

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Fourth Session — Fifteenth Legislature**  
**22nd Day**

**Monday, March 6, 1967**

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

**WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**MR. J.E. BROCKELBANK (Saskatoon):** -- Mr. Speaker, this is rather out of order I would suspect, but there are a group of students that I came down on the train with today from Saskatoon. I understand their trip is delayed because the train was delayed. They may enter the Chamber later on this afternoon. In the hope that they will enter the Chamber later on this afternoon, I would take this opportunity to mention that they are from St. Edward's School which is about a stone's throw from my residence. They are grade seven and eight students and 33 in number. They will be accompanied by Mr. Pat Mooney and Mr. E. Pulak. This school was singled out by the Separate School group in Saskatoon to hold the Centennial flag presentation ceremony a week to two weeks ago. I would like, if they do arrive, Mr. Speaker, to hope that they have an eventful and knowledgeable day in the Chamber.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. G.G. LEITH (Elrose):** -- Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in introducing through you to the Members of the Legislature, a group of nine high school students from the Elrose constituency who are in Regina for a two-day tour of the Legislature and a visit to a couple of the departments of government. I want to tell you, Sir, and the other Members that they are chosen by the principal of each of the nine high schools. I wish them a very educational afternoon and a safe journey home. I also want to mention that their drivers are here; Mr. Lorne Byrnes, Mr. Albert Mewis, and Mr. Willard Kallio.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. SPEAKER:** -- Our galleries would have been full of students again today. I'm sure we would all wish to welcome them in absentia and hope that they will get here later on.

**CONDOLENCES TO MADAME VANIER**

**HON. W. ROSS THATCHER (Premier):** -- Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan were saddened yesterday by the death of our Governor General. The passing of General Vanier has ended the career of one of our nation's most illustrious sons. His death will leave a void in our national life, for His Excellency was always an unassuming servant of both Her Majesty and the Canadian people. His contribution as a soldier was unsurpassed; as a diplomat he was known and respected by statesmen in all parts of the world. Most of us knew him as our Governor General, the role in which the people of Canada gave him their deepest affection and loyalty. His visits to Saskatchewan will always be recalled as warm and stirring occasions on which he asked only that our people serve Canada and humanity in a generous and dedicated manner. On behalf of the people

of Saskatchewan, my most sincere condolences go out to Madame Vanier and the members of her family. Mr. Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, (Mr. Lloyd):

That this Assembly unites in paying tribute to the memory of the Right Honorable Georges Philias Vanier, D.S.O., M.C. and Bar, D.C., Governor General of Canada, whose death on Sunday is deeply mourned by all and whose lifetime of service to his Sovereign and his country will ever stand as an inspiring example to Canadians in all parts of our land.

**HON. W.S. LLOYD (Leader of the Opposition):** -- Mr. Speaker, I rise to second both the remarks of the Premier with respect to our late and highly respected Governor General, and also the motion that this Assembly join in sending our deep regrets to Madame Vanier and members of the family. The late Governor General represented one of the oldest families of Canada as he represented one of the oldest cultures of Canada. As the Premier has indicated, his career has been both distinguished and distinctive. It was a distinguished career measured in terms which we can only rarely apply to people in public life because it was so varied. He served Canada as a soldier and as a diplomat and in later years of course, we knew him in this part of the country best because of the very effective way in which he filled the very sensitive position of our Governor General. This service was distinguished. I think we will remember him most of all because he was such a distinctive Canadian as well. Those of us who have heard him will remember how very frequently and how very well he expressed an appreciation and an understanding of Canada as a nation. He always gave very impressive reasons with respect to his estimate and his affection for Canada; his words were emphatic because they were so intensely sincere. Even more than this it seems to me he had a kind of feeling about Canada, and people joined with him in this feeling which is sometimes difficult to define in more exact terms, and it is important that we do have feelings about our nation. I think Governor General Vanier was particularly apt because he had this feeling and he helped the rest of us to share in that particular feeling. He, I suspect, will be particularly remembered by the children of Canada. As one watched him on television and in other ways in association with groups of children of any kind, one couldn't help but feel there was very real communication between this older person and these very young Canadian citizens. I'm sure that they will have a deeper feeling about Canada because of their contact with the late Governor General. I thought something about this man has been expressed in a few lines written by Ruskin a long while ago. Here are the words to which I have reference:

Here is the element or the power of conduct, of intellect and knowledge, of beauty and of social life and manners, all needful to build up a complete human life.

I think our late Governor General did have a complete human life because he possessed within himself all of those characteristics. We join with great regret and deep sadness in the message which the Premier has just communicated to the House. May I say, Mr. Speaker, before sitting down that shortly before 2 o'clock, the Member from Arm River, the Leader of the Conservative Party, (M.P. Pederson) in the House spoke to me. He unfortunately has to attend another funeral and consequently was unable to be here.

March 6, 1967

He asked if I would express his regrets and to join his voice with that of the rest of us in this motion.

**MR. SPEAKER:** -- It has been moved by the Hon. Premier, seconded by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. Will the House take the motion as read? Is the House ready for the question?

**MR. THATCHER:** -- Mr. Speaker, I should like to move by leave of the Assembly, seconded by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition:

That the Resolution just passed be communicated to Madame Vanier by Mr. Speaker.

Motion agreed to.

**MR. THATCHER:** -- Mr. Speaker, I should like to move, seconded again by the Leader of the Opposition, by leave of the Assembly:

That when this House adjourns on Tuesday, March 7, 1967, it do stand adjourned until 2:30 p.m. on Thursday, March 9th, 1967.

This will permit Hon. Members, if they so wish to attend funeral ceremonies downtown or wherever they may be held, Mr. Speaker.

Motion agreed to.

**MR. LLOYD:** -- I would like to ask the Premier, is there any certainty yet with respect to public ceremonies on Wednesday in the city?

**MR. THATCHER:** -- No, we have not been able to find out just precisely what is going to be held in that regard.

#### **QUESTION RE: AIR SERVICES**

**MR. R.A. WALKER (Hanley):** -- Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I take it that the Government is aware of the recent applications by TransAir and NorCanAir and MelAir before the Air Transport Board, hearings of which will be held on May 1. I wonder if the Government could indicate whether or not it will be presenting evidence and a brief to that hearing and, if possible, could the Government indicate what steps it will take to ensure continuation of service between the cities of Saskatchewan.

**MR. THATCHER:** -- I would be pleased to look into that matter and try to give the Hon. Member an answer tomorrow.

#### **REPORT RE: SPORTING EVENTS**

**HON. G.B. GRANT (Minister of Public Health):** -- Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to advise that I have an unfortunate report to give on a sporting event of some importance held on Saturday last. The Members on this side, in a fit of enthusiasm a couple of weeks ago, accepted a challenge from the Press gallery to a bowling

event and unfortunately age outshone experience and majority and we came out second best. And if the Press was not aware of this, I wouldn't bother reporting it, but if I don't do it I'm sure they will. We've had two unfortunate competitive sporting events, the broom ball and this bowling event. We have one more coming up next Sunday when we meet the city council and I for one will state publicly that if we are not successful, then I'm going to retire from competitive sports and restrict my activities to running where my only competitor is time.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. W.S. LLOYD (Leader of the Opposition):** -- Mr. Speaker, I'm in a position to remind the House of a much more fortunate result in the world of athletics of the weekend and it is that a Girls High School rink from Asquith, on Saturday were successful in becoming the Provincial Champions in that field. Asquith is a town which is somewhat close to Saskatoon, growing very rapidly, close to a potash mine, may I say, on a good highway and all sorts of other fine characteristics of that kind. I'm sure that the group of girls from a relatively small town really do distinguish themselves when they win in such an event, and I know all the members would want to join me in congratulating them on it.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

## SECOND READINGS

**HON. L.P. CODERRE (Minister of Labour and Co-operatives)** moved second reading of Bill No. 22 -- **An Act to assist Producers to increase their Income from Production on a Co-operative Basis.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, in rising to move second reading of an Act to assist producers to increase their income from production on a co-operative basis, it is to make it easier for producers to organize for joint production of agricultural or other products on a co-operative and mutual basis. Another purpose is to make it more convenient for producers to provide themselves -- and I hope that the Members opposite will provide themselves with education and listen -- jointly with services that will assist them in their individual production. We now have about some 250 production associations of various kinds in the province and these include machinery associations, community pastures, associations for feeding and finishing livestock, and so on. These have been organized in the past, Mr. Speaker, under Part 3 of The General Co-operative Associations Act. In view of the increasing need for many producers to pool some of their production operations, a new and separate Act was necessary to help them achieve this goal. This Act spells out the different kinds of production services and operations that can be organized. This Act will be used as a legal basis for organization and administration. The need for this kind of an Act has been mentioned to the Department many times by members of existing production associations. We are taking their advice in the hope that this kind of legislation can be of special help to the smaller and medium-sized farm operator and assist him to maintain or improve his position. In other words we expect that this kind of legislation will be one method of maintaining the family farm. This will happen where the operator is willing to work with his neighbor in providing production services. Rising farm cost, the need for new sources of income by agricultural

March 6, 1967

producers in some cases, and the possibility of more efficient farm operations through joint provisions of service to assist in the individual production process, show the need for this kind of legislation. The question we often ask is; how can the producer increase his income under this Act? Now, let me give you a few examples. By joining a machinery association, the producer can cut his investment in machinery per acre and lower operating costs, thereby increasing his net income. I don't believe there is a community in the province where you haven't found people doing that in a sort of unorganized way. This gives them the necessary machinery to get together to work on and to administer properly. I expect that amendments to The Farm Machinery Syndicate Credit Act will make possible direct loans to machinery associations which are limited companies in a sense, as well as to machinery syndicates. I understand that there will be some amendments in the Federal Act; we hope anyway to help them out in that respect. By joining a machinery association, a producer can also pool the crop proceeds from the acreage farm with the machinery operated by the association, thereby overcoming the problem in timing in machinery use. Experience of the Department proves that this is true. The producer can also if he wishes, join with his neighbors in pooling most or all of his farm operations. This can also be of particular value in a family group including a father and son combination, giving the advantage of continuing co-operation with legally binding working agreements and clearly recognized borrowing powers. Where in the past it was four, now it would be two, which are father and son. He can diversify his operations by going more into livestock, such as livestock feeding and finishing with assistance from the association as he can increase his livestock production by joining a small pasture or fodder production association. He can join a small co-operative irrigation project or an association to guard against soil or water erosion.

The producer in the north, whether a mink rancher, a pulpwood cutter, a fisherman, can also improve his position by working with his neighbors. For example, native fishermen might purchase a modern power boat, or boat with the necessary equipment to get their share of fishing in competition with well-financed individual operations. Pulpwood cutters in the north could also combine their activities in the purchase of an operation of modern wood-harvesting equipment. More and more farmers are using professional accounting and farm management advisory services on a group basis. The new Act will provide a suitable corporate basis for such a group if they so wish. The Act concentrates on mutual help in production with power for supplementary services where required to carry out the production process such as marketing in certain instances. By contrast The Co-operative Associations Act stresses the purchasing of goods or services; The Co-operative Marketing Associations Act, the marketing and process of agricultural products. The Credit Union Act encourages the savings in the provision of credit. The production associations require special procedures and have special problems due to the very real possibilities and more need for this kind of joint operation to help the medium-sized operator. A new and special Act of this kind is necessary. As I said, it will replace Part 3 of The Co-operative Associations Act which is no longer adequate.

I wish to mention briefly the different parts of the Act and their purposes, and you will note what is meant. Part 1 for example outlines the incorporation procedures, the general powers and administrative methods at the local level. Parts 2 to 9 inclusive describe the main types of associations that can be organized. They are: Part 1, which is the machinery association. Examples: for joint ownership and operation of large and specialized machines. Part 3, farm associations; almost entirely for

incorporating family groups. Part 4, livestock associations, for example: animal breeding, feeding and operating of dairy cow pools etc. Part 5, specially for grazing and fodder associations for small pasture and fodder production groups. Part 6, land improvement associations such as conservation against wind or water erosion, small irrigation projects etc. Part 7, lake, forests and fur associations including group purchase and operation of boats for small fishermen, pulpwood procurement and fur conservation and marketing. Part 8, manufacturing associations based on natural products, chiefly for producer members like a handicraft co-operative, as an example. Part 9, production services association to assist producers to improve their production efficiency. Example; the organization of hiring, farm management and accounting consultants. The remainder of the Act of course deals with the usual amalgamation, dissolution, reporting and inspection procedures.

There are some special features to this Act. As I said a moment ago, any two or more persons, whereas in the past it was any three or more. I think this helps out in the father and son combination. This is the same minimum as in a private joint-stock company. This feature could assist a father and son to incorporate thereby giving a continuing organization on a co-operative rather than a joint stock basis. Two or more production associations could also incorporate. Section 4 for example, provides that an association under this Act may use the word 'co-operative' or the word 'pool' or the word 'mutual' as part of its registered name. Each association must also use the word 'limited' in its registered name. The word 'mutual' may seem more suitable for small incorporated family groups. Groups which organize for the purpose of pooling certain operations such as, for example, the operation of a dairy herd or the use of machinery, may wish to use the word 'pool' especially if the association is also used to market some products jointly. We expect to issue regulations providing for general procedures applicable to all the associations because each one has its different problems. These regulations can also include special provisions for the guidance of associations of certain types. In other words a regulation can be used as a general guide, but with the Act being available as a legal basis for organization and a more detailed reference to legal procedure. While the Act is fairly long, procedures will be made as simple and brief as possible. Provision is also made for local bylaws providing for local administration of each association to meet its particular need, geographically or otherwise. All associations hitherto, operating under Part 3 of The C-operative Associations Act will then come under this Act as will all associations organized in the future for production purposes. With these few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I wish to move that Bill No. 22 be read a second time.

**MR. H.A. BROTEN (Watrous):**-- Mr. Speaker, this is indeed a very interesting Act and it's a long Act and several of the Members on our side haven't had a chance to study the whole thing. I move that we adjourn debate at this time.

Debate adjourned.

HON. J.W. GARDINER (Minister of Public Works) moved second reading of Bill No. 23 — **An Act to amend The Public Works Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, the amendment being projected for consideration is to provide legislative authority for the operation

of a Central Vehicle Agency and the method of financing it.

The amendment simply provides for a commercial cost accounting system which is an advance from the Provincial Treasurer for the purpose of paying all costs associated with the operation of the Central Vehicle Agency. These costs will not only include all depreciation and operating costs, but also all administrative costs. Offset in revenues will be obtained by charges to users of the equipment based on a predetermined schedule of rates. The financial structure is identical to a number of other advanced accounts in the Department of Highways, Department of Agriculture and the Department of Natural Resources, used for the purchase and operation of vehicles and equipment.

**MR. H.D. LINK (Saskatoon City):** -- Mr. Speaker, I would like first of all to make it clear that I am not opposed to the Central Vehicle Agency as such. That seems to be quite a sensible sort of an arrangement.

However, looking over the Bill, there are two or three things that are rather interesting. I feel for one thing that it leaves itself open to certain abuses. I also feel that there is not enough provision for certain safeguards that I would like to have seen in the Bill. However, I think that the things that I have in mind might better be dealt with in Committee, Mr. Speaker, and as far as I'm concerned that is where I propose to ask the questions.

**MR. W.G. DAVIES (Moose Jaw City):** -- Mr. Speaker, I haven't any lengthy remarks to make about the Bill, but I think the House has some concern with this very short Bill, which permits the Minister to requisition from the Provincial Treasurer up to \$4,250,000 for the purchase of equipment and machines and services.

I noted in the Bill, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister has the sole right, as I read this section, to set the basis of rental which is one of the principles of the Bill. I am concerned here because it seems to me that this is a great deal of power to reside in one person. I wonder, without any imputation, why these powers do not rest at least in the Lieutenant Governor in Council.

At this point I say that it is possible for inflated charges to be decided upon without special regard to good business or accounting practices. These charges can be set off by similar or complementary inflated charges to those people who use the equipment that the Central Vehicle Agency will be renting. An example is in the renting of automobiles, vehicles, or other equipment, to other departments. I also feel that there is something that the House should know about the fact that the Bill says nothing on the purchase of vehicles, machines, or services being made by the Minister or those he authorizes, without any reference to public tenders.

The Minister may say he intends to have all purchases made by tender, but certainly the Bill doesn't say so. He may say that the regulations that will be pertinent to the Bill, will set these forth. At this time we are not looking at the regulations; we are looking at the Bill. And if I may say so, there is again a great deal of power given to the Minister in making decision by regulations. I remind you again, Sir, that we are here dealing with the right to spend some \$4,250,000. I would

think that the Bill could be a little less sparse in its provision and should spell out some of the guarantees that ordinarily are provided. Additionally, I noticed that the Bill provides that annually there shall be a report made through Public Accounts.

Now, I say report, Mr. Speaker. That is not quite accurate. The word is 'statement' and it doesn't speak about a full report, it speaks about particulars being given in Public Accounts. I personally take some exception to this. I think that in an operation of this magnitude with the kind of expenditures envisaged, remembering that this is a continuing expenditure and a continuing operation over the years, that there should not only be a mention of all the expenditures and the particulars of operation with the Public Accounts Report but there should be a full printed report in the same way as there is a full and printed report from certain Crown operations during the year. The public, and I think, this House, are entitled to the fullest possible explanation each year as to what has gone into the operation of this Agency.

I, with my friend from Saskatoon (Mr. Link) see nothing, in principle, the matter with a Central Vehicle Agency. In some regards this has been the principle followed in the previous Government. A somewhat different method is followed here. But I do think that the public and the House and the buyers and sellers in general, should be permitted to know precisely what goes on from time to time with respect to the operation of this Act. I point out again, Mr. Speaker, that a great deal of power seems to rest with the Minister. I would personally prefer that some of the powers would be subject to the approval of the Lieutenant Governor in Council. Certainly I would hope that a few of the misgivings that I have could be removed in the regulations. At the moment, as I say, the Bill certainly doesn't outline the safeguards I have made mention of this afternoon.

