefore, be determined by any school district boundaries there may be or by order of the Minister of Natural Resources.

The Bill also sets out who may initiate the taking of a vote in a time option area. Briefly, it is any school board in that time option area. If 100 persons or 25 per cent of the persons residing in a time option area, whichever is the lesser in number, petition a school board to initiate a vote they must take a vote in that area. In essence this gives the urban centres the power to initiate a vote in a time option area. The procedures of taking a vote are similar to the voting procedures in the Liquor Licensing Act. Persons entitled to vote are those who have been resident in the area for six months and who are over 18 years of age. Once a vote has been taken in a time option area, no vote can be held in that area for at least three years thereafter. As I stated at the beginning, Mr. Speaker, this Bill has been drafted essentially in accordance with the recommendations of the Time Committee. I am sure there will be a number of things that could well lead to some further discussion. Accordingly at this time I would beg leave of the Assembly to move second reading of this Bill.

Mr. Lloyd: — Before the member takes his seat could he say just a further word about the position of those areas west of the line during the summer time and the choice they have.

Mr. McIsaac: — They are all on central standard during the summer.

Mr. Lloyd: — Oh, they are all on central standard time in the summer.

Mr. M. P. Pederson (Arm River): — I have been very anxiously awaiting this Bill because I believe that the general area that I represent will probably be subjected to greater difficulties than any area in this province if this Bill is to be allowed to pass in its present form. I brought in the resolution last year suggesting that the government take a firm stand and a move on this question of time. I thought that perhaps they would approach this thing with some degree of courage. Instead I find that they have allowed every possible alternative that is conceivable. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this Bill, if allowed to pass, is going to leave this province in precisely the same predicament that we are in at the present time. I believe that, when we start thinking in terms of dividing Saskatchewan down the middle by some type of an arbitrary line, we are going to have the question of time on our hands forever. When I take a look at the facts and see that the proper and standard time division in our province is on the 105th meridian, which is considerably east of the proposed line, and that the normal mountain standard time zone runs 7 ½ degrees to either side of that line which is more than sufficient to encompass the entire province of Saskatchewan, I fail to understand why the government didn't have the courage to institute one standard time across the board in this province. The entire problem of time stems from the fact that we have differences of time within the boundaries of Saskatchewan, differences of time from one village or hamlet to the next. I am going to give you an example of how ridiculous this proposal is. In the area that I come from, if you can visualize the railway line running from Outlook, southeast to Hawarden and then south to Elbow and realize that the towns of Outlook, Glenside and Broderick will be in the west zone, which, according to the minister, is the slow time zone, the village of Hawarden will be in the east zone which is the fast time zone. Then two miles south of that you cross into the Strongfield, Loreburn and Elbow area which are in the west

zone, the slow zone again. Here we have a community, fast and slow time up and down the line, exactly where we were before and this is true all the way up and down this line. You cannot arbitrarily divide communities anywhere in the province without encountering great difficulties. I know that there is and has been tremendous pressure from our city residents, in particular, to give them the benefit of this extra hour of what they call daylight in the summer time. Well I perhaps am too much of a farmer to buy that argument. I maintain that, if city people want an extra hour of daytime, let them get up in the morning and get it.

Never mind this nonsense of closing up in the middle of the afternoon. If we had an even time zone across this province and a government who had the courage to institute it and stand by it, not back off s has been done in the past, the question of time would be settled for evermore. I have encountered many types of time zones in my time. During the war, and those who were overseas will recall the institution of double summer time, in great emergencies like that it's probably necessary for saving electricity. In the latitudes where we are, where the sun is barely set for 5 1/2 hours at the peak of the summer, surely to goodness the fiddling around with clocks isn't going to mean that much to our residents in the city, in the country or anywhere else. You can get 14 to 16 hours of daylight whenever you choose to have it, but the big question that must be settled is the question of providing an uniformity across this province. The bill, Mr. Speaker, completely fails to do that. I had thought that I would perhaps support this bill on second reading in order to get it into committee, in the hope that some amendments might be considered by the minister that would remove some of the anomalies that are evident. I don't know how to get this corrected now because in studying the Bill further I find that an amendment, such as I would like to see, would be physically impossible. So I am afraid what we'll have to do is settle for second best and try to get this line that has been drawn arbitrarily by the committee, recommended to the government, and the government seems to accept, juggled and twisted and turned in its contours as it comes down the province, so that we don't separate trading areas from their towns, school areas from their towns and so on. I don't know how we are going to do this, but something has to be done to change either the line or the general area in which this line is drawn in the province. Because of that I find that, much against my will, I am forced to support this on second reading in the hope that I can do something to have some amendments and some changes made in Committee of the Whole.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J. H. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — When I picked up this map which was put on our desk, I didn't know whether this map was related to time or the blackout in Lloydminster on Bill 82 of the Home-owner Grant. Maybe it will serve for both.

Now it is true that the real time situation is, according to standard time, we are all in the mountain standard time zone. The east side of the mountain standard time zone is near Portage La Prairie in Manitoba, and the west side near Drumheller in Alberta, so this certainly takes in the whole of Saskatchewan, but the whole of Saskatchewan has never been at any time in its history, as far as I know, all on mountain standard time. You may meddle with time and it doesn't change the actual number of hours and minutes in a day and it doesn't change the actual hours

or minutes that the sun shines each day. It's a very good job, Mr. Speaker, that it doesn't make those changes. I think this problem in regard to time has been overemphasized and given too much importance. True it's a nuisance but not an insurmountable nuisance by any means. I will have to give the minister and the government credit for attempting to solve this problem; they say discretion is the better part of valour. Maybe we'll have to compliment them on their valour but doubt about their discretion.

