LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fourth Session — Fifteenth Legislature
29th Day

Thursday, March 16, 1967

The Assembly met at 2:30 o'clock p.m.

On the Orders of the Day

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. R.A. WALKER (Hanley): — Mr. Speaker, on your behalf and on behalf of all Members of the House, I would like to welcome to the east gallery, that fine, distinguished-looking group of students from the Clavet Composite School. Hon. Members will be familiar with that school if they've passed along Highway No. 14 east of Saskatoon. It's that beautiful unique architectural wonder on the north side of the road, about 30 miles east of Saskatoon. It is one of the finest schools in Saskatchewan and one of the finest groups of students in Saskatchewan. All of their parents live in the Hanley constituency and in spite of anything the Premier has done to date, they still live in the Hanley constituency. So, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of yourself and all Members I want to hope that they've had a good visit to Regina and to wish them a safe journey home.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MRS. SALLY MERCHANT (Saskatoon City): — Mr. Speaker, I would like through you to introduce to the Members, groups of students from three schools in the city of Saskatoon. I should say that due to what the Member for Hanley (Mr. Walker) did when he was Minister in charge of The Electoral Act, we are not as sure of where the parents of these students live as he is of the parents in Clavet School. The city of Saskatoon is so divided constituency-wise that we are not quite sure who owns them in this Legislature. And I know you'll join with me in welcoming a group from Vincent Massey School as well as a group from Carolyn Robbins School and a group from W.P. Bate School. The names of the schools, Mr. Speaker, I think are rather interesting. Vincent Massey of course is named obviously for the Governor General, but Carolyn Robbins is a teacher in the city of Saskatoon who is one of the very few who have gone to the Canadian Teachers' Federation from this province, and the W.P. Bate School is named after one of the very earliest pioneers in the city of Saskatoon. So I'm sure that the students from all of these schools will live up to the example that has been set for them by the people for whom their schools are named, and I know that Members will welcome them here to be with us.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. H.H.P. BAKER (Regina East): — Mr. Speaker, I take extreme pleasure in welcoming students from another very fine and exceptional school — the Thomson School in the city of Regina in my constituency. They are here with their outstanding principal, Miss Gayton and three of the ladies from the Thomson Home and School Association. It is the grade eight class. This school has a tremendous reputation. It was named after the famous Dr. Thomson who was once

a city alderman and medical practitioner here. Thomson School celebrated its fortieth anniversary last week together with their Centennial birthday. My daughter took her public school education here and I had the privilege of being president of the Thomson Home and School for some seven years. There are many outstanding things that have happened there. The great Mr. Coldwell was the principal at Thomson School for a good number of years when he embarked upon his great political career. He became the leader of the greatest political party in Canada. I want to welcome them most sincerely. I know we are going to see many more legislators come out of Thomson School or from those who have been associated with it. We welcome them, we welcome Miss Gayton and the students most warmly.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. D.V. HEALD (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure this afternoon to introduce to you, Sir, and through you to all Hon. Members, 36 students of the grade seven and eight classes from the Pense Consolidated School in my constituency. They are seated in the Speaker's gallery and they are here this afternoon with their principal, Mr. Berger, and they have been transported here by seven drivers, Mrs. Anderson, Mr. Hanley, Mr. Brunskill, Mr. Harlton, Mr. Lusted, Mr. Lasby, and Mr. Saul. Mr. Speaker, in the Lumsden constituency and in the Pense district they grow fine boys and girls and if you'll have a second look in the gallery, you'll see they also grow pretty good beards. Hon. Members opposite, I think, have some kind of a Centennial project this year. Well out at Pense, they have a Centennial project too. It's a different kind of a project. They are growing beards at Pense to publicize their Centennial celebration which is going to take place in July. I'm sure, Sir, that you would want and I would want to welcome these students. They've been here since early this morning. They have toured the building and they are going to have to leave in a few minutes to get back in time to catch their school buses. I want to welcome them here on your behalf and to wish them a very instructive afternoon and wish them a safe trip home.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

QUESTION RE: COPY OF SCRIPT OF TELECAST

HON. W.S. LLOYD (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, on the Orders of the Day yesterday, the Minister in Charge of the Power Corporation undertook to consider whether he would make available the copy of a script of a recent telecast. May I ask him, since he is not volunteering, if he is prepared today to make available this script to us?

HON. D.G. STEUART (Minister of Natural Resources): — Well, Mr. Speaker, first in answering that, I would like to state very clearly that the television show was not political. It was the truth and I can't be responsible if the truth hurts the people opposite, the Socialists. I can understand after their performance when they ran the Power Corporation that it would hurt them. Secondly, it's typical Socialist hypocrisy for anyone on that side to get . . .

MR. LLOYD: — On a point of order, Mr.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! We've got a Member up on a point of order and the rules of this House say that if anybody chooses to raise a point of order, he should be heard forthwith. The Member from Biggar, on a point of order.

MR. LLOYD: — Mr. Speaker, my question required only a yes or a no. It didn't require . . .

MR. STEUART: — He made a speech yesterday on it . . .

MR. LLOYD: — I'm sorry I didn't make a speech on it yesterday. I can make one today though if you continue . . .It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister in making this kind of a speech which doesn't allow for replies, as I understand it, is clearly contravening the rules of order of this House.

MR. STEUART: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, you may have recalled that when he asked this question, he had quite a bit to say before he asked it. I'm just trying to answer him. I read the letter he tabled yesterday, this wretched little miserable, whining letter he wrote to the Board of Broadcasting Governors, that he doesn't really need . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! We try to avoid personalities as much as we can and I suggest the words hypocrisy, miserable and whining, just don't really belong in a debate of this nature.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:— Hear, hear!

MR. STEUART: — Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't think of calling him those names, but it would appear to me that he's already had a copy. Since I deliver many non-political speeches and non-political television programs and speeches about events in the Power Corporation and other subject matters concerning the Government, if I started to table them all it would really bog down the business of the House. My answer is No.

MR. LLOYD: — May I ask a supplementary question. Will the Minister explain why the script of a telecast which was paid for by the people of Saskatchewan and which presumably was a report to the people of Saskatchewan about the Saskatchewan Power Corporation is being denied to the Members of this Legislature?

MR. STEUART: — It's not denied to them at all. The speech was there. The law calls for any television broadcast script to be lodged with the television station. At least this is the law of the land; we obey the law of the land. As I say, if you read the letter that was supposed to be sent to the BBG, this rather ridiculous letter, you will find I'm sure, that you have a copy of it. My answer is as I said, No, I don't intend to table it.

MR. WALKER: — You should be ashamed of yourself.

MR. STEUART: — No, I'm proud of myself as

a matter of fact. I'm proud of the great job we've done with the Power Corporation. I can't help it if you're a little bitter.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:— Hear, hear!

MR. A.R. GUY (Athabasca): — Before the Orders of the Day, I wonder if I could ask the Leader of the Opposition if he's got a new election date — his last one proved rather wrong.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:— Hear, hear!

MR. LLOYD: — Yes, indeed, Mr. Speaker. Whenever the Premier finds an excuse which is in the interest of the Liberal Party regardless of the interest of the Province, then there will be an election.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:— Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER: — Are you always wrong?

STATEMENT BY MR. SPEAKER — RE: MOTION FOR RETURN RE: WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION BOARD (PENSIONS)

He said: I made a ruling on March 7, 1967 in connection with a Motion for Return which I don't think that I need to read to you. However, it covered somewhat the same broad topic. The same ruling which covered that problem at that time would also cover this one. Now in regard to the point of order raised on the motion for Return No. 43 and this one which is No. 74, standing in the name of the Member for Moose Jaw — I've refreshed my memory on a previous ruling I made upon the former occasion and I find that the ruling referred to can be found in the Journals of February 17, 1966, and related to two parliamentary questions which I ruled out of order because, as stated in the 17th edition of Erskine May, questions addressed to Ministers must relate to the public affairs with which they are officially connected, that is, any matter of administration for which the Minister is responsible. However, the citation and the rules based thereon refer strictly to parliamentary questions as such. The present point of order refers to a motion for a Return, that is, a motion made by a Member seeking the production of certain information. While the Government may not be responsible or unable to produce the information foresaid, a Member has the undoubted right and privilege as a Member of this Legislature to make the motion and it then becomes the responsibility of the House to deal with the motion in the usual way.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

RESOLUTIONS

RESOLUTION NO. 1 RE: MUNICIPAL LOAN AND DEVELOPMENT FUND

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. T.M. Weatherald (Cannington)

> That this Legislature recognizes the difficulties being experienced by local governments in the sale of municipal debentures and urges the Government of Saskatchewan to investigate the feasibility of establishing a Municipal Loan and Development Fund to assist with the purchase of municipal debentures.

The question being put, motion was agreed to.

RESOLUTION NO. 6 RE: INCREASE FOR MAXIMUM AND MINIMUM PRICES OF WHEAT

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. I.C. Nollet (Cutknife)

> That this Assembly, recognizing the seriousness of increasingly high farm costs and low farm prices, strongly urges the Federal Government to negotiate for an increase of 50 cents per bushel for both the maximum and minimum prices for wheat under the International Wheat Agreement when renewal of this agreement is under consideration.

MR. T.M. BREKER (Humboldt): — Mr. Speaker, I note with optimism the piece in the Leader Post on Tuesday by Stirling King.

> Although there is nothing definite resolved as yet, there was a feeling of optimism Tuesday in the House of Commons that an increase in the minimum and maximum prices for Canadian wheat would be provided in a new International Wheat Agreement. In the House, External Affairs Minister Martin, replying to a question from Mr. Rapp, said that he thought western members would be happy with the way Trade Minister Winters prosecuted his assignment in Europe the other day.

The article goes on to say:

> Mr. Green, the Agricultural Minister said, "I can assure the Member, Jack MacIntosh, that representatives at Geneva are working actively and forcibly to see to it that the western wheat farmers get a good shake in any new world agreement. An increase in the minimum and maximum prices of wheat under the International Agreement due to expire this year is being sought not only by western Members of Parliament but

by various organizations which have been asking for increases of up to 40 cents a bushel."

Mr. Speaker, this Resolution is a good resolution but it may be too late to affect the Geneva outcome.

Mr. Speaker, agriculture is still our largest industry in Saskatchewan and approximately $4,500,000,000 of capital is used by farmers of this province in the form of land, buildings, and machinery. There are approximately 135,000 workers employed in agriculture. About 50 per cent of gross and net value of commodity production in this province is produced by agriculture. Because of the fact that many of our service, trade and manufacturing industries are based on the needs of farmers, a large part of our economy is dependent upon a healthy agriculture. Mr. Speaker, we have seen over the years in agriculture and during the last fifteen years, the number of farms dwindle from 112,000 to 84,000. We've seen the size of farms increase from 550 acres to 769 acres. We have seen land values rise rapidly. In 1965 the average value per acre for land in farms including buildings was $66. In 1966 it will be at least $75 per acre. In some districts, the increases are even more dramatic. In the central part of the province for example, as in the area of Humboldt, Watson, and Naicam, prices of $120 to $150 per acre are not uncommon compared with prices about one-third this level, in the late 1940's. For the seller of land, these high prices are good. For the beginning farmers or those wishing to expand, these prices are posing real problems in many cases. And for those relying on credit, there is an increasing vulnerability to adverse economic or production developments. We are concerned, Mr. Speaker, that Saskatchewan is so highly dependent on agriculture and within agriculture, so highly dependent on wheat. In the year 1966, about 80 per cent of our production was from field crops and of this about 80 per cent was in the form of wheat. Therefore, the province and its farmers are highly vulnerable to crop losses. And more normal yields of wheat would mean at least some 200,000,000 bushels of wheat less than in 1966, and this would mean about $35,000,000 less to Saskatchewan farmers. The impact of a normal wheat crop on our whole economy would be a severe cutback in activity. If we compare the value of agricultural production in 1966 with a drought year like 1961, we see a startling result. The total estimated value of field crops and livestock in 1966 was $1,500,000,000. In 1961, the total was $630,000,000, a different of $917,000,000. This difference would seriously affect practically every sector of our entire economy.

