

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
First Session – Sixteenth Legislature
11th Day

Thursday, February 29, 1968.

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. D.A. McPherson (Regina South West): — Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great pleasure to introduce to you and to the Members of the Legislature, 55 grade eight students from Athabasca School. They are sitting in the west gallery and are here touring the buildings and watching the procedures that go on. They are here with their teacher, Mr. Cullum. It gives me a great deal of pleasure to welcome them here today, and I hope that their stay is a very, very interesting and enjoyable one.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. H.H.P. Baker (Regina South East): — Mr. Speaker, I'd also like to welcome on behalf of the Chamber, here today, a group of grade eight students from Strathcona school that is located in the heart of the South East constituency of Regina. They are accompanied here by Mr. Lindburg, their Principal and Mrs. Schweitzer. Strathcona school has a long record of education in this community and one of great reputation. So on behalf of the Chamber, here today, I take great pleasure in welcoming them here. I hope, and I know, that their experience here will be of great value to them. Also, I would like to extend a welcome to the Athabasca school, as echoed by the Member from Regina South West, and I hope that their stay will be a very pleasant one as well.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. J.A. Pepper (Weyburn): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you and through you to the Members of the Assembly, a group of students in the two front rows of the east gallery. They are a group of 23 students, grades nine and ten, from the Creelman high school. Creelman is a very thriving little town in the north east corner of the Weyburn constituency. These students are accompanied by their Principal, Mr. Fred Short and their bus driver, Mr. Don Anslow. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the Members join me when I say that I hope their visit here proves very educational and pleasant. And I hope that this continues throughout the journey home.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. W.A. Forsyth (Saskatoon Nutana South): — Mr. Speaker, I would like through you to introduce to this Assembly a group of students who are seated in the Speaker's gallery, from George Vanier school, which is located on Wilson Crescent, in Nutana South constituency, in Saskatoon. I am very happy to see such a large group from this school and I would congratulate their teachers, Mr. Blakney and Mr. Poulak, for bringing them on this tour. They have just arrived in town and they have a very busy schedule. I am sure they will enjoy not only their visit to the Legislature, but the other points of interest in Regina which they will be visiting.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. J.J. Charlebois (Saskatoon City Park-University): — Mr. Speaker, I received a letter from Mrs. Averbach, the teacher of the grade seven class in North Park school, Saskatoon, and she advised that she was going to be here with her class, in the Speaker's gallery. I am afraid that they must have been delayed as I don't see them here. But in the event that they are behind me, and I am not able to see them, and also in the event that they do come in a little late, I am sure that they will appreciate their stay here and enjoy the proceedings, and I hope that they will have a very pleasant journey home.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. W.G. Davies (Moose Jaw South): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to join in the greeting to the pupils and their teachers from Strathcona school, especially because some years ago I went there in grade four and grade five. As a matter of interest, Mr. Speaker, Mr. M.J. Coldwell was the Principal and a very fine teacher he was.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

SASKATCHEWAN ECONOMIC REVIEW, 1967

Mr. J.E. Brockelbank (Saskatoon Mayfair): — Before the Orders of the Day, I wonder if I might direct a question to the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart). I have taken the opportunity of getting in touch with the Saskatoon Public Library and they informed me that they do not have a copy of the Saskatchewan Economic Review, 1967. And they further informed me that they thought they had a standing order that they would receive this particular document. I wonder if the Provincial Treasurer is prepared to forward a document to them?

Hon. D.G. Steuart (Provincial Treasurer): — Certainly. This is one of the best sellers we've

ever had. The demand is so great that we are going to have some more printed.

MARGINAL NOTES

Mr. A.E. Blakeney (Regina Centre): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I wonder if I might direct a question to the Attorney General (Mr. Heald) and this has to do with our marginal notes. The Bills are beginning to pile up. Some of them are probably compilations of Acts. I think that all of us know just how helpful the notes are. And anything that the Attorney General could do to speed along the work – and I know the pressures – would be greatly appreciated.

Hon. D.V. Heald (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I had a short discussion with the Hon. Member the other day about this. I undertook to look into it, and I am looking into it. I found the Throne Speech Debate so fascinating that I couldn't tear myself away long enough to do some of these little chores. But I will get into it, today.

MOTIONS FOR RETURNS

RETURN NO. 19

Mr. D.G. Willis (Melfort-Tisdale) - Moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 19 showing:

The address and square footage of office space being provided by the Department of Public Works for use of Government departments or agencies and the annual cost to the Department of Public Works in each instance for 1967.

Mr. A.R. Guy (Minister of Public Works): – I have discussed this Return with the Hon. Member and in order to clarify the intent so that he gets the information that he is requesting, I would like to move, seconded by the Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac) that Return No. 19 amended:

That the word “rented” be inserted between the words “of” and “office” in the first line.

The amendment was agreed to.

The motion as amended, was agreed to.

RETURN NO. 20

Mr. C.G. Willis (Melfort-Tisdale): — Moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 20 showing:

The address and square footage of office space being provided by the Department of Public Works for use of Government departments or agencies and the annual cost to the Department of Public Works in each instance since 1966.

Hon. A.R. Guy: — Mr. Speaker, for the same reason as for No. 19, I would like to move, seconded by the Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac) that Return No. 20 be amended:

That the word “rented” be inserted between the words “of” and “office” in the first line.

The amendment was agreed to.

The motion as amended, was agreed to.

RETURN NO. 28

Mr. E. Whelan (Regina North West): — Moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 28 showing:

- (1) The date the building and property located at Winnipeg and Eighth, Regina, formerly owned by the Department of National Defence, was purchased by the Government of Saskatchewan.
- (2) The total price paid by the Government of Saskatchewan to the Government of Canada for (a) the said building, and (b) the said property.
- (3) The disposition which has been made of (a) the building and (b) the property to date.