I don't think this proposal is going to suit all of the members in this House. It may suit some on both sides of the House. I am sure it is not going to suit all the members on the other side of the House no matter how they may vote on it. It's not going to suit all the communities in Saskatchewan. If, according to law, the community is supposed to be on central standard time and they don't like it and so they go on mountain standard time, what are you going to do about it, Mr. Speaker? Well, you're not going to do anything about it. I'll bet you that's just what it is going to be. You're not going to send out policemen to adjust their clocks or tell them they have got to adjust their clocks. Therefore, there is little use I think in passing legislation except on the off-chance — and I think it's a long chance — that it might solve the problem. Far be it from me to stop anybody from trying but I really don't think that this is going to solve the time problem in Saskatchewan.

There was another very sincere effort made to solve this problem some years ago. After very careful consideration by members of the legislature in a Special Select Committee, after hearing a good deal of evidence about the whole situation, the solution offered at that time was for the whole province to go on mountain standard time in the winter and central standard time in the summer. Well, the people on the west side of the province didn't like central standard time in the summer, and the people on the east side of the province didn't like mountain standard time in the winter. Now I thought they would enjoy that extra hour in the morning in the cold dark winter hours of December, January and February; but no, they didn't. There were communities all up and down the eastern border of the province that pretty soon were back on central time in the winter. you couldn't send out anybody to enforce it as I think everybody would recognize would be ridiculous. So the law was repealed and we were back again in the old situation. Now with or without this Bill the problem appears to be getting a little more order and a little less chaos in it, as time goes on.

At one time in my area of the province, there were certain communities that went on central standard time and to the east of that on mountain standard time. Well, that has pretty well disappeared now and people have been exercising their choice, but there will always be some confusion in the Province of Saskatchewan. I am not going to oppose the Bill. My constituency is all on central standard time at the present time unless they change their mind. But certainly many members will disagree with the Bill and many communities will disagree. All of us had a circular letter from the Prince Albert Superintendency School Trustees' Association asking us to oppose this Bill, or stating that the School Trustees' turned down the plan of the Plan Committee when it was presented to their annual convention for they don't like this. Now you are going to run into this, but all I can say is that, if this Bill is passed, I hope it does solve the problem but I wouldn't bet any money on it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. E. Kramer (The Battlefords): — I am not in favour of this Bill. I suggest that while it may, as the hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Pederson) has stated, clear up the situation in some instances, it does nothing to clear up the overall problem. I like to think of Saskatchewan as a complete entity. I don't like the idea of drawing a sort of Berlin wall in two or three places, first of all down the middle and then the other one in the Lloydminster area. You have given a privilege in this Bill to the people on the east side of the province to retain what they have always had. The hon. member for Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank) mentioned when he was speaking that he had made an attempt before which was turned down for certain reasons. But the idea which was put forward at that time at least was consistent. It provided one time at certain times of the year for all of the province of Saskatchewan so that when you entered the borders of Saskatchewan you knew what time it was regardless of whether it was winter or summer. It was far more expedient to change the clock at a certain time each year to go from mountain to central time and vice versa than it is to have all these lines drawn back and forth, with an option in one area, no option in another area and something else somewhere else at the permission of the minister or in the Lloydminster area. This Act is a hodgepodge, completely lacking consistency. I maintain that if it hadn't been for a group of politicians in the eastern part of the province playing politics and stirring up controversy, they would have done as the people would have accepted it. The people of the western part of Saskatchewan accepted the earlier Act, we went along with the suggestion of the government and throughout the summer months the Act worked well in western Saskatchewan. But when it came to gaining co-operation from areas like Melville and Yorkton and further down the line all the way down to Estevan, it seems that there were a few people that just weren't prepared to go along. Most of the trouble that I am aware of, was stirred up by petty politicians choosing to try and make it difficult for the government rather than good for Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I for one, and possibly I am the first one, am going to oppose this Bill. I am going to oppose it because it does nothing to provide consistency. It does nothing for all of Saskatchewan. I maintain that if we are going to do something in this House let us do something that is going to solve the problem once and for all. If you can't do a complete job you had better leave it alone. We're going to have the situation similar to what was true before where one little town would be on one time and another one on another. You are going to have that problem all the way down this Berlin wall that you have drawn down here. You are going to have people dashing across the time barrier. This was one of the hazards that was created by the former situation, the race to get back from one pub to another so that they would get an hour longer, if they were within twenty minutes or a half hour driving distance. This was one of the games that were played and a few accidents were caused by it. No, Mr. Speaker, if we are going to do something about the time let us at least have something that is going to be consistent, that is going to retain Saskatchewan as a complete entity so that citizens of Saskatchewan have a Saskatchewan time for all of Saskatchewan, and let us have the intestinal fortitude to do the job right while we are at it.

An Hon. Member: — Why didn't you do it?

Mr. Kramer: — We did do it. There are people sitting right in this House, Mr. Speaker, that saw to it that the people of eastern Saskatchewan didn't go along with it for politics' sake.