Now what about inflation? Inflation is causing a serious problem for our farmers, especially because they have become so heavily dependent on purchased inputs for needed production. When farmers were more self-sufficient, inflation was usually welcomed, but now they are caught in a squeeze of fairly stable product prices and rising costs. The problem is evident if we express the price of wheat in terms of constant dollars. In 1935 we had a situation where a 60 cent bushel of wheat would buy 64 cents worth of goods. In 1966, $1.75 bushel of wheat would only buy 69 cents worth of goods. These figures show that in constant dollars, the price of wheat has not changed much from 1935, whereas the cost of inputs is now abut three times the 1935 level.

Now increased production and higher levels of efficiency have made it possible for many to survive that squeeze. And a series of good crops including and since 1962 has concealed the effect of the rising cost of production. Our monoculture centered on

wheat is partly a result of our limited alternatives. We cannot produce corn or similar crops. The market for rye is declining and oats and barley are having trouble competing with wheat in terms of profitability. In livestock we face the dual problem of not having a local market and having a long and costly haul to the concentrated eastern markets. Our livestock producers have to absorb these freight costs, and this means that enterprises become unprofitable sooner here than they do in eastern Canada, unless we have a surplus of cheap food. In this case, the loss is shifted to the grain producer. Now Saskatchewan is still predominantly a primary producing area, agriculture, petroleum, and potash. And as such it is increasingly vulnerable to higher costs or services such as trade and transportation. The primary producer often cannot pass the increased cost on to the next user so he must absorb the cost. Thus we are extremely concerned when we hear of pending freight rate increases, high wage settlements in industries manufacturing machinery for our production processes. We are extremely concerned when we hear that machinery is still going up, fertilizer is going up, everything is going up and thank the powers that be, grain is going up. But, Mr. Speaker, due to the International Wheat Agreement, we may rapidly reach the point at which no further increase in the price of grain can take place. I think we are justified in asking for a 50 cent increase proposed for maximum and minimum prices for wheat under the International Wheat Agreement. Mr. Speaker, it is my colleagues' intention and it is my intention to support this Resolution wholeheartedly.

I personally would like to change the Resolution so that it would include a two-price system. Mr. Speaker, we in Canada are eating the cheapest bread in the world when you compare the wages of the working people in this country and those of working people in countries that are importing our wheat. We sell wheat on a no-hold-barred market, and we produce wheat in an environment subject to tariffs, pending freight rate increases, high wage settlements, strikes and inflation. The farmer is at the mercy of not only the elements, but he is at the mercy of organized and sometimes irresponsible labor unions. He is at the mercy of the law of supply and demand when bargaining at the international level. But, Mr. Speaker, he should not be at the mercy of the law of supply and demand when it comes to setting a price on domestic consumption, because, Mr. Speaker, the Saskatchewan farmer does not receive the benefits of the law of supply and demand as it affects industry in Canada. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I support the Resolution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:— Hear, hear!

MR. I.C. NOLLET (Cutknife): — Mr. Speaker, that was about the most sensible speech that I've heard coming from the other side of the House in a long time and I'd like to remind the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Steuart) that there are other Members who are concerned about the law of supply and demand which adversely affects the farmer as well. I am very pleased, Mr. Speaker, that there was no disagreement in the House on this particular question of asking the national government to do all in its power to negotiate an increase in the price for wheat under the International Wheat Agreement, specifically at 50 cents a bushel and I want to register my thanks to all the Members of the House for supporting this motion. I'm sure it will be greatly appreciated by the farmers of this province.

Motion agreed to.

RESOLUTION NO. 15 RE: SETTING UP OF THE OFFICE OF AN OMBUDSMAN

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. C.G. Willis (Melfort-Tisdale)

> That this Assembly recommends that the Government give consideration to the setting up of the office an Ombudsman whose duties would be to inquire into imputed cases of alleged administrative injustice within Saskatchewan; to make recommendations to the Government concerning his findings, and to report annually to this Legislature as to his activities.

The Resolution was negatived on the following Recorded Division:

YEAS — 23

Lloyd	Willis	Link
Hunt (Mrs.)	Whelan	Baker
Wood	Nicholson	Snyder
Nollet	Kramer	Larson
Walker	Dewhurst	Pepper
Brockelbank (Kelsey)	Berezowsky	Brockelbank (Saskatoon City)
Blakeney	Michayluk	Davies
Smishek	Pederson	

NAYS — 27

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

RESOLUTION NO. 7 RE: OLD AGE PENSION SUPPLEMENT

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution moved by Mr. Whelan as amended:

> That this Assembly congratulates the Federal Government for implementing the Guaranteed Income Supplement so that all people in need over the age of 65 will receive up to $105 per month.

MR. BROCKELBANK (Kelsey): — Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say a few words on this motion . . .

MR. STEUART: — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, in the printed form it would appear that we are just debating the motion but are we not debating the motion as amended?

MR. BROCKELBANK (Kelsey): — Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, this is the motion as

amended that is before us now and you don't have to put in the words "as amended". This is the Resolution, and Mr. Speaker, I'm going to support the Resolution, but I must say that I never proceeded to congratulate anybody on anything less than is in this Resolution. Here we have a Government that goes ahead a few dollars for a few people and goes backwards from a very important principle and we compliment them for it. I suppose that may be all we can expect from that kind of a Government at Ottawa so I would say we might as well congratulate them and let it go at that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:— Hear, hear!

MR. E. WHELAN (Regina North): — Mr. Speaker, in closing this debate I would first like to answer some of the comments that were made during the course of the discussion by Members opposite. In answer to the comment by the Hon. Member for Melville (Mr. Gardiner) that the Liberals introduced the old age pension, I think he knows that they were forced to do so in order to retain the support of the man who later became Leader of the CCF, James S. Woodsworth, and his seat-mate, Mr. A.A. Heaps.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:— Hear, hear!

MR. WHELAN: — In 1925 when the Liberals' political life hung by a thread and negotiations were introduced by the then Prime Minister, William Lyon McKenzie King, for support from Mr. Woodsworth and Mr. Heaps, in order to retain the Government's majority in the House of Commons, a letter dated January 7, 1926 was written to Mr. King, and I'm quoting from "A Prophet in Politics" by Kenneth MacNaught. The text of the letter and the circumstances surrounding it are found on page 218 of his book and I quote the letter:

> Dear Mr. King:
>
> As representatives of labor in the House of Commons, may we ask whether it is your intention to introduce at this session, legislation with regard to (a) provision for the unemployed, (b) old age pensions.
>
> We are venturing to send a similar inquiry to the Leader of the Opposition.
>
> Yours sincerely
>
> J.S. Woodsworth
> A.A. Heaps

On receipt of the letter a meeting was arranged by Mr. Charles Bowman, at that time political editor of the Ottawa Citizen, between James S. Woodsworth, A.A. Heaps and Mr. King. James S. Woodsworth acted as spokesman and he sought a commitment that the Government would amend the Immigration Act, the Naturalization Act, the Criminal Code, and that immediate legislation be introduced to implement old age pensions and unemployment insurance. After considerable negotiation and in order to save the political fortunes of the Liberal party, Mr. King replied in a letter dated January 20, 1926, and I quote this letter in part:

MR. BROCKELBANK (Kelsey): — Listen to this one, Wilf.

MR. J.W. GARDINER (Melville): — I've read it.

MR. BROCKELBANK: — Then read it again.

MR. GARDINER: — It's just like a broken record.

MR. WHELAN: — It must be irritating, but it's factual and here it is:

> Dear Mr. Woodsworth:
>
> Replying to the letter from Mr. Heaps and yourself, dated January 7, in which you ask whether it is the intention of the Government to introduce at this session, legislation with regard to (a) provision for the unemployed, and (b) old age pensions, I would refer you respecting provision for the unemployed to the answer given in the House of Commons today by the Hon. Ernest LaPointe on behalf of the Government in reply to a question by yourself which indicated the Government's intention of carrying out with respect to emergency relief, the practice adopted in cooperation with provinces and municipalities in the years immediately following the war. In answer to a question by Mr. Neil, Mr. LaPointe further intimated that it was the intention of the Government to introduce at this session, legislation with respect to old age pensions.

I'm not going to quote the rest of the letter; it completes the understanding, but I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this indicates clearly who negotiated and who was responsible for the introduction of the old age pension at that particular time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:— Hear, hear!

MR. WHELAN: — I concede to the Hon. Member for Melville (Mr. Gardiner) that the Liberals introduced the old age pensions. I concede that. They did so because they were pushed into it and the history of the introduction of social legislation by the Liberal party in this country has been the same over and over again. They have introduced it when they had their backs against the wall and they have introduced it when they were threatened by progressive citizens and when their political future was dim and their chances of staying in power without granting concessions were exceedingly thin. The Hon. Member for Melville can say the Liberals introduced old age pensions. I say the Liberal party in 1926 and '27 introduced the pension, not because they wanted to and not because of their conscience but because they were forced to.

The Hon. Member for Melville rose to talk about CCF inspectors and they way they operate. He must have done so with his tongue in his cheek. His mind must have been completely blank, for he must have realized that years ago the record of Liberal inspectors and their activities politically and otherwise in every province in this country is a sad and blank chapter in the history of the operation of many departments of government of that day, but more particularly in the departments that administered social aid of one kind or another.

During the period the CCF was in Government, I worked as an inspector for them. I am fully aware of the instructions

that were given. I know exactly what sort of reprimand was ready and set for anyone who mistreated or threatened any citizen regardless of his views and regardless of the problems. I remember as many others will, the standard that was set and the policy that was followed and that policy still exists in the Civil Service of this province. Those who deal with the general public as representatives of any government in this province will never return to the dark days of political decisions based on handouts, welfare and other forms of assistance.

MR. GARDINER: — How did you get your job?

MR. WHELAN: — As a boy, my mother was a recipient of a widow's allowance. An inspector called on her periodically. I can say to this House that I recall this inspector, the interrogation, the performance, and the attitude. Believe me, this was long before there was a CCF elected in any province in this country. If you are going to talk about the behavior of inspectors and the treatment of any group, the Hon. Member for Melville should be very quiet. He has no room to talk, and there is no justification for the criticism he has aimed at the previous Government in this respect. I would hope that in debates of this kind, we would not have to dig up the past to prick the conscience of a government that refused to look at the present.

In summary, may I again say, I disagree with the Resolution as amended and I support the Resolution in its original form as first presented.