**MR. GARDINER:** -- Mr. Speaker, I haven't any intention of making a lengthy reply. I understand from both Members that they are prepared to allow the Bill to proceed into second reading with probably more information being provided in Committee reading. I would like, however, with regard to one of the arguments of the Hon. Member from Moose Jaw (Mr. Davies) who has just taken his seat, to indicate that under The Highways Act the Minister there is provided with \$9,000,000 with a much briefer Act and the Provincial Treasurer may, upon the requisition of the Minister, advance out of the Consolidated Funds and give them the power to purchase and dispose of equipment in the Department of Highways up to the sum of \$9,000,000. This particular portion of The Highways Act is a much smaller provision and I think probably with less protection than is provided under the amendment that is being made to The Public Works Act at this time. I would just indicate by that that I think the provisions that have been drawn up will give protection, and anyone who has looked at the advance account procedures in our Public Accounts each year will recognize this. I do agree with the Member that perhaps in the past we haven't looked at these as carefully as we could have, but the information is usually contained in our Public Accounts relating to the expenditures under the various advance accounts in our departments. So I would feel that there are protections under this Act for the money, and I am quite certain that this advance account will be carried on as well and as capably as the advance accounts have been carried out in the other departments. Public Works, itself, of course at the present moment has the right to carry advance accounts within the Department. This is really an addition to



March 6, 1967

the Public Works' role. We could have continued in the same method that was used last year to provide funds to the Central Vehicle Agency. It was felt that this was actually giving to the Members and to the people in general, a fuller account of the operations of the Agency than was provided by the legislation in appropriation last year. This was our general reason for bringing this forward. I am quite certain that we can give Hon. Members the answers to their questions in third reading.

**MR. DAVIES:** — Mr. Speaker, before the Minister takes his seat would he answer a question?

**MR. GARDINER:** -- If I can.

**MR. DAVIES:** -- May I ask again, is it the intention of the Minister in the regulations to stipulate public tender in the buying of all equipment?

**MR. GARDINER:** -- Well, I think I can say up to the present moment that the Purchasing Agency, all purchasing is done through the Purchasing Agency, so that this is taken care of. I would say that probably in the regulations it will state that purchases would be carried out through the Purchasing Agency.

**MR. DAVIES:** -- Is the answer probably, yes, or . . .

**MR. GARDINER:** -- I would think it would be Yes, but I haven't the regulations here and I don't know whether they are drawn yet.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

**HON. G.J. TRAPP (Minister of Education)** moved second reading of Bill No. 26 -- **An Act to amend The Larger School Units Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, this amendment to The Larger School Unit Act would provide for the rearranging and renumbering of sub-units. Sometimes in transfers one sub-unit disappears altogether and this would allow for the renumbering of the sub-units that remain. Section 8 is amended. At the present time for transfers of various school systems to another it requires a Queen's Bench judge and this is sometimes a bit difficult. We would like to make it so we could use District Court judges.

In Section 4, where it has been agreed to have a judge consider the alteration of boundaries, he can order a transfer of the area in accordance with the application or he can decide not to transfer the area. I think we would like this amendment so that he can make such alterations in the boundary of any school district that he sees fit. Sometimes we have found that it would be better if a judge could use his own good judgment. It might be something in between which would really be more satisfactory to the people concerned. Now that is what this Section would do. He can, under this, alter the area or refuse to alter the area or make no changes or do as the application has stated.

Section 32 would amend the present Larger School Units Act to provide an indemnity to unit trustees up to \$20 a day from

the maximum of \$15 to \$20 per day. Section 58 is amended. The nine month financial report is deleted. We have deleted this from other parts of other Acts. We do not want this to be a mandatory report.

Section 81 now provides the DRO and poll clerk each to receive \$8. This would change the Section so the DRO or the poll clerk could both get a maximum of \$10, or there might be a differential between the DRO and the poll clerk. That would be up to the board to decide this.

In No. 10, sub-section 15 of Section 81 of the Act is repealed as many school systems do not now hold this annual meeting at this time. Instead I think they tend to concentrate on annual sub-unit trustee meetings. They would prefer that they could still hold the meetings but they need not by law hold them.

Section 83 would make it possible to have agreements made between units and cities for elementary school education as well as high school education.

In No. 13, whereas now rural municipalities no longer are really concerned with the changes of school district boundaries, the new sub-section would make the holding of local annual trustee meetings permissive rather than mandatory.

I think, Mr. Speaker, these are the main changes proposed.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

MR. TRAPP moved second reading of Bill No. 27 -- **An Act to amend The School Act.**

He said: I shall try briefly to give a summary of this amendment. The application for alteration of boundaries and school districts used to be made either to the Department of Education or to the Municipal Council. In recent years when municipal councils were no longer involved because the alteration affected consolidated districts or units which had been removed from the authority of municipal council. It really makes the same change here as we did in the previous Act in this regard.

The amendment to Section 118 permits a school board to make an agreement with a board of a high school district. This is required so that joint board arrangements can be permitted to develop division three schools.

Section 122; this Section removes the words which refer to education of such children as mentally retarded and substitutes the word 'exceptional', which refers to not only the mentally retarded but the gifted child as well.

Section 126; the indemnity of a board where the maximum is changed from \$15 to \$20 per meeting.

In Section 146, this sub-section (3) formerly made the payment of the debenture coupons in a village or rural district a charge upon any grants payable to the district at any time. By removing the word referring to the village and rural districts this provision would now apply to boards of town districts as well.

Section 209, sub-section 2, requiring that English be the sole language of instruction has been removed and an amendment to

March 6, 1967

sub-section 2 permits the use of the French language as a language of instruction for one hour a day. This is subject to regulations of the Department, and the board of the district must pass a resolution to that effect.

Section 210, sub-section 1; This sub-section used to require that religious instructions be given only during the last half out of the school day. The amendment permits the half hour of religious instruction to take place at a time other than the last half hour and a language other than English may be used for such religious instruction.

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

**MR. LLOYD:** -- Mr. Speaker, in the form of a question that has to do with the change in recognition of a different language during the course of instruction, I'm wondering how this may become operative in the school district of, say a school district like the city of Regina. If the Board were to accept the opportunity which is offered here, would it be possible for them to do this in one school in the whole city only or would it have to be done in all schools of the city only? Would it be possible for them to do it one classroom in one school or would it be necessary to have it uniformly spread throughout all of the classrooms? It is just a technical question but it does seem to me that it would make sense if the board were able to do this in one school regardless of whether it did it in other schools as well.

**MR. TRAPP:** -- I would certainly think it would be true that you could designate any school or classroom in which they wanted to do this. Definitely in units they would want to, and I am of the understanding that it certainly could be done in any school or any classroom that they might designate.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

**MR. TRAPP** moved second reading of Bill No. 28 -- **An Act to amend The School Grants Act.**

He said: The amendments here contemplated, Mr. Speaker, are those that would increase the grants to school systems. I'll first turn to grants to schools not in the school units or cities. Amendments to The School Grants Act will extend equalization grants for the small non-unit jurisdictions, those employing less than 15 teachers. Heretofore this equalization grants for these small non-unit boards was applicable only if the assessment per classroom was less than \$150,000. The amendment proposes to provide an equalization grant to those small non-unit boards with assessments per room of \$160,000 or less. The amendment further provides that the rate of equalization grants for these districts of less than fifteen classrooms will be increased by about \$200 per classroom on the average. The maximum will be increased from the amount of \$10.80 to \$12 per day for classrooms in town districts. There are approximately 27 non-unit centres in this category with less than 60 teachers. The amendment will provide an additional \$40,000 to \$50,000 for the districts in this category. In the case of school units and the non-unit urban centres of 15 or more classrooms there will be an increase in the percentage of approved costs to be borne by way of grants.

In the past year the approved or assigned cost covered by grants ranged from 33 per cent in the highest areas to 85 per cent in the lowest assessed areas. For 1967 the range will be from 36 per cent to 88 per cent. A jurisdiction then maintaining exactly the same assessment and employing the same number of teachers as in the preceding year would receive an additional three per cent of the approved program by way of grants. However, if this system has conveyance, conveyance grants are also being increased. However, in the expanding system such as larger urban centres where increased numbers of teachers are required to be employed, the system would benefit to an even greater extent in terms of increased grant dollars. This would be due to the lower assessment per teacher they would have as compared to the preceding year, coupled with three per cent increase in the percentage scale. I could give you an example in the illustration just cited where the board increased their staff from 150 teachers last year to 160 teachers this year. This would give them an assessment per teacher of \$125,000. Percentage level would then be increased to about 63.9 per cent, not 58.9. An approved program of \$1,260,000 would really make the grant \$1,260,000 times 63.9 over 100 or \$805,140. The grant increase with ten additional teachers would then be approximately \$100,000. In the school units where the transportation of pupils represents a substantial expenditure, which is not faced by urban boards, I think in 1965 the transportation total amounted to around \$11,000,000. The rates used in the grant formula to calculate the approved conveyance cost will be revised. The rates used for the pupils carried and the mileage travelled will be increased by \$2.00 each. This increase in the recognized conveyance cost coupled with the previously mentioned improved percentage scale will result in the grants under the general formula for school units increased by approximately \$400 per classroom. In 1967 we shall continue to reimburse school boards for the employer's share of the contribution to the Canada Pension Plan required on behalf of their teachers, which is thought to be in the neighborhood of \$1,000,000. Grants will be provided this year to school boards which make special assistance available to teachers undertaking certain vocational library and guidance training. Grants toward driver education programs for high school pupils will be provided to boards at the rate of \$25 per pupil.

**MR. WALKER:** -- Mr. Speaker, I think the Minister in giving his explanation of the Bill, dealt with a great many other aspects of school grants that what are just dealt with in the Bill. As I understand it some aspects were driving training and so on which has nothing to do with this Bill.

**MR. TRAPP:** -- Mr. Walker, I think you're right. It isn't in the Bill.

**MR. WALKER:** -- Now the Minister gave us some examples or illustrations of how the grant would be effected in districts of under 15 classrooms and districts over 15 and so on. I venture to suggest that his Department has probably calculated the impact of these changes so far as they would affect every district in the province, that is every school unit and every non-unit district. Would that be correct?

**MR. TRAPP:** -- We are working on it and we hope to give Hon. Members these calculations when they're ready.

March 6, 1967

**MR. WALKER:** -- I wonder, Mr. Speaker, then in view of that, if it's a little hard to discuss the principle of the Bill when it's really impossible to tell what the principle is. And I don't know whether it's a small Bill that could be got through Committee very quickly. I wonder if the Minister would be prepared to make these figures available to the Members and let the Bill stand in second reading for a few days or whatever time it would take to make this available. When it's the principle that is involved, Mr. Speaker, it's always the money you're concerned with. Most of us can't really apply these figures to our own situations where we are unfamiliar with the facts because there are so many of the facts that we don't have at our fingertips, and I appreciate the Minister saying that he will have such a statement ready soon and I wonder if he'd be agreeable to let the matter stand. If so I would move the debate on the second reading be adjourned until that might be done.

Debate adjourned.

**HON. D.V. HEALD** (Attorney General) moved second reading of Bill No. 29 -- **An Act to amend The Private Detectives Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, these proposed amendments have been prompted by a letter which we received from a law firm in the city of Regina, acting for one of the licensed and bonded private detectives. The letter came from the firm of Pearce, Hyman and Kuziak. This firm acting on behalf of their client has complained that some law firms have been employing unlicensed persons on a part-time basis to carry out work in the private detective field, in competition with people like their clients who are licensed and bonded. As you know and as Members of the Legislature know, Mr. Speaker, the Act provides for the licensing and bonding of these private detectives. They pay a \$200 annual fee and they are required to file a \$3,000 bond. Now, this law firm has advised us that some of these unlicensed persons were working full time on detective work and would have several law firms as clients at the same time. In other words they might be part-time for one law firm, but really they're in business full-time. They are really sort of getting around the intent or the purpose of the statute which is to provide public protection by regulating private detectives. And when we looked at the exemption which was in the Act, which is in the Act now for barristers and solicitors, we were inclined to agree with this law firm that probably this exemption is too wide. In the existing exemption and I'll read it for the Hon. Members: "Barristers or solicitors in the regular practice of their profession or their employees while acting in that capacity." It seems evident to the Department that the clause in question is too all-inclusive and it would for example, I think by reading it, permit a law firm, for example, engaged in the practice of law in Vancouver, to send a person to Saskatchewan to do detective work without being licensed under our Act because they are of course barristers or solicitors in the regular practice of their profession. And this man coming from Vancouver in my example would be an employee of theirs acting in that capacity. So the purpose of this amendment is to close that loop hole, if you care to call it a loop hole, and I think it is. The proposal in the Bill is to limit the exemption first of all to barristers and solicitors resident in and practising in Saskatchewan and secondly, their full-time employees while undertaking work in the detective field that is directly related to the practice of law by their employer. We think that this will really do what the Section was intended to do in the first place. We're proposing that it come into force on the first

day of July, 1967. This date will give the public and those who are concerned sufficient notice of the change.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

**MR. HEALD** moved second reading of Bill No. 30 -- **An Act to amend The Municipal Hail Insurance Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, these amendments have been asked for by the Saskatchewan Municipal Hail Insurance Association. These amendments will enable the Association to extend its hail insurance coverage on crops to include loss or damage to such crops through fire so it's an extended benefit. Such additional coverage is now being provided by insurance companies under hail policies. In addition the amendments will enable the Association to pay for loss or damage to crops by hail occurring after June 1 rather than June 10. The object of this is to cover crops such as flax or rape, which have on occasion been damaged by hail prior to June 10. The other amendment in the Bill provides a restriction on eligibility for election of directors to the Association. It will provide an additional qualification that no person will be eligible for election as a director unless he is or has been a member of a rural municipal council or is a retiring director. The Association has asked for this because they feel that the directors of this Association should have had municipal experience. In Committee, I will be moving a slight amendment to include in the schedule to the Act, a municipality which has just recently been organized. It's the RM of Old Post No. 43, but I'll be doing that in Committee.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

**HON. D.G. STEUART** (Minister of Natural Resources) moved second reading of Bill No. 31 -- **An Act to amend The Power Corporation Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, this Bill merely extends the borrowing power of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation from \$275,000,000 to the amount of \$400,000,000. With the tremendous industrial development that is taking place under the Liberals, this is absolutely and vitally necessary. I'm sure all Members will join in joyfully to vote in favor of it.

**MR. W.A. ROBBINS (Saskatoon City)**-- In view of all the comments of the Government against borrowing -- that terrible thing that the previous Government did -- borrowed money from the Power Corporation -- I'm amazed that the Member for Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart) should get up and say they want to extend the borrowing powers of the Power Corporation from \$275,000,000 to \$400,000,000. Tough Davey, tough!

**MR. R.A. WALKER (Hanley)**-- This proposal to put the Province further into debt to the extent of \$125,000,000 over the next few years, I wonder if the Minister can tell us over what period of time he expects to push the Province into debt to that extent, before he finishes, before he closes the debate. It strikes me as being a pretty large sum of money. I wonder if the Minister would be able to consider amending this from year to year, so the Legislature could ask him for particulars of what he is proposing to use the money, the \$125,000,000 for, because once this is passed, the Minister won't have to answer to the Legislature then for this \$125,000,000 at all. I think it's a statutory appropriation. I don't think he

has to put it in his estimates. He simply borrows the money, sells the debentures and turns it over to Power. The only time I know of when we have a chance to look into these proposals is when the Bill is before the House, either now in second reading or in Committee. So I wonder if the Minister is able to give us particulars of what he's going to use the \$125,000,000 for and over what period of time.

**MR. W.J. BEREZOWSKY (Cumberland):** -- Mr. Speaker, I hope that the question that has been asked can be explained quite clearly in detail. I think the Minister will probably do that. I think particularly of maybe another dam on the Saskatchewan River. Is that what it's for? Is it to bring let's say, power to resources such as Candle Lake, which I'm personally interested in, and other such communities? Will the Minister give us plenty of detail in the debate?

**MR. STEUART:** -- Yes, Mr. Speaker. It's a pleasure. First, I'd like to point out that I don't agree with the Hon. Member from Hanley (Mr. Walker) that it would be a good idea to come back year after year. The last time that the Minister representing the Power Corporation came to the House and asked to have this limit changed was in 1961. It's always been the practice even under the Socialists, and I think it was a good practice that the Power Corporation was given some leeway and some room to breathe in the matter of borrowing money. He asked the question, how quickly did I anticipate the Power Corporation would be increasing the debt of the Power Corporation? Well, I hope it will be very rapid because as we get more potash mines, more pulp mills, more mines, the demand on the power will increase and increase very rapidly, so we must borrow money. Although we are making a reasonable profit now, and we are beginning to buy back the Power Corporation and increase the Province's equity in it, we still can't increase the equity fast enough, and we can't generate the money fast enough. The cash flow has improved tremendously. The cash flow is twice as large as it was at any time under the former Administration, but we still can't and wouldn't expect the Power Corporation to generate enough funds to take care of the fantastic expansion that will take place, has been taking place in the last few years and will take place in the next few years. Now, the Hon. Member from Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) asked what we would be using this for. Well, we may be using it for a dam at Nipawin. I certainly hope so. Very shortly we will be using it for the extension of gas, for example, to all the small towns that you people by-passed for years. We will be using it to take power to potash mines or the pulp mill for example. I can assure you that we will be using this money to extend the services of the Power Corporation, both the electrical and gas services to the consumer, the residential consumers in our towns and villages, and to industries. We will continue as long as we have responsibility to run the Power Corporation in such a manner that we will generate more and more of our own money, of the money that we need for our own expansion. But no one, I am sure, would suggest that a corporation expanding as fast as the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, would ever be expected to generate all the funds needed for this expansion. This is not dead-weight debt. It is debt that will be repaid, and I'd like to point that out, especially since we started operating it in a business-like way. A few years ago when it failed to make a profit, it could almost be referred to as dead-weight debt because for many years the only way it ever repaid the amount of money it owed through Power Corporation was by borrowing more money for the Corporation. So we have done away with those very inept business practices and now

we generate the money out of legitimate profits to pay back principal and interest on any money we borrowed. I'm sure all Members will agree that we want to see this great utility expand. We want to service the tremendous amount of industry that is coming here. We want to extend natural gas as fast as we can to all the people, to as many of the people in the province as is feasible. I hope I've answered in my usual clear and forthright manner all the questions that were asked.