Hon. W. Ross Thatcher (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, down through the years, since SEDCO was set up, any correspondence or business pertaining to it has been privileged. Now as the Hon. Members knows, the answers to 1 and 2 can be obtained from the House of Commons records. But item 3 the Government considers as privileged, and in the public interest we are not prepared to release that information at this time. However, Mr. Speaker, if the Hon. Member should give me his assurance, personally, that he will treat the information as confidential, I would be pleased to give him the figures on a confidential basis. Under the circumstances we have no choice but to defeat this motion.

Motion negatived.

RETURN NO. 30

Hon. W.S. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition): — Moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for

February 29, 1968

Return No. 30 showing:

With respect to loans to students which have been made by the Government of Saskatchewan, exclusive of loans made by the Government of Canada, the number that were made in the (a) fiscal years 1966-67; (b) 1967-68 fiscal year to February 1, 1968.

Hon. J.C. McIsaac (Minister of Education): — Mr. Speaker, the question asked the number of loans made by the Government of Saskatchewan, exclusive of loans made by the Government of Canada, in the two fiscal years referred to. I think the Hon. Member is well aware that there are other loan and bursary programs operated by other Departments, as well as the Canadian Student Aid Plan, which is also operated through the Provincial Department. In order to give him the full picture of student assistance loans, bursaries, and otherwise, I would move the following amendment:

That all the words after the word “showing” be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

With respect to student assistance which has been provided by the Government of Saskatchewan, the number of loans, scholarships and bursaries granted in the (a) fiscal year 1966-67 and (b) 1967-68 fiscal year to February 1, 1968.

While the motion could be more extensive, I will show the breakdown of Provincial student loans, and the other departmental bursaries.

Mr. Lloyd: — Would you see to give loans and scholarships separately or are you lumping them all together?

Mr. McIsaac: — I'll give you as complete a breakdown as possible.

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, the amendment is fairly comprehensive and a shade confusing, at least from where I sit. So I would beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

RETURN NO. 32

Mr. W.E. Smishek (Regina North East): — Moved an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 32 showing:

(1) Since October 15, 1967, the name and position of each person appointed to the staff of a department, board, commission, Crown corporation, or other agency of the

Government of Saskatchewan.

(2) The above positions which were filled by: (a) Public Service Commission competitions, (b) Orders in Council, (c) appointment by Board of Directors, (d) any other method.

(3) The date on which each such person was appointed.

Hon. D.T. McFarlane (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, this motion would ask that the Government provide the names, positions, of each person appointed to the staff of a department, a board, commission, a Crown corporation, or any other agency of Government since October 15, 1967. It also asks which of the above positions were filled by the Public Service Commission competitions, Orders in Council, appointments by Board of Directors, or any other methods, and the date on which each such person was appointed. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that you will agree that this would involve a great deal of staff time. It would mean going into, as the motion asks, every board and commission and department of Government.

I am remember some years ago, when those people who are sitting to our left this afternoon, were on this side of the House — at that time I believe there were 14 of us in the Opposition ranks — and we had asked a similar question. I can remember the tirade we got on that occasion from the then Provincial Treasurer. In fact he said that the staff was too valuable, during the session, to be transferred to providing information of this sort. And he said on that occasion that, if we were to get the type of information that we wanted, it would necessitate the tying up of staff in these departments for most of the whole of one summer. I think he came through with some cost figures to indicate the amount it would cost the taxpayers of Saskatchewan. So I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if those answers were appropriate in those days when they were the Government for this type of information, then in all sincerity I suggest the same answer could be true on this occasion. So in order to speed up the work of the different departments of Government, especially during the session, especially in view of the fact that we are going to have a very busy year next year, I suggest in the interest of all concerned that the motion be dropped.

Mr. W.G. Davies (Moose Jaw South): — Mr. Speaker, it appears to me that questions of this sort have been answered in previous sessions of this Legislature. If I am also not mistaken, the matter that the Minister of Agriculture refers to, was not just precisely as he has put it. As I recall, there was a question asked, asking for similar information for seven or ten years, which certainly does involve a tremendous amount of work. I suggest that the Minister of Agriculture this afternoon has distorted the events of that time and the remarks of the Provincial Treasurer of that period. The question here of course is for a much more limited period. It is a perfectly proper question and I think it should be answered.

Mr. W.E. Smishek (Regina North East): — Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that this would be an easy chore for the Government's various departments, in the light of the statements that have been made by the Premier and other people in the Government that very, very few people were hired. The Premier told us right after the election that he was invoking a freeze. We know that certain people with certain privileges, because of the results of the election, were given employment in special positions. I can think of at least two Cabinet Ministers that somehow the freeze did not apply to. Mr. Speaker, if there were just a few people and that the freeze was in effect, then it seems to me that the Public Service Commission must have done very little work in terms of hiring a number of people and could answer the question very simply. Certainly there must have been very few Orders in Council, and the arguments presented by the Minister of Agriculture, unless the Government is hiding something, do not apply. It is only for a matter of the four-month period. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that, based on the arguments presented by the Premier and others, it would take a matter of 15 or 20 minutes to answer the question if the arguments were true.

Motion negatived on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 24
Messieurs

Lloyd	Willis	Wooff
Wood	Kramer	Blakeney
Davies	Dewhurst	Meakes
Berezowsky	Romanow	Smishek
Thibault	Whelan	Snyder
Michayluk	Brockelbank	Baker
Pepper	Bowerman	Matsalla
Messer	Kwasnica	Kowalchuk

NAYS — 31
Messieurs

Thatcher	Howes	McFarlane
Cameron	Steuart	Heald
McIsaac	Guy	Loken
MacDougall	Grant	Coderre
Bjarnason	MacDonald	Estey
Hooker	Gallagher	McLennan
Heggie	Breker	Leith
Radloff	Weatherald	Mitchell
Gardner	Coupland	McPherson
Charlebois	Forsyth	McIvor
Schmeiser		

RETURN NO. 33

Mr. E. Whelan (Regina North West): — Moved that an Order of Assembly do issue for Return No. 33 showing:

The legal description and street address of any and all land held in the name of the Provincial Government or any of its agencies, located within the boundaries of the constituency of Regina North West.