There is no justification and it is not necessary that we have an income test. And let me repeat what I said in my original debate. I think universal payment is a principle and a right and has been established and should be continued. For 15 years, since 1951, increases in the pension have been on a universal basis. Proof of age was all that was required. Canada is an affluent country and can afford payment to everyone without any means test or income test.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, one of the Hon. Members opposite used a term in reference to me which I object to. I regret the use of the term, I regret that the Member used it because in presenting this Resolution, I could not have been more sincere. I have always felt that pensions of this kind should be paid to people as a right, and they should be paid by the Federal Government and they should be associated with their rights as citizens. If we are going to keep Canada together I think every citizen should get the same treatment, Mr. Speaker. Any variation in treatment from province to province divides it. This Resolution was aimed at the Federal Government and I think it is the responsibility of the Federal Government to provide an equal pension for all Canadians and a pension at the same level and the original Resolution said that.

One of the Hon. Members can talk about the food allowance being raised from 12 per cent or 22 per cent or whatever it was, but 22 per cent of almost nothing is still almost nothing. Since he made that platitudinous and pompous statement about the food allowance, I've had telephone call after telephone call giving me the exact amount of the food allowance increase and the people cannot believe that anyone could be so exuberant over such a small amount. But I guess you have to be a Minister of Welfare in the Liberal Government to put on such a show. And that is all it is.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:— Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! Order in this House.

MR. WHELAN: — When the Hon. Minister rose in the House, I expected him to support the Resolution because of the position he holds. I would expect that he would want to give this sort of treatment to every person in this country, particularly as he is the Minister if charge of Centennial celebrations, that he would want to give without any hesitation a universal pension in this Centennial Year. I felt that here was a man who was going from place to place in this province, who is the representative of this province, who is a spokesman for this province, who lauds, congratulates and pays verbal tribute to the accomplishments of our senior citizens at every possible opportunity. And I congratulate him for they deserve it. I think he should do this, but I would have thought that he would have voted for the Resolution in its original form. But on the other hand he refuses to condemn the Federal Government because of his own political stripe, I presume, a Federal Government which in this Centennial Year, on the 100th birthday of our country, insists that senior citizens write out, bare their soul and complete a complicated form in detail and do it accurately or be fined $500. On one hand as the Centennial representative he applauds these people, and on the other hand without protesting, he would have them complete an embarrassing form, a humiliating form, a form in which, if they prove they are poor enough, it will give them a guaranteed income. Such a man may not think he is a hypocrite; he may think he is not a false pretender; he may think he is virtuous. Mr. Speaker, I leave it to the judgment of this House and I leave it to the judgment of the senior citizens and I am going to suggest that they will tell him in the constituency of Melville when the time comes. I'll see to it that they know the position that he took and I'll let them decide who is the hypocrite. I'll let them decide.

Hon. Members refer to this pension in the debate as the guaranteed income supplement. In conclusion, I don't think it's a guaranteed income unless you fill out this ridiculous, complex form. They call it income. Whose income? Often the pensioner has to provide a portion of it with an annuity; you would think that they put it up. And the supplement! A supplement to what? To a universal plan that should apply all across the board without an income test. To call this a guaranteed income supplement is an example of political hypocrisy.

No one in this House is going to vote against the Resolution as amended, but everyone in this House, even though the Resolution is amended knows in the bottom of his heart the original Resolution should have been passed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:— Hear, hear!

Resolution as amended agreed to by the following Recorded Division:

YEAS — 38

Messieurs

Howes	MacDonald	Lloyd
McFarlane	Gallagher	Wood
Cameron	Breker	Walker

Steuart	Keith	Brockelbank (Kelsey)
Heald	Radloff	Blakeney
Gardiner (Melville)	Romuld	Willis
Guy	Weatherald	Whelan
Merchant (Mrs.)	MacLennan	Nicholson
Loken	Larochelle	Larson
MacDougall	Hooker	Robbins
Bjarnason	Coupland	Pepper
Trapp	Gardner (Moosomin)	Brockelbank (Saskatoon City)
McIsaac	Mitchell	

NAYS — Nil
Messieurs

MR. M.P. PEDERSON (Arm River): — On a point of order I would like to register to the House the fact that I deliberately abstained. My conscience would not allow me to extend congratulations.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Smishek: That Bill No. 64 - An Act to amend The Hours of Work Act be now read a second time.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in closing the debate in respect of this Bill, I would like to repeat what I said the other day that I urge the Members to give support to this particular Bill. It will benefit many people in the province of Saskatchewan. It is a Bill that some 70 per cent of wage earners in the province would benefit from. In this age of automation and technology, the time has arrived for us to take those measures which will relieve some of the pressures that are forced on people by industrial modernization. I do not propose to get into the argument the Minister of Labour did the other day, that the passage of this Bill will not result in additional jobs. The Minister knows full well that with the reduction in hours of work there will be new and additional jobs created. I noticed just the other day in the newspaper - it was yesterday in fact - that unemployment is on the increase. When the Premier presented his Budget he made reference that there is a softening of our economy. There are a number of signs that point to the fact that there are some soft spots occurring in the total economy of Canada and of the province. So for that reason too, Mr. Speaker, we should be taking those measures which will create additional jobs for people. The Bill before us tries to do that as well as do the important thing of reducing hours of work. It is also an endorsement of the Canada Labour (Standards) Code.

Members opposite belong to a political party which did introduce a 40-hour work week law for employees under Federal jurisdiction. This was after many, many years of prodding from organized labor and particularly by Mr. Stanley Knowles who, year after year brought legislation into the Federal House to reduce hours of work and to establish on a national level, minimum labor standards. Finally, under great pressure the Federal Government acceded and the Hon. Alan McEachen finally introduced the Canada

Labor (Standards) Code. So if the Members opposite subscribe to the belief of their Federal colleagues they should be compelled to vote for this Bill. Finally, Mr. Speaker, in closing debate I urge all Members to give approval to this Bill.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

HON. C.P. MacDONALD (Minister of Social Welfare) moved second reading of Bill No. 44 - **An Act respecting the Correction of Adult Offenders**

He said: Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to say that I am introducing a Bill for second reading this evening, The Corrections Act, which I think is one that should be commended by all the Members of the House. It deals with three basic principles: probation, work release and parole in Provincial statutes. Most legislation in Canada deals with incarceration and emphasizes custody; very little or no mention is made of treatment, training or rehabilitation. Some institutions have developed treatment programs and have been able to meet the needs of some offenders. However, the needs of many who are incarcerated are not met. Many now believe that crime and delinquency are closely associated with problems in the community, and so they are now looking for the community to assist them with rehabilitation. Increased knowledge in corrections has pointed to the great need for community-centered correctional programs. In our province, community-based correctional programs such as probation and parole are available to offenders who are convicted under Federal statutes. The Criminal Code permits probation for a limited number of offenders and the National Parole Act provides parole for individuals sentenced under Federal statutes. However, Mr. Speaker, there is no provision for probation, parole or work-release programs for the individuals who are convicted of offenses under Saskatchewan statutes. The seriousness of this omission is realized when we face some of the facts related to corrections in Saskatchewan. First of all, it costs over $3,000 a year to keep a man in custody, while it costs $150 per year to supervise a person in the community. Second, there are at least 10 times as many convictions under Provincial statutes as there are under Federal statutes during any given year. Third, last year there were approximately 35,000 convictions under Provincial statutes in Royal Canadian Mounted Police courts in Saskatchewan. Fourth, there are well over 100,000 convictions under total Provincial statutes. During the same interval, 3,169 persons were sent to Provincial correctional institutions for violation of Provincial statutes. Nearly all of these people were serving sentences in lieu of fines. They were not eligible for probation or any other community-based program under current law. Approximately 75 per cent of women sent to Provincial correctional institutions were sentenced to 60 days or under. Most of these were also for non-payment of fines under Provincial statutes. Approximately 90 per cent of the women in the Provincial correctional institutes and 30 to 50 per cent of the men are of Indian ancestry. Our Government feels that the time has come to give legislative support to these new concepts in programs. The main focus then of the new Corrections Act is to expand probation, parole and work-release programs to Provincial statutes. These programs are intended to provide alternatives to full-time institutional care. They will endeavor to assist the individual in solving his problems in the community.

Let me discuss each one of these items briefly. Probation is a program which is predicated on the suspension of sentence

following a conviction in a court of law. As such it is an alternative disposition to incarceration or the payment of a fine. The convicted person remains in the community, bound by a recognizance which requires him to keep the peace and accept the supervision, counsel and direction of a probation officer. The court also has the option of placing other restrictions or conditions on the person as the need dictates.

The germ of modern probation first made its appearance on this continent in 1841 when a Boston cobbler stood bail for a drunkard, and the first probation statutes were enacted in Massachusetts in 1878. The first statutory recognition came to Canada in 1889 when an Act was passed to permit the conditional release of first offenders. The probation supervision as such was not introduced into the Criminal Code until 1921. Even then it only allowed provinces to provide probation services to persons convicted under Federal statutes. Provincial legislation was required if probation services were to be available to people convicted under Provincial statutes. The evolution of probation legislation in Canada indicates the trend toward a gradual broadening of the eligibility restriction, making this form of correctional treatment available to an ever increasing number of offenders. The high level of success which this form of disposition of offenders has attained is ample evidence that the trend is heading in the right direction. At the present time probation services are restricted to the provisions of Sections 637 and 638 of the Criminal Code, therefore, only persons convicted under Federal statute are eligible for probation, and even then it is primarily restricted to first offenders. It is a time when many people are not particularly amenable to supervision. The need for Provincial legislation enabling courts to use probation as an alternative form of disposition is long overdue, and the vigorous development of this program has become mandatory.

The second principle in this Bill is the work-release concept. It began in the so-called Huber Law and was enacted in Wisconsin in 1913. This statute allowed prisoners who had committed minor offences in violation of country laws to continue working in the community while serving sentence. Since then at least 24 states have made legal provision for work-release. Although known by a wide variety of names, day parole, work furlong, and temporary parole, work-release provides for prisoners in confinement to go into the community to work. Also the release privilege can be extended for purposes other than work including education, vocational training, home visits, and special treatment. They usually return to the institution at night and remain there during weekends and holidays. This program has the advantage of enabling staff to make the best use of custody while at the same time enabling the person to become re-established in the community. The work-release program is not considered a panacea for correctional treatment. Rather it holds promise of still another alternative to full-time institutional care. It should not be used in the place of probation and it does not take the place of various kinds of treatment programs which are required by many offenders. However, this program of work-release will have extensive application for persons convicted of minor offences under Provincial statutes who require controls beyond that which can be provided under probation supervision.

The third principle is parole. Parole allows an offender to serve part of his sentence in his community under supervision. The Government of Canada passed a National Parole Act in 1959 and thereby set up a National Parole Board that has the authority to

grant parole to offenders committed to institutions under Federal statutes. This method of treating offenders in the community has proven very successful, not only in Canada but in nearly every country in the western world. We feel it is time offenders convicted under the Provincial statutes have an opportunity to benefit from such a community-centered program. Not only are community-based correctional programs good treatment, they will ultimately save the taxpayer's money. As previously indicated, it costs approximately eight dollars a day to keep a man in a correctional institution, whereas it costs less than fifty cents a day to supervise a man in the community. At the same time, the man can earn a salary and support both himself and his dependents. If a youthful offender is permitted to complete his education, he will be preparing himself to eventually become financially independent and earn a decent livelihood. These programs then will also assist in dealing with the problems of poverty, unemployment, lack of educational opportunity and social disadvantage; problems very closely associated with crime. I would like to say that there are three amendments that I'm going to bring in on the third reading. They are in relation to three specific clauses which discussion has generated not only with Members of the Opposition but with other associations about the administration policy of the Act. These will be introduced during the third reading.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WALKER: — I think that Members on this side of the House will applaud any progress in the treatment of prisoners and the sentencing of offenders. On this side of the House I think we approve of the proposals to introduce some more constructive treatment for prisoners, for people who have been convicted of Provincial offences.

