

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fourth Session — Fifteenth Legislature
38th Day

Thursday, March 30, 1967

The Assembly met at 10:00 o'clock a.m.
On the Order of the Day.

MESSAGE FROM HIS HONOUR THE LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR

HON. W. ROSS THATCHER (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I have a message from His Honour the Lieutenant Governor.

MR. SPEAKER:

R.L. Hanbidge,
Lieutenant Governor

"The Lieutenant Governor transmits Further Supplementary Estimates of certain sums required for the service of the Province of the twelve months ending March 31, 1967, and recommends the same to the Legislative Assembly."

Regina, March 29, 1967

MR. THATCHER (Premier) moved, seconded by the Hon. Minister of Resources (Mr. Steuart):

That His Honour's Message and the further Supplementary Estimates be referred to the Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to.

QUESTIONS RE RETURNS
QUESTION RE: RETURN NO. 22

MR. F.A. DEWHURST (Wadena): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I'd like to ask the Provincial Secretary if he yet has Return No. 22.

HON. D.V. HEALD (Attorney General): — I have a number here which I am signing. I'm not sure what. No. 22 was it?

MR. DEWHURST: — Yes.

MR. HEALD: — No, it's not here yet. I'll check it up.

QUESTION RE: RETURN NO. 23

MR. J.H. BROCKELBANK (Kelsey): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with I would like to ask again about the Order for Return No. 23 which was in regard to the expense account of the elusive Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy). It's very hard to find apparently.

MR. HEALD: — I specifically asked about that one yesterday, and I'm

March 30, 1967

told it's being prepared today. If you'll be patient I hope to have it later on today.

QUESTION RE: RETURN NO. 89

MR. C.G. WILLIS (Melfort-Tisdale): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to ask the Minister of Industry and Commerce (Mr. Grant) whether or not his Department is having difficulty finding an answer to Order for Return No. 89 regarding the amount paid to MacLaren Advertising Agency.

MR. G.B. GRANT (Minister of Public Health): — Mr. Speaker, I've been so busy the last week, I haven't been in there for a few days. I don't think they're having any trouble. I hope not.

MR. WILLIS: — I take it, Mr. Speaker, that the Order will be down before the end of the session.

ANNOUNCEMENT RE OIL DISCOVERY AT ESTON

HON. A.C. CAMERON (Minister of Mineral Resources): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I have an announcement to make which I think will be of interest to the Members of the Chamber, particularly to the Member from Elrose (Mr. Leith). I have just been informed of a new oil discovery 18 miles east of the town of Eston.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON: — The discovery is 30 miles removed from the nearest producing discovery and oil field at Dodsland. The oil is coming from the Viking formation. This is the first success of oil discovery in the Eston area and opens up a new pool in an area in which oil was not discovered previously.

MR. BROCKELBANK (Kelsey): — Does the Minister know the gravity of the oil?

MR. CAMERON: — The medium light gravity.

MR. I.C. NOLLET (Cutknife): — What Company made this discovery?

MR. CAMERON: — Yes, it's a small independent company called Huston Oils of Calgary.

The Assembly recessed from 12:30 until 2:30 p.m.

VISIT BY CENTENNIAL OFFICIAL

HON. J.W. GARDINER (Minister of Public Works): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity before proceeding with Estimates to introduce to the Members of the House Miss Henriette Bourque, who is the Assistant Regional Director of the Centennial Commission from Ottawa just appointed

recently. She is sitting in the Speaker's gallery above the clock. She is making her first tour across Canada meeting with the representatives of the Centennial Committees in the various provinces. I would like to welcome her here this afternoon on behalf of the Members of the Legislature.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

WELCOME TO MR. BOLDT

MR. J.H. BROCKELBANK (Kelsey): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to say that we are glad to see the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) back in his seat.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BROCKELBANK (Kelsey): — Even though we disagree with the greatest of violence short of physical violence to some of the things he has to say, we still wish him health and hope that he is feeling better and that he will continue to feel better.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. G.J. Trapp (Minister of Education), that Bill No. 28 — **An Act to Amend The School Grants Act**, be now read a second time.