Hon. A.R. Guy (Minister of Public Works): — The Member here is asking for information that is not readily available since it has never been and isn't now the practice to list Provincial Government buildings by constituencies. The officials in my Department have no reason to be aware of the constituency boundaries and therefore would be unable to provide this particular information. Therefore, I would suggest that the Member drop it.

Mr. W.G. Davies (Moose Jaw South): — Mr. Speaker, I must say I have never heard a more ridiculous excuse in this House than the one that we have just heard. The fact is that the Department of Public Works does have this information. It has this information for every centre in the Province of Saskatchewan. All that needs to be done is to delimitate the lines, the boundary lines for the constituencies and to take the information with respect to property within those lines. This information, Mr. Speaker, can be provided and this is nothing but a bare-faced evasion.

Mr. Guy: — It is not their responsibility to be worrying about constituency boundaries.

Mr. Whelan: — Mr. Speaker, I'm most disappointed with the reply. When we were the Government we were accused of losing cars. I'm beginning to think that the Minister in charge of this Department may have lost some land and apparently doesn't know where it is. I feel that there are parcels of land in this city that belong to the Department of Public Works or some agencies of the Government. As a representative of the Government, responsible to the people of the constituency that I represent, I'm most anxious to know where they are located. I think it's a good question, it's a logical question, it's the sort of question that should be answered and I think that they are being treated with contempt when this information is being refused.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Motion negatived.

RETURN NO. 40

Mr. A.E. Blakeney (Regina Centre): — Moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 40 showing:

Copies of any agreements or contracts entered into between Saskatchewan Power Corporation and North Canadian

Oils Limited since January 1st, 1964.

Hon. G.B. Grant (Minister of Public Health): — Mr. Speaker, the Power Corporation enters into quite a number of contracts with private parties and I would feel that it is not in the public interest to make the information of any of the contracts available and thus I will be obliged to vote against this motion.

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I think that we all know what this matter refers to. There were numerous press reports to the effect that portions of the public domain of this Province, either property or oil and gas rights, were sold to North Canadian Oils Limited — the Premier had no hesitation in giving some details of these alleged agreements to the press. If they are confidential, the Minister in charge of the Power Corporation ought to have advised the Premier to this effect, because certainly he had no hesitation in giving details to the Leader Post — at least some details — allegations that contracts were made in March of 1964 giving dates and some details. It seems to me that, if Ministers of the Crown are going to make public statements as to what are contained in agreements between the Power Corporation and private individuals, particularly when these agreements deal with the disposition of the public domain, then such agreements should be laid before this Assembly. There can be no possible justification for bandying about in the press the details with respect to agreements between the Government agencies and private citizens, and then refusing to give the details of these agreements to the Legislative Assembly. I think that under these circumstances and particularly, as I say, when this is not really an ordinary business contract but one of long-term duration dealing with the permanent disposition of substantial amounts of gas reserves — if I can believe the press reports — there can be no justification for not giving this information to the Assembly. If this information is not given, I think we and the public are entitled to draw the conclusion that the Government does not wish to keep its dealings with these companies confidential for the purpose of business relations, but rather that the Government has something to hide from the people of Saskatchewan and from this Legislature.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Motion negatived on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 24
Messieurs

Lloyd
Willis
Berezowsky
Thibault
Pepper

Wooff
Wood
Romanow
Brockelbank
Bowerman

Kramer
Meakes
Smishek
Baker
Matsalla

Blakeney
Whelan
Messer

Davies
Snyder
Kwasnica

Dewhurst
Michayluk
Kowalchuk

NAYS — 32
Messieurs

Thatcher
Cameron
McIsaac
MacDougall
Bjarnason
Hooker
Heggie
Radloff
Larochelle
McPherson
McIvor

Howes
Steuart
Guy
Grant
MacDonald
Gallagher
Breker
Weatherald
Gardner
Charlebois
Schmeiser

McFarlane
Heald
Loken
Coderre
Estey
McLennan
Leith
Mitchell
Coupland
Forsyth

RETURN NO. 41

Mr. W.G. Davies (Moose Jaw South): — Moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 41 showing:

- (1) Whether the Government has acted to appoint a Committee of Review of the Workmen's Compensation (Accident Fund) Act and Regulations and if so, the names of members of the Committee.
- (2) Prior to the appointment of the Committee whether the Government wrote to invite Provincial labor and employer organizations to submit nominations and if so, the names of these organizations, and the names proposed in each case.

Hon. L.P. Coderre (Gravelbourg): — Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that the Hon. Member would like to have the complete information. Therefore, I move, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Grant:

That all the words after the word "Government" in the first line of paragraph two be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

requested labour and employer representation to accept nominations and if so, their names.

- (3) Whether these representatives of labour and employers accepted the nominations.
- (4) Whether any withdrew their names and if so, the names of those who resigned, and those nominated to replace them.

Mr. Davies: — Mr. Speaker, I must point out that the effect of the

amendment that has been now submitted by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) is to escape providing the information that is asked for in the second part of the motion. The second part of the motion asks, as I have submitted in the motion, for an answer on whether the Government asked the provincial labour and employer organizations to submit nominations. The effect of the amendment that is now being submitted is to ignore this request and to speak of labour and employer representation rather than to deal with the question of the organizations themselves. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Compensation Act provides that, when the Committee of Review is set up (and it is required to be set up every four years), the Government is to appoint organized employer and employee representatives. Now, representatives, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, means exactly what it says. It means representatives of bodies that can speak for a group or groups and this was the purpose of the question. I will say again that the amendment as submitted by the Minister of Labour would deny me the information that I am seeking in this motion.