I think however, that we ought to keep the matter in proper perspective. While it is true as the Minister has pointed out, that the overwhelming majority of people who are convicted in this province are convicted under Provincial statutes, it must be remembered of course that the people who are convicted under Provincial statutes are very frequently sentenced to seven days, and ten days is very common as an alternative for payment of fine. When he recites this magnificent total of 100,000 people convicted, he is of course including the speeder who paid a $15 fine or the parking violator who, failing to answer the ticket to go and pay his $2 penalty may be fined $10 and costs, or the youngster whose dog is picked up without a licence and pays a $2 fine. You can get quite a magnificent total by including all this great area of cases.

One has only to sit in a police court for an hour when the docket is being dealt with at 9:00 o'clock to see that many days there are 30 or 40 people sentenced, none of whom will serve any time in jail. Only occasionally is someone given a mandatory jail sentence for violation of a Provincial statute.

Now it is true that some folks do find their way to jail because of their inability to pay a small fine and this is regrettable. When a $10 fine is imposed or in default of payment, spend seven days in the provincial jail, there are some who do find their way into provincial jails as a result of this. The Minister is quite right when he says that these are very often folks who are in the unfortunate economic circumstance. I have always felt that it is inherently discriminatory that people without

means have no alternative but to serve a ten day jail sentence because of inability to pay a $20 fine, but I wonder if this legislation really accomplishes very much in that regard.

The purpose of this is to provide some sort of restrictive custody over such folks, so that they can't enjoy all the liberties of other citizens but can be rehabilitated by the proper functioning of a probation officer. I question how much can be accomplished in rehabilitating people during a one-week or a ten-day sentence by the probation authorities under this new Act.

Little as it does, it is of course welcomed as a step in the right direction, but it should be recalled that the present parole and probationary services are not being properly used today because of inadequate staff on the part of the Department. I have many instances of people who have been given a sentence of six months which was suspended and in which case they were placed under supervision of the probation officer, but where it was just impossible for them to see the probation officer because he was always too busy.

If they are going to do any good the Government could simply double or treble the number of probation officers there are under the existing law. I suppose the reason why there hasn't been a doubling or trebling of the number of probation officers is because of the financial circumstances of the government. But much more real good could have been done by doubling or trebling the number of personnel available for this work than to go through this formality of making a slight extension on paper of the list of offences for which probationary services are available.

In other words the real shortcoming of the Government's correctional program today in my view is not the lack of this service for provincial offenders, but the almost complete lack of this service for those who are covered under the present law.

I look at the Estimates and I don't see any very significant increase anywhere, unless it's hidden somewhere and I can't find it in the expenditure of funds for this purpose. I would be very happy, if when we come to the Estimates, the Minister can point out a very substantial increase in the number of personnel and the amount of money to be spent on this service. Unless the Minister is prepared to vastly increase his budget for this purpose then this is just window dressing. This is really just papering over the cracks.

Now I find that there are two or three objectionable features in the Act. The Minister has suggested that he has two or three House amendments, and as I gather from him they deal with the very matters which we have been discussing. I think he said three. As I recall it, there were three matters which I discussed with him. I won't go into these now because I think the proper time to go into them is in the Committee of the Whole. So while I would support this with the reservations which I have made and with the reservation that the Minister is going to do something about the deficiencies in the Act, I would say again that I shall look forward to something worthwhile being done in the provision of extra funds and extra people who administer this service. The service doesn't presently need to be extended in its area so much as it needs to be provided in the area that already is covered in the existing legislation in the Criminal Code. So I want to temper my enthusiasm for the legislation by saying that, while I think it is a step in the right direction, much more significant and tangible benefits could come from these

other alternative proposals that I suggest.

MR. MacDONALD: — Mr. Speaker, I only want to make a couple of comments on the comments of the Member for Hanley (Mr. Walker). First of all there is no question about it, when we talk about 100,000 offences under Provincial statutes, that we are talking about many, many minor offences and small fines. Unfortunately it is these minor offences today that are causing the great majority of the people that are sentenced to jail sentences by Provincial statutes to be sentenced because of these very minor offences. For example, the people of Indian ancestry in particular. It is a very unfortunate thing indeed when the Provincial Government must take a woman from the community of Kamsack or wherever it may be in the province of Saskatchewan, and because of her economic position in life, her inability to pay a $10 fine, must then transport her to the city of Prince Albert, sentence her to jail for ten days or whatever the alternative sentence may be, give her that type of an atmosphere and that type of surrounding and background, because of the economic position rather than the fact of the offence itself, because many offences are committed daily by other people who are in a more fortunate economic position. Probation provides an alternative for this type of a sentence, and even though only a minor number of these will be provided, certainly this will be a very positive aspect in the field of corrections in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Well, Sir, I find it a little difficult to understand the lack of appreciation of the concept that is involved here. The Member for Hanley (Mr. Walker) points out the lack of probation officers. Certainly I appreciate this. I also appreciate the fact that there are three very basic principles in this Act, not only probation but work-release and parole. I would hope that we would not be able to apply all three principles overnight, but that we can start with the work-release, the probation, or the aspect of this Act and try and build on it to provide a framework to build a real rehabilitation program in the Province of Saskatchewan. The thing that enthuses me most about the Act is the work-release aspect, where we can take young offenders, give them the opportunity of going to school, going to night classes, perhaps to university according to their mental ability, put the time that they have spent in the jail to a worthwhile activity, so that when they leave the institutions they'll have something worthwhile to build on. I think that the work-release program is a very exciting and a new concept. I think that probably this is the most aggressive legislation in the Dominion of Canada in relation to Provincial statutes in Canada today. The only comment that I have to make is that I hope that the number of probation officers will be increased. We certainly recognize that this is a problem that to be effective certainly requires the staff to implement it. We would hope that, as the time progresses, as our experience in this field broadens, we will be able to look after the problems that have been mentioned by the Member for Hanley (Mr. Walker).

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

SECOND READINGS

HON. J.C. McISAAC (Minister of Municipal Affairs) moved second reading of Bill No. 58 - **An Act to amend The Rural Municipality Act**.

He said: Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 58

contains amendments to The Rural Municipality Act. Some of the amendments proposed are to correct typographic errors that occurred during division of the statutes and others are relatively minor. One I would like to comment on. Under the present provisions of The Rural Municipality Act, the buildings and a parcel of land which is over 20 acres are tax exempt if there is any agricultural operation on that land. This provision has occasionally been used by persons who are not primarily engaged in farming as a means to escape taxation on their homes. We are amending the Act in this respect to ensure that the buildings on rural lands will be exempt from taxation, only where they are occupied primarily or used primarily in the agricultural operation of the land. I have a House amendment to clarify this particular intent. Another amendment I would like to comment on briefly is one that will directly benefit many of the Indian reserves in the province. For the first time, Indian bands will share in the revenue derived by municipalities from taxation of Indian reserve lands that are under lease to persons who are not members of the reserve. This new provision which has come about largely as a result of direct requests by the Indians themselves is another step that we are taking to facilitate the maximum possible social and economical advancement of Saskatchewan's Indian people. The current situation has been a subject of some controversy for a number of years and we feel that this amendment will result in fair and equitable treatment for both the rural municipality and the Indian bands. The problem has been the result of two main factors. A rural municipality has neither the right nor the responsibility to do any real work on the Indian reserve. Although Indian reserve land is exempt from taxation, The Rural Municipality Act states that a non-Indian occupant or lessee shall be taxed in respect of that property. Therefore although the municipalities have been collecting taxes in respect to Indian lands, actually they have neither the right nor the responsibility to provide road services on the reserve except where the road is along a road allowance purchased by the municipality. To be fair to the municipality I should point out that some municipalities have provided services by the construction of roads to the borders of the reserve and in some cases in the reserve. In some cases, as I mentioned, they have acquired right-of-way and built roads to accommodate the traffic and the people on the reserve. In other cases, however, the Indian reserves have not enjoyed a return on those tax moneys for roads on the reserve. This amendment will provide for the payment of 50 per cent of such taxes to the Indian bands and will make it possible for more of these tax revenues to be utilized right on the reserves themselves. Just how the money will be used of course will be entirely up to the individual bands. Indian bands in the province are presently looking at the feasibility of establishing some form of municipal government on the reserves. And the sharing of municipal taxes will certainly assist them in this endeavor. The latest information that we have — and we think that it is almost complete — we have written to the municipalities involved — indicates that some $40,000 in taxes is involved here in 21 different rural municipalities. The Indian bands, therefore, as a result of this amendment, if it is approved, will have access to an additional $20,000 each year based on 1966 taxation estimates. There are other amendments here, Mr. Speaker, which I think could best be discussed in Committee. Accordingly I move second reading of this Bill.

MR. E.I. WOOD (Swift Current): — Mr. Speaker, I do agree with the Member who just sat down, the Hon. Minister, that most of the amendments in this Bill are not of a controversial nature. In fact, I doubt if any of them

are too much that way. They are simply a matter of straightening small things that have crept into the Act from time to time.

In regard to the amendment that is mentioned regarding the taxation of buildings upon farm lands, the Minister did indicate that there was to be an amendment. He didn't indicate what this amendment might involve, but I'm afraid that through the amendment to the Act that was put forward in this Bill, we could not possibly do what I think he intended to do. I think that he is counting upon being able, not to tax the farmers but to tax the people who are upon farm land and who are not there primarily as farmers. The section as it read earlier reads that buildings that though situated upon land which is agricultural in nature or use, are not used or occupied in connection with the agricultural operation of the land, shall be assessed at 60 per cent of their fair value. I assume, Mr. Speaker, that this had to do with farm land, farm holdings, farm buildings, that were occupied by people who were not farmers.

From time to time we've had cases where people working as oil drillers and so on were living in farm buildings and were thus taxable. Whether putting the word, primarily, in after the word, occupied, is going to have very much bearing upon the whole subject is rather doubtful to me.

Another question I would like the Minister to give us some information on when he closes the debate if he doesn't mind, is how this section may affect small farmers who eke out, if I may use the word, their income by working at other jobs on the side. In times of poor crops it could easily be that the farming was not a larger portion of their income and I was just wondering how this would work out. There are people who, on comparatively small holdings, supplement their income with other work, and it is a little difficult sometimes to say whether a man's primary occupation is farming. I was wondering if he could explain this to us. possibly the amendment that they'll bring forward may put some clarification upon this. There are other items here that I think can better be discussed in the Committee of the Whole.

MR. LLOYD: — I want to say only a very few words with respect to the provision which provides for the refund of some taxes on Indian lands presently leased back to the Indian bands. This is a principle which I assure the Minister we endorse very heartily, and commend him for introducing it into the legislation and the administration of these affairs. One can't help but wonder why the figure of 50 per cent was chosen and I wonder if there is some justice in considering a figure such as 100 per cent less that which the municipality spends on roads in the reserve. Perhaps the Minister would comment on any problems there are in connection with that one proposal, if you please.