**MR. WALKER:** — Would the Minister permit a question? I noted carefully what he said and it only adds up to \$124,000,000.

**MR. STEUART:** — Commissions!

**MR. E. KRAMER** (The Battlefords): — What's a million!

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

HON. L.P. CODERRE (Minister of Labour) moved second reading of **Bill No. 32 — An Act to amend The Industrial Standards Act**

He said: Mr. Speaker, in giving second reading to this Bill, it's explained that this amendment merely provides for the possibility for further conditions being included in the schedules under this Act covering the barber industry in the cities of the Province. Amending the Act in this fashion will make it possible for the Advisory Board to include in the barbering schedule, the requirements that each city shop employ at least one journeyman. The amendment does not necessarily dictate that the Minister has to approve such a schedule but rather to make it possible for the Advisory Board to recommend. With these few words, Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw to the attention of this House as well, that somehow or other there is what I would call a repetitious word — journeyman: the first class journeyman, the second class journeyman etc. I will have an amendment to rectify this to first class apprentice and second class apprentice when the Bill goes into Committee.

**MR. DAVIES:** — Mr. Speaker, I think it might have been helpful if we had previously had the explanation which the Minister volunteered in the last sentence before he sat down. I don't know whether I understood him correctly, but I think he is saying that where the words, 'first class journeyman' and 'second class journeyman', 'third class journeyman' are mentioned in the Bill that the word 'apprentice' will be substituted for the word, 'journeyman'. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that the Section that this replaces is, to my mind one that should be adequate. The Section that the old sub-section deals with, establishes what number of proportion of the employees of an employer affected by the schedule may be apprentices, learners, or inexperienced employees, or part-time employees. I wonder why, having an eye to the facts of the trades, the Minister wants to make the kind of changes here he says he does. As I get his explanation he says that the barbers in one of the cities at least, have made this request to the Advisory Board. I don't know whether the Advisory Board, the Apprenticeship Board, or any other authority has passed upon this favorably, but I do want to point out that to my mind, it opens up an area that may be dangerous for the future, both for the relationships within unions, the organized trades, and the employers



March 6, 1967

of organized employees. I point out that the general regulations of The Apprenticeship and Tradesmen Qualification Act have relevance, and I think the Minister will agree that if we discuss this Bill here, we have to discuss The Tradesmen Qualification Act because it has a bearing on what happens under The Industrial Standards Act.

Section 14 of the regulations, Mr. Speaker, says that where any person is issued with a certificate of status in any designated trade, "the said certificate shall indicate thereon that the holder thereof has a status equivalent to that of a beginner, fourth, third or second class apprentice of the status of a journeyman". In the trades concerned, and of course in the unions that are a party to the agreements for apprenticeship relationships, there has been over many years, in fact I think it is fair to say it is traditional, continual struggle to ensure that a first-class trained person is known as a journeyman.

In the parlance, a journeyman means a person that has gained that competency, that full experience that not only protects the trades but gives protection to the public. By The Industrial Standards Act and The Tradesmen Qualification Act, the public is protected as much as is the tradesman himself, so that there has always been in this field of legislation a joint and a legitimate endeavor to keep proper standards both for the workman and for his employer as well as for the public at large. For this reason the number of learners and apprentices in relation to graduated tradesmen, has always been on some agreed-upon ratio because where you get, for example, say seven or eight apprentices to one journeyman in any trade, you have a situation arising where it is not possible for proper knowledge to be imparted to the learner that is, the apprentice, because of the fact that there are not enough journeymen around to do that teaching job. Moreover, you find creeping in servicing done by persons who are not really qualified. Where you have a ratio of, say again by example, three or four apprentices to one tradesman or one journeyman, then one may be assured of competency and the proper service being rendered, simply because of the fact that there are enough journeymen around to superintend the job.

I wonder, even with the Minister's explanation, whether there is any reason for the amendment that he is suggesting here to day, in the light of the fact that it may open up a field that in the long haul will be deleterious for the general public, for the employers and the employees concerned. I wonder whether sufficient attention has been given to the points I have raised. I must say in fairness that the amendment that will be proposed by the Minister, in part satisfies the chief objections that I have had, because if you have a first class journeyman, second class journeyman, third class journeyman, the thing would be so wide open that it would be impossible to administer the Act, let alone for the parties to enjoy some comfort within the regulations.

Leaving that aside and taking the Minister's House amendment that he says he will introduce at its face value, it does seem to me that the old clause was quite proper for all the needs that are indicated in The Industrial Standards Act. After all when you talk about beginners, when you talk about apprentices and inexperienced employees or part-time employees, you have a very, very wide field. This is precisely what the new sub-section (j) now does. It may be that one of the trades, the barbers, as the Minister has indicated, feels that the Section is not quite wide enough. I would like to ask the Minister when he rises to close debate as I think he has every indication of doing, to

explain to the House, whether some legal opinion has been got from his law officers on why, in fact, it is necessary to make the amendment because of just one of the trades. I suggest that, although this amendment may satisfy the questions raised by one of the trades, it may mean that a number of the other trades, the trades that have had a long experience with The Industrial Standards Act and the complementary legislation, The Apprenticeship Act, are going to be hurt by the amendment. I would also like to ask whether he has had any consultation with trades people and whether trades people have expressed any apprehension about the effects of the amendment.

**MR. CODERRE:** -- In referring specifically to the protection to the public insofar as barbers are concerned, I can assure the Hon. gentleman across that he and I don't have to worry too much about the protection because we haven't got much left to protect; I mean on top. I don't believe that the Government or anyone else for that matter should dictate to any particular group of people. I made it clear at the time that in amending the Act in the fashion that it is being amended, because the wrong wording of journeyman, such as a first class journeyman who is in fact a journeyman and second class apprentice, was an oversight; it does leave it to the Advisory Board to make the recommendations to the Minister and that applies to any particular trade. You'll notice that the old section in particular indicates only the number or proportions of employees, but it does not say whether there shall be a journeyman particularly at that particular time. We state that in some areas there should be at least a journeyman. Then the ratio can be advised or adjusted upon recommendations of the Advisory Board. Some of the trades have been approached in that matter but particularly it applied to the barber trade; they are the ones who brought it up. We've had consultations with some of them and they are very concerned. The electrical trade is controlled in that respect and many of the other trades as well. I think it is important that there should be a journeyman particularly in some geographical areas.

Again I state that The Trade Qualifications Act, as far as that is concerned, has really nothing to do in this respect. It is The Industrial Standards Act that lays the standards of any particular schedules. For example, let's take again the barbers. There were so many schedules it became impossible to administer. When I consulted the Barbers Association after I took office I had a request for several changes in schedule and I asked my staff, just when do these schedules stop and when do they start? The barbers themselves, for example, have now established five zones or five areas and we can look forward to only five schedules. These are some of the problems we have had and I think that you will find that when we deal with this in Committee we will have a better opportunity to go into the various details and cross-questioning on that. There is nothing anywhere in this amendment which will do anything but good to the trades.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

**MR. CODERRE** moved second reading of Bill No. 33 -- **An Act to amend The Credit Union Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, in rising to move second reading of this Bill, the amendments proposed are of routine nature and are entirely for the purpose of clarification. The proposed changes have been submitted by the Credit Union League and fully

March 6, 1967

discussed with departmental officials as well as the members of the League. Credit unions continue to show an ever-increasing rate of growth as evidenced by the increase in fixed assets over the past two years from \$208,000,000 in 1964 to \$300,000,000. I just spoke at the Credit Union League meeting in Saskatoon this morning and the assets as of the end of January were \$325,000,000. This is an indication of the growth of our economy in this period. Not only have our rural credit unions shown great growth, reflecting of course a bumper crop in recent years, but the urban credit unions as well, which include many working people, have grown at a rate that can not only be attributed to the increased membership, but to the economic conditions in the province, and also the confidence that the people have shown in the credit union movement as a whole. You know, not one cent has been lost by a member in the thirty years that the credit unions have been established in this province. I feel that my Department has a great deal to do with the outstanding achievement, along with the field staff's fine performance, fine inspection and advisory service.

Rather unique at this point, Mr. Speaker, just to show you what happens. I have a report on my desk of a rather unique situation, where an officer of public relations from La Federation de Casse Populaire indicates that the book assets of a credit union were something around \$60,000 and embezzled by \$942,000. So you wonder how it can be done. But I think our fine inspection service assures the members of our credit unions that everything is in order here in Saskatchewan.

**MR. ROBBINS:** -- I might just make one or two brief comments. The Minister talks about the growth of the credit unions which occurred over thirty years and I would remind him that twenty of those years were in those terrible Socialistic stagnation years that he is so fond of talking about. I admit that the credit union growth has been excellent in this province, but a lot of hard ground work had to be done in the initial years, and I am going to say, Mr. Speaker, that I am a person who had some participation in that. I spoke to 488 credit union meetings in the last twenty years or more. I welcome all the Johnny-Come Latelays, like the Minister of Labour who is now a supporter but who wasn't such a strong supporter fifteen or twenty years ago, or at least I never heard of him saying anything in favor of credit unions in those days. I see nothing in the particular Bill before us that I think would be of any harm to credit unions. I feel that he is correct in his statements when he says that credit unions did ask for some of these changes. I would like to ask a question. Perhaps I could defer this though until the third reading with respect to one particular section.

**MR. CODERRE:** -- I don't think there is anything so small, Mr. Speaker, as a person who criticizes the Johnny-Come-Lately. Those who call at the eleventh hour are just as capable and just as good members as those who came in early. If the Hon. Member from Saskatoon (Mr. Robbins) would read the Bible he might know a little more about it. I am proud to be a member of the credit union and I don't need any of the Hon. Members to let me know anything about it. The first thing that I mentioned in this House, and that has been mentioned time and again is that they have the audacity to take political credit for the work that the credit unions have done. The credit unions were built in this province by the people themselves in 1937, prior to 1944. The credit unions in

this country started much before the honorable gentleman was even born. It's people like them who do the Credit Union and Co-operative movement more harm than anything else. I say to CCF friends across the way: "Get your cotton picking fingers off the back of these shares". I think I have said everything I need to say.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

MR. CODERRE moved second reading of Bill No. 34 -- **An Act to amend The Employees' Wage Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, in rising to move second reading of this Bill, in introducing this Bill to the House, I would like to explain that there has been a need for a considerable period of time for an improved means of protecting the wages of employees where the employer defaults in his payments.

There have been many cases in the past and these situations continue to occur when the employer has defaulted in the payment of wages to his employees and where our inspectors have knowledge of the monies being owing to that employer by a third party. The monies owing will, in most cases be for work performed by the employer for the third party, and may only be a progress payment or could in fact be a final payment.

What we are attempting to do here is to make it possible to secure the money owing by a third party to the employer, in such a way that the employee of that employer will not suffer loss of wages, or to ensure that any loss would be minimized. We believe that if this is contained in these amendments, it will have a far-reaching effect on the amount of lost wages suffered by employees.

The Members will have noted that we are extending the provisions of this Act very considerably, to make them to apply to all employers including RMs and Urban Municipalities, Provincial, and Agencies in the Crown Corporations.

**MR. DAVIES:** -- Mr. Speaker, the Minister has told the House that the Bill before us seeks to improve The Employees' Wage Act, which of course was legislation of the previous Government. And to the extent that there are improvements, I think that I would want to support them.

There are at this particular moment, however, questions that I want to put to the Minister, but I think these questions are questions that should be dealt within Committee, so I won't now try to transgress on the rules of the House. But, Mr. Speaker, I do want to raise the matter of the explanatory notes on Bill No. 34 and make some remarks which in my opinion apply to the explanatory notes all through the piece. I'll limit my remarks at this point to the explanatory notes on No. 34.

When the notes were adopted some years ago, it was on the recommendation, at that time, of Members of both sides of the House. The intention was to have the notes serve in such a way that they would explain not only the intent and the principle of the Bill, but would make it unnecessary, in most cases, to have to refer to the statute at all. Everyone knows what happens when one looks at amendment by Bills. They go backwards and forwards and

March 6, 1967

one is lucky, as is the case at present, to have the revised statutes at hand. In any case it can be quite a chore and the explanatory notes were intended to relieve Members of the obligation of having to wade through the statutes to find out what the Bills were all about. No. 12(a) is listed as self-explanatory, as an example, Mr. Speaker. It refers, I suggest to you, to a rather complex situation which just simply begs explanation, however brief that explanation. However, none is provided whatsoever. I think that the very laconic and casual references that are mentioned here in these explanatory notes are just a travesty of what was intended originally.

I'll grant that in the beginning when these explanatory notes came out under the previous Government, they were not all that could be desired. But I think that they were better than these. I suggest that we should work towards some improvement. If these explanatory notes are going to mean anything at all, then let's try and do a little work on them so when Members get the Bill and the explanatory notes, we can do a better job because of the explanation provided. Now for example, new Section No. 7 is listed as self-explanatory and refers to the powers of the Government to make regulations. This is one of the outstanding principles of the Bill.

When you look at the old Section you find that it provides for a publication of the regulations in the Saskatchewan Gazette. The new Section wholly removes this obligation. The obligation to report through the Gazette is wholly removed and I say to the Minister, Why? Will the regulations in some way be available to the public? It certainly is not indicated by the revised Section and I would like to have him give some indication that he would be prepared to insert into the new Section, the proviso that was in the old Section.

Well in this, and with respect to all other Bills, I want to repeat before I sit down, that the explanatory notes this year are more than ordinarily deficient. They seem intent on avoiding full explanations rather than supplying that which would facilitate the understanding and work of the House. I feel very keenly, Mr. Speaker, that it would serve for the use of all of us if something were done to change this situation and rectify it.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

**HON. W. ROSS THATCHER (Premier)** moved second reading of Bill No. 36 -- **An Act to amend The Liquor Act.**

**MRS. M.A. HUNT (Regina West):** -- Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that there will be no great surprise to Members of this Legislature, that I rise to oppose this Bill on second reading. I oppose it in principle. I opposed a similar Bill last year. I rise to oppose it this year and if I am in the Legislature next year and a similar Bill comes in, I give notice that I shall oppose it again.

I would like to make it clear at the outset that I am speaking for myself in much of what I have to say and not necessarily for other Members of the Legislature. But this is a matter that I feel quite keenly about and I have remarks that I would like to make.

Members on this side of the House opposed a similar Bill

last year on the grounds that this was putting the sale of spirits into commercial hands. We felt that this was a very wrong principle, and I still agree with this stand.

In the first place when you put the sale of liquor into commercial hands you cannot exercise the same control that you can over your Government liquor stores. You can't exercise the same control after hours; you can't exercise control really at all.

In the second place there is a profit incentive when you put the sale of liquor into commercial hands which is not present when liquor is sold under Government auspices. So this is one reason and I think this is the main reason expressed on this side of the House. We are opposing putting increased outlets into the hands of commercial people.

But I also opposed this on another ground. I feel that these additional liquor outlets, and particularly those in commercial hands will have the effect of increasing consumption of alcoholic beverages in this province. When you look at the fantastic amount of money that is spent in Saskatchewan and in Canada on alcohol, I cannot see that it is good to do anything that will increase sales. Whatever may have been the motive of the present Government in its actions regarding liquor; whatever their motives may be, it seems to me that every action it has taken is an action that will increase the consumption of alcoholic beverages. And I find it very, very hard to understand the thinking behind the Government's action where liquor is involved.

I think the Minister of Public Health (Mr. Grant) will agree with me that excessive consumption of liquor impairs the physical and mental health. It causes serious disorders of the liver, causes hardening of the arteries, is harmful to the heart and also does brain damage. And he knows that alcoholism is a frightening and a very growing problem.

Now the Minister of Health has under his care, a health education division. I would like to ask the Minister this, knowing the health hazards involved: how much money has been spent by the Health Education Department over the last year or two years, in informing the public of these dangers? As far as I know, and the Minister can correct me if I am wrong, not one cent has been spent in this sort of education in spite of the fact that more damage can be done here than in many of the other programs that the Health Education division does deal with. I would think that the Minister of Social Welfare (Mr. MacDonald) would have to agree with me when I state to him that many, many of his problems are associated with over-consumption of alcoholic beverages. Much of the poverty and the dependency is due to alcoholic consumption, and it causes social aid costs and social aid problems. Much of the child neglect comes from over-consumption of liquor. Many children are taken into foster care, and he knows that, because one or the other, or both parents are alcoholics and the children have to be taken out of the home. He also knows that in cases of broken homes, divorce, and separation more often than not, liquor is the major cause. He knows the cost of custody in jail through liquor offences and the large percentage of crime where liquor is involved. He knows this. Also he knows that there has been a very unfortunate increase in the number of young unmarried mothers. And the story is so often the same, this would never have happened, but we were drinking. He knows all these things.

March 6, 1967

Now, in his Department he is prepared to spend money on the Bureau of Alcoholism, to try to rehabilitate alcoholics. This is good and we don't spend enough on it. It is necessary, but this is done after the damage has occurred. Apparently there is no effort to try and prevent it. It doesn't seem intelligent to me. I just find it hard to understand.