Mr. W.E. Smishek (Regina North East): — It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that it is pretty obvious what the Minister (Mr. Coderre) is trying to do. He is telling us, by bringing in this amendment, that he and the Government have not asked either employers or labor to propose names to the Committee of Review. Yet the Government, through a method of choosing and handpicking, itself tries to select people on these kinds of bodies. This was never the intent of the legislation. Mr. Speaker, this is not the first time that this Government has by-passed the official and central labor bodies in this province and perhaps the employer organizations, from whom I do not have that much information. But, Mr. Speaker, time and time again, where representation is called for from labor and from employers, and in the case of labor, labor is not consulted, labor is not asked to name its representatives. All that this Government is doing is showing its contempt for proportionate and proper representation on bodies of this nature. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have more discussion on that and I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

RETURN NO. 45

Mr. Davies: — Moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 45 showing:

Whether the Saskatchewan Medical Care Commission has undertaken any studies or investigations during the past three years with respect to deterrent fees for medical or hospital services in the Swift Current Health Region, and if so, (a) when they were made; and (b) the information disclosed, and recommendations if any, proposed.

Mr. Grant: — There are quite a number of investigations in the Department of health on various matters pertaining to many things passing between branches and the Minister, and between Commissions and the Minister. A document, such as referred to here, I would consider in the privileged class and I will be forced to vote against this motion.

Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that this afternoon we have achieved another first for Saskatchewan, one which we can have no reason whatsoever to be proud of. We've achieved another first, and the first this time is in respect to the Government refusing to make available information to this Legislature. It will be recalled that we began the afternoon with a comment from the Member for Saskatoon Mayfair (Mr. Brockelbank) drawing attention to the fact that the 1967 Statistical Review has not been made available in the usual way and that information was withheld. This afternoon with respect to questions, we have been told that we cannot get information with regard to something the Government has sold; we cannot get information with regard to what the Government owns in one part of the city; we cannot get information with respect to property, very valuable oil-bearing property which the Government has sold.

Mr. Thatcher: — What's that got to do with this motion?

Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, I'm pointing . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! I think the Member will have to confine himself in his remarks to the Motion that's before the House.

Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, I'm going to relate this to the Motion before us and to the remarks of the Minister (Mr. Grant) who has just taken his seat, saying that again we can't get this particular information. And I'm pointing out to the Government the very dangerous precedent which it is bringing up here, in that this will be the fourth or fifth time this afternoon when the Government has said to this Legislature and the people in the province, "You have no right to know these facts."

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — Sir, I am objecting to it . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — . . . as a serious breach of the rights of Members of the Legislature and the people of Saskatchewan.

Now with respect to this particular Motion, the Speech from the Throne, comments of the Premier, and comments of the

Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) for the past several weeks have indicated to us that we are going to have another added tax in the Province of Saskatchewan; this time, an added tax on sick people; this time a deterrent fee with respect to either medical or hospital charges or both. It is known that there have been some studies made which have a bearing on this topic. It is known that there have been deterrent fees in the Swift Current Health Region. It is suggested in this Motion that getting this information may help the Members of this Legislature and the people of the province to assess whether the Government's proposal in this situation is good or bad. In the face of this we are told again by the Minister of Health, this is information you cannot have, this you have no right to know. Mr. Speaker, this needs to be objected to, and I suggest that the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) is on poor grounds when he asks us to support his suggestion to vote down this Motion.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. A.C. Cameron (Minister of Mineral Resources): — Mr. Speaker, I have one comment to make on this Motion. I think the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) still is unable to realize that he's not in the Government; he's in the Opposition. He is so accustomed to receiving information on surveys and studies made by Departments, in Crown corporations and inter-departmental memos, but he doesn't realize such information just is not available to the Opposition but to the responsible Ministers. And the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) in exercising his responsibilities as a Minister, may have asked officials within the Medical Care Commission, or officials within the Health Department, or officials with inter-departmental connection to make a review. He'd be within his right to do so, and if he was efficiently administering his Department, I would expect that he would do so. But I would fully expect that, if he was to receive proper and sufficient and full information, those people supplying it would have to be free to give it to him on a confidential basis. Therefore, he gets a full disclosure of the feelings of his Department officials and thus has the advantage of their knowledge. Here is the Leader of the Opposition asking this House to stick his finger into the Department of Health under the Minister's jurisdiction and seek out the most confidential information, as inter-departmental memos which the Minister may have written to his staff, confidential information which his staff may have given to him in order that he may have a mature judgement in the operating of his department. No Opposition that I know of in the Commonwealth would stand up and say in the House that they have by right of Parliament the right to go into the inner sanctum of a Minister's Department and insist that all the information he has be made available to them. This is what the Leader of the Opposition is asking for.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Cameron: — Precisely, and he's not in

agreement with what I'm saying. But I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that it would be a sad day for Parliament and for democracy, when anyone has the right to look into the secret compartment of everyone of the Ministers and his Department and ask that any confidential letter or document or information be made available to him and laid bare before the Leader of the Opposition.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Cameron: — For this reason, Mr. Speaker, the House is justified and it is its obligation to prevent the spread and dissemination of material of this nature. Then he talks about wanting to invade the Power Corporation; what contracts have they entered into with private individuals? I can recall when I was in the Opposition, that was always considered as privileged information.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! Member on a point of order.

Mr. A.E. Blakeney (Regina Centre): — On a point of order, I ask the Member to confine himself to the motion under discussion. We've already dealt with the motion dealing with the Power Corporation and I suggest that any comments that have to do with the motion already disposed of are out of order.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! The Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) on a point of order.