I hope, as he has said, that this is the one step toward encouraging a more highly organized and recognized local government on the reserves. I hope that the time is not too far distant when the Federal Government will pay full taxes — that is their business of course — and that it can be followed up by making provisions for the representatives of the Indian people themselves to sit on our local governments.

With respect to this same legislation, Mr. Speaker, I note the use of the word, tribe, is employed in the legislation.

Here again I wonder if the Minister would have a look at it. Perhaps it does have some legal connotation which I am not aware of, but it seems to me that the word, tribe, is not really one that is used by the bands for administrative purposes. They use bands rather than tribe, and the tribe of Indians may in fact involve Indians on many different reserves and may be more than one tribe within this certain band. I just wonder if there is something there that needs looking at.

The other suggestion I'd like to put forth at this time is that of considering the responsibility of refunding the money to the Indians in care of the Superintendent of the Indian Agency, but of refunding it directly to the band or the tribe, whatever the proper entity is. I think that all of us realize that there are some problems associated with the control of the funds by an agency of the Federal Government or any government. I think most of us who have been in contact with these people realize that they would benefit from having more direct responsibility administering their own funds. Again there may be problems, I'd like the Minister's comment on the suggestion that, instead of making this available in care of the officials of the Indian Agency, the refund be made available directly to the Indians themselves without them having to get it from an agency. Presumably this carries with it some idea of authority of the Agency to restrict and possibly even direct spending.

MR. W.J. BEREZOWSKY (Cumberland): — I can only add that I am very happy that the Minister is bringing in this legislation concerning the Metis people. But I did want to ask him — I hope I'm not out of order — I hope that this kind of principle is extended to the LID Act and to other acts, so that the people in those areas if there are such situations also benefit in some way. Maybe the Minister would make some remarks on that point. The other thing I want to say, to reiterate is what was mentioned by the Member from Swift Current (Mr. Wood). I'm just a little bit worried that it may affect a number of my people who might be hurt. It's pretty difficult to decide whether they are farmers or working people. They are only people who are trying to make a living and any imposition of a further tax-load on them would be very hard on them.

MR. McISAAC: — Mr. Speaker, I perhaps should first comment on the remarks of the Member from Swift Current (Mr. Wood). I agree with him that the present provision we are bringing in may not be the total answer in these cases. This was discussed quite thoroughly by the members of the Department and people in the Assessment Commission and others. We were in contact with the Province of Alberta, in this connection. It was felt that this amendment could accomplish most of the objectives that many of the RMs and the people in the Department had in mind.

With respect to those people on smaller holdings that were mentioned that could perhaps be working elsewhere, you will note that the amendment we proposed, and I will read you the House amendment, which differs very little:

> That though situated upon land agriculture in its nature or use, are not primarily used or primarily occupied in connection with the agriculture operation of that land.

In other words, if that man on that small holding, has buildings

there, definitely and directly involving the operation of this land, there would be no taxes on those buildings. As I say we will have to see how this works out, but it was felt, in discussing with a number of people including the SARM people, that this was a step in the right direction and would possibly catch a number of people that are now getting by without paying taxes on buildings. While it may not be the entire answer, we will know in a year or so just how well it is working.

The Province of Alberta has a similar provision tied to the income of the occupant and this does not work very well according to our information. This does not seem to answer the problem at all, so that we stayed away from that particular approach when we tried to draft something in this regard.

The Member from Biggar (Mr. Lloyd) mentioned a point or two that I hadn't noticed with respect to this particular amendment regarding paying back some of the taxes to the Indian band. I hadn't particularly noticed that word 'tribe' and we will certainly have a look at it. Perhaps you are quite right, Sir, and perhaps that wording should be amended.

As far as the 50 per cent figure is concerned, it is pretty difficult to arrive at a proper figure. We discussed this with the municipal people themselves and felt that the 50 per cent was perhaps a fair figure, because in many cases the municipality itself is involved in roads within the municipality up to a reserve, so that they are making expenditures on behalf of the reserve within the municipality now. And also many of the figures involved in some of these cases are not very large and to calculate actual dollars involved, I don't know whether it would make very much difference or not. Here again we would be prepared to look at the operation of this clause in another year after we see how it is working out.

The Member for Biggar also mentioned, Mr. Speaker, if possible I think, if I interpreted his remarks correctly, he would like to see the money go directly to the Indian band. This I certainly agree with him, and this is our intention also, but we drafted it this way because in some cases we cannot send it direct to the band. They don't always have a proper agency as such. So it's to the band in trust. If we can pay it direct in some cases, we certainly will with no strings attached.

The Member for Cumberland, (Mr. Berezowsky), Mr. Speaker, asked if this amendment would apply to the LID's. The answer is Yes, it will apply to reserves in LID territory. I think that any further questions can be left to Committee, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WALKER: — Just one question before he takes his seat. This proposal to tax the residences on small farms surrounding the city. I believe that there will be scores of people around Saskatoon who are in this predicament. I wonder if the Minister has made an estimate of the number of people who will be affected by this new tax on their dwelling, those who work in town and live on a farm. Has he made any assessment or estimated the number or proportion of rural people contiguous to a town, to a city say like Saskatoon? Who will be affected?

MR. McISAAC: — In answer to the Hon. Member's question, Mr. Speaker, we have no real accurate estimate to that.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the second time.

MR. McISAAC moved second reading of Bill No. 60 — **An Act to Amend The Superannuation (Supplementary Provisions) Act**.

He said: Bill No. 60 proposes two amendments which I think can best be dealt with by discussing them individually.

In 1965 adjustments were made to pensions granted prior to April 1, 1951, pensions of less than $2,400 per year being paid to superannuates and widows. The formula for adjustments was $10 per year for each year of service to a maximum of 35 years or a maximum of $350 per year, and the adjustment plus the pension was not to exceed $2,400 per year. Widows received 50 per cent of this formula. This applied then and now of course to five Government superannuation Acts, Public Service, the Liquor Board, the Saskatchewan Power, Telephones, and Workmen's Compensation Board Superannuation Acts.

Again in 1966 a further group of similar pensions were adjusted covering pensions granted between April 1, 1951 to April 1, 1954, and so on. And now this amendment this year proposes another group of people whose pensions will be adjusted upward, those people who retired and whose pensions were granted between April 1, 1954 and April 1, 1958. We estimate that there will be approximately 200 pensions adjusted as a result of this amendment.

Another amendment that is proposed here provides for the removal of the penalty of three per cent per year reduction in pension for employees with 35 years of continuous service who elect to retire under the age of 60. This penalty is three per cent for each year under the age of 60. Thus for example, a person with his 35 years in and at the age of 56 at that time, if he chooses to retire, he would be faced with a 12 per cent reduction of his normal calculated pension. All this provision does is to remove that penalty clause. I have a House amendment that will clarify it a little bit further when the Bill receives third reading.

And with those few comments on those two principles, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of this Bill.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

HON. D.V. HEALD (Attorney General) moved second reading of Bill No. 61 — **An Act respecting Securities**.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in rising to move second reading of The Securities Act 1967, I should say at the outset that I will try to confine myself tonight to a brief statement on the principles which are contained in this Bill. You know, Mr. Speaker, this is a very lengthy Bill and I expect that we'll have a great deal of discussion and it will take us quite some time to go through Committee. But I think that the principles that are contained in this Bill can be summarized in not too great a period of time.

I think at the outset I should say that the new Act strengthens and adds to the Act which we now have, which was first of all enacted in 1954. Before 1954, securities legislation in our province dealt largely with potential fraud in the sale of securities and provided for the licensing of persons engaged in the industry. The fundamental feature in the 1954

Act was the addition of prospectus provisions which ensured that a member of the public, buying securities in primary distribution, received in the words of the Act, full, true and plain disclosure. Now that Act, apart from the power to license persons who were engaged in the trading of securities, that Act which we still have, confers really not very much authority to regulate the secondary market in securities. It does provide good regulations with respect to prospectus on primary distribution, but it doesn't too much so far as the secondary markets are concerned. Now it is believed in all jurisdictions in Canada that changes in securities legislation should recognize two basic propositions. These two basic propositions are taken from the report in Ontario of the Attorney General's Committee on Executive Legislation which was prepared and became available in March of 1965. These two principles have been adopted in this Bill before the Legislature now. The first one is that, to the extent that securities legislation is improved in the interest of investors, the securities industry will benefit from increased public confidence, and secondly, to the extent that the industry becomes a more effective and efficient part of the economy the general public also will benefit. We think that both objectives will be met by raising the standard governing the industry to the level which is presently maintained by the more responsible members of the securities industry and we think now that these standards should be maintained as a requirement of law in the public interest.

Now I'll deal with some of the changes — the Commission — the makeup of the Commission — concerning the constitution of the Commission there is no change proposed at this time. In Ontario they have made provision for setting up a Director as well as a Chairman of the Commission. They of course, have a much larger volume than we do. We felt that at this time it wasn't necessary here to provide for the setting up of a Director, so we haven't made any change in the constitutions of the Commission. Registration: the Act now requires that underwriters will be registered. Now, in Saskatchewan underwriting at the moment is not of much importance. Sales are being conducted mostly through your investment dealers or by way of securities' issuers. We have found it advisable to include this provision to cover the event of underwriting becoming significant in the province. We think it's quite likely that in a few years there will be considerable underwriting in the province so we have put that provision in. Now, exempt securities: we have amended the list of exempt securities under the present Act but the changes are really not changes of substance — they are more a matter of form. There is an important change in the Act in respect of private placements, the exempting of private placements from registration. And a further change is that the Act will no longer exempt all trustee securities. I'm sure all Hon. Members know to what I refer when I talk about trustee securities. These are securities which are permitted under the Trustee Act. In this new Act the particular trustee securities that are exempt are spelled out. It's spelled out and I think perhaps the Member from Kelsey (Mr. J.H. Brockelbank) would agree to this that the cross-reference to another statute was questionable draftsmanship, because changes could be made in the other statute without regard to the effect in The Securities Act and furthermore the class of securities we felt in the Trustee Act was wider, the list of exemptions was wider than it should be, so we've made some changes there. Provision in regard to investigation and sanction by the Commission: a change in this connection is that a person tendering evidence is given the

right to have a counsel, a lawyer. Furthermore documents seized are required to be made available to the person from whom they were seized.

These are important changes I think from the point of view of the individual. He's able to have counsel and he is able to have access to these documents after they've been seized to prepare his case. We think that there may have been cases in the past or at least there was an opportunity under the present Act, where you would seize documents from an individual, and he would be charged with something under the Act. He might need access to those documents in order to prepare his case, so we've made it clear that he is entitled as of right to have access to them even while they are seized. Trading in the course of primary distribution which of course is initial distribution of treasury shares, the Act gives some of the rules relating to prospectuses and further details will be contained in the regulations which will be passed pursuant to the Act. We think that the result will make prospectuses more complete and that they will be more informative documents than they are at the present time.