Now the Minister of Education (Mr. Trapp) knows that there is a worrying increase in teenage drinking. He knows this, and he knows that we are beginning to find it a very sad thing. There is a growing number of alcoholics amongst teenagers, amongst children who are still students. Yet what about this matter of education in the schools? Instead of giving increasing money for an Alcohol Education Committee for scientific education, money was reduced. I don't know what you are going to do this year but I hope it will not be reduced again. I hope it will be increased.

But I think that the Minister of Education, being a teacher himself, as well as Minister of Education, realizes that if you are going to have any effect, any good effect, in scientific education on alcohol, the time is when they are in school. Yet how little the Government is prepared to do in this area.

The Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) the Minister in charge of the Traffic Board, knows the problems that he has with drinking drivers. Government Insurance people, they know the terrible toll of death and injury on the highways. I was listening to the manager of the Insurance Company speaking on the air Friday night or Saturday, and the toll of death and property damage and injury on our highways is pretty staggering. And a very large percentage, and I'm not going to state the percentage, it is stated sometimes as high as 80 per cent, is due in part at least to over-consumption of liquor.

The Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Thatcher) may look at the swollen liquor profits this year and with a good deal of satisfaction, because of the amount of money revenue it brought into the Treasury. But I would suggest to the Hon. Provincial Treasurer, if he'd only sit down and take an objective look at the other side of the ledger, count the costs in welfare, hospitals, mental institutions -- many people are in mental institutions because of the effects of too much alcohol -- count the cost of medical bills, the cost of jails, or the property damage and of the deaths on the highway, I think he would find, even from a financial point of view, that his profits shrank to nothing, in fact a loss instead of a profit, even from a financial point of view, to say nothing from the human point of view.

With all this evidence before them, Mr. Speaker, this is what I find so hard to understand. I don't think anybody can get up and say that anything that I have said is not correct. With all this evidence it does seem to me that everything this Government has done has been to help increase the sale of alcoholic beverages. I sincerely, Mr. Speaker, believe that easy availability does increase sales; I don't think you can argue against that. Retailers don't hide the things they have to sell. They display the goods they want to sell as attractively as possible and the things that they want to sell the most, they put right under your nose.

Now, advertising increases sales. It is the only purpose of advertising. The Government brought in legislation to allow advertising. High pressure salesmen increase sales and the

Government is allowing high pressure salesmen. Lengthened drinking hours, well it might do something to lessen bootlegging, but it certainly increases sales. And the profit incentive which you are introducing in the House by putting it in private hands, that increases sales, unquestionably in my mind at least.

Now the Government claims the reason for this is that it is very concerned that some people in rural areas and small towns may have to drive quite a few miles to get to a liquor store. But I would like to point out to the Provincial Treasurer, that for many things they have to drive miles. They have to go for miles for repairs for machinery; they have to go for children's clothing, for shoes, for furniture, for many things. Why are you so concerned about this one item? That it be placed right within a mile or two so that it is right at hand? And I do remember, Mr. Speaker, the indecent haste with which this Government brought in legislation last year to put a liquor outlet in our non-existent auditorium. And if the same speed had been used in going ahead with the base hospital as providing a liquor outlet in a non-existent auditorium, we wouldn't be in the position now with a non-existent hospital as well as a non-existent auditorium.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MRS. HUNT:** -- Well, Mr. Speaker, because I believe this is wrong, because I believe that liquor should be under the control of the Government and not in private hands, and because it is my firm opinion that this sort of action will increase the consumption of alcoholic beverages, I must oppose this Bill on second reading.

**MR. D.G. MacLENNAN (Last Mountain):** -- Mr. Speaker, in listening to the remarks from the Lady Member for Regina West (Mrs. Hunt) she expressed a fear that the Government does not exercise the same control over the special outlets as they do their own store. On this I beg to differ with her. We have the same controls. We have the same hours in the outlets as in the Liquor Board stores. In the Liquor Board store we trust the manager because he is a man of a great degree of integrity to . . .

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MacLENNAN:** -- I said in the Liquor Board stores, but I hope they all are. We trust their integrity to adhere to the laws and regulations and its the same basis of trust that we have for these very capable people and very distinguished businessmen, that are the proprietors of the special agencies. Anyone that does not adhere to regulations, the Liquor Board has the control to withdraw their permits. As for the motive behind this -- the Lady Member is concerned with what the Government's motives are in establishing these outlets -- well upon taking office, this Government found that there were many areas in Saskatchewan where residents had to drive many miles to purchase liquor. Without getting into the merits or demerits of such a situation, we feel that rural residents should have approximately the same means of purchase as urban residents. Obviously it was not economical to open standard government stores in many communities. As an alternative it was decided that wherever possible the



March 6, 1967

agent would be a druggist. However if this was not feasible another retailer would be acceptable. The agent would carry a stock on hand in his retail outlet and be paid a modest commission by the Saskatchewan Liquor Board. It was decided, however, that in some cases where uneconomical stores had been already opened that they would be closed down. In the first two years of this program, 50 agencies have been allocated. In the same period, seven stores have been closed and in most cases replaced by agencies. Of course in each case a vote must be held. It is interesting to note that in almost every case the affirmative vote has been overwhelming. At this time all outlets authorized by the Legislature have been utilized.

There are at the present time about 50 to 60 applications for agencies on file at the Liquor Board. It is apparent that there are still some communities in Saskatchewan which are lacking an adequate service.

This Bill will therefore provide for another 30 agencies. In selecting the location of these outlets, the Board will continue to take such factors into consideration as population and distance from other outlets.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. F.A. DEWHURST (Wadena):** -- Mr. Speaker, as some of the members on our side of the House who wish to speak on this Bill are not present today, I would ask leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

**HON. D.T. McFARLANE (Minister of Agriculture)** moved second reading of Bill No. 37 -- **An Act to amend The Horned Cattle Purchases Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, experience has demonstrated that the limit of 400 pounds to be an unsatisfactory point at which to establish the weight exemption for cattle with horns. In recent years we have had nearly as many feeder calves marketed at over 400 pounds. Thus our livestock inspectors enforcing the existing Act are unable to explain to the producers why calves marketed at over 400 pounds are penalized while calves marketed at under 400 pounds are not. And since the original intent of the Act was to exempt feeder calves from the horned cattle penalty, it is therefore considered desirable to increase the weight exemption from 400 pounds to 500 pounds and thus exempt almost all feeder calves. Other changes recommended in the Act have to do with the recent changes in the Department of Agriculture in administration as a result of the dropping of the title "Livestock Commissioner" as was referred to in the original Act. This function is now performed by a new position, namely Chief of Livestock and Dairy Industry Division. And then Sections 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, and 11 pertaining to this recent change in designation, all it would mean here is substituting the word Minister for Livestock Commissioner.

**MR. E. KRAMER (The Battlefords):** -- Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to oppose this Bill, but I certainly have some grave doubts about bringing in this type of a Bill on behalf of the livestock industry. Now, I think the Minister is right when he says, why draw the line between a 400 and a 500 pound calf. There are some good reasons possibly why a 500 pound calf should be considered as an adult animal. In

the early spring there is time to handle calves that would be approximately that age and do the dehorning then and this is the best time to do it. And I believe that most farmers and ranchers would have the opportunity to do this if they took the time and the trouble to remove these horns when they were in the early stages. Now, I'll go along with this if it is not the thin edge of the wedge to move on up the lines and gradually exempt more and more larger cattle. Horns do a tremendous amount of damage to beef animals in shipping and in feed lots and I see no reason why those people who have taken the trouble to dehorn their animals or spend money on buying the hornless type of animals should have their animals damaged in shipping and in stockyards by those who have been careless and negligent, without some penalties being imposed.

I don't want to see the gate opened for any more negligence than exists right now in the livestock industry by removing penalties. There has been plenty of time for those people who wish to avail themselves of the opportunity to get rid of horns. There's plenty of facilities to rid their animals of horns as calves and as adult animals and I do think we should be mighty careful with a Bill of this kind to see that we don't open the gate too wide.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

MR. McFARLANE moved second reading of Bill No. 38 -- **An Act to amend The South Saskatchewan River Irrigation Act, 1966.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, Section 4 of The South Saskatchewan River Irrigation Act states that the Minister is required to file in the Land Titles Office an instrument stating that a particular parcel of land is subject to the provisions of this Act. Now since this must be filed in every title in the Broderick-Outlook Irrigation District, a substantial amount of work both for the Conservation and Development Branch and also the Land Titles Office would be involved. As it now stands, Section 4 has relatively little use, but we think that rather than repeal the whole Section entirely, it would be better to leave it in and remove the mandatory requirement under which the Minister must cause these instruments to be filed and therefore, we are proposing that the word 'shall' be deleted and the word 'may' put in its place. And the only other amendment to the Act is because of a typographical error in Section 11, substituting the word 'or' for 'of'.

**MR. R.A. WALKER (Hanley):** -- Mr. Speaker, this Act needs more amendments than the Minister has proposed.

I think that the Act will be drastically amended at the next session of the Legislature if the Premier gets up the courage to call his general election.

I think perhaps most of us are concerned about the situation that exists there. The Minister should be if he isn't, after meeting the farmers of the district a week or two ago. Most of us are concerned to see that public money is spent prudently and that it is not spent where it will not be productive or produce some social benefit.

I agree with the Minister that you can't invest a large sum of capital money in a project and then not have it used, but I want to say that, in my opinion and in the opinion of Members on

March 6, 1967

this side of the House, there is no necessity for the Government to adopt compulsory methods to ensure that irrigation will be carried on. If the irrigation system of producing crops is better than the dry-land system, if it is more productive and more profitable, then it isn't necessary in my opinion for the Government to force the occupants of the land in the irrigation district to irrigate.

Now the Government will say of course that they are not forcing them to irrigate, they are merely going to make them pay for the water rights and then they can suit themselves whether they irrigate. Well the water rights will cost about \$4 to \$5 per acre per year I expect, and will apply throughout the whole designated district. This means that there's no practical choice or practical alternative on the part of the farmers in that district to irrigate, they are compelled to irrigate in actual practice.

I'm well aware that the Minister is proposing to give them a period of years within which they may convert to irrigation and I'm well aware that they only pay this water-rights fee on a small acreage the first year and a larger acreage the second year and then in progression until they pay it on all their acres. I'm well aware too that the Government is proposing to make some loans, interest-free loans to farmers so that they can level their land and irrigate it. But I say this, that if the Government's program of capital assistance and other assistance is adequate to meet the demands and the requirements of the people in that area, then it is not necessary to compel farmers to irrigate on pain of paying a penalty of \$4.50 an acre for dry-land farming. The people of that area are just as reasonable and just as intelligent as the people in any part of Saskatchewan and they are just as well able to make intelligent judgments as to how they can make the biggest return from their land as the Government is.

Some recognition ought to be given to the fact that some of those people don't want to sell their farms, don't want to move away and may want to farm in that area for ten or twenty years under their present methods of agriculture.

There is no obligation on the part of the Minister to compel those people to farm by irrigation methods. The Minister can read the agreement between Saskatchewan and the Dominion Government over and over and over again. There is nothing in that agreement which requires this Government to compel those people to farm by irrigation methods. The obligation of the Government is solely and simply to provide the facilities or the works necessary to provide sufficient water to irrigate a specified number of acres, and there is nowhere any obligation on the part of the Government to require all or any of those people to pay a water-rights tax, to take water or to irrigate.

The Government may reply, "What's the use of putting in the works unless the people do irrigate?" I agree that there's no use in putting in the works unless the people do irrigate, but I am prepared to accept the word of the Minister that he lays down an adequate assistance and encouragement program, and if so this alone will cause the people to irrigate the land in that irrigation area and it is not necessary to take them by the scruff of the neck and push them into the water. It is not necessary. Not only is it not necessary, but it's undemocratic and arbitrary and dictatorial, and this Government ought at this late stage, to acknowledge that there is another way of persuading these people to irrigate.

The history of Western Canada is replete with examples of people who were forced into irrigation when they weren't ready or prepared for it. And there are bankrupt irrigation projects dotting the prairies of Alberta because they weren't ready for it. Some expert somewhere decided that they should irrigate and they should be taxed and forced to practise irrigation farming. And I say that the best way to encourage irrigation in that area is to put it now on a voluntary basis. Some people will try it, some people will experiment with it and some people are going to have to experiment with it anyhow under any kind of a system. They are going to have to see whether or not it is successful when practised by their neighbors before they will undertake it voluntarily. And if you don't do it that way, you're simply going to magnify your mistakes. If you are going to make mistakes in the methods of irrigation which they adopt and in the mode of irrigation which they adopt then let these mistakes be as small as possible. Let them practise on a small scale first, let them do it voluntarily. Then as they learn the methods and as they become adapted to the modes of farming that are done under irrigation, the practical methods can be extended to other farmers in the area.

There is no great urgency about getting that 50,000 acres under irrigation. They are not going to be got under irrigation anyway in the next ten years or even twenty, and all the Government is going to do is antagonize these people, it is going to arouse them, it is going to stir up resentments which they will never forgive nor forget.

It is not too late yet for the Government to amend this legislation, to provide that irrigation farming in that area will be on an optional basis and that only when the farmer elects to place his acres under irrigation will he be taxed for this water right.

It can be said that the cost of the investment in this project is large, but the additional investment that will result from any delays, any slight or minor delays, in getting the land under irrigation will be so small in relation to the total investment that it will be imperceptible. In any case you are going to find that you can't regiment these people. You're going to find that in some cases the water rights will not be paid, they will refuse to pay in some cases. The Government will be confronted, or the irrigation authority will be confronted with taking rather nasty proceedings to recover, to take land away from people, and I say this is all unnecessary.

The Minister can with his staff make advice freely available to the farmers in that area and offer assistance and can win a substantial number of those farmers to irrigation right at the beginning. There's a substantial percentage of them that are ready to go. Well, the success of the project will be measured by the experience of those farmers, those people who are interested in irrigation, those people who want to irrigate, if my friend will accept my suggestion. But if he will not accept my suggestion then there will be some who will show some measure of success, yet there will be others who through an unwillingness and a lack of a desire to irrigate will bring discredit to the project, will make it look less successful and will in the long run cause the Minister more difficulty and more delay than if he admits now that it can be worked on a voluntary basis.

So I make this earnest plea to the Minister at this stage before anybody has yet been put right up against the axe on

March 6, 1967

irrigation, that the Minister consider making it optional with respect to each farmer in the area as to when or if he incurs the expenses of irrigation.

There are some farmers who don't want to invest a hundred dollars an acre to convert their farm to irrigation when the outcome is problematical, the outcome is not assured. And there are many people who have gone through hard times, who have now accumulated a little money with the thought of retirement and who don't want to put this into a venture which is doubtful in its outcome. So what is their alternative? Their alternative is to sell their land to the Minister, to the Government at a price of \$65 or \$70 an acre plus certain allowances for improvements and then they go and they try to buy land. And when you try to buy land nowadays, it is very rarely that you can buy a complete farm, an economic unit complete. So what they have to do is pick up quarter sections here and there and try to make a farm out of it. And everybody knows that individual quarter sections sell for much higher prices than entire farms would sell. People are being required now to pay \$100 to \$125 and even more an acre for land that is no better than the land which the Government is buying in the Broderick area for \$70 and \$75 an acre. Little wonder that these folks don't want to be confronted with the loss of \$50 an acre by moving from their farm to another farm under pressure from the Government. Nor do they want to be in a position where they must incur expenditures of \$50 or \$100 an acre to capitalize their farm as an irrigation farm.

These people are worried and they are justifiably worried about the future. The Minister can absolve the Government from all blame or responsibility for any of this anxiety if it will simply adopt the suggestion that irrigation will probably prosper and grow just as successfully if it is put on a voluntary basis right from the beginning.

Now, the Minister may say that this isn't what the CCF would have done. Now I want to make it absolutely clear that the previous Government on more than one occasion gave a categorical assurance to the people in that area that they would not be compelled to undergo irrigation unless they voted for it by the majority.

Hon. Members will recall that the previous Government was carrying on studies on irrigation in several different areas surrounding the South Saskatchewan project so that there were two or three different areas where 50,000 acres might have been put together to form an irrigation project and the previous Government was carrying on extension work in all of that area involving some 150,000 or 200,000 acres. The principle on which the previous Government operated was that surely somewhere in that 150,000 or 200,000 acres, a group occupying 50,000 acres could be found who would be willing to vote in favor of an irrigation scheme. So we were trying to sell it all over the place. It may be that some of the officials in the Minister's Department didn't understand that this was the Government's policy.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. WALKER:** -- It may well be, it may well be, because some of them used to come to the Treasury Board with some pretty weird ideas about Government policy, but my seat mate, the former Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Nollet) and I spoke in Broderick and gave our unequivocal assurance that the people of that area would not be regimented or forced into irrigation unless they voted for it.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. WALKER:** -- Now the present Government has done away with that.

**MR. STEUART:** -- Tell them the truth, Bob.

**MR. WALKER:** -- When the present Government took office, there was only one way that irrigation could be set up in Saskatchewan and that was by the establishment of an irrigation district after a favorable vote of the people of the district. That was the only way an irrigation area could have been set up when the present Government took office.

It was the present Government sitting across there that passed legislation at the last session of the Legislature doing away with this right which the people had and which the former Minister of Agriculture and I would have honored in connection with this Broderick project. It was the present Government that did away with that vote.

Now it may be that it is all past history and we ought not to get into an argument about the virtue or merits of a decision that was made at the last session of the Legislature. Having made that decision and accepting that decision, the Government can still prevent the animosities, the hostilities, the anxieties which are going to flow from this project by saying on passage of second reading of this Bill, that it is prepared to leave the choice of when to commence irrigation in that area to each individual farmer himself.