Mr. I. C. Nollet (Cutknife): — Mr. Speaker, I just have a few remarks to make and I certainly agree with other members that in the all-important objective of trying to reach uniformity of time over the largest possible area this Bill does not achieve that objective. It only achieves that objective in the eastern part of Saskatchewan where there is no option other than central standard time the year around. But then we move to the west of this zigzag line and we say in certain specified areas it shall be mountain standard time the year around but in the rest of the area, during the winter time and for the winter period, it will be optional. It will again be placed on a local option as to what time the people may have in the winter as against the summer. Now I can't understand, if we made it mandatory east of that line, why we shouldn't make it mandatory west of that line, and say mountain standard time for this area entirely. Then you eliminate this whole problem of contentions and further plebiscites and local options which can only encourage a more confusing situation west of this line drawn on the map I have in my hand. Again may I repeat, maybe a good expression would be, as Lloydminster goes, maybe the whole area west of this line ought to go the same, and have some uniformity. But I think if we recognize that in this particular specified area there is a problem that requires mandatory mountain standard time the year around, I argue strongly then that the whole area west of this line ought to be mandatory mountain standard time. I am very reluctant, Mr. Speaker, to vote for the Bill because of its great deficiencies, because of my fear that we will wind up again in the same position that we were in previously. I would hope that this would not occur and we will do our best certainly in Committee to promote some amendments. I will specifically at that time suggest that west of that line we have a mandatory mountain standard time zone the year around.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. W. S. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I don't want to speak at any length at all to this but I do want to express one hope. That hope is that the government will not go out and attempt to claim, as they have been attempting to claim they were going to do, I hope that they don't go out and attempt to claim that they have solved the time question in the province. I don't object to them going out and saying that they have tried to do so but please let them refrain from saying that they have solved the time situation. I say this knowing how very difficult the problem is for people and communities and government alike. I draw the attention of the minister in particular to the problem which some of our constituencies face because of their proximity to the boundary line proposed, and because also of their proximity to certain larger centres. Now presumably west of the line, of course, they will all be required, whether they wish to or not, accept central standard time during the summer period. That means that areas which have traditionally resisted this move will be required by law to go on central standard time. I am conscious of the question that my seatmate, the member for Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank), asked. I would be very happy to hear the minister comment on it when he rises because I have a feeling some of my constituents will want to know. What are they going to do if the community refuses to

go along with the law which says, "Thou shalt observe central standard time" whether you like to or not.

The other problem arises during the wintertime. I asked the minister to consider the situation of people who live just west of Saskatoon. It is unlikely I think that area would vote in favour of central standard time during the winter, but it is likely that the city of Saskatoon will remain on central standard time during the winter, so that we do have a continued confusion in that area. We get the same situation as the area in North Battleford. Part of my constituency lies in the North Battleford school unit. It is entirely possible, I presume, that the city of North Battleford might have sufficient weight in the area to carry a central standard time vote during the winter period. If we suppose they do so this means then that a considerable number of people living some distance south of north Battleford are going to be on central standard time. It would be unlikely that the residents in the larger school unit at Biggar would vote for central standard time and they are going to be on mountain time. In travelling through my constituency in the wintertime I could easily change my watch about three times in order to keep up with the situation which the government is producing in this particular area. I admit, as I said before, Mr. Speaker, that the problem is a difficult one and I hope we don't hear the claim that the government by this legislation is solving the problem because it isn't.

Mr. R. A. Walker (Hanley): — Mr. Speaker, I don't want to say very much about this but I think it's a far from perfect solution to the problem. The only difficulty I am having is that I can't really put forward a better one that would please everyone. But the problem here is, Mr. Speaker, that I think we had a better plan. It was objected to by the people of Estevan and Yorkton and this caused it to be rescinded. This plan I think is not as good as the one that we had three or four years ago which the people at that time were not prepared to observe. Maybe they would be now, maybe they wouldn't; I don't know.

I draw attention to the problem in my constituency, Mr. Speaker. The constituency of Hanley is going to be torn asunder by the time boundary. Part of it is going to be on mountain standard time six months of the year and part of it on central standard time. What makes it even worse, Mr. Speaker, as I understand the Bill, the Saskatoon east school unit will be on central standard time all year around, the Saskatoon west school unit will be on mountain standard time in the winter and fast time in the summer. There is a little area between the Saskatoon east school unit and the city of Saskatoon which the drafters of the Bill seem to have overlooked. The boundaries of the Saskatoon east school unit don't follow the boundaries of the east boundary of sections wide, which means that the city of Saskatoon will be completely surrounded by mountain standard time in the winter and will be an island of central standard time surrounded by mountain standard time. That's something which I suggest might be corrected in committee or it may be that I have misread the Bill; but I think there is a little no-man's-land between the Saskatoon school unit and the city limits of Saskatoon. As the Minister of Education probably knows, the Saskatoon School District extends some distance outside the city limits.

Now the unhappy part about this is that the province should

either be all one or all the other in my opinion. We ought to remember that the Province of Saskatchewan lies exactly in the geographical centre of the mountain time zone, taking the 15 degree intervals from Greenwich. The 105th meridian is the exact centre of the mountain standard time zone and the mountain standard time zone extends from approximately the city of Brandon to approximately the city of Calgary. Here we are a province that lies smack in the middle of the mountain standard time zone, having to endure two different times.