Hon. C.P. MacDonald (Minister of Welfare): — Mr. Speaker, all the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) is doing is commenting on the remarks on this motion that the Leader of the Opposition has just finished uttering.

Mr. Speaker: — Well, it's a good possibility but he exceeded the correct scope of the debate when he made some of those comments.

Mr. Cameron: — I don't wish to prolong this discussion, only to indicate and to reiterate once again that it would be a most dangerous principle to begin divulging information such as asked for in Return No. 45 and I would hope that the House would vote against this Motion.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. G.T. Snyder (Moose Jaw North): — Mr. Speaker, we've seen an

exhibition here of a Member standing up with stately dignity and trying to convince the Members of this House that for one reason or another this is information that we shouldn't have. I think the reason that we are not getting it is apparent to most Members. I think, Mr. Speaker, that perhaps we made a mistake in sending the Hon. Member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) to the Parliamentary Association meeting. He described to us the other night a situation where a one-party form of government was the order of the day in some of the areas that he visited, while he was travelling about the Commonwealth last summer at the expense of us, the people of Saskatchewan. I wonder if some of this didn't rub off on the Hon. Gentleman in the course of his travels, because this precisely, Mr. Speaker, is what has emerged in terms of the questions that have been put to the Government opposite today. Time after time on matters of public consequence, the Members are standing opposite and telling us that we have no right to know about property that is held by this Government, about property of the people of Saskatchewan that is being sold by the Government of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Snyder: — I can only deplore this sort of action, Mr. Speaker, and I hope that the Government will reconsider and give us the opportunity to scrutinize matters that I think are of matters of public interest to this Assembly and to the people of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I simply want to make only one short comment. I think, if Members will recall what the Member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) said, every word of it could equally be applied to the Frazier Report, every word of it could equally be used, if his logic is correct, to deny publication of that. This was surely a report commissioned by the Government for its own personal information. There was no suggestion that it was bound to tender this report to the Legislature. I'm glad and I compliment the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) that he didn't hide behind the rather tawdry and threadbare arguments of the Member for Maple Creek in that regard. But I simply want to say this, that we are now informed of something we did not know before, that the Medical Care Insurance Commission was in the inner sanctum of the Minister of Public Health's secret compartments. Some of us had thought that that was an independent commission. Some of us had thought that the Medical Care Insurance Commission had an independent life of its own and was not a mere tool of the Minister of Public Health.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — We are interested in the

observation of the Member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron). We know now that what was an independent commission is no longer one. We know now apparently that one other part of the independent sector of this Government and of this Province has fallen prey to the long arms of the Thatcher Government.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. F.A. Dewhurst (Wadena): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the Minister's attention to some other rules. I know some of the quotes have been made in this House, some of the dispatches we are discussing this afternoon have been made outside the House, and Beauchesne 159(2) says:

A Minister of the Crown is not at liberty to read or quote from a dispatch.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! Now I shall ask the Member: is he rising on a point or order or he rising in the debate?

Mr. Dewhurst: — The debate. I'm just pointing out, Mr. Speaker, that Beauchesne 159(2) says,

A Minister of the Crown is not at liberty to read or quote from a dispatch or other state paper, not before the House, unless he is prepared to lay it upon the table.

But I just point out that as a number of these things have been quoted by the Ministers and given to the press, I feel that we have a right to have information within this Legislature.

Mr. Davies: — Mr. Speaker, I am truly amazed this afternoon by what I have heard from the ranks of the Government in refusing to us or about to refuse us, the information that we have asked in this Motion. When I listen to the Member for Maple Creek I'm even more astounded. He said something about the Members on this side of the House forgetting that they were in opposition. I wonder how short his own memory is, because I can remember his voice when he was in opposition not so long ago, being one of the loudest raised in requests demanding information that was given and granted freely when the Members on this side of the House were the Government. That's a matter of record that anyone who has watched the present Government and the previous Government would vouch for. In any case what is being asked for here, Mr. Speaker, is information that, as our Leader has said, can be extremely important and will so remain in any discussion on deterrent fees.

The Swift Current Health Region happens to be an area where

some deterrent fees have been employed over a period of years. It is probably one of the best examples that we could look to in getting some information at least about the effect of this type of levy and impost. Therefore, it is vital, in my opinion, that the House secure from the authorities that have gained this information what we have asked for in the Motion. Now there is nothing to my mind that would involve a matter of privilege. We are not dealing here with secret records of patients and physicians; we are dealing with general figures about the use of hospitals and medical care and the effect of deterrent fees, and so forth. Not a matter at all of individuals, it is a matter of general statistics. Now so far as we know, there have been no inter-departmental memos, at least not until the Member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) intimated that these have been flying between the Commission and the Minister. But the question asked whether there have been any studies or investigations during the past three years on the matter of deterrent fees. If there have been investigations of this kind, then the Government should supply them, not only for edification of the Members in Opposition, but for the public of the Province of Saskatchewan, because these are the people who have to stand in judgement on the actions of the Government whatever may come, with respect to deterrent fees within the next few weeks.

Motion negatived on the following recorded division:

YEAS – 24

Messieurs

Lloyd	Wooff	Kramer
Willis	Wood	Blakeney
Davies	Dewhurst	Meakes
Berezowsky	Romanow	Smishek
Thibault	Whelan	Snyder
Michayluk	Brockelbank	Baker
Pepper	Bowerman	Matsalla
Messer	Kwasnica	Kowalchuk

NAYS – 32

Messieurs

Thatcher	Howes	McFarlane
Cameron	Steuart	Heald
McIsaac	Guy	Loken
MacDougall	Grant	Coderre
Bjarnason	MacDonald	Estey
Hooker	Gallagher	McLennan
Heggie	Breker	Leith
Radloff	Weatherald	Mitchell
Larochelle	Gardner	Coupland
McPherson	Charlebois	Forsyth
McIvor	Schmeiser	

STATEMENT BY SPEAKER RE: ORDER IN THE CHAMBER

Mr. Speaker: — Before we proceed to the next

order of business, I would like to say a word or two in connection with order when a division of the Members is taking place.