If you do absorb a few thousand dollars of extra costs by reason of some delay in respect to some acres, you can use that money to assist those who are eager to proceed at a more rapid rate and in the long run you won't lose anything in regard to this project. I make this appeal to the Government to consider this at this stage and I say to the Government categorically that if it won't agree to do this and there's an election between now and the next session of the Legislature, the CCF Government will do this, we will do it without equivocation and without hesitation.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. STEUART:** -- How about the NDP?

**MR. I.C. NOLLET (Cutknife):** -- Mr. Speaker, a year ago, I presented very extensive arguments as to why in my opinion any compulsory approach to irrigation wouldn't achieve the objective intended. I think to date it will have to be admitted that it hasn't increased the possibilities of accelerating irrigation in the Broderick or any other area to any degree whatever. But there has been one consequence and I hope the Government as stated by the Hon. Member for Hanley (Mr. Walker), will reconsider its position. One aspect though is very evident and that is that it is going to cost a lot more to shove irrigation down people's throats. You're buying expensive land at a time when the Minister is also bragging about all the Crown land that he is selling on one hand and buying more costly land because of their mania for compulsion and compelling these people to irrigate. I can recall Hon. Members opposite when we introduced the provision in the Department of

March 6, 1967

Agriculture Act that would give authority to our engineers to go on these lands for surveys only, shouted 'dictatorship, Russia, communism,' and all the rest of it. Well, what is this? I remember the Hon. Member for Maple Creek, (Mr. Cameron) saying, "Yes, your engineers and you can go out to a farmer's place, around his buildings and around his woodpile and then say to him, 'So what?'" Now look what they're doing. You are compelling farmers to sell because either they must irrigate or pay the cost of irrigation. In that event, it is sell your land and get off at a price that certainly isn't sufficient to re-establish elsewhere. If I have ever seen any evidence of compulsion I've seen it in this legislation. I would suggest that instead of just changing one word in one paragraph from 'shall' to 'may' you change the whole Act to 'may' and let freedom-loving people exercise their good judgment as citizens as to whether they want to irrigate or not. Mr. Speaker, in my experience I've discovered that wherever compulsion was tried, whether it was in the United States or Canada in regard to irrigation development, it has not succeeded. It has certainly not succeeded in accelerating irrigation development and in all cases it has proven to be very much more costly in the end. My seat mate is right. We assured the farmers in that area that we couldn't compel them to irrigate and that they wouldn't have to irrigate unless, in their view they could obtain ample remuneration for their extra work and cost. This is the basis on which irrigation can succeed. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Government reconsider its policies, make its policies more generous, adopt a go-slow policy initially and then let these farmers decide whether or not they are going to irrigate. Let these farmers decide as to whether or not they will set up a water-users' association or an irrigation district. Let these farmers then decide as to what the administration shall be and who shall enforce regulations and other aspects of irrigation farming and not by a dictatorial Liberal Government.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. NOLLET:** -- These are the men that keep talking about Socialist regimentation and dictatorship and now here we have the full evidence of it and it is getting them nowhere, Mr. Speaker.

Among other things with reference to the legislation itself, I would suggest that instead of changing just one word in one paragraph from 'shall' to 'may' the entire Act ought to be changed to 'may'. This was my contention a year ago and it is still my contention and I think experience to date will indicate some of the observations that I made a year ago; namely that you cannot speed up irrigation by any compulsory measures and that to do so would simply mean added cost for irrigation development. This has proven to be the case where it has been tried elsewhere. I think that approach and that concept to irrigation in this modern day age is completely out-dated. I have always held to the belief and still do that if the economics of irrigation are proven, irrigation will expand on its own merit. This has been my view. In pursuance of that I have felt that the Government must assume the major costs, not only of the main works, but also of the laterals, the field ditches, provide sufficient financial assistance for really long-term credit and that the repayment periods, particularly over the development stages be very nominal. It is in this manner I believe, that successful irrigation will eventually develop. I have pointed out too that this policy sets a precedent in the Broderick area and that it will build up resentment against irrigation development in other areas of the project. The other point too that I often referred to, Mr.

Speaker, has been that perhaps our entire concept of irrigation development ought to be updated and modernized. I sometimes in my own mind wonder, when one considers the ditch system, floor irrigation, the waste of water by evaporation, the almost impossibility of applying water evenly over an area of land, the cost of proper land levelling and the long period of time it takes to develop a viable irrigation district along orthodox methods, whether or not it wouldn't be wise to try out permanent underground water systems and permanent sprinkler systems for irrigation which would give farmers very good control over water, would prevent a whole lot of salinity in the soils, would avoid in many cases, too very costly land levelling and eliminate the whole question of water wastage and land wastage in this process. Now, the other point I made was that the local irrigation agency should have local autonomy. I don't know of any other way that satisfactory results can be achieved and I think this has pretty well been proven elsewhere as well. There's no way of getting instant development apparently, though the Premier of this province who seems to believe, and has convinced himself too, that prosperity can be brought about instantly in as little as two years, that he also probably thought that irrigation could be brought into development instantly. This is a completely false assumption and it will prove to be exactly that. He probably thinks too that by applying his concept of big boss private enterprise, he can, by dictating to farmers, stimulate production. Mr. Speaker, it almost reminds me of the story of two young men who during the last war were unfit for military service but who were of a very patriotic turn of mind and felt they ought to do something extra for their country. They heard that eggs were in great demand for example, that the Government was crying out for eggs for our armed forces so they decided to go into the chicken business, into egg production. Neither one knew anything about chickens or egg production, but at least they made the attempt. They got themselves a chicken house, bought some chickens, put the chickens in the chicken house, got some feed and began feeding the chicken, but after a week or so there were no results and they debated this amongst themselves. They didn't know what to do about it. Finally one said to the other, "You know everything runs on slogans these days. If we could get a good production slogan over to these hens and inspire them with the patriotic motive of producing to help the war effort, maybe we can get some results." "Well," the other said, "I'll tell you what we'll do. We will get a parrot and we'll get the message over to the hens." And they did, they got a cigar-puffing parrot and they coached him and trained him over and over to say, "Now, girls, it is production we need, we got to win this war, it is our patriotic duty to produce more and more." And they had the parrot pretty well trained and finally came the big day. They turned him loose in the chicken coop and they closed the door gently and sure enough the parrot went right to it. He walked around in there like a big boss among the hens saying, "Now girls come on, it is production we need, production we need, we will not win the war unless we have more and more production." They thought everything was going fine. They were smiling and congratulating one another. Finally a very ominous silence fell over the chicken coop. They cautiously peered in and two roosters had this parrot backed up in a corner of the chicken coop. Just then the parrot explained, "Now, now, boys, take it easy. You've got me all wrong, I'm only here in an advisory capacity."

Now I would think that the Government should revert to the role of not only being a good advisor but provide sufficient funds to make irrigation attractive to farmers. I believe



March 6, 1967

that, if this course is followed, the expansion and development will come naturally and that it will generate a whole lot of good will and enthusiasm for irrigation development in Saskatchewan. I'm not going to oppose this minor amendment, Mr. Speaker. Now don't get me wrong, only to say that I hope that this word 'shall' will be changed throughout the whole Act to the word 'may'.

**MR. F. LAROCHELLE (Shaunavon):** -- Mr. Speaker, I just stood here and listened to the ex-Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Nollet). Well I think I can assure you that they have had a few words added to the dictionary since he has left office and that is the changing of the word 'shall' to 'may', because from my experience when he was Minister of Agriculture, the word 'may' was not part of his dictionary.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. LAROCHELLE:** -- Now he talks about expropriation and dictating. And I'd like to state to this House, I'm not going to state the experience of others, I'm going to state my own experience. In 1942, I had developed an irrigation or flood program in my own land. I had spent a few thousand dollars and this thing was working fine until one day my hired man came into town and told me that there were some people working in the wheat field. I said, "What are they doing there?" He said, "I don't know." So I went out to find that these chaps were from the Department of Agriculture and were surveying for ditches and for irrigation. Now that is the first I had known about it. Now he tells us that we should forewarn those people a long way ahead. I think he should have practised a little bit of what he preaches tonight. He talks about pushing people into irrigation. At that time I had my own project, I didn't feel like being pushed around, I thought I had spent money and I had a good thing going for myself. They came to me, I had no alternative. Again I say the word 'may' was not in there. They used the word 'shall'. I was in the irrigation project and to this day I am quite happy to be in it. But he just mentioned that the word 'may' should be used. Well I wish it had been in his dictionary when he was Minister of Agriculture. I quite agree with him that you must have the right atmosphere before you develop an irrigation project. To this I certainly agree, because you must educate those people to what an irrigation project will produce before you can push them into it. In this I think I quite agree with him. But I think he should be very careful how he uses the word 'may' because it wasn't in his dictionary when he was Minister.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. A.C. CAMERON (Minister of Mineral Resources):** -- I was interested in the Member for Hanley (Mr. Walker) saying that the farmers should have a choice, it's most unfair for farmers who have spent a lifetime to have no choice whether or not they wish to have irrigation and that it should be left entirely to the individual farmer. If a farmer wishes irrigation, he may have it, says the ex-Minister. If a farmer does not wish irrigation, it is his choice and must not have it if he doesn't wish to do so. The Member for Hanley or the Ex-Minister -- I forget which one it was -- said, "You know, we assured the farmers that they would have a choice, that they may if they wish or they may not enter into an agreement to irrigate."

Then he says, "Of course you know the officials of the Department aren't aware of this." The officials were not aware of this, there was no policy issued to the officials of the Department, the Minister was apparently unaware of it, but the Member for Hanley (Mr. Walker) said, "I gave my pledge that in the event of irrigation you would have the right to choose whether you wished it or not and if you don't wish it you won't have it." That's the strange thing, when the former Attorney General (Mr. Walker) was setting policy for the Minister of Agriculture. The former Minister of Agriculture also conveniently neglected to tell his staff what the policy was. This is interesting. I think I know why this policy decision was not passed on to the staff. Because under the contract the Province undertook to have 50,000 acres ready for irrigation within three years from the date of the transfer of the reservoir or within one year of when the reservoir was filled. Then the question naturally arose in the negotiating as to how this would be carried out. How are you going to assure your partner, Canada, that you'll undertake to have this done? They put in the clause to assure the senior partner that they would undertake and meet this commitment. The order says that to meet this commitment, "the commission may without consent of the owner . . . enter upon and take possession of any lands" from him in order that we can meet our commitment of 50,000 acres within one year.

**MR. NOLLET:** -- Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, would the Hon. Member tell me what document he is reading from . . .

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. CAMERON:** -- I'm reading from an Act respecting South Saskatchewan River Development Commission, April 14, 1959, and in order to fulfil your commitment it says here before the expiry date in one year or three years from when it is transferred to the Province, we shall have 50,000 acres ready for irrigation.

**MR. NOLLET:** -- What about possession of land?

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. CAMERON:** -- Then it says you may, or your officials may, without consent of the owner -- without even telling the owner -- without even the owner's knowledge, certainly without his consent, enter upon his land, take possession of it and do whatever is necessary to guarantee that there will be 50,000 acres under irrigation.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. NOLLET:** -- Oh no.

**MR. CAMERON:** -- Where was his 'may' in this Act? I looked through it and I didn't find one word 'may'. It says we undertake the following commitment. The Commission may without the consent of the owner enter upon and take possession of the lands . . .

**MR. NOLLET:** -- Take possession of land for what purpose?

March 6, 1967

**MR. CAMERON:** -- To fulfil your 50,000 acreage ready for irrigation.

**MR. NOLLET:** -- . . . untrue.

**MR. CAMERON:** -- And it says in the event the farmer isn't satisfied with what we pay him, there are provisions for an arbitration board who will set the awards that the farmer gets. No choice to the farmers, it's not whether he may wish to have irrigation or may not. The farmer's wishes are not mentioned in one section of this Act. It's what the Government undertakes to do to meet its own commitments. It says in order to assure the Federal Government that we can meet this commitment, this is what we are prepared to do -- enter upon and take possession of the farmer's land without his consent.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. CAMERON:** -- And now he talks about 'may', and it's a strange thing when the 'may' came in and the former Attorney General says "I gave my sound commitment to the farmer and if he doesn't wish it he may not have it and that there be a vote. There's no mention of a vote in this contract. Where did the vote come in? There's no provision for a vote in this contract. The only reason I'm going to tell you how the vote came in was because when we were in the Opposition he was standing over here proceeding to tell us how he was going to get the 50,000 acres. We raised the point: where does the farmer come in? What rights has the farmer got? Why doesn't the farmer be asked whether or not he wants irrigation? And his reply after a great deal of furor, "Well," he said "you know there is a possibility that the farmer may have a vote on it, but it isn't provided for in the contract." Now this is the so-called policy statement which he didn't advise his Deputy Minister or any of the staff in the Department of Agriculture, nor any one of the Commission members that this was the Minister's policy. And the Attorney General says, "If the Minister didn't give it, I gave it personally and I wish to guarantee to these people that if they don't want it they will not be obliged to have it." Contrary to the contract, contrary to the fact that the minister didn't even tell his officials that he had such a policy. If he had a policy he kept it locked up in his vest pocket only to bring it out when he was talking in some little schoolhouse up there where the press wasn't around. Then they tell the farmers if you don't want it you may not have it. But they never established a policy, never informed the House, never even informed his own officials in his own Department that this was the policy of the Minister with regards to the farmers there. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring out some of these facts because I've been around this House for some time and I know some of the discussions.

**MR. NOLLET:** -- Too long.

**MR. CAMERON:** -- I can remember the time when the Minister brought in legislation which gave even his surveyors the right to walk all over the farmer's yard without even asking permission. They didn't even have the courtesy to ask his permission. When the farmer enquired what it was, he was politely told, "It's no concern of yours." We did at least get this concession from him that before they go on the farmer's land, they'd at least notify the farmer that they were coming. They didn't ask permission but they at

least consented to notify him that they were going on his land. Now he talks about may instead of shall and must when there is nothing in his contract, nothing in his commitment and nothing in his policy to the Department which mentions the word may at all.

**MR. NOLLET:** -- On a point of privilege, the Hon. Member has been constantly referring to a contract as though he was reading from a contract or a policy between the Department of Agriculture and the farmer and I'm saying this is a complete misrepresentation, this is not the case. He was quoting from the agreement between the Government of Canada and the Government of the province.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. McFARLANE:** -- Mr. Speaker, we witnessed quite a demonstration this afternoon of the former Attorney General (Mr. Walker) backtracking and disassociating himself from any policy they had laid down when they were still the Government. We witnessed the former Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Nollet) doing likewise, disassociating himself with anything he had drawn up in the form of an interim policy, doing a complete political cartwheel. I want to remind him of some of the things that he had put down on paper while he was still Minister of Agriculture. Now the agreement referred to by the Minister of Mineral Resources as an agreement entered into by the Federal and the Provincial Governments. One of the things that was supposed to be done, as the Minister indicated, was the provision of 50,000 acres of land ready for irrigation one year after the dam was filled or three years after the agreement had been signed. Now I'm going to review some of the statements made by the Member for Cutknife (Mr. Nollet) first. One of the things he said that you cannot speed up is irrigation by compulsive measures. If the economics are proven, it will expand on its own merits. So now he is suggesting, as did the Member for Hanley (Mr. Walker), that the farmers in the area be given from ten to twenty years to make up their minds whether they want to irrigate or not. Well, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Cutknife did in fact, on March 23, 1959 sign a tentative policy and here is one of the paragraphs in that policy and I'll read the first one.

**MR. NOLLET:** -- It's a statement.

**MR. McFARLANE:** -- Now he is saying that the farmers should have from ten to twenty years to make up their minds and we shouldn't proceed with irrigation on an accelerated scale.

**MR. NOLLET:** -- Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I never made the statement the farmers should have ten or twenty years to make up their minds.

**MR. McFARLANE:** -- All right, you're advocating a go-slow policy if you want to figure it that way. Now, here is what he said: "All the irrigable land in each block must be irrigated as soon as possible after the works are completed. The common sense of this should appeal to everyone. Large, expensive, main and secondary canals, pumping stations and extensive field distribution systems should not be built unless full use is made of them. The Government believes -- this is NDP Government -- that the development policy for this project must

March 6, 1967

involve measures that will encourage the full irrigation of all irrigable lands within a relatively short period of time.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. STEUART:** -- Hey! Those chickens are coming home to roost, Toby.

**MR. McFARLANE:** -- Then he said, "The Government should bear the cost of main ditches, canals, laterals, etc." This is what he said here tonight. What did he say in 1959? "We believe (this is the Government of the day) that irrigable land and the water used for irrigation should bear the cost of operation and maintenance of the main works including a reasonable share of the operation and maintenance of the main reservoir itself to facilitate a rapid development of irrigable lands. There may be room for sharing this cost in the early years of project operation." He completely disassociated himself tonight with the statements he had put down in this policy of 1959. And I may point out, Mr. Speaker, the agreement was signed in 1958, he formulated an interim policy in 1959, not another thing was done until they went out of office in 1964. Not one acre of land had been bought to try and acquire the 50,000 acres in the project. And then, Mr. Speaker, he got up at one time this afternoon and contradicted himself again. He said we are buying all this expensive land. His seat mate (Mr. Walker) said the price is too low. One says we are paying too much, the other says we are paying too little. It depends on whose land is involved. They are a little bit scared that there may be an election coming up in the immediate future. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is obvious, I think, from the few remarks that I have made in regards to statements made in the House just recently by the Member for Cutknife (Mr. Nollet) that he is making a complete political somersault. When he's in Opposition he says one thing and when he was the Minister of Agriculture he failed to act.