MR. D.W. MICHAYLUK (Redberry): — Mr. Speaker, I notice that the proposed amendments to The School Grants Act are minor, due to the fact that the assessment figure of \$150,000 is changed to \$160,000. I am just wondering what effect this will have on rural and village and other districts where the assessment is over \$150,000. I notice, for example, if a school district is assessed at \$200,000 under the Act as it was up until now, that taking away the \$150,000 would leave an assessment of \$50,000, and taking 20 mills on the balance, taking 1/200 part of it, the grant would be \$5 per day. This amendment which is being proposed by the Minister (Mr. Trapp) would reduce this grant by \$1 per day. Taking as an example, a school district assessed at \$200,000 if you take a difference of \$160,000, which you are proposing to do in this amendment, that leave \$40,000 at 20 mills, which, divided over 200 days, would give a per diem grant of \$4. So that the effects of this amendment where the assessment of a district is over the \$160,000 are that the grant is being reduced in all instances.

A question I wish to ask of the Minister is: what happens in districts where the assessment is below the \$160,000? What effect would this amendment have? One other amendment is the per diem amount, the maximum for a continuation or a high school room is being raised from \$10.80 to \$12 and in every other room from \$7.50 to \$8.50.

What and how will this affect school districts? In the estimates a year ago, the 1966 estimate was give as \$30,814,847, that is including the newly formed school unit and that was Rosthern, but the actual amount received by these school districts was \$29,349,892. In other words the actual expenditure for 1966 over the previous year was seven per cent higher.

March 30, 1967

Now we have been given the estimates, as were given to the various school jurisdictions for 1967, and the grant figures for 1966 and the grants as given in the first estimates for 1967 are 8.2 per cent higher. Mr. Minister, if Rosthern is included the total increase in grants to the units and the school boards is only 5.4 per cent. This does not in my estimation cover the increase in the cost of education. If this amendment to The School Grants Act is to assist the local school boards by the Department of Education assuming a larger cost of education, then I think the move is in the right direction. But if the increase in the total overall grants paid to the schools and the school units will be only 5.4 per cent, this does not cover the increase in the cost of education for the ensuing year. Therefore, the taxpayers of Saskatchewan will have an additional burden to carry in respect to the cost of education. This is not the promise, Mr. Speaker and Mr. Minister, which the Liberal Government made to the Saskatchewan people in the 1964 election.

I would want the Minister to state what effect will this grant change have on the school districts assessed over \$160,000. What effect it will have on school districts below the \$160,000 and what effect will the amendment of The School Grants Act will have by this grant change for the taxpayers?

HON. G.J. TRAPP (Minister of Education): — Well, first I would like to say on the increase from \$150,000 assessment to \$160,000, that this only applies to those schools not under the regular grant formula. I don't know if you are aware of those outside the regular grant formula. What really is done here in this Bill is to increase every school district to the same level. If they have exactly the same teachers and the same assessment as they had last year, they would get a three per cent increase; they would also get an increase in their transportation allowance. Now mind you this does not just mean a three per cent increase, because the greatest increase is probably in growth and in more expenditures and on teachers and so on. So there is a greater increase. You will notice when you had your list given that some have increased nearly \$100,000 in some units. But this will partly be due because their system has also grown. So this is what the Bill does.

The Bill that is before you really increases the equalization grant which was at 33 per cent. It moves it up to 36 per cent at the minimum and from 85 to 88 at the maximum. That is how this is accomplished not by changing the formula directly but changing the percentage that is given.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. G.B. Grant that Bill No. 92 — **An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Medical Care Insurance Act** be now read a second time.

MR. W.E. SMISHEK (Regina East): — Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to take anymore than about five minutes, and if I go past 5:30 p.m. I hope that you may stop the clock.

Mr. Speaker, you may recall that when the Minister moved

second reading of this Bill, he did not go into any explanation as to the contents of the Bill. In my search to find the answers to the amendments contained in Bill No. 82, it appears that the Health Department officials and the Minister are trying to make some corrections to the Act based on experience. However, to make an improvement or corrections, in some of the sections, problems arise in drafting since the areas are extremely technical. The end result of the amendments before us is that, while the Bill attempts to correct the old problems, the new sections create a series of brand new problems.

It would appear to me that those drafting the Bill did not envisage during the period of drafting the new complications that do arise. I do not propose to get into any detailed discussion of the problems that do arise. Mr. Speaker, I have had the opportunity to discuss the problems somewhat with the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant). He informs me, based on our conversations, that regarding Section 22 which is the one that bothers me most of all, a House amendment is forthcoming and I do not propose to discuss the problem that is posed there.