It is all very well, and I am sure no one objects to a little good-natured chatter when the bell is ringing and Members are coming into the Chamber. But when the doors are closed and the Clerk is recording the voice vote, I would ask that the House maintain order and reduce the buzz of conversation.

I ask this in order that the Clerk may be able to clearly hear the replies of the Members, thereby preventing any chance of a mistake.

RESOLUTIONS

RESOLUTION NO. 1 – HOUSING PROGRAM

Mr. Whelan (Regina North West) moved, seconded by Mr. W.E. Smishek (Regina North East):

That this Assembly urges the Provincial Government to enlist support of the Government of Canada in developing a housing program particularly for low and medium income families which would include:

- (1) the establishment of a Provincial housing authority;
- (2) the provision of funds at a low interest rate for home building;
- (3) the establishment of research facilities to develop new and less costly techniques for the construction of homes; and
- (4) the development of a program which will guarantee the construction of a minimum yearly quota of housing for each province in Canada.

He said: Mr. Speaker, there is no better example in Canada of the lack of Government leadership at all levels than in the field of housing.

In the community that I represent, the present city council is controlled by the Liberal party, the Provincial Government is in the hands of a Liberal party, the Federal Government we think is in the hands of a Liberal party or Réal Caouette, I'm not sure. The combination of these groups in keeping the philosophy of every man for himself, has brought about the worst housing crisis Regina has ever experienced. Recently a conference was called by a Liberal member of the city council to discuss housing. With the government of the city, of the province and of the country in the hands of the same group, there is hardly need to discuss housing. There should be action, Mr. Speaker, immediate action on housing. There is no need for study, no need for a conference, we have examined the problem

enough I would think. There have been so many conferences and so many discussions and there is so much information available in this field that it would take a Member of this Legislature three weeks reading night and day to survey the material that has been written and the minutes of meetings that have been called to date. I hope that the new Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Estey) will adopt an approach more realistic, more active, and more effective than that of the former Minister (Mr. McIsaac), who had to take a survey to find out if there was a housing shortage in this province.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest to Members of this House that, if they want to find out the severity and the seriousness of the housing shortage of any Saskatchewan centre, particularly Regina City, that they insert an ad in the newspaper, House for Rent, and sit back and count the number of telephone calls that they receive. There is among Members opposite, opposition, I am sure, to the use of Government funds for public benefit. However, I am sure all of us would agree that without the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, and the National Housing Act, most of the housing in Regina City, in the last few years, that we have would not have been built. The legislation that has provided the funds and the ground rules are government-initiated and government-administered, but like so many programs of this kind, it has provided housing for the rich and denied housing to those in need.

Mr. Speaker, the present Federal system has provided housing for those in the upper-income brackets, but persists in protecting the private money-lender first and guaranteeing him a return on his money. This has always received first consideration. Housing federally and provincially has not been made available to those who need it. It seems that housing at the present time is not treated as a necessary social requirement in our country and in our province. We must take a serious look at channelling huge sums of money into the housing field. We should also take a look at control. I would like to use a term that some of those on our side of the House use, when they're talking about interest rates, because it's applied to other areas. We should take a look at controlling by compulsory arbitration the unbelievably high interest rate. This is snuffing out the housing industry and curtailing the construction of family dwellings in this province.

Mr. Speaker, the housing program we have has been typical of Liberal Government programs. Socialism for the rich, capitalism for the poor. The poor have been forced to borrow from private lenders at a fantastic rate of interest. They have not been able to acquire a home, they have had to live in crowded circumstances and pay high rents. The situation now has reached the stage that is acute, so acute that the Federal Government of Canada called a meeting of all the Provinces on housing. This might have been a good idea, if the housing meeting had been presented with any suggestions, any ideas or a concrete program, that would provide housing for those who are in desperate need.

Mr. Speaker, we have been told that there was an increase in housing starts in Saskatchewan last year, over the previous year. I am at a loss to locate the source of this exaggerated statement. I was in touch with Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation in Regina City and as recently as February 8, 1968, I received a letter from the assistant manager. The letter reads – I'm going to quote it to the House.

Further to our recent conversation, I am pleased to supply the following information as requested: Dwelling units as completed by type of financing, all areas, Saskatchewan, 1965, 1966, and 1967.

The totals are shown and I'd like the Minister to take them down – 1965 – 7,218; 1966 – 6,830; 1967 – 5,873.

Mr. Speaker, let me make clear that units include apartments in blocks, complete self-contained suites, basement suites. Many of these units were suites that were denied to family groups. In the city of Regina in 1966 there were 1,504 completions of family units, all units that is, apartments, duplexes, single family dwellings, semi-detached dwellings. In 1967, that's last year, there were 854 completions; in 1966 – 1,504 completions; in 1967 – 854 completions, about one-third of these were apartment blocks. It had dropped in Regina from 1,504 to 854 completions. But the trend is getting worse. This year, in January of this year, the first month of 1968, the housing starts totalled 20, while in January, 1967 the figure was 31. This is a reduction of approximately 35 per cent for January of this year as compared to January of last year.