**MR. NOLLET:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. McFARLANE:** -- Now the Member for Hanley (Mr. Walker) said this afternoon that we had a meeting in Broderick a week ago Saturday with the people interested in the irrigation areas. This, Mr. Speaker, was the fifth meeting that I have had with farmers in that area since I have become Minister. One when a delegation met with the Cabinet, one I attended over a year ago in Broderick, and one on Saturday and the others in my own office. I want to say this because of the interest that this Government has shown in irrigation in that area and because of the attitude we have taken toward irrigation in that area and because we are concerned and co-operated with the people in that area, I would just like to indicate to the House tonight that the whole atmosphere is altogether different today than it was two years ago, three years ago and yes, even in 1959 when your Minister of Agriculture was the Minister responsible.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. McFARLANE:** -- And why has that attitude changed? Firstly, Mr. Speaker, we took it upon ourselves to show the people in that area the advantages of irrigation. It is true that there were some farmers, who because of age, weren't too interested in irrigation. When we set up our land-purchasing policy, we said to these farmers, "Now if you don't want to irrigate, the

Government will put itself in a position where it will offer you a price for your land at going land prices. If you wish to sell to us, we'll acquire this land and parcel it out later on to people who want to get into irrigation." By virtue of that fact as of this date, we've acquired some 33,000 acres of land in that area. Besides that, we set up our policy so that if they didn't wish to irrigate and didn't at the start, they would still have to pay the water rates on their land. Now, the Member for Hanley this afternoon tried to leave the impression that this rate of \$4.50 per acre would be levied against all the land the farmers in that area owned. I want to correct that misinterpretation this evening, Mr. Speaker, because in the first year of operation, a \$4.50 per acre water rate will only be imposed on ten per cent of the irrigable land or ten acres per quarter section, whichever is the greater. This increases every year as time goes on. It certainly is quite a difference from the impression he tried to leave here this afternoon. Over the years the Department of Agriculture, the staff of my own Department, had been meeting with the farmers in that area. First in order that we would have the most modern structures in all of North America, certainly in Canada, we sent our staff down to the United States to view all the irrigation projects that were in operation in the United States. Then we sent them out to the province of Alberta where they could view all the irrigation projects in operation in that province. Then, because of the experience they gained and because of having had the opportunity to talk over the latest technological advancements in our own system here in Saskatchewan, we have the most up-to-date irrigation system of any province and certainly any state in the Union, and I'll stack that up against anybody.

Our structures are of the latest design. Our structures are completely modern, of pre-cast concrete and are going to be a credit to the people of Saskatchewan and certainly a credit to the people in that area.

Further to that, last winter and again this winter, staff from my own Department have talked with the farmers in that area who are interested in irrigation. They have discussed all phases and all techniques of irrigation with those people, yes, even the economics of irrigation. Because of that, this is another thing that has led to the friendlier atmosphere that we are experiencing today compared to a few years back.

I just want to close the debate. I'll have more to say about this in Estimates. There can more questions asked in Committee.

**MR. NOLLET:** -- You had better read this.

**MR. McFARLANE:** -- It is quite obvious here this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, -- and I'm sure it's true -- that some of the Members, at least on the Opposition side along with the people of this province, realize that it is going to be one of the greatest developments in the history of Saskatchewan. The whole Province is going to benefit and many farmers in that area realize too that they are going to benefit. And I think that I can indicate some of the concern and interest in that area by telling the House tonight that, after having made the announcement some three weeks ago that twenty-five quarter sections would be up for allocation, when the allocations closed we had more applicants than we had quarter sections. Certainly this indicates the interest in irrigation in that area.

And so I suggest that Members of the Opposition know that

March 6, 1967

this is going to be a success. They know that there is a great deal of interest in irrigation in this province. And they must realize too that there are industries ready to come in and to establish the minute the main canals are constructed and water is flowing.

And so this is going to be one of the greatest crop insurance schemes, or certainly one of the greatest insurance schemes there is for the sustenance of livestock in this province in years ahead. Even the beekeepers in the province are interested in getting into the area when forage is being produced. And so I say that many of the comments this afternoon weren't made in any hopes of seeing the project a success. Many of the comments were made on the eve of what the Opposition thinks is a Provincial election. They were doing some political talking hoping to stir up some more animosity in the area.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

HON. D.V. HEALD (Attorney General) moved second reading of Bill No. 40 -- **An Act to amend The Surrogate Court Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, item No. 16 and item No. 15 are really companion amendments, but I think it would be easier for Hon. Members to follow if we took item No. 16 ahead of item No. 15.

These are proposed amendments to The Surrogate Court Act. They have been suggested by the District Court Judges Council. The resolution that was presented to me was that the Surrogate Court be given concurrent jurisdiction with the Court of Queen's Bench, on the matter of interpretation of wills and applications under The Dependents Relief Act.

The situation at the present time is that where there is any question as to the interpretation of a will, it has to be dealt with by a Queen's Bench judge. It has been felt for some time that a District Court judge who is also a Surrogate Court judge could just as sensibly deal with these matters of interpretation of wills.

We have District Court judges situated in judicial centres throughout the province. It will make it easier for people to get these matters before the courts and so the effect of this amendment is to provide the Surrogate Court judges with equal or concurrent jurisdiction with the Queen's Bench judges.

That is one change that is proposed in this Bill. There are two or three other changes, Mr. Speaker.

At the present time in The Surrogate Court Act there is a provision that when someone passes on and leaves a small estate of \$500 or under, there is a simple and easy procedure provided. It has been in the Act for a number of years that instead of having an application for probate or an application for letters of administration, which is quite costly, having regard to the fact that the estate is only worth \$500, there has been a provision that the people involved in this estate, the beneficiaries, can go to the clerk of the court and for a very nominal fee, I think it is \$3.00 they can make this application to have the will probated and the estate distributed and the only cost is this \$3.00. It cuts out the legal fees. What we are going to do here in this amendment is to increase the value of the estate

where this can be done from \$500 to \$1,000. It is felt that in these days of inflation a \$1,000 estate is still a very small estate and we think that the benefit of having this done should be increased from \$500 to \$1,000. It is still a small estate and we don't think it should be necessary for the beneficiaries to have to go and hire a lawyer and perhaps pay a couple of hundred dollars in legal fees. So the purpose of this amendment is to increase the amount of the estate that can be processed in this simple, easy manner from \$500 to \$1,000.

The other amendment deals with official administrators which are Trust Companies which handle estates where there is no executor appointed or where there are no known beneficiaries and no one comes forward to apply for an estate. There has been a provision that the official administrator in small estates of \$200 doesn't have to pass his accounts. We are increasing that to \$1,000 for the same reason that I explained in the previous amendment. Because these estates are small, we think that \$200 is too small and we think there wouldn't be anything wrong with increasing this to \$1,000. And so the proposed amendment is to provide that the official administrator would not have to pass his accounts in an estate up to \$1,000. Here again the purpose of this is to do away with unnecessary expense, because passing of accounts involves court cases, it involves lawyers. We felt that by reducing these expenses there would be more of the small estates available for the beneficiaries. This after all is the purpose of the Surrogate Court, to ensure that the beneficiaries get the estate without unnecessary legal expense.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

MR. HEALD moved second reading of Bill No. 39 -- **An Act to amend The Dependents' Relief Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, as I said, this is a companion amendment. The Dependents' Relief Act is the Act under which, as all Members know I'm sure, dependents, usually a widow or infant children of a deceased, if they are of the opinion that the deceased has not made adequate provision for them in his will, may make an application to the Court to break the will or set aside the will, or have the judge change the terms of the will, so that adequate provision will be made.

This is simply a provision along the lines of the last provision to provide that this application can now be made to a Surrogate Court or a District Court judge, rather than just to a Queen's Bench judge. Here again it's putting the people in a position where they can make this application in the area in which they live. They won't have to come to the Queen's Bench judge in larger cities in the province. This is the effect of the amendment, Mr. Speaker, and I would move second reading.

**MR. DAVIES:** -- I'm sorry that I didn't ask this before you sat down, Mr. Attorney General, but could you tell the House, why, in the past the handling of matters like this has not been extended to District Court judges?

**MR. HEALD:**-- Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question of the Hon. Member from Moose Jaw, I can't think of any good reason why it hasn't been done in the past. It has been brought to a head here, because we have been thinking about it in the Department. When I



March 6, 1967

spoke to the Council of the Surrogate Court judges last summer at their convention, I threw this out to them as a suggestion. I personally feel it's better to have justice come closer to the people and this one way in which you can do it, by giving these District Court judges more jurisdiction. Later on in the session I will be introducing a Bill which will give them considerably more jurisdiction under The District Court Act. I feel that it is a thing that they can do, and I can't really think of any particularly good reason why it hasn't been done before. When I suggested it to them they considered it and thought it was a good idea and subsequently passed a resolution and submitted it to me for our consideration.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

HON. C.P. MacDONALD (Minister of Welfare) moved second reading of Bill No. 43 -- **An Act respecting the Profession of Social Work.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to just say a few words about this new Bill respecting the social workers of Saskatchewan.

This Bill was recommended by the Social Workers Association of the Province of Saskatchewan. I think all the Members of the Assembly are aware that social workers in Canada are now in great demand. The competition on a Provincial level and the Federal level is becoming very keen. With the passing of the Canada Assistance Act, the need for social workers across the country has increased by leaps and bounds. In the Province of Saskatchewan, like many provinces in Canada, there is no professional recognition for a social worker. I hope that in this Bill, it will provide a basis for growth of the social workers' profession and the expansion of the profession, not only in interest but also in calibre.

Within recent years, I think that all of us would agree that a new concept of welfare has evolved. It is recognized today that social welfare does not consist of financial handouts only. To be effective, welfare service should be focused toward providing the rehabilitative tools and means necessary to make an individual self-sufficient, rather than creating continuing dependency on financial assistance.

In other words there is a real need to improve both the calibre and the number of social workers. When we talk about welfare services in the Province of Saskatchewan, and welfare workers, we are talking not only of the public service but also of private agencies. I can refer to, for example, the Family Service Bureaux in Moose Jaw, Saskatoon and Regina, providing assistance to families with marital problems, the Catholic Family Service Society in Regina and Saskatoon, the YMCA, the YWCA, the Canadian Institute for the Blind, the John Howard Society of Saskatchewan, and many others, as well as the workers in the Department of Public Health. In total there would be something in the neighborhood of 375 social workers in both the public and private sectors affected by this Bill.

It is an accepted fact that at the present time there simply are not enough professional social workers to meet the ever increasing demands for their skills. As a result both government and private agencies have had of necessity to employ persons with less than professional qualifications. We are attempting to ensure that they are receiving adequate supervision by professional trained social workers.

At the present time however, there is no way for the public to discern the level of professional competence of persons providing a given service. Therefore, the proposed registration legislation has been requested by the Saskatchewan Association of Social Workers, to clarify for the public, the qualifications of persons giving service. Similar legislation is presently enforced in the Provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Quebec, and Manitoba, while Ontario, British Columbia, and Alberta are presently working on similar Acts.

It is not the intent of this legislation to limit in any way the freedom of any employer to hire persons at any level of professional training, nor to deny to anyone the opportunity to obtain such employment. Nevertheless the Saskatchewan Association of Social Workers strongly believes that the public should have the right and the opportunity to be aware of whether an individual working in a social worker position meets at least minimum qualifications in terms of level of confidence and standards. With the registration of social workers, the use of the designation RSW would be restricted to these persons permitted to enter their names upon the registry. The public will then be able to identify the qualified practitioner and be assured that he is obligated to provide service of the highest level possible.

In addition since all persons presently employed in positions of a social work content have the opportunity to apply for registration, the Association has committed itself to the responsibility of encouraging and providing the means to non-professional members to upgrade themselves through the medium of seminars, institutes and training courses.

With this, Mr. Speaker, I commend this Bill to the House.

**MR. A.M. NICHOLSON (Saskatoon City):** -- Mr. Speaker, I must congratulate the Minister on the statement he has made in introducing this important piece of legislation. In addition to the roles mentioned by the Minister I think he might have mentioned the introduction of medicare in all of Canada in the very near future. It has been recognized by the Federal Department of National Health and Welfare that the welfare worker has a very important role in modern society and in recent years the Federal Government has shared with the Provincial Government in providing bursaries to make it possible for people to go from provinces where there are no schools of social work to centres where there are schools.

I am delighted that the Minister in a recent statement intimated that Saskatchewan will in the near future have a school for social work. I am aware of the problems in providing competent staff for a successful operation of this type of school. I think that it has been established in other fields of activity, in the training of teachers, in the educating of medical doctors, that a province with our population can provide good training in a great variety of fields. I look forward with a good deal of optimism to a school of social work performing useful service in the province. And I am sure that having on the statute books of this Province an Act respecting the profession of social work, will be of assistance in building up the number of trained social workers which will be available on the Saskatchewan scene.

And so I am sure that Members of the House will support this measure unanimously.

March 6, 1967

**MRS. HUNT:** -- Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Hon. Member a question. Will this Bill go to Law Amendments Committee as a professional Bill or will it be dealt with in this House?

**MR. MacDONALD:** -- To my knowledge it will be dealt with in Committee.

**MRS. HUNT:** -- You wouldn't consider it as a professional Act that would have to go to Law Amendments?

**MR. MacDONALD:** -- No, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to the Member that this is a Government Bill and is being sponsored by the Government.

**MR. DAVIES:** -- Mr. Speaker, the same thing that had occurred to the Lady Member from Regina (Mrs. Hunt) had occurred to me. Normally a Bill of this type does come before us as a private instrument and goes to Law Amendments Committee in the usual nature of things. The Bill comes back to the House identical in most cases to the Bill that went to Law Amendments Committee. But in all the professional Acts, it seems to me, that there is good reason for the scrutiny of the Committee. In the first instance it is desirable, Mr. Speaker, that some of the causes, disciplinary causes, causes of suspension, etc. be as identical as possible, one with the other. And it is quite easy, it seems to me, for some of the sections to differ. While I'm not making a point of it at this time, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to the Minister that this might be a preferable procedure, that it go to the Committee and come back to the House. This of course would permit the organization, if it wished, to make any representations, to go more fully into each one of the sections concerned.

I thoroughly support the principle behind it but I think in everyone's interest it might not be a bad idea if we call the forum that we would have called had this come to us in the nature of a private member's instrument. I remind the Minister that by and large, this is the way almost all such Bills come to this House.

**MR. J.H. BROCKELBANK (Kelsey):** -- Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say a word or two along that same line.

When a professional Act comes into force, it has the effect first, of giving some rights and privileges to members of that profession. But it also imposes upon them some discipline. There is another thing that a professional Act nearly always does and that is, it imposes a restriction upon people who may have been working or might in the future be working in that line of work, but were not registered or not qualified to be registered. Now these different groups of people have a very definite interest in professional Bills. There is no provision for any of these people to appear before this Committee and make representation. I really don't think there are very many Members of this Legislature who know enough about the actual work of the social worker, enough about this profession to really give us a good guidance on the question. And I think it would be very good if the people concerned, who have been working in this line are given the chance to appear before a Committee and say, "We like the Bill, or we don't like the Bill. We think this clause

is dangerous,” and so on. This is a good way to handle this kind of legislation and I would suggest that the Government give it a second thought as to whether it be sent to the Law Amendments Committee rather than the Committee of the Whole.

**MR. MacDONALD:** -- Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to say that normally a private Member’s Bill is taken to the Law Amendments Committee but not a public Bill or a Government Bill. Because I felt, and I think that the Social Workers felt that this was a Bill that should have the unanimous approval of the Government as well as that of the Opposition, that it was unnecessary to take it to the Law Amendments Committee. However, I have no desire to prevent scrutiny of this Bill or the discussion of it and I am sure that the Social Worker’s Association of the Province feels exactly the same as I do. Therefore I will do everything to facilitate this opportunity for all Members of the House. Perhaps we could let it stand until I check, as a new Minister, the proper procedure whereby we might accommodate the Members opposite.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

**MR. McFARLANE** moved second reading of Bill No. 46 -- **An Act to amend The Dairy Producers Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, all of the proposed amendments of this Act are of the housekeeping nature and designed to bring definitions into line with modern production trends and technology in the dairy industry. In Section 2, clauses (b) and (c), the amendment there is designed to change the definitions of cheese factory and creamery, to bring it more in line with the present-day conditions. In sub-section (j) of Section 2, the words “or any other product intended for use as a dessert topping or as a coffee whitener” are added. This exempts these products from the definition of imitation dairy products. If they were not so exempted, Section 54 would prohibit their sale and they are at the present time widely used.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

**MR. McFARLANE** moved second reading of Bill No. 47 -- **An Act to amend The Artificial Insemination Animals Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, the Animal Industry Branch and the Plant Industry Branch will be amalgamated into a new branch called The Production and Marketing Branch, effective April, 1967. This amendment is required to correctly define the director under this new administrative arrangement.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

**MR. McFARLANE** moved second reading of Bill No. 48 -- **An Act to amend The Livestock and Livestock Products Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, the administration of fur farms is being transferred from the Department of Natural Resources to the Department of Agriculture, effective April 1, 1967. This amendment is necessary to provide authority for the Department of Agriculture to make regulations concerning the classification and the licensing of persons who raise and sell live fur animals, and to prescribe the conditions under which live fur animals may be

March 6, 1967

raised and sold in any part of the province.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

MR. McFARLANE moved second reading of Bill No. 49 -- **An Act to amend The Livestock Purchase and Sale Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, recent changes in the Department of Agriculture administration have resulted in dropping the title, Livestock Commissioner. This function is now performed by a new position, namely, Chief of Livestock and Dairy Industry Division. Further, the present trend in legislation is to make reference to the Minister rather than specific members of this staff. This provides for the delegation of the specific function to any staff member to act on the Minister's behalf. This provides greater flexibility in administration.