I think it is going to be a real nuisance to the people of the Saskatoon area. The people just west of Saskatoon who work in the city, who get their mail from Saskatoon, do their shopping in Saskatoon, do all their business in Saskatoon, are going to get a different time than the place where they do their shopping. It strikes me, Mr. Speaker, that the government could have found some way of drawing that boundary so that it doesn't go right down the boundaries of a city of 140,000 people. The rural people who are just on the edge of that boundary are going to be severely inconvenienced and likewise the merchants and business people of Saskatoon are going to have to displease a certain percentage of their customers on being on a time different from the time kept by their customers. This will be particularly so in the wintertime. I should think that the government could have found some way of either leaving that boundary east to the third meridian or moving it further west so that it would divide the trading area between Saskatoon and Battleford and not run it right down along the city boundaries like that. So, Mr. Speaker, I will have a good deal of hesitation about supporting this plan because I don't really think it is a solution to the problem. It is less of a solution than another experiment that was tried a few years ago. I hazard the prediction that two or three years from now this will look just as strange. I don't think this will be the pattern two or three years from now.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. W. G. Davies (Moose Jaw City): — Mr. Speaker, I have also only a very few words to say on this matter. I do so feelingly because at one time I was chairman of a committee of the Urban Municipalities Association that was charged with the job of bringing in a recommendation on the subject of time. We did. The recommendation was very much the same as that to which the hon. member from Hanley (Mr. Walker) has referred. As everyone knows that when this kind of suggestion (not quite the same as we made but very close to it) was implemented there was some adverse expression of opinion. We all remember what transpired at that time and I don't want to go into that part of history. It does seem to me, however, that the solution that was advocated a few years ago was a better solution than the one we are looking at here. I say this in the most unpartisan way because I quite understand the many views on time in this province.

It seems to me that it is hard to find a question on which people can be more emotional and sometimes irrational, and on which it is so hard to pin down opinions. It's like quicksilver. You put your thumb on it and it scatters into a dozen different assorted opinions in almost any area that you might care to mention. Perhaps there has been in the last few years an evolution of attitudes on the time question; I don't know. My guess is that things have not changed very much in the last few years and that there is still a considerable difference of opinion. What bothers me here, of course, is the fact that we are going to have some

most irregular patterns as has already been suggested by other speakers — this in a province where so much depends on provincial patterns; where laws and trade, anything you want to mention really, depend to some extent on the time feature.

I personally feel, difficult though this question is, that I am not sure that the plebiscite way might not be the best way to finally resolve this issue for the people of this province. I grant that we had difficulties on this some years ago, but I am hopeful that there might now be some desire on the part of the people of the province to adopt one general time throughout the province for part of the year and another time throughout the province for another part of the year. I say again it seems to me that this would be a better solution than the one that is before us.

Of course for the part of the province that is on the westward side of the line in the map that we have before us, it means that the people in that area are going to have for half of the year, or approximately that, a decision imposed upon them and an option only so far as the other part of the year is concerned. It seems to me that they are not going to like that and that we are going to experience a great many difficulties because of this decision. Now I feel that the effort that has been made by municipal officials to try and get a consensus is and has been laudable. A great deal of exchange of opinion has been effective in the last two or three years. I would like to compliment the persons that are responsible for having tried to get that consensus. However, everyone knows that it is one thing to talk to a few municipal officials, it's quite another thing to get an opinion in depth going all the way down to the taxpayers in each municipality. For these reasons I doubt, with all respect to the persons concerned, that they have necessarily plumbed the full extent of local opinion in the areas that are going to be most concerned, particularly those areas that are adjacent to the demarcation line. So far as the city of Moose Jaw, my own constituency, is concerned; this decision will not affect us very much. It will, however, concern people who use Moose Jaw as a trade centre, who purchase their supplies there. I would think that a number of people on the west side of the line and who regularly come to Moose Jaw, would find this decision an inconvenience. While I say it with some hesitation I feel that perhaps the best way that this might be resolved in the analysis is to try and find a clear formulation — and I fully realize the difficulties of doing this — to put this matter to the people of the province again by referendum.

Some Hon. Members: —Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — I would call the attention of the House to the fact that the member is about to close the debate and if anybody wishes to speak he must do so now.

Mr. H. A. Broten (Watrous): — Mr. Speaker, I think we all agree that we are dealing with a knotty problem. We in the Lanigan school unit in which I live, had a vote this winter and voted to go on mountain time and central standard in the summer, so it is not unanimous over a large part of the area right now. This is after a long struggle on this problem. I have often thought we could have central standard time in the summer over the whole province and mountain time for four months during the winter. I sometimes think that that probably could be accepted as well as anything. In the area

that I live in, it is quite a struggle for the people that have children going to school in the winter time and having to go out early in the morning. This seems to be quite a solid thing as far as I can see. I have also asked many people in our area if they would go on central time in the summer and mountain time for four months in the winter. Most of them have said that is the solution they would accept. It is probably the most acceptable to the people that I approached in our area. This is all I can add to the debate at this moment.

Mr. McIsaac: — Mr. Speaker, I think that the remarks to date typify one conclusion that you invariably draw when discussing this time question, that it is very difficult to get any degree of unanimity on the problem. I would like to say a word to the member for Arm River (Mr. Pederson) who is not now in his seat. He indicated that the plan did not meet with his approval. Time Committee members did discuss the entire proposal with him that we have drafted. The Bill represents the almost complete suggestions as put forth by the Time Committee. If he had suggestions to make I am sorry he didn't make those suggestions to the committee at that time for we would certainly have considered them. We will still consider them as far as that goes. He also indicated to me earlier that the general proposals as put forward in the Bill were acceptable to him. Members opposite say that the time problem will still be mixed up, it will still be a hodgepodge. I would suggest that it will certainly be less of a hodgepodge than it is now if the House should adopt the Bill. It does provide for uniformity for six months of the year.

I might mention to members of the House that last fall the premier of Alberta announced that they were considering implementing legislation which would provide for a vote permitting the province of Alberta to adopt central standard time in the summer months. As most of the members know Alberta has been on mountain standard time by law for a number of years. I haven't yet been advised as to whether or not this Bill is coming into the Alberta legislature this winter. If it should and if the vote should be favourable, I understand the way they intend to do it is that the whole province will vote on whether or not they will adopt central standard time in the summer. Should all these "ifs" come about, we will have the province to the west of us on central standard time in the summer.