What are some of the reasons for the desperate housing shortage that exists? (1) We are just not building enough houses and the quota established and suggested by the Economic Council of Canada is not being met. We are hitting about 40 per cent of the quota the Council has suggested. (2) There is an increase in the number of new family formations. Many of the people being married today were born during the war and shortly after the war. There is a marked increase in the number of new family formations. (3) There is an increased cost in building and materials. Materials used in housing could be manufactured in this province if there was a regular quota of house building guaranteed. Manufacture of materials here by eliminating freight rates, and development of new techniques could as a result influence the price of building. In addition, Mr. Speaker, there is an 11 per cent Federal sales tax which adds to the already high cost of housing accommodation. (4) There has been an increase in the cost of land. Although it is worse in other provinces, some lots in Regina City sell for prices that are beyond the reach of the person in need of a home. (5) There has been an increase in the cost of surveying land, of sidewalks, the installation of sewer and water, installation of underground wiring. (6) There has been an unprecedented increase in the cost of money. Interest rates are the highest on record. Interest rate books are now out of date because they carry tables only to nine per cent. The rates are nine and a half and nine and

February 29, 1968

three-quarters for conventional mortgages at the present time. (7) The housing shortage is also due in some respect to the heavy movement of people from rural areas to urban centres and from rural areas to industrial areas. (8) Although electricity and water are now available, there has been no low-cost financing for home building in rural areas. (9) Approval of plans for sub-divisions, and the legal procedure for organizing new housing development are cumbersome and far too slow. (10) No overall plans have been available for organizing community development in smaller centres or organizing new extensions to cities, satellite cities as they are called. (11) Present building techniques should be up-dated to develop economic construction of housing, rural and urban. (12) At present there is no financing for houses for those in the \$4,000 and under income bracket. Last year in Canada there were only 2.4 per cent of new homes built by those whose income is \$4,000 or less. Yet they make up a terrific percentage of the working group in our country who are seeking homes at the present time.

What does this add up to? It adds up to this. A country like Canada, a province like Saskatchewan, rich beyond measure, provided with raw materials that provide the component parts of housing, endowed with the industrial genius that could produce homes, if the instigation and motivation were there, has failed those who need housing. It seems that thousands of our people, literally millions across this country, pay high rent, live in poverty, exist as second-rate citizens.

Poor housing spawns disease, crowds out jails, fills our juvenile courts, populates our mental hospitals. These people, if homes were provided, might have a chance to be better citizens. There would be reduction in expenditures for social assistance. The housing industry could become a permanent year-round industry. At present it is turned off and on as the money supply is turned off and on, like a water tap. The housing industry in Saskatchewan today is in a shambles. Journeymen in all the trades are leaving the province.

For many years I visited farms in Saskatchewan almost every week. On occasion I have visited the big cities of this country and walked through the poor sections of some of them. The housing that I have seen tells me clearly that there has been no leadership among the Government leaders. There has been no leadership in this field. We have made speeches about the war on poverty. These speeches are a mockery. Look at the fantastic housing shortage in Canada today, look at the sickness and unemployment, the despair and degradation that exist in this country because of a lack of housing. Then I say this. If we are waging a war on poverty, if we are waging a war that will produce houses, good housing for these people, it's about time we fired a few shots. It's about time we got in the battle.

Mr. Speaker, let's look at the area where I think we should begin. (1) We should establish a Federal Department of Housing and Urban Development, and this Department should survey the housing needs of Canada and immediately establish a long-term

quota for housing construction, urban and rural, for every province in Canada. Let us say to the housing industry, "We think housing should be built on an assembly line, or if you like, piece by piece on a city lot, but it should become a permanent industry." This Department of Housing could establish, with the backing of the people of Canada, a method of financing that would not fluctuate and would provide financing for housing at a permanent fixed interest rate. This Department could provide research for new housing techniques. It could estimate the number of houses needed for families in the low-income group, the number of rental units needed in every province, every year, and plan to replace the antiquated, broken-down hovels that are now being occupied in many parts of our country.

(2) We should provide by a vote of the House of Commons every year a fixed sum of Federal money for housing to meet the quota that has been established. This housing would include low-rental housing, co-operative housing, student housing, senior citizens housing, as well as individual family dwellings.

(3) We should immediately reduce the interest rate to six per cent under NHA. At the present time, the interest rate of eight and a half per cent on a \$15,000 home mortgaged for 35 years, at monthly payments of \$110.00 amounts to total payments of \$46,372. You pay back \$15,000 principal and \$31,372 interest. If you cannot qualify for an NHA mortgage and you pay the nine per cent (you can't get them for nine anymore), but if you pay nine for a conventional mortgage today on a \$15,000 mortgage over 35 years, the monthly payments would be \$115. You pay back \$48,623 or \$15,000 principal and \$33,623 interest.

(4) The new Federal Department should be active in land assembly and development, without payment of finances by municipalities or the province. Land would be adjacent to the city and include in it the original layout provision for schools and recreational areas. Land assembly financing would be undertaken without the financial assistance of the province or municipality, but with the planning, co-ordination, approval and sanction of the two junior governments.

(5) The Federal and Provincial governments should organize their own building corporation which would provide competition on major housing projects and also provide leadership in new building techniques. Our experiences in the fields of highway construction and Government insurance prove the value of establishing a good yardstick in construction. By the introduction of this type of building corporation, new techniques for construction could be development, new materials could be tested and used in construction.

(6) Limited-dividend company rates for public housing should be allowed to increase from the present five per cent for investment to nine per cent by legislation. At the present time a limited-dividend corporation is restricted in the rate that it can earn. It is restricted to five per cent. In view of this situation, limited-dividend housing construction is at a stand-

still. The present rate is unrealistic, impractical and I would suggest that at the earliest possible date the limited-dividend rates be allowed to increase to nine per cent. Money that is now going into expensive motels and hotels would be rerouted automatically into the housing field.