**MR. NOLLET:** -- Mr. Speaker, there is perhaps another reason why I agree with the amendment in order to bring this legislation in line with other legislation where the Minister is mentioned, and not a specific person within the administrative set-up of the Department. That's the way I took it and it's not entirely because of the change of name of the Animal Industry Branch, but more specifically I would think the bringing of this legislation in proper line with other legislation by naming the Minister instead of an individual civil servant on the administrative staff.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

HON. G.B. GRANT (Minister of Public Health) moved second reading of Bill No. 50 -- **An Act to amend The Mental Health Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, in speaking to this Bill, quite a number of the suggested changes are merely by way of clarifying existing provisions. The Act now provides a physician to be appointed as the superintendent of each Mental Hospital, Training School or Psychiatric Centre. It is generally recognized that the superintendent is in charge of all matters within the Institution or Centre, both administrative and professional. In a General Hospital, the superintendent or head administrator is in charge of the administrative affairs of the hospital while the medical staff are responsible for the provision of care and treatment of the patient. It is believed that it would now be appropriate for this concept to be applied to the Saskatchewan Hospital at Weyburn. The proposed amendments provide for the removal of all reference in the Act to a superintendent and require a physician to be appointed for each institution and psychiatric centre who would be known as the medical officer in charge, who would be in charge of care and treatment being provided to patients. Upon these amendments being made, a lay administrator at the Weyburn Hospital would be made responsible for all the administrative matters within the hospital and a physician will be placed in charge of all admissions, discharges, treatment procedures and all other matters directly relating to the care and treatment of patients. It is not now intended that any similar changes be made in the other institutions and the psychiatric centre at this time. However, the amendments will permit more flexibility in fixing administrative responsibilities in these facilities in the future.

Another amendment relates to the claim of the Minister of Public Health against the estate of a person who had received care and treatment in an institution for the cost of care and treatment provided for that person in the institution. It is now provided in the Act that the Minister's claim does not apply to that portion of the estate passing to the father or mother, husband or wife, brother or sister or child of the deceased person, if residing in Saskatchewan. The purpose of another amendment is to prevent the possibility of renunciations of claims and assignments in the interest of the estate by relatives residing outside Saskatchewan, causing the entire estate to pass to near relatives residing within the province and thereby frustrating the Minister's claim. It is believed that this amendment is consistent with the original purpose and intent of the existing provisions of the Act in this regard. The remaining amendments relate to the admission of a person to a facility upon the authority of the certificate of one physician. This is a minor drafting provision and does not change the meaning of the Section to any significant degree. In that regard Section 12 authorizes the admission of a patient to a facility upon the certificate of one physician. Subsection 1 now seems to imply authority for the apprehension of the person only where the medical officer in charge causes or arranges this to be done. It is believed advisable that the authority to apprehend should be expressly stated and more broadly provided for.

**MR. G. T. SNYDER (Moose Jaw City):** -- Mr. Speaker, I have some reservations about a matter or two associated with the Bill that is before us, the amendments to The Mental Health Act. There are a few questions that remain unanswered as far as I am concerned. Section 5 in the amendment relates to what a physician may or may not do in order to commit a person to be detained in a mental institution. Perhaps when the Minister closes the debate he might describe a little more fully the procedure involved. I, apart from this, have no particular objections but I just question the procedures and what the change is from the former arrangement where a Minister might possibly admit or detain a mentally disturbed person in a mental institution. Perhaps this is something that could be better dealt with in Committee but I'm just questioning Section 5 in the amendments and I was hoping that the Minister, when he closes the debate, might explain somewhat more fully the provisions of Section 5 at a later date. And I would be willing to allow the discussion to be dealt with more fully in Committee if the Minister could relate a little more fully to Section 5.

**MR. DAVIES:** -- Just a question or two, Mr. Speaker, with respect to this Bill. Perhaps the Minister will answer these questions when he rises to close the debate or in Committee if he doesn't have the answers to these questions now. But I wonder about this phrase that he explained, I think, medical officer in charge. This doesn't suggest that the person concerned has to be a psychiatrist. My question is; does this simply mean a physician or a physician psychiatrist, and in the same section of facility? Does 'other facility' relate to all facilities where mental patients will be housed? Does this mean that there would be part-time supervision by the medical officer in charge in the case of a facility that had, say, a number of mental patients there in a custodial nature? Now, I think there are some other matters that aren't quite clear to me, this whole matter of the renunciation of the estate. But I don't think I should ask questions on this right now because I don't think it's proper at this time in the debate, but I was a little concerned about whether or not

March 6, 1967

the medical officer in charge is a person with the requisite training because, as the amendment seems to me to be now, it could be a person without any special training in psychiatry.

**MR. E. KRAMER (The Battlefords):** -- Mr. Speaker, there's another section here that the Minister made a remark or two on, Section 6(a).

**MR. GRANT:** -- My hearing isn't that good.

**MR. KRAMER:** -- I usually don't have that trouble, Mr. Speaker. Regarding Section 6(a), the Minister made some remarks about people outside the province frustrating the interests of the Government or frustrating the interest of the Minister. I don't think there is a great need to build bulwarks against people rooking the Government because most of them are reasonably honest. And when you do this you do something else, Mr. Speaker. You frustrate the interest at times of people right here in Saskatchewan. Now it happens and quite often that an elderly person remains with one member of the family for a number of years, while others of the family may be off in Alberta or British Columbia or down in Ontario, probably not doing anything about taking care of or taking part of the responsibility for caring for their mother or father in their own home. It falls on the lot of the one who remains at home and keeps the parent at home, sometimes for years. Then this parent becomes possibly unmanageable and may spend two or three years or less in a mental institution. Now, quite often it also happens that while this is all going on, no will is made, and possibly the brothers and sisters in some other province say, "Oh well, Mary or George can have our interest, we don't care." But no one has said so on paper, Mr. Speaker. So finally, this person becomes incompetent and can no longer make a will on behalf of the rightful heir and he can no longer designate. Yet the moral right to that estate is actually with the son or daughter who spent many years taking care of that parent, and the brothers and sisters in Ontario or British Columbia or somewhere revoke their right to that estate to heirs in Saskatchewan because they know they have this share coming for the care they gave the parent before he became an inmate of that institution. What you do in this Act is to frustrate the interest of the one who remained at home and did the duty of a son or a daughter. This thing works both ways, Sir, and I think you should consider this and try to provide something that would be fair to the one who had a right and didn't put in a bill, because it was mother or dad. So there is another area here that should be looked into, the moral right of the son or the daughter that takes care of their parents, and the rights of the ones that are away from home to give their interest in the estate to the one who did the work.

**MR. GRANT:** -- Mr. Speaker, in reply to the Hon. Member from Moose Jaw, I think that in Committee I could answer all the questions he would have. In reply to the Senior Member from Moose Jaw, (Mr. Davies) all I can give him in this regard is the definition of medical officer as described in The Mental Health Act. A medical officer in charge means the superintendent of an institution or psychiatric centre or the clinical director of a psychiatric ward or mental health clinic or the physician appointed to be responsible for the operation of any other facility. So I think in answer to your inquiry, that it doesn't necessarily mean that he would be required to be a psychiatrist. In answer to the Hon. Member from Swift Current . . .

**MR. KRAMER:** -- You've got me wrong, boy!

**MR. GRANT:** -- I'm sorry, The Battlefords. I think it is necessary to have this in, because while I agree with you that most people are honest, unfortunately there are quite a number who will bend every twig to try and do a government out of what we consider to be a rightful interest. In the case cited by the Hon. Member, there is discretion given to the Minister to deal with this, not only under those circumstances but other circumstances where the direct family are involved and do not live in the province. I think it would be adequately covered by those means.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

**MR. GRANT** moved second reading of Bill No. 51 -- **An Act to amend The Hospital Standards Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, the amendment proposed to The Hospital Standards Act deals with several subjects. It does not introduce any new programs or any new principles. They are mostly amendments to existing provisions. The Act now authorizes two or more hospitals to co-operate with each other in the establishment of a Hospital Council; there are presently five of these Regional Hospital Councils that have been established under the Act. An amendment will authorize a Hospital Council to make rules and regulations. At the present time it is restricted to membership from participating hospitals. It is believed that the participation of the medical profession and proprietors of nursing homes in the affairs of a Regional Hospital Council would be a benefit to the council as it would broaden the general knowledge of the council members and expedite council business.

The Saskatchewan Hospitalization Act now provides for payments of expenses incurred in administering a scheme established under the Act to be made from the Saskatchewan Hospitalization Fund. In practice, the only administrative expenses paid out of this Fund had been those incurred by the administrative unit known as The Saskatchewan Hospital Act but also persons engaged in the administration of The Hospital Standards Act. In addition, a few members of the Branch spend part of their time in administering portions of The Hospital Revenue Act, 1966 and The Health Services Act relating to and making of grants to hospitals. Hospitals are approved under The Hospital Standards Act for the purpose of The Saskatchewan Hospitalization Act. The two Acts are therefore closely related and it seems reasonable that the payment for the expenses of administering both Acts should be made from the Saskatchewan Hospitalization Fund. The authority to pay for the expenses of administering other Acts relating to hospitals other than The Mental Health Act from this Fund seems to be advisable so that all the administrative expenses incurred by the entire staff of this Branch can be paid from the one source.

The Act now contains a penalty provision to be applied against the hospitals failing to submit a monthly financial statement to the Minister of Public Health. It is my understanding that this penalty has never been imposed. The Bill, Mr. Speaker, provides for the removal of this provision from the Act. The remaining amendments provide for minor changes to the provisions providing for the auditing of financial affairs of the hospitals and hospital councils. Our suggestion in this area is similar to that pertaining to hospitals, namely that it is the auditor's responsibility to prepare the audited statement; it is not his



March 6, 1967

responsibility to see that it is submitted to the Department. We're placing that onus on the hospital itself rather than on the auditor as set forth in the Act at the present time.

**MR. W.E. SMISHEK (Regina East):** -- Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister a question particularly regarding the extension for medical representation on hospital councils; whether this particular area has been discussed with the Saskatchewan Hospital Association and what their feelings are in terms of allowing this representation? Do they feel that it is a desirable move or do they question the amendments that are before us?

**MR. SNYDER:** -- I have no quarrel with the early portion of the amendment that is proposed. I think the indication here that a financial statement consisting of an abstract of the revenues, expenditures, assets, and liabilities of the hospital probably provides a very useful service with respect to the operation of the hospitals and the concern of the Department of Public Health with this kind of a submission to be made to them. My only question in connection with this is that I hope the Minister might make some comments on it in respect to subsection 8(a) in paragraph 4 which draws attention to the fact that payment for all expenditures incurred by the Department of Public Health in administering provision of the Act or any other Act except The Mental Health Act relating to hospitals, shall be made from the Saskatchewan Hospitalization Fund. I wonder if the Minister when he closes the debate might give us an indication as to whether this is a new charge on the Hospitalization Fund and from what source these expenditures were made prior to this time. Perhaps I am not as knowledgeable as I should be in this connection, but I wonder where these charges were levied prior to this time, these charges that are now to be made upon the Saskatchewan Hospitalization Fund.

**MR. DAVIES:** -- I make only a brief reference to what the Member for Regina East (Mr. Smishek) already alluded to, Mr. Speaker, and that is the part of the Bill that permits the Hospital Council to add to their numbers by choosing representatives of the medical profession or replacing them after they are chosen, and representatives of nursing homes, on the Hospital Council. Now, I suppose that from time to time, representatives of almost any organization, particularly those that are near to a hospital from a point of view of servicing, would be useful on the Hospital Council. But the same thing could be said of a host of organizations.

Now the Minister may say that there is a general phrase to the effect that other bodies and organizations as considered advisable can be included under this particular principle, but the mention of the one profession it seems to me, may point to the likelihood that other bodies that should very well have membership on the Council are going to be ignored. I hope this wouldn't be the case, but when one or two areas are mentioned and the others are ignored, it certainly points in that direction. Apart from that, however, it seems to me that the Hospital Councils have drawn together the representatives of hospitals in an area for a number of very good purposes. Over a period of time these purposes have had to do with administration generally and matters of hospital practice and a range of very useful things that have to do with the everyday life of hospitals. However, this has

been a body of the public administration of public hospitals and the administration of private hospitals within a Council in a Region, if this is correct, Mr. Minister.

It seems to me to be somewhat of an anomaly at this time to say that we are including in this quasi-public body, representatives of organizations who are not the representatives of the public or representatives of the owner of private hospitals. One wonders where you stop with this kind of a hybrid. Some years ago we did have in the province an all-inclusive type of advisory body which the present Government in its wisdom saw fit to disband several years ago. I think a great mistake was made at this time because this body drew together the efforts of a great number of organizations within the province for the purpose of advice on health matters.

I'm wondering about the wisdom of course that would appoint a number of representatives to a body which is essentially policy-making within its own bounds and administrative in character. If you add any one or two groups, wherein is the argument that all other interested groups within the community should not be given membership as well? I say that it just doesn't make sense and it seems to me that this type of council body is the type of body where these organizations should have representation. Rather there should be a broad body of citizens, professional et al, groups that would advise hospitals, would advise whomever, as a matter of fact, they thought it wise to advise. But within the structure as I understand it to be here, it does seem to me to be a bit anomalous.

**MR. GRANT:** -- In reply to the Hon. Member from Moose Jaw (Mr. Snyder) with regard to Section 8(a), the Hospital Branch was organized within the Department just a few years ago and it consists of the Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan and the Hospital Administration and Standards Division. The SHSP staff receives the tax, determines eligibility, assesses hospital accounts and pays out the money to the hospitals. Payment for these personnel has always been made by the Hospitalization Fund. In the Hospital Administration and Standards Division its two important functions have been to fix the rate of payment to be made to the hospitals, to inspect the hospitals and to ensure that the Minister may continue to approve them for the purpose of The Saskatchewan Hospitalization Act. Payment for these personnel has never been made from the fund although it can be argued that the rate setting and hospital inspection fund are part of the scheme. In the past, payment has been made from the general funds of the Department, specifically the ones for this branch.

With the Hospitals Branch combining these various functions into one branch of administration, it is now thought that the payment for all of these groups of personnel should be paid from the Saskatchewan Hospitalization fund because it is all part and parcel of administering that fund. The amendment would also authorize payment from the fund for small groups of departmental personnel administering The Hospital Revenue Act, and making of grants to the hospitals under the help of the Services Act.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

**HON. J.C. McISAAC** (Minister of Municipal Affairs) moved second reading of Bill No. 54 -- **An Act to amend The Local Improvement Act.**

March 6, 1967

He said: Mr. Speaker, the proposed amendments here are to The Local Improvement Act which deals with the installation of water and sewer and other local improvements. There are two related amendments involved here. The present Act provides that the urban council involved may enter into an agreement with railroads and other owners of unsubdivided land for reducing the frontage rates on such property. If the council does not come to agreement, the owner of the land may then petition the Saskatchewan Assessment Commission to adjudicate the matter. It may then order the two bodies to enter into an agreement according to such terms as the Commission lays down. This procedure, as I say, is there now and will certainly remain except that the application which that owner may make to the Commission must now be made within 30 days of the date of the final notice of intention with such public works.

The second amendment merely says that the decision of the Commission in this regard shall be final in those cases.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

**MR. McISAAC** moved second reading of Bill No. 55 -- **An Act to amend The Housing and Urban Renewal Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, these amendments are to The Housing and Urban Renewal Act introduced here last year. In the course of the first year's operation there were two or three things that we discovered that should be clarified and extended. The National Housing Act at present provides that CMHC may undertake to do housing research and community planning and these provisions are contained in part 5 of The National Housing Act. Two of the amendments proposed here will allow the province and municipalities of housing authorities to enter into an agreement to operate under part 5 of the NHA Act.

The second amendment that could be commented on; there seems to be some doubt by our Provincial auditors as to the authority in the present Act before us to acquire land, build houses and so on, so that an amendment is proposed which clearly spells out the powers of the Province in this respect. The Province may acquire and develop land for housing purposes, construct and furnish houses for sale or rent, acquire, maintain, improve, convert existing buildings and so forth.

The third amendment that is contained in those proposed amendments is a request from the Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association which provides that an urban municipality may make a grant of \$500 to the owners of substandard housing that has been ordered condemned. It is felt that this would avoid spending an equal amount on legal fees and it would also avoid a good many of the hard feelings in protracted negotiations that are sometimes involved in this. We think, also, that this would tend to promote a degree -- shall we say -- of spot urban renewal in certain areas of certain communities if they wish to proceed along these lines. It is permissive legislation and I think it is good legislation, so therefore I move second reading of this Bill.

**MR. SMISHEK:** -- Mr. Speaker, I have no quarrel with the Bill that is before us. As the Minister has pointed out, in the main it extends or gives the Provincial Government more authority to take

action in the whole housing field. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that it is not additional authority really that is needed, it is really the will and desire on the part of the Government to start acting. What is needed is to appropriate needed funds and to appoint a housing authority or a housing agency which is provided for in the Act and which the Government has done nothing about since the Act was passed last year. This Government is only giving a good deal of lip service to housing rather than taking real action in the whole field of housing. Its priorities are those of building homes for people. The Government, Mr. Speaker, now together with CMHC has all kinds of power and authority to build houses of all types for people, to acquire land and to develop it for housing purposes and to enter into urban renewal programs. Now this Government in the last two years or two previous budgets received \$50,000,000 more in money than was estimated but has not provided one additional penny for housing over and above those expenditures that were estimated. To me, Mr. Speaker, the provision of good housing for people rests in the same category as provision of health care and providing an equitable opportunity for education. It is my feeling that you cannot build healthy bodies and healthy minds in slums or inadequate housing. Many countries in the world have considered the provision of adequate housing in the same category or have made it part of the overall social security program. Mr. Speaker, I have a quarrel or a bone to pick with the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McIsaac) in his handling of the Tuxedo Park, the urban renewal development in the city of Regina. I would suggest to the Minister that before he starts shooting off his mouth the odd time, that he gets his facts straight. He is trying to lay the blame on other people for his own failures and his lack of knowledge of the problem and his disregard to people who live in the Tuxedo Park. Mr. Speaker, the Minister was reported in the local press on February 11 . . .