The member for Hanley (Mr. Walker) made a suggestion that possibly the boundary, the line drawn around Saskatoon with respect to Saskatoon east school unit, could be incorrect; we will certainly look into this. If this is true we will certainly change this. Also I could remind the member from Hanley that this Bill does not say that Saskatoon east school unit and the people in it will automatically be on mountain standard time in the winter time. They will have the opportunity to vote. In an area such as that it is quite likely that they would decide to go on central standard time throughout the year. But the people on the west side of the so-called arbitrary line — and I agree it looks a bit like a snake's back all right — they have the opportunity to decide for themselves whether or not they wish to go on central time in the winter.

I would again just suggest that the Bill does provide for uniformity throughout six months of the year in the province, that the local option area now takes in both rural and urban people, so that all of the people in an area can have their say.

March 28, 1966

The third important feature as I see it is that school unit boundaries are considered for the local option areas. The main problem seems to be that most people say they don't really care themselves what the time is but they are concerned about the children. For this reason the option areas are geared to school purposes.

The problem of a plebiscite was mentioned by the member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Davies). If he could suggest a wording that would be decisive I am sure we would be very happy to look at it. If the previous solution or the previous proposal as brought in by members opposite was so much better, I wonder why it was not accepted by the people of the province at that time. I do not say that this is the ideal solution by any means, but I do suggest that it is a plan that at least reflects the existing situation fairly closely.

Some Hon. Members: —Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — The question before the House is on the motion of the Hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McIsaac) that Bill No. 36, An Act Respecting Time, be now read a second time.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the second time.

Hon. J. M. Cuelenaere (Minister of Natural Resources) moved second reading of **Bill No. 80, An Act to amend The Northern Administration Act.**

He said: This Bill provides for two amendments to the Northern Administration Act. Section 23 provides that the Provincial Treasury may upon requisition of the minister advance out of the Consolidated Fund such monies as may be required for industrial development and other developments in Northern Saskatchewan. Sub-section 2 provided that the total amounts shall not exceed one-half million dollars. Now as at the end of 1965 that half million dollars had practically been completely used up. This is a request to increase the amount from a half million to a million dollars, or an additional half million dollars. The other part of the amendment provides for the repeal of part 8. In 1964 the legislature of the province passed two new parts to the Northern Administration Act, namely; parts that were then parts 5A and 5B, now in the Consolidated Statutes as parts 7 and 8. Part 7 provided for the establishment of northern community areas and part 8 provided for the northern Housing and Development Board. Now part 8 is the part that is being eliminated or repealed. Part 8 provided for a board of seven to nine members to be appointed throughout Northern Saskatchewan that would meet to advise on housing and industrial development. After giving the matter very careful consideration the people in my department felt that we should take steps to immediately establish northern community areas. I am very pleased to be able to announce that effective on the 1st of January of this year, 1966, four northern community areas were established, namely Buffalo Narrows, Ile a la Crosse, Cumberland House and Sandy Bay. These northern community areas are now in operation. However, in view of the demand on the fund it was felt that this wider board of nine members, or seven to nine members, in the Northern Administration District was not necessary.

Apart from that I want to point out to the Assembly that we have had a re-organization in the administration of the northern Administration District. As matters now stand we have established

three Northern Administration areas and Northern Administration Supervisors have been appointed, one at Buffalo Narrows, one at La Ronge and one at Creighton. These supervisors are entrusted with the duty and responsibility of meeting with local people, arranging for community development and assisting people who require advances for housing, mink ranching, fishing and housing other community developments. So, after discussing the matter and looking into it with some care, it was decided that a board of seven to nine members drawn from such a vast area would not serve any real purpose. It has been recommended, therefore, that Part 8 be repealed and that we continue to encourage and to develop the establishments of northern community areas. I might point out that it was also discovered that in the majority of cases, when there were applications made for industrial loans, it was necessary to obtain the services of people who were qualified and experts in the field in the particular type of industrial development that was proposed. A board such as was contemplated by Part 8 would not, it is suggested, Sir, serve any real purpose.

Now, we might be able to discuss the matter further in committee, but the principle of the suggested amendments is to increase the loan money to which I assume there will be no opposition and to eliminate Part 8, which provided for this broad advisory board. Mr. Speaker, with these few words, I would call the attention of the House to the fact that the member is about to close the debate and if anybody wishes to speak he must do so now. beg leave of the Assembly to move second reading of this Bill.

Some Hon. Members: —Hear, hear!

Mr. E. Kramer (The Battlefords): — Mr. Speaker, I would just like to ask the minister a couple of questions. First of all, with regard to the raising of the fund now, I am certainly glad that this fund is being raised if it is put to proper use. I would like the minister to say a few words as to how the previous fund was used. Were you bouncing on the ceiling of that \$500,000 during the last two years, and if so, what was accomplished by it? I have a purpose in asking this because the member for Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart), who is not in his seat, at the time it was introduced — and I had the honour of introducing this Act two years ago — suggested that this was going to be nothing but a tremendous political fund for the Minister of Natural Resources to work with in the north. I don't know just how the minister has made out with this political fund, but I certainly hope he has used it for constructive purposes. I think the House would appreciate a few words from the minister (Mr. Cuelenaere), to indicate how this program has generally gone along. Possibly this would indicate what would be done with the doubling of the fund.