The revised procedures will require the filing of a preliminary prospectus, and there will be a minimum waiting period of ten days before the final prospectus becomes effective. During this waiting period, the underwriter or issuer can distribute some information subject to safeguards which will protect the public. Then there's the provision for the cooling-off period when no purchase agreement for securities will be binding. This is on primary distribution and for two days after the purchaser has received both the copy of the filed prospectus and written confirmation of the transaction itself. Many of the investment dealers, I think the Investment Dealers' Association, have this policy now, but there are many of the, shall we say, the more questionable operators, who haven't been following this rule or practice of a two-day cooling-off period. We think this is highly desirable in primary distribution of new issues. Another change: prospectuses will be required for banks, loans, trust companies and insurance companies which distribute their shares to the public. They haven't been required before and we think they should. We don't see why there should be any exemption for them.

The new Act will also require the giving of reasons for the rejecting of a prospectus, that is to say, if the company files a prospectus or sends it to the Commission for filing and the Commission is not prepared to accept the prospectus, there is provision now that will be mandatory that the Securities Commission will have to give reasons for rejecting the prospectus. Now this will probably place an added burden on the Commission, but we think it's desirable in the interests of fair play and being fair to the people who have applied for registration that they should know the reasons why the prospectus has been rejected. From the industry side, the reasons will indicate what they must meet, the standards being set out by the Commission; and on the Commission side, these reasons will be a guide in later cases. I would think that we will eventually build up a substantial body of case law which will be a guide both to the Commission and of course to the industry as to what they have to meet.

Now with respect to trading in securities generally, the Act, the new Act tightens up some of the trading rules. One is

the prohibition against registrants which means brokers or dealers, voting shares that they do not own unless they have first sought instructions from the owner. There are lots of shares in the hands of brokers in street form and there's no prohibition at the present time against them voting these shares, if they have been made negotiable. So there will be a provision in there that they can't vote these shares unless they have specific instructions from the owner. This is to prevent the broker or dealer being in the position of having a lot of shares and perhaps being able to control a meeting of a company. This provision is designed to put control of companies more directly into the hands of the real share-holders.

Then there are provisions which effect the fundamental change made in the Act, which is intended to provide for disclosure of information to investors. The whole purpose of this Act or one of the main purposes is to provide more information to the investing public. This of course deals with the factor of public confidence. Now there are provisions with respect to take-over bids. The provisions relating to take-over bids do two things. First of all, they require the delivery of a take-over bid circular, and secondly, they fix certain terms and conditions as a part of each bid. A major section in the Act, I think it's Part 10, covers in detail this quite controversial area of take-over offers for shares of a company. This section spells out in detail the time limits, the information that has to be disclosed by both the bidder and the officers of a take-over target, that is to say, the company which is the target of a take-over. Take-over bids or take-overs are defined in this section, this part of the Act, and they apply when more than 20 per cent of the outstanding shares, the issued shares of the company, are involved. That 20 per cent will include shares which are already held by the bidder. So if they have 10 per cent and they make a take-over bid in respect of another 10 per cent, then the take-over section of the Act takes over and applies. There is provision that at least 21 days have to be allowed for shareholders to consider a bid. Shares offered, when a bid is made, cannot be taken up for seven days, so there's a statutory period of reflection here and I think this is a desirable thing. This also of course, this last seven-day period will permit the shareholder to take advantage of a higher price if the second bidder appears. Then there are some special provisions governing bids for less than all of the outstanding shares of the company. This bid must be pro rata and you can see the reason for that. It wouldn't be fair if they just came along and made a very attractive bid to just a certain number of the shareholders, and this has been done before. Shares cannot be taken up until after 21 days and the offer cannot extend beyond 35 days. Directors, senior officers and holders of 10 per cent or more of the voting shares of the company will be required to disclose their holdings and to disclose whether they intend to accept or reject an offer.

Then there's a provision with regard to proxies. There has been some abuse with respect to proxies over the years in all parts of the country. A company will now be required to solicit proxies and send shareholders prescribed information for each meeting of shareholders. A proxy form must indicate whether or not it is solicited by or on behalf of management and must give the shareholder an opportunity of voting on each matter or group of related matters identified on the proxy on an information circular. It must also provide for the appointment of a nominee of the shareholders' choice, not just some officer of the company. Then there's a section in the Act dealing with inside trading and

it's defined of course. Public disclosure by insiders in the securities of their own companies will be required. They will have to report trades ten days after the month during which the trades take place. These details will be available for public inspection at the office of the Saskatchewan Securities Commission and the Commission will publish a monthly report of these transactions. The associates of insiders and their affiliates will also be under a new liability to the company and those with whom they trade, if they make use of confidential information not known to the public, will be liable to pay compensation for any direct losses suffered by the other party as a result of the transaction.

Then there's a section dealing with financial disclosure. These provisions require comparative financial statements, including interim statements every six months. The information, which will now have to be filed having to do with finances and financial statements, will include sales or gross operating revenues, source and application of fund statements, explanation of changes in accounting practices or principles, contractual obligations requiring abnormal expenditures, material contractual obligations in respect of long-term leases, aggregate direct remuneration paid to directors and officers, reasons for not consolidating subsidiaries, a company's proportion of profit or loss of unconsolidated subsidiaries, and also there is some new information which will have to be required on reserves. This financial information which is in much more detail than it was in the past has to be filed with the Commission where it will be available to the public. Mr. Speaker, those are the highlights, those are the changes in the Bill and those are the principles that I think there is some change in respect of. I think, as I said at the outset, there will be a great deal of discussion, and I think there should be a great deal of discussion about this Bill when we get it into Committee. With that short explanation I would move second reading of the Bill.

MR. R.A. WALKER (Hanley): — Mr. Speaker, if I might just ask the Attorney General one question? Would it be possible for the Minister to tell us just how these principles that he applies would apply to the sale of mutual funds?

MR. HEALD: — It would apply the principles in the Act. The Act of course will only apply if the particular mutual fund or a particular mutual fund comes within the definition of securities in the Act. And they do, they are required to be registered under the Act so they will be subject to these requirements. I expect to be attending before too long, a conference called on mutual funds. I appreciate the Hon. Member's concern about mutual funds; I'm concerned about them and we are having a Dominion and Provincial Conference on them before too long, but I certainly think that this Act will put us in a stronger position than we've been in, in respect of mutual funds.

MR. WALKER: — If I may in speaking on second reading of this debate, I'll postpone my remarks until tomorrow but tonight move the adjournment of the debate so that I can consider the address of the Attorney General.

Debate adjourned.

MR. HEALD (Attorney General) moved second reading of Bill No. 62 — **An Act to amend The District Court Act**.

He said: Mr. Speaker, these amendments to The District Court Act do a number of things. First of all, the main thing that I suppose that they do is they increase the jurisdiction of the court from $1,200 to $5,000. This was suggested to us by the Council of District Court Judges of the province. It has been felt for some time that we have the district court judges situated in judicial centres throughout the province and there is a pretty good argument for feeling that their jurisdiction should be extended. They are closer to the people, they are situated in places like Swift Current, Battleford and Prince Albert, Humboldt and so on. They are closer to the people, they are highly competent. There is no reason for their jurisdiction being restricted to a sum of $1,200. So we felt that it should be extended to $5,000 and that's one of the main things that these amendments to The District Court Act do. It also complements the amendments which were passed to The Surrogate Courts Act and The Dependant's Relief Act and removes the limitation on the jurisdiction of a district court judge respecting actions in which the validity of any devise, bequest or limitation is disputed. It also in a companion way enlarges the jurisdiction of the court respecting counter claims also up to the $5,000. It provides for transfer of an action to the Court of Queen's Bench where the counter claim exceeds $5,000. Then there's one further amendment which was asked for by the Criminal Justice Sub-Section for Saskatchewan of the Canadian Bar Association. This had to do with appeals to the District Court. At present under Section 55 of the Act, the appeal is to the District Court at the judicial centre nearest to the place where the conviction or order of appeal from was made or the sentence was imposed. This is different than Section 721 of the Criminal Code which provides that an appeal should be heard at the sittings of the Appeal Court that is held nearest to the place where the cause of the proceedings arose rather than conviction or order the appeal from was made. So it was felt by the Criminal Justice Sub-Section that the amendment here should be made to put the provision for appeals in the District Court in the same categories as appeals under Section 721 of the Criminal Code. So this amendment will provide that an appeal then under a provincial statute or municipal bylaw shall be to the same District Court to which an appeal would lie on a summary conviction under the Criminal Code. So that provision is in there. So there's those three things then; there's the increase in the jurisdiction, there's the removal of the limitation in respect of construction of a will and this provision with respect to appeals. So with that short explanation, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of this Bill.

MR. WALKER (Hanley): — Your Honor, if I may be permitted to ask a question, really I don't think anybody on this side quarrels with the provisions. They probably seems to be in keeping with the decreasing value of money over the last 20 years, but this will result in a fairly substantial increase in the number of cases that will be heard by District Court Judges and I believe we now have 13 or 14 District Court Judges. Has the Minister considered what increase in the complement of the District Court Judges will be necessary to do this extra work. If he could give us some information as to how many extra District Court Judges he could expect to appoint as a result of this, it might

allay considerable anxiety in the country.

MR.HEALD: — Mr. Speaker, first of all — and I know this wasn't intentional — I don't appoint the District Court Judges, the implication was that I did. Secondly, I can assure the Hon. Member that if I did appoint the District Court Judges and if he were interested and I gather perhaps that was . . .

MR. WALKER: — I suggest he controls the number . . .

MR. HEALD: — I thought perhaps the Hon. Member was interested in one of these new appointments that he thought might be necessary as a result of this amendment. I'd be glad to give him a recommendation, but that might be the kiss of death, I don't know. I've discussed this with the District Court Judges, Mr. Speaker, and the feeling is that there is a sufficient number of judges at the present time to handle any increase in work that might result from this amendment. Now this of course could change and it's a situation that we would have to watch. My recollection is that at the present time there is one vacancy, that is, there could be one more judge appointed at the present time without any change being made in the . . .

MR. BROCKELBANK (Kelsey): — Keep that for next year.

MR. HEALD: — Thank you very much. I'll be glad to do that. I'll try to keep that in mind. The District Court Judges don't feel that this increased amount of work would result in there being a need for very many more judges. As I say it is something we will have to watch, but at the present time we don't contemplate raising the number of District Court Judges in the province.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

MR. HEALD moved second reading of Bill No. 63 — **An Act to amend The Wascana Centre Act**.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this Bill proposes a series of rather detailed amendments to The Wascana Centre Act. They don't really raise any important questions of principle. The amendments proposed are of such a varied character that it is not possible to describe them clearly until the Bill is considered in detail in Committee. I think they can be summarized by saying that in part they clarify clauses that have not previously been as clear as they might have been. In part they effect small improvements and matters of procedure and evidence and in part they express more effectively than does the present Act those obligations as to construction and maintenance of roads and other service facilities that the Government, City, and the University — the three partners — have thought should be applicable in respect of roads and streets within Wascana Centre. Now these obligations that are now spelled out in the Bill a little more clearly, are dealt with in Section 7 of the Bill. I should say, Mr. Speaker, that an opportunity was given to each of the participating parties, the Government, the University and the City to discuss the proposals contained in this Bill before it was finally drafted.