**MR. McISAAC:** -- Is the Hon. Member debating this Bill that is before us or is he getting something off his chest that he hasn't as yet had the intestinal fortitude to do?

**MR. SPEAKER:** -- Order! The Member will have to relate himself to the amendment or to the principle thereof, he can't debate the whole Act.

**MR. SMISHEK:** -- Mr. Speaker, I am discussing the whole question of housing and I think that we, on second reading, can discuss the whole Bill as before us. Mr. Speaker, I want to draw to the attention of this House to the Minister being reported in the press on February 11. Speaking to a meeting of the Regina Northeast Liberal Association, the Minister of Municipal Affairs said, and let me quote:

Last April a meeting was called of the owners and people involved in the Tuxedo Park project. It was attended and addressed by two MLAs for the area, Mayor Baker and Walter Smishek.

It went on and said:

At that meeting promises were made for increases over and above the appraisal value which would be and should be paid to the owners.

March 6, 1967

Mr. Speaker, if there was a meeting last April of Tuxedo Park residents and property owners I know nothing about it. I was not there. I am aware of a meeting on May 30.

**MR. McISAAC:** -- The Hon. Member is not debating the principles of this Bill. If he wishes to debate this particular topic he is now involved in, I would be very happy to do so, but not at this time.

**MR. BROCKELBANK (Kelsey):** -- Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the Hon. Minister can't always pick his time when he has debates. The Bill before the House is on the question of housing and urban renewal. Now how can the House discuss a Bill which affects housing and urban renewal without discussing these subjects themselves, housing and urban renewal. How do we know what we need, what we want in regard to law in this question, unless we talk about what we've got in the way of housing and what we need in the way of urban renewal. So even though the Minister doesn't like it, I am afraid that the Member has to be considered in order when he is talking about these subjects with which the Bill is concerned.

**MR. McISAAC:** -- Mr. Speaker, again on the point of order, I have no objection to talking about it now as far as that goes. He is quoting a press release that he read in the paper, quoting another press release that I was reading from and I don't think that this is the time and place for it.

**MR. SPEAKER:** -- Order! The Member will have to relate his remarks to the amendment. The Bill that is before the House is an amendment to The Housing and Urban Renewal Act and any remarks made on second reading have to relate themselves to the amendment. Now whether some meeting took place somewhere between somebody has anything to do with that is something that I can't tell you.

**MR. DAVIES:** -- Mr. Speaker . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** -- Order! Now we can't have three Members all at once. Now we'll start with the Member from Moose Jaw on whatever he is on.

**MR. DAVIES:** -- Mr. Speaker, I was on my feet when you were about to rise before, I am sorry if I interrupted you but I suggest that this Bill here relates to a whole number of powers. I am sure you have the Bill before you, you will notice that subsection 4A talks about the acquisition and development of land for housing, constructing and furnishing of houses, acquisition, maintenance, improving of housing, selling and leasing. I won't go into all of the other powers. Subsection 6A has to do with the municipality making grants on whatever terms and that's spelled out. Surely if the Minister at this time is referred to as having made statements with respect to some urban housing policies or projects, it is quite in order for the Member to do so. I think it would be impossible for a person to discuss this Bill without discussing all of the powers that are residual in The Housing and Urban Renewal Act. I think the Member is quite in order.

**MR. SMISHEK:** -- Mr. Speaker, if I may proceed, this particular Bill affects the people in my constituency very much and they are very much concerned about it, particularly one group of people who are considered in an urban renewal program and would like to relate this problem to the Minister. I'm afraid the Minister has not acquainted himself with the facts. He has also chosen to make some allegations about people and he does not have his facts correct. I was saying that he was reported in the press to have made some charges against me at a meeting I was supposed to attend. I did not attend a meeting in April. I am aware of a meeting that took place on May 30. I then attended a meeting which was organized by the people concerned. I was invited to attend the meeting and did so. The press was also there at the meeting. I asked the Minister to read the news coverage of that meeting and I asked him to produce one shred of evidence that some exorbitant promises were made by myself or anybody else. May I advise the Minister that at that meeting the people agreed to form an organization to be known as Tuxedo Park Property Owners Association. They elected a committee, they agreed to make representation to the City Council because an overwhelming majority of those present were dissatisfied with the offers made. What took place at that meeting and the tone of the meeting were reported in detail in the press. Let me quote one part of a statement that appeared in the press, as one of them put it:

I don't want what isn't coming to me but I do want a home. The general feeling of those present was that although their homes may not be castles they are still their homes. 'We want a fair deal, that's all', shouted one from the back of the room.

These people are entitled to a fair deal and I will support them in that, Mr. Speaker. I was asked at that meeting as to how they might proceed with making their representations. I suggested that as a first step those present should give their elected committee the offers that were made to them and what they considered to be a fair price for each of the properties. This was done at the meeting. Mr. Speaker, any time a group of citizens I represent invite me to attend a meeting or to discuss problems I intend to be there whether the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McIsaac) likes it or not. I refuse to act like some Members on the other side of the House, including Cabinet Ministers who refuse to go to meetings when invited.

The position of those people who were at the meeting was well represented in their submission to the City Council. Let me quote:

We are the Tuxedo Park Owners Association, elected at a meeting at the Beleton Hall on May 30th, 1966. Eighteen of the twenty-five homeowners were present. We are here tonight on behalf of the offers we were made. We feel that the offers made to us were not an appropriate settlement as stated in our letters. The prices we were offered will not buy us other accommodation without going into debt. Some of the people, particularly the elderly, are reasonably satisfied with the accommodations they had and they cannot afford to go into debt. Question 1, the prices for the corner lots are the same but yet the taxes are higher. Why? Question 2, what authority did the real estate have to offer higher prices to some people? Question 3, why did the real estate try to sell his

March 6, 1967

homes that he had for sale, and when he did take us out, to show us homes that were much higher than what we were offered?

These were the questions they posed to City Council in their submission. Now let me carry on with the quotation:

We know that our homes are not exclusive but yet they are our homes. They would be in better condition if we would have been allowed improvements by the city. The real estate said they could not get us another home equal to what we had for the offers we were made for our homes. We are asking for a better settlement than we were offered in order to be relocated. We don't want to go to court or to arbitration. We would appreciate a fair settlement.

Mr. Speaker, according to a series of newspaper articles appearing in the Leader Post on February 11, 13 and 14 -- let me quote: "The total asking price of 25 resident home owners was \$215,225." Still \$61,804 more than the \$153,421 figure. The difference is about the cost of building one mile of highway; but in the line of priority it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that this Government puts highways ahead of people. Remembering that the cost is to be shared with the Federal Government, with the Federal Government paying 50 per cent and the Province and the city 25 per cent each, the Provincial share would be approximately \$15,000 only of the \$61,000 figure. This Government was able to find in the two-year period some \$13,000 more for highway construction. It found thousands of dollars for tearing up perfectly good floors and replacing them with marble floors in this Legislature. The Premier found an additional \$116,000 more of public funds for propaganda purposes but they can't find \$15,000 for some 25 citizens. Many of them, Mr. Speaker, are pioneers who built this province. In the final analysis, Mr. Speaker, it will not cost the Government anything because the property will be resold for industrial purposes, so it is merely a loan. By not allowing these citizens some \$61,000 the Government is really asking them to subsidize industry by that amount. I say "Shame." I say that this is not fair and I'm going to be on their side. I say that any time that they call me to attend any meetings to discuss this problem or any other problem, I will be there to help them. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McIsaac) to reconsider his position on this matter. I would also ask his office to persuade the Federal Government authorities to give the people of Tuxedo Park a fair deal.

May I also make a suggestion that they consider including in this Urban Renewal Plan the entire residential area east of the tracks up to and including the residences on both sides of Victoria Avenue. I ask also that these people be made a fair offer, making it possible for them to purchase good homes in other parts of the city. I make this request, Mr. Speaker, realizing that if Tuxedo Park is redeveloped for industrial purposes, traffic will increase, so will the noise and likely air pollution will worsen. So from the standpoint of health and safety, the total area should be redeveloped with the home and property owners given a fair deal. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to bring these matters to the attention of the Minister. I certainly have no quarrel with the amendments that are here before us. But I would ask the Government not to give just lip service in the whole area of housing but that it provide some money, a fair chunk of money for the housing and for renewal programs and particularly

that it allow more money for the Tuxedo Park Renewal Development.

**MR. W.J. BEREZOWSKY (Cumberland):** -- Mr. Speaker, I cannot resist saying a few words in connection with this Bill. I think the Bill itself is an excellent piece of legislation and I commend the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McIsaac) for bringing it in. But when I think of the record of the free enterprisers in the city of Prince Albert and the opportunities they've had to solve the problem of housing over the past dozen or more years, I can't help but think that this may be just an election gimmick. It would be just another bit of Liberal legislation which will stand on the books and nothing will be done. We have the situation in B.C. where a Liberal Government passed health legislation in 1930 but it didn't have the courage to go ahead and proclaim it while it was the Government. I don't think it was ever proclaimed. This is what I'm afraid of in this Bill. I do hope that the Minister would use all his powers of persuasion with the rest of the members of the Executive Council to see that the provisions in this Act will be brought into effect. Now why did I say so? I do represent or will be representing a large part of the city of Prince Albert. It's the part . . .

**MR. STEUART:** -- No you won't!

**MR. BEREZOWSKY:** -- I will be. You will be out.

**MR. STEUART:** -- I will be there. As a matter of fact you are helping me to do it. Another 500 majority which I didn't need.

**MR. BEREZOWSKY:** -- That's alright! You'd better worry, not me. The fact is this, Mr. Speaker, that some years ago when there was a by-election I happened to make a statement. It got into the press where I said that we needed 1000 houses in the city of Prince Albert. I remember that a member of the city council suggested that the Member for Cumberland was wrong. They only needed 500 houses. The Hon. Minister from Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) has boasted that over a period of some 10 years they were able to build 30 houses for needy people.

**MR. KRAMER:** -- Big deal!

**MR. BEREZOWSKY:** -- Big deal! And this is what worries me, 30 houses instead of 500. As a matter of fact the city of Prince Albert has been dubbed by people who have visited our lovely city -- we like it although it's a poor city -- a city of shacks. I would like to see the working people and the poor people in our community own just as good houses as you arrange to build for the administrators or the management of the pulp mill. You should see their houses. They're pretty good.

**MR. STEUART:** -- They sure are! You had 20 years, why didn't you build one?

**MR. BEREZOWSKY:** -- What I'm trying to point out is that there was legislation under which the Provincial Government and the Federal Government provided assistance for low income people to the extent of 95 per cent as we all know, and all that this city had to do was put



March 6, 1967

up 5 per cent. The only reason they didn't put it up is because of the city council's attitude and that of the mayor, the friend of the Hon. Minister from Prince Albert West. Of course the real estate agents didn't want it that way. They rather preferred to place people in the city of Prince Albert in tar shacks and then collect rent. And now, Mr. Minister, you have the opportunity to do something about it in the city of Prince Albert. This legislation is excellent but I'm somewhat afraid that if you are persuaded by other Ministers in your Government, this Act may be standing unused for the next year or till the next election. But I'm supporting the Bill, I think it's an excellent piece of legislation.

**MR. LINK:** -- Mr. Speaker, I'm a bit surprised at some of the things contained in this Bill because I think I'd be quite certain that the Minister is fully aware of some of these things mentioned here. I think he had the power to do so before. He probably spelled it out better than he spelled it before, but I'm sure that many of these things he had the power to deal with before. They're good, but I think to try and make this House believe that he didn't have the authority to do so before, this is quite wrong. One comment I'd like to make is under 6A. This probably could be dealt with better when we have it in Committee. It seems the immediate question that arises of course is: who decides such things as substandard and who decides whether the owner is prepared to accept \$500 under these conditions? Now probably this will be spelled out later, but maybe the Minister can answer that when he closes the debate, but at the moment it does seem a bit arbitrary to have somebody come along and say that your house is substandard, we will give you \$500. Again who decides whether the house is substandard? Does the Minister decide this or who does? Again, by and large, there certainly is nothing one can quarrel with particularly in the Bill except that, I repeat, I think the Minister had many of these powers before he ever brought the Bill into the House.

**MRS. M.A. HUNT (Regina West):** -- The Member might be interested in just a bit of this article from the Toronto Daily Star, February 24, in which they say:

In case some people have fears about public housing, the first reaction of real estate brokers and salesmen is that public housing is a form of creeping Socialism in which government is taking away from private enterprise and indirectly from us, the management of housing and this is something that we should be opposed to. If we consider the matter more carefully we'll come to an opposite conclusion and we'll realize that public housing will not only benefit the lowest income group for which we are unable to find satisfactory housing, but will also benefit the middle income group and thus will benefit ourselves, since our clients presently fall mostly within the middle income group.

It goes on to point out the difficult situation in Toronto where soaring prices, particularly of land, and in Metro-Toronto you can hardly build a house for less than \$80,000. I just wanted to quote one or two figures here.

In some European countries public housing is part of the basic stock of the country's wealth. We should explore

New Zealand's method of letting tenants in public housing apply their rent to the eventual purchase of the unit in which they are living, thus making public housing a spring board to home ownership. Then in Scotland 50 per cent of the housing is public; in Sweden 35 per cent of the housing is public. In Canada only one per cent of the total number of houses is under public housing authority. Even large cities in the United States, like New York, Chicago, and Pittsburgh have a higher percentage of public housing than Toronto. Public housing can be very helpful developments. It would certainly solve some very drastic and immediate problems for a number of our citizens.

I thought you might be interested in this approach to housing and, as I say again, I do welcome this Act.

**MR. McISAAC:** -- Mr. Speaker, I would just like first to acknowledge the fact that my honorable friend from Regina West took a great deal off this chest.

**MR. McFARLANE:** -- Regina East.

**MR. McISAAC:** -- Regina East or the Far East (Mr. Smishek) as the case may be, sounded quite a bit like the Far East tonight because most of his remarks should have been directed to the city council and his colleague from Regina East. The urban renewal program in Regina was initiated I believe about two years ago on a motion or a resolution of the city council of Regina. At that time the city council, my honorable friend opposite, and the residents of that area should have been well aware of the terms of urban renewal schemes. The principles involved are fairly simple and straight forward. Yet only after the agreement had been made and the decision to proceed had been made this last summer did my honorable friend opposite and his cohort, the Mayor of Regina, get concerned about the terms in the agreement that they had worked out in this particular case. And it is because I am concerned about future urban renewal developments in the province that I was very concerned about the niggardly way that they went about expressing their concern for these people in this district in the Tuxedo Park area. They, I think, are very well aware of how these figures are arrived at. The percentage share he pointed out was quite correct. The figures for the subsidies involved here from the Province and from Ottawa are arrived at by appraising the value of the properties in the urban renewal district, or the urban renewal area as the case may be, and subtracting from that, the anticipated resale value of the land, and the difference has been divided these three ways. The figure of the valuation of the properties in Tuxedo Park was arrived at by three different appraisals, one by two city appraisers, Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation did an appraisal, and then there was an independent appraisal done. The best appraisal I think in this case was used. As a matter of fact they are paying \$80 a foot for land in that area which is certainly a good price for the land in this district. As I say, following the agreement having been made with the province and with Ottawa, my honorable friend opposite and his friend the Mayor, went back out to those people. First he said he didn't attend the meeting and then he went on to say that he did attend the meeting at the call, of course of his constituents and this is very commendable. I commend him for going and looking after his people, except I

March 6, 1967

do criticize him for being two years too late in making the move.

**MR. STEUART:** -- Where were you?

**MR. McISAAC:** -- The other thing that disturbs me a little bit here is that I didn't see or hear him get up and express the same concern, the same crocodile tears for the other people in similar situations. The process used here by the city is just the same as that used in expropriating or acquiring land for the ring-road or widening a highway or for any other public purpose, and yet he doesn't mention it in this case. He doesn't get excited in those cases. There is one more thing that is done for the residents of an urban renewal scheme than is not done for someone -- let us say -- whose house has to be purchased and moved out as a result of widening a road. In the case of the urban renewal scheme, there is provision made to find that person similar or adequate housing elsewhere, so that there is this protection there for those people. In spite of this as I say, he only got concerned about this particular program and about this particular group of constituents long after the time he should have expressed concern. I don't know whether the fact that the Federal and Provincial Governments are paying 75 per cent of the cost would have anything to do with the fact that he and his fellow member from Regina East (Mr. Baker) would like to spend our money. He should remember that he is also a part of the Legislature just as we are on this side. He mentioned what we're not doing with respect to urban renewal studies, what we're not doing with respect to public housing and so on, but he fails to pay any attention to the steps that we have been taking. This last year we have had a very active program in this branch in just one year of operation. A program of land assembly and getting lots prepared for these urban centres in need has been available to this Province for the last 15 or 16 years, but until we passed this Act last year, only one urban community has taken advantage of it. We have approximately 22 communities that are now taking steps to take advantage of this program. We have urban renewal studies either underway or well in the advanced stage of negotiations in 22 more communities in the province of Saskatchewan. We have public housing programs for an additional 300, and some units underway and should be under construction at the end of this year. When they left office that had 414 units of public housing in the province. In this one year we'll almost duplicate the effort of their twenty. I agree that the problem is bigger now perhaps than it was then but certainly we have not been idle in this field of housing.

Mr. Speaker, I think I will leave the subject at this point and leave other comments for Committee.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

**HON. A.C. CAMERON** (Minister of Mineral Resources) moved second reading of Bill No. 57 -- **An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Government Telephones Superannuation Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, this Bill is very similar in its contents to others with regards to investing of pension funds in The World Bank, or the International Bank of Reconstruction and Development. I think all members will agree with that.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

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