I am disappointed in the deletion of Pat 8. Your present legislative assistant at the time this Act was introduced said that it was a wonderful thing to bring these people in, but that the appointment of these people was — in the hands of the minister — a dangerous situation. Now, specifically, Mr. Speaker, this board that is now going to be done away with (in fact, you cannot do away with something that does not exist, because I don't believe there was ever one appointed) was designed to do certain things: (a) to advise the minister with regard to projects suitable to development of industry and promotion of improved housing facilities; (b) to study and recommend standards and rates of developments respecting housing and industry; (c) to study and recommend housing in industrial development projects; (d) to make recommendations for projects to be undertaken by the minister through the use of funds that may be available in the

Northern Housing Development Advance Account; (e) to recommend the interest rates, guarantee securities, prices of material, costs of services and other terms and conditions respecting the advances of funds out of the Northern Housing Development Advance Account; (federal) to consider, study and report on any matter or question relating to housing and industrial development that may be referred to it by the minister.

Now it was the hope and I would think it would still be the hope, of the present administration to at least draw to some extent from the advice and experience and the knowledge of community leaders in the north. I congratulate the minister on the fact that he has proceeded with the plans of setting up these Community Boards and made some start at local governments which was anticipated by the Act. But, this particular board referred to in section 8 should be appointed regardless of distance. The problem of distance, Mr. Speaker, will always be there in the north and to simply set up the minister and his people without any liaison or any advice from the people of the north themselves, is just not good enough. We had this complaint from the opposition when we were the government, that we didn't listen to people. Now, after two years in office, the very thing that we set up so that we could draw on the advice and the talents of these good people in the north is being discarded. They may not be graduates from universities, Mr. Speaker, but these people do know the problems of the north, I suggest, possibly better than the minister or his assistant and some of his servants. In fact, the very fact that a great many of the experienced staff are leaving the department right now and the fact that you are going to be faced with a need for experienced staff in the north and throughout the department in the north, ought to commend this board to you so that you would be getting advice from experienced people.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this is the wrong time to be thinking of just sloughing these people off, forgetting them, and saying we know best here in Regina, the minister and his servants know better than the people in the north. Saying, "We don't want your advice, we don't need your advice, we are going to ignore you and we are going to come to you with a plan that will be final; you will have nothing to say". If this is the way, Mr. Speaker, that this government is going to encourage these people to stand on their own feet, to encourage them to be self-sufficient and take their place as citizens and take their place in local government and in the affairs of this province, I suggest that this is a sorry way to approach them.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that certainly I can congratulate them on raising the fund that is going to be spent on behalf of the natives in the north, if spent well. I can commend them on getting the northern districts and local governments set up in the north. At least this is some start of local government, but I must decry the withdrawal and the repeal of Part 8 of this Act. It is a wrong move and certainly it is bad for the people of the north. I think it is wrong for the minister to be setting himself and his servants up as the end-all and be-all of the entire Northern Administration District. I certainly want to stress this and register my disapproval, in no uncertain terms of the repeal of this section of the Act.

Mr. Cuelenaere: — Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to take very much time in replying to what the member from North Battleford (Mr. Kramer) stated. He did ask the question as to how the fund, or how much

of the fund had been spent according to the latest figures which I have received. As at the end of the year, that is December, 1965, a total of \$482,125 had been spent. In addition to that we have now applications pending in the process of being serviced which would bring the total amount to \$513,000. Part of these are dependent upon this amendment being approved by the House.

In other words, I think that it is fair to say that from the time the fund was made available and became known about a year ago, or a little over a year ago, there has been a considerable demand on the part of the people in the north for advances from the fund. I have a breakdown. There have been 38 loans approved for housing, six from milk ranchers. Then the La Ronge industry drew fairly heavily from this fund and one co-op has borrowed from the fund. There has been a considerable amount of material and other things bought which will service these northern areas.

As far as this overall board is concerned, I must tell the House that very careful consideration was given before a decision was made to amend the Act and not to proceed with the appointment of this Northern Housing and Developing Board.

Now, the problem appears to be this, that when we came to selecting or trying to select representatives for this board of seven to nine members, we felt the fair way would be to divide the province into approximately three parts, and say that we would appoint three members to this board from the eastern portion and three members from the central portion and three from the western portion. This would have meant that somebody from the Creighton area, Pelican Narrows area, would be placed on this board and would be one of the men advising or expecting to have quite a complete knowledge of conditions in the La Ronge area, and the Buffalo Narrows area and so on, and vice versa.

We felt, Mr. Speaker, that the purpose could better be served by consulting with the people in the area themselves, in the local area. In other words, the people in the eastern area would be asked by the Northern Development Officer to meet with him in the eastern area, and the same thing in the west and the same thing in the central area. Frankly, we saw no real purpose that this board could serve, that there could be the possibility of competition between the various areas. We discovered that far from requiring a group of people to meet and advise — this is all that this is intended to do — to promote the development of the area, we immediately discovered that applications for housing and for development loans were quite numerous. We found out that it did not require a board to advise people to make application. As a matter of fact applications came in fairly rapidly and there are still quite a number that are under consideration. The fact that we are applying for a further amount of money would indicate that we are able to get quite a large number of applications without the necessity of having a board to advise on projects suitable for development or industry. We feel that the people themselves can decide the projects that are suitable, and people have come forward. Indeed in the course of making loans we have sought the advice of local people. By the repeal of Part 8 it is not intended that this department should try to tell northern people what they should do, far from it. It is the northern people who, themselves, have come to us. They haven't had to go to a board. They set up their own local developments, their own projects, and they have come forth and made applications directly and they received loans.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think that this was just another one of these boards that would meet from time to time; they would be scattered; it would be very difficult to keep them together and to meet more than once or twice a year. This is all this part provided for. Frankly we felt that it would serve very little purpose. I might say that senior officials in my department, when we came down to the practical working out of it, felt that a board such as this would not serve any real purpose towards developing the north and that we would be far better off to do it by way of reorganization and decentralization in our administration. I think it is working out much better and is serving the people of the north much more satisfactorily.