The result, therefore, is that we feel that the Bill as now

presented, expresses amendments which all three partners find acceptable — they have all approved them. I think that's about all that I need to say at this time about the principle of the Bill. The details of course will be discussed in Committee and with that short explanation I move second reading.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

MR. HEALD moved second reading of Bill No. 68 — **An Act to amend The Magistrates' Courts Act**.

He said: Mr. Speaker, these proposed amendments to The Magistrates' Courts Act provide an increase in salary for the Magistrates, the Judges of the Magistrates' Court from $12,000 to $13,500 per annum. They also provide for the appointment of a Chief Judge for the court, the judges of the Magistrates' Court. There's a provision for an additional $1,500 for the Chief Judge so that he would receive a salary of $15,000. There are also provisions with respect to the removal of the Chief Judge. There is also a provision with regard to his superannuation; it's the same principle as with respect to the other judges. The provisions are that the judges receive half of their annual salary by way of pension or superannuation and this same principle is carried into the provisions for superannuation for the Chief Judge. Now there is a provision that by increasing the salary to $13,500 the pension will also go up, the non-contributory pension will go up to $6,750 which is half of the amount of their salary. There are some other small provisions in the Bill, but the basic principle involved here is the raise in the salary of the Magistrates from $12,000 to $13,500. I hope before too long that it will be possible to raise the salaries of these judges even more. They dispense justice in a very large majority of the cases in our province, that is to say, by far the largest number of cases in volume come before the judges of this court as compared to the District Court or the Court of Queen's Bench, and they are a very important part of the administration of justice in the province. It's difficult to get suitable personnel, suitable people to staff this court. I think we've been very fortunate in the calibre of the people that we have been able to obtain. I think the Member for Hanley (Mr. Walker) was very fortunate when he was Attorney General in some of the people that he obtained. I think that we've been fortunate in some of the people we have obtained. But the facts of life being what they are, in our affluent society it is no longer possible to attract as good a person or person with as much experience as we would like to have with the salary as it has been at $12,000. So we are proposing to raise it to $13,500 this year, and I hope that it will be possible in another year to make another substantial raise in the amount of the salary payable to these people, because they do have a very responsible job and I think they are doing a good job. With that explanation I would move second reading of the Bill.

MR. WALKER: — Your Honor, I would like to say something on second reading and I don't intend to take much time, just agreeing with what the Attorney General has said. Much of this is obviously necessary, particularly this increase in the salary. I am sure that I can speak about that matter without being thought to be harboring any personal interest in the thing.

I think something should be said about this business of salaries for Judges of the Magistrates' Courts. First of all,

a little bit of the history of it would be in order. When the previous Government established the position of Judge of the Magistrates' Court, consideration was given to the question of salaries. Salaries had been rather low for many years, and when the Act was passed it was intended to increase the salary to the point where it was just slightly below the salary of District Court judges. We considered that the work of the judges of the Magistrates' Court was just as important so far as the liberties of the citizens were concerned as that of the judges of any other court and that these salaries should be as close as possible, permitting recognition of the scale of seniority or superiority of the courts. At that time, I think it's not unfair to say that the Treasury Board were prepared to consider at that time setting a salary of $15,000 for judges of the Magistrates' Courts. There was only one thing that deterred the Treasury Board at that time from setting a salary of $15,000, which we thought was reasonable then, and that was that the District Court judges were getting about $13,500, and it wouldn't have looked right to pay the judges of the Magistrates' Court, because as everyone knows certain appeals go from the Magistrates' Court to the District Court and the public wouldn't appreciate an arrangement where you are appealing to a judge who is on a lower scale of salary and therefore apparently of less importance than the judge that was being appealed from so the salary was set at the time at $12,000 in full anticipation that something was shortly going to be done with the District Court judges' salaries.

Now the District Court judges' salaries have since been raised twice and now they are in the vicinity, I think, of $18,000 or $19,000. Now no one can appeal for better salaries for magistrates on the basis of need, no one can say that they are suffering economic hardship at the salary which they are getting, but we are living in a society where you have to pay people according to what their alternative income would be, and it seems to me the income tax statistics show that the average income, that is net income of members of the legal profession of this province, is around $15,750 or of that order. I think it would probably be fair to assume that one-third of them would be between $14,000 and $17,500, and about one-third of them would be above $17,500 and about one-third would be below $14,000. So to raise the salary to $13,500 is in my opinion paying in the lowest third of lawyers' incomes in the province.

Now the people of Saskatchewan have a proprietary interest in ensuring that the best qualified people can be obtained, are obtained for these appointments, and I believe that the Attorney General is limiting his choice too severely, if he can only offer a salary which is comparable to the bottom third of incomes enjoyed generally by the legal profession.

Now I concede of course that there are other factors to consider in taking a judicial appointment, and I am perfectly prepared to acknowledge that most of the people who take judicial appointments take them at lower salary levels than they were earning before their appointment. But the lower it is, the more restricted your choice of candidates is going to be.

I think it is a more important occupation for any solicitor or lawyer to take an appointment as a judge of the Magistrates' Court than it is to carry on a private practice of law. I don't think that you can have as much freedom of choice in your appointments, if your salary level is down in the bottom quartile

of lawyers' net income in private practice. I think the people of Saskatchewan will do better if the Government will raise this. If not at this session, certainly it should be raised within a year to something approaching the District Court judges' scale of salary, which I believe now is around $18,800. So it could be, I think, appropriately set at $16,000. This figure would be just about right on the median income of members in the legal profession in private practice in Saskatchewan.

I'm not feeling sorry for them, and I'm not feeling sorry for lawyers, because they are hard up, but I am saying that you have to hire these people and you can make certain appeals to their patriotism and to the importance and the dignity and the honor of the position. But you can't go very far with that if you haven't got a little money to match it. I think perhaps the Attorney General is sympathetic to what I am saying, but I wish him all the luck in the world in convincing his Treasury Board that this should be done and done now. He has been lucky in the appointments he's got to date, but I think he ought to have more freedom of choice in selecting these people.

The previous Government was prepared to recognize a salary of approximately $1,500 or $2,000 less than a District Court judge, and I think that range should be preserved.

I believe I heard some rumbling, not from any of the judges I must say, to the effect that there has been offers made by the Government to people to take this appointment on the basis that it was going to be raised to a larger figure than $13,500. I believe that some of the people who declined the invitation are under the impression that the Government was assuming that it was going to be raising the salary above what is now proposed. If this is so then the existing incumbents will feel equally unfairly treated. I hope that my remarks on this matter won't be extensively reported, because I certainly don't want to be embarrassed when I appear before these judges, with having said what I have. I say these things because I think that the interests of the Province demand that the importance of this job be recognized properly in terms of salary.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. HEALD: — Mr. Speaker, I don't disagree too much with the remarks of the Hon. Member for Hanley (Mr. Walker). I would point out however, that when he says that the salaries of these judges is $13,500, this is true, but I would remind Hon. Members that in addition to the $13,500 they receive a non-contributory pension of half of their salary which is $6,750. Those of you who have inquired into the cost of the pension of $6,750 per year will know that this in terms of dollars and cents represents a pretty valuable perquisite to this job.

But if you go out at age 40 or 45 or 50, and buy a pension and you would have to pay for it yourself — of nearly $7,000 per year, it would cost you quite a tidy sum of money. I don't have any actual figures so that is not correct to say that the cost to the government or the benefit to the magistrate or to the judge, is only $13,500. I think if you added that to the $13,500, you would find that in terms of as my hon. friend said that we should be getting up to $15,000 or $16,000. I think you would find, Mr. Speaker, that probably you are getting up at $13,500, up to $15,000 or $16,000.

MR. WALKER: — Would the Minister permit a question? Is the pension plan for judges of the Magistrates' Court any more generous than the one for District Court judges?

MR. HEALD: — No, but I wasn't dealing with that point. The point that I was dealing with was your argument that they should be getting up to $16,000, because this is what the average lawyer makes in the Province of Saskatchewan. What I was saying, Mr. Speaker, was that this is competitive or comparable. When you take the $13,500 and you add to it the dollar value of this pension, you are in the ball park and you are competitive. I quite recognize the proposition that in order to get the right kind of magistrates we have to be competitive as the saying goes. I am convinced that we will be in a position at this new salary, if these amendments are passed, where we can attract and continue to attract the right kind of people to this Court and I am confident that this amendment is realistic under the circumstances. I agree with the Hon. Member that we should seriously consider as early as next year, a further amendment and I will certainly keep that in mind.

The other remark about prospective applicants for these jobs being offered $15,000 is not correct. The suggestion that I made to them was that I would be recommending to the Government and to the Treasury Board an increase, which I did, and of course the Treasury Board and the Government did approve this increase of $1,500 a year which is reflected in this amendment.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

HON. D.T. McFARLANE (Minister of Agriculture) moved second reading of Bill No. 71 — **An Act to amend The Brand and Brand Inspection Act**.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the proposed amendments under The Brand and Brand Inspection Act embody mostly a number of housekeeping items which will bring the wording of the Act in line with the reorganization of the administration of the department.

In addition there are certain housekeeping provisions that are designed to introduce more practical procedures in the Act.

I might point out that one of the major amendments is to establish the requirement under Section 16 that all truckers transporting livestock within a brand inspection area, carry a description of the cattle on form D, or a certification signed by a livestock inspector to the effect that the cattle being transported have been brand inspected and that the horned cattle penalty has been paid on any horned cattle in the loaded trucks.

The present Act does not require truckers to carry these forms if the cattle were loaded outside of the brand inspection area. Thus under the present legislation, it is difficult for the Royal Canadian Mounted Police to conduct an adequate check on all cattle being transported within a brand inspection area.

Further amendments, Mr. Speaker, to Section 16, place inspection services along the Alberta border on a more practical basis than they are at the present. Arrangements have been made with the Department of Agriculture in the Province of Alberta to check Saskatchewan cattle delivered to public markets at

Cereal, Empress, Provost, Walsh and Edmonton, and return the shipping manifest to the Saskatchewan Department of Agriculture at the end of each week.

Very few cattle are shipped to Calgary and these will be required to be inspected prior to leaving Saskatchewan under this proposed amendment.

A new section is also added in making provision for number branding of cattle to identify individual animals within a herd, which is on record of performance program for beef cattle in our province.

Those, Mr. Speaker, are some of the main changes in the Act. I think that the others can be better dealt with again in Committee of the Whole.

With that brief explanation I move second reading of The Brand and Brand Inspection Act.

MR. E.I. WOOD (Swift Current): — Before the Minister sits down, could I ask him the size of the brand inspection area that is contemplated in the Act under question?

MR. McFARLANE: — We would hope eventually the brand inspection area would be extended to cover the whole of the province. At the present time it covers an area less than one-half of the province, running from about Regina up to the northwest.

MR. WOOD: — Mr. Speaker, just on this one point. It seems to me that this matter of brand inspection and, well, cattle rustling is a matter which is becoming of increasing importance in the Province of Saskatchewan. It seems to me that, when this Act is before us, it is time to give some consideration to the size of the brand inspection area. It would appear to me that, if you are going to have adequate control over cattle rustling, it is difficult, and I do know that the cattle can be shipped outside the province, but the fact that we have only half of the province under control of this Act, does give the people who would take advantage of any opportunity to sell cattle that weren't their own a better opportunity to operate. It appears to me, Mr. Speaker, that the Hon. Minister should give consideration, as soon as possible, if not at this very time, to extending these services completely throughout the province, because where cattle are not inspected for brands, this gives the rustlers that much better opportunity to not only pick up the cattle there but also to dispose of them in these areas. I would recommend that the Minister did take a hard look at examining this area across the province at this time. I notice he said as soon as possible, which I grant is a very good phrase, but I think it should be done immediately if at all possible.