In respect of another section contained in the Bill, and if I may be specific with your permission, Section 25, this section guaranteed that where an employer contributed to the cost of insured medical care services on behalf of the employees, prior to the introduction of the Medical Care Insurance Plan, he was required to pay employees an equal amount after the introduction of the Plan, but only to those employees employed prior to July 1962. Payments had to be paid monthly unless otherwise agreed upon. Where the marital or the dependency status of an employee changed, the amount paid by the employer prior to 1962, was guaranteed. The amendment permits an alternation to be made which on the surface may appear to be fair, but it does more than that, Mr. Speaker.

The words: "Or shall pay such other amount to the employee as may be agreed upon between the employer and the employee," will give employers an opportunity to use the powers of persuasion to reduce the amount previously paid. The result could be a financial loss to the employees.

Mr. Speaker, I direct the Members to pages 114-117, of the Thompson Commission Report, for a more complete argument on this particular question, including the amounts of money that are involved. The problem that this section presents may be quite general, but more specifically it will be a problem to employees who are employed in shops that are not unionized.

The removal of the monthly payment provision also creates obvious problems, but, if there are complaints that it involves added administrative costs by the employers, the section could then be amended to provide that, at least annually or on termination, payments will be made to employees, rather than monthly. There may be those employers who would suggest that payments under the new amendments would be permissible on the basis of once in five years. I would suggest to the Minister that he consider bringing an amendment to this section ensuring that payments to employees will be made at least once a year.

Another section provides that a seven per cent interest payment must be made where monies are owing to the Commission by physicians and are not refunded in a certain period of time. I do not know, Mr. Speaker, what amounts of money are involved.

March 30, 1967

The amendment may be logical, particularly where large sums of money are involved. However, I am a bit concerned that it might open the door to new pressure. Will the Commission be asked in the future to pay interest to physicians for monies that are owing to them, if this particular section is adopted. An equally good case can be built that the physician should also be paid a seven per cent interest, where the Commission owes money. I understand that on occasion the Commission does owe money to group practices, to the tune of \$20,000 to \$30,000 for periods of two and three months.

Mr. Speaker, with these brief observations I have made, I would urge the Minister to give the matter reconsideration and consider bringing amendments with respect to Sections 25 and 45, possibly, but particularly Section 25. It is the one I am very much concerned with. We would then be able to deal with them in Committee.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, Hear!

SECOND READINGS

HON. D.G. STEUART (Minister of Natural Resources), moved second reading of Bill No. 93 — **An Act to Amend The Legislative Assembly Act.**

He said:

Mr. Speaker, the amendment suggested in this Bill affects 12 constituencies. Mostly they are just tidying up some obvious errors that were made when the Bill was brought down. I think it was two years ago, or it might have been last year.

For example, there are some typographical errors. In some of the constituencies the boundaries between the constituencies went right through towns; in the constituency of Biggar, for example, between Biggar and Rosthern, the town of Warman is divided, cut right in half. We don't think this is good and we are suggesting it be changed. In the constituency of Cutknife, part of the town of Battleford was divided and the same thing at Hanley. Humboldt was only a typographical error, some figures were put down wrong in the Act. Moose Jaw for example, Moose Jaw South, the constituency dividing line, the south boundary line of Moose Jaw South and Morse constituency divides the property of the Moose Jaw Training School. In fact I think that there were some buildings that were bisected. So there are no serious or no real important changes being made. It's more tidying up the map and the Act as it now exists.

When we go into clause by clause consideration, I have given the Members opposite the explanation that I have here and I will have the Returning Officer or one of the assistants to answer any questions when we go into Committee. But really there is no great principle involved as this is just tidying up the Bill.

I would move that Bill No. 93 now be read a second time.

MR. J.H. BROCKELBANK (Kelsey): — Mr. Speaker, I don't want to take much time on this, but if I remember right, this is the third Redistribution Bill that we have had in three years. I was wondering if the Minister is contemplating another one at the next session of the Legislature

and how many will it take to get it all set up right. I never saw anything like this before where there are really so many Redistribution Bills coming in. but as the Minister said we can consider it in Committee.

Now the Minister did give me notes explaining each one and then he borrowed them back again. I suppose he will give them back to me again.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STEUART: — Yes, I'll be glad to give them back to you.

MR. A. THIBAUT (Kinistino): — Mr. Speaker, I just wonder whether you are quite sure to win the election on these basis now?

MR. STEUART: — High hopes.

MR. THIBAUT: — What about St. Benedict? I've been wanting to get these people for a long time. There is a good Liberal population that I would like to have.

MR. STEUART: — Don't think we would like to give it to you.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

The Assembly adjourned at 11:05 o'clock p.m.