Some Hon. Members: —Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

Hon. G. J. Trapp (Minister of Education) moved second reading of **Bill No. 47 — An Act to amend The Student Aid Fund Act.**

He said. Referring to the amendment to the Student Aid Fund, Mr. Speaker, the fund actually contains two parts. There is a statutory amount of \$1,000,000 which was put there in 1949 and \$2,000,000 which transferred from the School Lands Fund, making a total of \$3,000,000. This is the statutory part of the fund. Then there is another portion of it, which the legislature appropriated to the fund, which now stands at \$2,656,500. The amendment to the legislation would allow this latter portion to be withdrawn. One of the main reasons for this is that money that is now available from the Canada Loan Fund, which this year amounted to more than \$3,000,000, is now available for students' loans, and, therefore, the large sum is really not required.

I think there are some who think there is some danger in the government hiding, should I say, a large sum of money in various nooks and crannies, keeping in mind the fact that taxpayers have put up this money. I want also to say that we seem to have no difficulty in obtaining sufficient funds for loans to students from the Canada Loan Fund. Also the amount of money, if it is withdrawn, if this amendment is passed, could again be appropriated at any time by the legislature if it so desires, and restored, or more could be added to the fund. It doesn't necessarily mean that the fund must be reduced and kept reduced if there seems a need for the fund. Certainly the legislature could appropriate money at any time it so felt and restore the fund to its present level or higher. Mr. Speaker, with those few words, I would beg leave of the Assembly to move second reading of this Bill.

Mr. A. E. Blakeney (Regina west): — Mr. Speaker, I want to say about this Bill that I oppose it and oppose it very vigorously. This Bill will move well over \$2,500,000 out of the Student Aid Fund into the general revenue of the province.

The minister (Mr. Trapp) in his explanation says that \$3,000,000 is the amount which was placed in the fund either when the fund was established fifteen years ago, or by transfer from the School Lands Fund and that the balance is money which has been appropriated from time to time by the legislature. You will note and I will note that the minister is giving absolutely no credit by way of earnings to this \$3,000,000 which has been in the Student Aid Fund, \$1,000,000 since 1949, and the other

\$2,000,000 since about five years ago or thereabouts. All of the earnings of the fund are to be taken out and all of the money appropriated by the legislature from time to time over the years is to be taken out, and all that is to be left is the \$1,000,000 set up in 1949 and the \$2,000,000 transferred from the School Lands Fund, which was a trust set up for the education of the people of this province in 1905 or thereabouts.

I think that one can only view this with a good deal of misgiving. Firstly, I don't think this is the place where the province should get its monies to finance its ordinary program. Secondly, the minister asserts that there is an excess of money in the fund. Well, there is only an excess of money in the fund because there is a deficiency of imagination in the government. There is no possible argument for saying that all our needs for scholarships, and grants, and bursaries, and loans have been met. It is true that some progress is being made with respect to scholarships and loans for people going to university. But even here in the university area the situation in Saskatchewan is a very long way from what it is in many parts of the world. People sometimes think of a University like Oxford as being a place where only students from the upper class attend. But I know that when I was attending Oxford, fully 75 per cent of the people there were in receipt of scholarships of one kind or another. That is the extent to which university education has been made available in some other countries. There are restrictions, undoubtedly, in Great Britain, but their restrictions are based upon academic accomplishments and not upon availability of funds. Certainly we in Canada should find ways to make it much easier to make our universities available to all our students, to all those who can benefit because they have the necessary intellectual equipment.

The Premier admits that there are people excluded from our university because of a lack of funds. When he was responding to students at the University of Saskatchewan Regina Campus, to their pleas for free tuition, his reply was that the facilities would be overcrowded, that there would be a flood of students. Obviously if the academic entrance requirements are the same, the only thing that could produce a flood of students would be a dropping of the financial barrier. This is a clear admission that financial barriers now prevent young Saskatchewan people from attending university. I am prepared to admit that substantial progress has been made because of the federal loan program, and I commend the federal government and the provincial government for participating in this program. What I am not prepared to do is to admit that we have gone as far as we can go. We have much to do yet to make our universities available to students from lower income families.

I think that the limit in the horizons of the government opposite is indicated by the fact that the minister argues that the federal program is the reason for stripping the Saskatchewan Student Aid Fund. It should rather be a reason for focussing the Saskatchewan Student Aid Fund on other areas which are not now covered at all.

Some Hon. Members: —Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — I am sure that member s opposite have inquiries from their constituents about how their constituents or children of their constituents can get an education of some kind. I had two letters last week, one from a lady wondering how she can get a

business course in order that she and her family can get off social aid, she is now pursuing a course through the facilities of the Department of Social Welfare. She said she is having a great deal of difficulty making a go of her course and she would be a very worthy recipient of a loan from the Student Aid Fund. I have another letter from another person. This letter didn't happen to be a constituent of mine, it came from outside my constituency. This person told how her son who was in grade 10, and how his father didn't earn very much. She inquired how she could see that her son got technical training in view of her financial difficulties.

Here is another area which presents a challenge and an opportunity for the use of the Student Aid Fund. I know that a couple of years ago an acquaintance of mine in Regina left school in grade 11 and became a taxi driver because he wanted to be married. Admittedly a foolish thing to do. His family weren't well to do. If he had had just that much encouragement that a loan might have given, or some other aid available from the Student Aid Fund I am sure that I could have convinced him to stay on to complete his grade 11 and go on to a technical institute at Moose Jaw. He is a very fitting candidate for it, and he, himself, would have had a trade rather than have the limited prospects of a taxi driver.