MR. McFARLANE: — I'd be very happy, Mr. Speaker, to point out to the Member for Swift Current (Mr. Wood) what the Government has in mind now that he has asked the question.

As all Members are aware, as I pointed out earlier, the brand inspection area is roughly on the west half of the province. This has caused quite a problem over the years in administration of the Act. The people in the westerly part of the

province have been paying a fee of about 20 cents per animal to carry the brand inspection program in that area. This to date has not been too satisfactory, because some of the hot cattle have been moving from the western part of the province and finding their way to the shipping centres in the eastern part of the province or on into Manitoba.

I am very pleased to indicate to the Members of this House that you will be asked, when the Department of Agriculture estimates come up, to approve extra funds for the extension of the brand inspection area to cover the entire area of Saskatchewan. If these estimates are approved, then we will have brand inspectors in most of the centres in the province, Yorkton, Prince Albert, and all livestock marts in the eastern part of the province plus inspection services at Brandon and in Winnipeg. This will be on a restricted basis. We will be asking some of the inspectors at the Winnipeg stock yards to help us out, as we are asking inspectors in Alberta to do that for us now.

We believe that once we get the whole of the province into the brand inspection area, then because of the computer-type service that we will be able to provide in the Department of Agriculture, we can by virtue of this service go back to the shipping manifest, back as far as about six months' time. If we get a complaint from a farmer, we can check the shipping manifest, put it through our computer service and, inside of a very few minutes, we can tell when the animal was marketed, where it was marketed, and the number of the brand. This we will report to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police which will do the checking. If they are successful in finding the hot cattle, the courts can take immediate action. And we feel that, if this service is extended over the whole of the province, we will not only be able to give the cattlemen in Saskatchewan almost complete protection, but a further service that can be rendered to the livestock industry by virtue of our computer service. We will know at the end of every week how many cattle, calves or head of livestock that have been recorded in the manifest had been marketed. So we not only will have protection, they will have a complete record of cattle marketed each week and the kinds of cattle marketed each week throughout the province.

One other thing that I would like to point out is that there might be an impression among some of the producers in the province that all animals in the brand inspection area have to be branded. This isn't necessarily so. At the present time in the province we have some 18,000 brands, but if they are branded we will make provision that only certain types of brands can be used. They must be legible brands. But it doesn't necessarily follow that every producer of cattle has to have his cattle branded. On shipping manifests he can even designate them by color or something like this. We will have a fairly good means of identifying cattle and a good service of tracing hot cattle in the future.

I just want to indicate to the Members that, by virtue of the monies that will be in the estimates, if we can get approval, then we would hope that the whole province could be under the brand inspection area. This has been requested by the Stockgrowers Association in the province over the years and requested by the SARM groups for the last three or four years. I believe it will be requested this year. In fact is have been requested by just about all segments of the cattle industry in the province.

The motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

HON. J.C. McISAAC (Minister of Municipal Affairs) moved second reading of Bill No. 72 — **An Act to amend The Homeowner Grants Act, 1966**.

He said: Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 72, amendments to The Homeowner Grants Act, I believe, are best discussed individually as to the principle involved.

Last year's experience, our first year in the operation of this Act, showed that many dwellings are owned by their occupants. Some of these are workers involved with the development of potash, oil resources and other similar situations. We consider that these persons are definitely homeowners and are eligible for the grant provided of course they are assessed and taxed with respect to their dwelling.

The first Section of this Bill makes this category of homeowners eligible to receive the grant in the forthcoming year. In this new Section 2B we are also clarifying the intent of the legislation than an owner is required both to own and reside in the dwelling for six months before he is eligible to claim the grant. Because a good number of homes are sold throughout the year, it may not be possible for the owner to file an application for a grant prior to the date of the sale. We are providing that an owner can apply subsequent to the sale to qualify in respect to ownership and residence, if he shows that he owned and resided in the home for at least six months prior to the date of sale. Previously the Act was interpreted, (and this was never our intent) that he must apply before he had made the sale, otherwise he was ineligible as the Act was presently written. This was never the intent of the Act, so this is being clarified by this amendment.

We also found that a number of homeowners were unable to claim for the maximum grant because the general property tax levied against their dwelling was insufficient for them to qualify for the maximum. Yet at the same time many of these people were paying local improvement taxes and their total tax bill was a great deal larger than this. Quite often, as Members can appreciate, these were the older people in the many of the smaller centres of the province, and tax notices would indicate that local improvements were involved in their total taxation. So that provision is made here for the inclusion of these taxes in the interpretation of the general property tax. And it will permit more homeowners to claim the maximum grant and generally increase the grant for a number of others.

Section 3 of the Bill proposes an amendment to provide that both owners of a duplex can obtain the homeowner grants. We believe that both owners should be eligible to claim the grant. Regulations will be made to set out the actual details of his particular item.

MR. WOOD: — Again, Mr. Speaker, I do disagree with the amendments that are brought forward in this Bill. My objection to the Bill on principle is not in what it contains but rather on what it does not contain. The Hon. Members will possibly recall that last year when the original Bill was before the House, I rose in my place and spoke to some length in regard to those people who are not covered and who obtain no benefits from this Act.

I refer largely to those people who are renters in the

province, Mr. Speaker. I pointed out last year the number of people in the various centres in the province, who are shown to be renters on the 1961 census. I think that the Hon. Members will recall that at that time I pointed out that very close to 40 per cent of the people of the city, which I have the honor to represent, were not homeowners but were renters. And I feel that again I have to raise the question, Mr. Speaker, in regard to the rights of these people, 40 per cent of the people of the city which I have the honor to represent in this House. If anyone is to speak on their behalf, I think it must be myself.

Mr. Speaker, I do maintain that renters pay taxes just as well as anyone else, and I mean property taxes. They not only have to pay the taxes in regard to the dwelling in which they live, but they also have to pay a profit to the landlord.

MR. WALKER: — . . .Power Corporation?

MR. WOOD: — Give me time, I'll get there yet. I do maintain that they are just as entitled to assistance from the Government in this regard as the people who specifically pay the taxes, because they assist in paying these taxes and not only in effect pay the complete taxes, but also go beyond this in paying some amount of profit, large or small, to the landlord in regard to the house in which they live. I might say that they also pay other taxes and as taxpayers of this province they are, I think, entitled to benefit from the revenues of this province. All these renters — I shouldn't say all — but a very large proportion have electricity in their homes and they will be paying their light bills. The Government this year has taken some $3,000,000, out of the funds of the SPC and this $3,000,000 will more than pay one-third of the cost of these homeowner grants. I think that it is only right and proper that the people who assist in putting up these funds, should be beneficiaries under this Act.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I make as strong plea as I can at this time that the Members opposite will take a look at this thing, that the recommendation I made last year should not go unheeded, that they should take back this Bill we have before us and amend it in such a way as to make householders and renters as eligible under this Act as those who pay the taxes directly, the homeowners themselves.

MR. BEREZOWSKY: — Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a word about what has been said by the last speaker. I just want to bring out one point, seeing that the Act is open. I think the Minister is aware of what I am going to say and it is this.

There are a number of people in Saskatchewan that pay their taxes during each year and then because of lack of certain guarantees in the Act, they can't collect the grant. As a matter of fact I asked the Minister a question the other day, and he replied that although some people, though they paid taxes and own homes, yet couldn't collect the grant.

I would like to point out to the House that a year ago I asked a question in the House of the Premier. I asked him what would happen to a person who paid his taxes on or before the last day of December but couldn't get the information into the Department immediately. I was assured by the Premier at that time that this person would get his grant. Nevertheless now I

know of at least one case where a person paid his tax, a substantial tax, to the municipality away back in September of last year, who made an application for a grant in the month of February. I don't know whether the delay was his fault and I don't intend to take this up at this time, or if it was someone else's fault, but the fact is that he was unaware that he had to submit his application before the end of December, the result was his delayed application has been turned down. I would like to see the Minister consider putting into the Act something that would be fair in principle, providing people who pay their taxes in a certain year, have a period of at least 60 to 90 days, whatever he thinks is fair, for forwarding their applications and be able to collect the grant. As the Act stands at the present time, it contains a very bad principle, because, if the Minister can decide not to pay a grant to anyone who sends in his application at anytime after the 31st day of December, such a person is denied justice. I wish the Minister would have a comment on this and maybe we can do something with the Act when we get into Committee.

MR. McISAAC: — Mr. Speaker, I am sure after listening to the Member from Swift Current and his remarks in connection with renters, nothing I can say will satisfy his question on this regard at any event. We will not be bringing in such amendments at this time, otherwise they would have been contained in the Bill.

The Bill still pertains to homeowners and certainly there is a point to be made in the remarks he has made, that it can be considered that the renter does pay part of the property tax, but he is not paying them directly. He is not responsible for the maintenance or upkeep of the home itself. As I say, I would again refer him to the title of the Bill, The Homeowner Grants Act.

The Member for Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) brought up a point with respect to the cutoff date for the receipt of applications. It is possible that the end of December is a little too rigid for this. We did extend it for a few days in January and perhaps we could extend it a little more next year, but I would just point out that . . .

MR. J.H. BROCKELBANK (Kelsey): — Six months.

MR. McISAAC: — . . .we only had something over 200 applications of this kind, that were received in January, out of a total of 171,000 some odd all told. So it was a very, very small percentage. I think if we stick to this principle in another year it will become common knowledge and it will not be a problem in the future.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

HON. D.G. STEUART (Minister of Natural Resources) moved second reading of Bill No. 73 — **An Act to amend The Regional Parks Act**.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the changes that are proposed in this Bill to amend The Regional Parks Act are not very many and they have all been requested by the Regional Parks authorities.

The first one allows the Minister to name or to change the name of the park boundary for legal purposes and to state what Regional Park authority is in charge of what area.

Another section provides legal opportunity for the Park Authorities to charge fees for revenue purposes. Still another change provides for the general municipal powers to be given to the Park Authority.

The Park Authority under these amendments will be granted more control of such matters as health, speed, safety, movement of vehicles, traffic, poison, firearms, litter, etc. within the park boundaries. There is a change. The formerly called Depreciation Allowance Schedule, if the depreciation allowance was granted to the regional parks has been changed, and it is now called Capital Maintenance Schedule. The reason for this change is to emphasize maintenance and not depreciation.

Another change allows for the picking up of the maintenance allowance that may not have been claimed in prior years. The formula is laid out in the Act to determine the Government's contribution in maintenance capital assets.

Finally there is a new section added to the Act that will enable prosecution for offences under the Act or the regulations; for example, in matters of speeding, vandalism and so on.

As I say, these have been requested by the park authorities. They want more revenue, they want more control. My own people in the Department say that the legalities of the boundaries of parks should be tidied up and this is the principle behind the two changes that are suggested to The Regional Parks Act in these amendments.

MR. LLOYD: — Mr. Speaker, the Member from North Battleford (Mr. Kramer) may wish to make some comments on this, but he is away this evening in order to attend the Municipal Convention. So I move adjournment of the debate.

Debate adjourned.

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