There are many, many fields of need. We all know of farmers being displaced by the consolidation of farms and we know that ARDA is looking at this problem. We know that there is a retraining job to be done. But I don't know that facilities are being offered from the Student Aid Fund for these types of people. If they are, I wish the minister would tell us. There are many other areas. I think of farmers who could be induced to go into for example, potash mining technology, or nursing home management, or I think of young girls from farms who could become child nurses or train in other areas of endeavour in the service trades where admittedly they will not be pursuing a university course, but where just as obviously they could use assistance and aid in getting the education which will give them an opportunity to fulfil their potential.

There is indeed a great scope for scholarships, in the technical institutes, in the business schools, in the area of nursing — and we are going to have fess for nursing in a short time — and in other areas of endeavour. I think there is another area where we simply haven't looked at the problem up to now and that is the problem of students who have been unable to pursue their high school career because of lack of funds. Now I admit that the number of these is not large, the number of students who can't get a high school education because their families simply can't afford to keep them off the labour market that long is not large. But we are reaching the point where we shouldn't be talking about large numbers or small numbers. We are reaching the point where we should be asking, "Are there any who are being deprived?" If the answer is Yes, we should be focussing the Student Aid Fund on this group.

I ask you to look at the problem of northern education. If any member can believe that there are no young people in northern Saskatchewan who are being deprived of an education because of the meagre financial resources of his or her parents, I suggest he knows nothing of the problem. There is a very real problem there. Here the Student Aid Fund could operate in the field of scholarships, or loans or bursaries. It would need to be a special program, but, as I have indicated in this House

before, I think that we need to have more specialized programs for northern education.

So here is another field where the Student Aid Fund could serve a very useful purpose. I could go on with many other suggestions. My point is simply this; that there are areas of unfilled needs in Saskatchewan, areas with needs which could be filled by an extended program of scholarships, loans and bursaries from the Student Aid Fund. These areas ought to be looked at, ought to be canvassed and these needs met before the Student Aid Fund is stripped to provide funds for the Provincial Treasurer.

There can, I think, be no justification for stripping \$2,500,000 out of this fund which was set aside by previous legislatures in order to meet these very needs while these needs exist.

Mr. Speaker, it is my submission that the needs do exist. It is my submission that they are unmet and that they could be met by the use of the Student Aid fund. And while they could be met I suggest that is wrong for this legislature to strip the fund.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I will be voting against the Bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Assembly recessed at 5:30 until 7:30 p.m.

Mr. Trapp: — Briefly, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that I very much agree with the idea of scholarships. When the hon. member mentions an institution like Oxford, which picks its students from all over the world, you would expect a high percentage of those being there to be on scholarships.

I think there is another side to scholarships, bursaries and wholesale gifts to students. I think every student should have the opportunity to go on to post-high school education and high school education. However, I think, when you think of a system of bursaries, wholesale bursaries and gifts to students, you must also remember that you are not giving away your own money, you are giving away the money of the taxpayers of this province.

How do you justify it when you think of a young chap who finishes high school and goes out to farm. He must borrow tens of thousands of dollars at six and six and a half per cent interest and he must pay it all back over the years. I think you must think of all the citizens when you think of wholesale loans of this nature, or gifts, should I say? I think loans are very valid, very valuable, and every student should have an opportunity of a loan if he needs the money. I think we have come to this place as far as post-high school education is concerned. The member from Regina West (Mr. Blakeney) mentioned technical vocational schools. I think he is aware that technical vocational education students, going on after high school, may qualify for loans if they are taking a two-year course.

Now there are some dangers in loans when students have not completed high school. I think many of the hon. members across the way are aware of these dangers. I think one of the great

March 28, 1966

danger is to encourage students to leave school and say, "Well, I'll just quit and I'll go and get a loan, I'll go and get some bit of a course", instead of finishing their whole high school. I think this is a real danger that they are not encouraged to leave school, before they have finished high school. I think our technical vocational high school plan will provide technical education for those who want to continue after high school, vocational training for those who cannot or those who do not want to go to university or to the further technical training. I would hope that we can provide educational opportunities to them during their high school life for all students in the province. I must admit that we have been studying and are continuing to study this whole plan of further loans and encouragement to students at high school level.

I would, therefore, move second reading of this Bill, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. D. W. Michayluk (Redberry): — Mr. Speaker, am I out of order if I ask the minister a question before you take a vote?

Mr. Speaker: — Well, the minister closed the debate, but I think you will have ample opportunity to ask questions in committee.

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 28

Howes	Coderre	Romuld
McFarlane	Bjarnason	Weatherald
Boldt	Trapp	MacLennan
Cameron	Cuelenaere	Larochelle
Heald	McIsaac	Hooker
Gardiner (Melville)	MacDonald	Coupland
Guy	Gallagher	Gardner (Moosomin)
Merchant (Mrs.)	Breker	Mitchell
Loken	Leith	Grant
Radloff		

NAYS — 20

Lloyd	Thibault	Link
Cooper (Mrs.)	Whelan	Brotten
Wood	Nicholson	Larson
Nollet	Dewhurst	Robbins
Walker	Berezowsky	Pepper
Brockelbank (Kelsey)	Smishek	Pederson
Davies	Michayluk	

On the motion of the Hon. Mr. Steuart, the Assembly adjourned at 9:58 o'clock p.m.