(7) Every province in Canada should be encouraged to pass condominium legislation to aid the organization of public, limited-dividend and co-operative housing. In many instances an older couple occupies a large house. This house could be sold to a family and the older couple could buy into a condominium. They have purchased ownership and the rent would not fluctuate; they have protected themselves against rental increases that would materially reduce a very limited income. This arrangement for condominium purchases will provide housing for office workers in the central part of the large cities on expensive land and thereby remove some of the pressure from family-type dwellings in the suburban districts.

(8) Governments should remove the sales tax, provincially and federally, on residential housing where the construction costs are less than \$15,000. This would reduce the cost for the low-income group and at the same time it is in line with a policy of taxing those with the ability to pay.

(9) Mortgage loans under NHA with respect to older homes should be increased about the present \$10,000 minimum. Large, older type homes which have been renovated require considerably larger mortgages. In addition the procedure for obtaining these loans should be speeded up. At the present time it is cumbersome, lengthy and it takes a great deal of patience to complete an arrangement of this type.

(10) A policy for the encouragement of home-improvement loans, for regular maintenance of present housing is a must. Proper maintenance of older homes often retains their value. Encouragement, Mr. Speaker, of home improvement loans on a periodic and regular basis to maintain the property in a good state of repair would, in the long run, guarantee that our Canadian housing would have a longer life expectancy. This would increase the life expectancy of the average Canadian home by perhaps 25 years, and in some respects, reduce the need for replacement of existing housing.

(11) The Province of Saskatchewan should establish a building code for the cities that is realistic and would allow the construction of assembly-line housing. The Province should also take the lead in negotiating a national building code that would make possible assembly-line housing acceptable across Canada.

(12) The Government of Saskatchewan should organize a Provincial Housing Authority to:

- (a) provide in conjunction with municipal and Federal

governments financial arrangements for rental housing, student co-operative housing and rural housing.

(b) provide research facilities and technical assistance for developing new materials, new construction techniques, new building codes and a constant survey of housing needs.

Some of the methods we must investigate for financing public housing are:

- (a) to provide Provincial subsidy for interest rates. At the present time, the interest rates are outrageous, and beyond the reach of the low-income people.
- (b) to make available to Saskatchewan citizens for housing the funds from their own Canada Pension Plan, that is loaned back to the Province by the Federal Government and make it available to these people at the same rate of interest that the Province pays for it.
- (c) to guarantee long-term investment loans designed for housing at a fixed interest rate.
- (d) to negotiate with the Federal Government income tax incentives for residential mortgage investment on the part of the investors.
- (e) to negotiate with the Federal Government the advance payment of mothers' allowances in a lump sum to be used as a down payment on low-income housing accommodation.

Mr. Speaker, the proper housing authority, providing the proper incentive or combination of subsidy and incentive, together with recognition of urban and rural needs of Saskatchewan, could develop housing for Saskatchewan citizens; could develop, if housing construction were on a quota basis, a permanent manufacturing and permanent employment for hundreds of Saskatchewan citizens.

Mr. Speaker, at the present time, the housing that is being built is so expensive that 27 per cent of the income being paid on a monthly basis forbids the purchasing of a house by the vast majority of working people in our province. The average income of the people purchasing homes in Saskatchewan last year, was around the \$7,500 mark. Central Mortgage and Housing regulations for purchase of a house, the plans for joint ownership, for rental, and the whole approach to housing by the Federal Government at the present times are impractical, unrealistic and do not provide accommodation for those who need it. They do not provide accommodation and do not reach them.

The Minister should look at our housing position in Canada. I come back to what I said when I began. He belongs to a party that controls the city council, that controls the Provincial Government, and controls our Federal Government. This situation

February 29, 1968

has never existed before. Every government at every level has the same political flavour. There is no political animosity, they are all working together, they are all the same group. The sky is the limit. They should be able to accomplish anything in this field. But what are the facts? There was less housing in Saskatchewan in 1966 than in 1965. There was less housing in Saskatchewan in 1967 than in 1966. The trend in Regina for the month of January, this year, shows another decrease. Mr. Speaker, even in Saskatoon where the starts in 1966, according to Central Mortgage and Housing, were 1,784, in 1967 they were 1,275. The Federal Government held a conference. The former Provincial Minister in charge of housing held a survey. I repeat, if any Members of this House wants to find out if there is a shortage of housing in Regina or Saskatoon, just put an advertisement in the paper: For rent – 3-bedroom bungalow, immediate possession. Give them your telephone number. They will phone you at all hours of the day or night. They will phone you from as far away as Vancouver, and they will come to see you and you will never know how they found you.

The situation is desperate and it is getting worse, not better. Let's look at it. Let's consider again. We are one of the most affluent countries in the world. We have a Federal Government that could, if it wanted to, mobilize money, research and staff; all our resources are at its disposal. The Provincial Government is prepared to make a guarantee for one \$65 million industry and I think this is a good idea. But here, I am talking about an industry that has a guaranteed market. Here is an industry that will use our own resources, human and material. Here is an industry that would eventually cut the cost of social welfare. And we are a province that is supposed to be one of the most affluent provinces in Canada. Mr. Speaker, either we don't do anything about housing, or we don't care about the plight of many of our citizens. We don't care about the experiences they are having, because of the shortage of housing. Perhaps if we play ostrich, the problem will just disappear.

Mr. Speaker, we have to tackle the problem. I have set out in some detail the causes of our housing situation; some proposals that we should try, that we should use to solve the problem that exists. I challenge the Government to get on with the job. There is a new Minister at Ottawa in charge of housing and a new Minister in Saskatchewan in charge of housing. If they can take the best experience from the past, and pick up the best ideas from the present, and developing a housing program that will meet the needs of our citizens, particularly the low-income citizens, then this Resolution will not have been in vain.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. H.H.P. Baker (Regina South East): — Mr. Speaker, I have a few comments that I would like to make at some later date, and I would therefore beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

RESOLUTION NO. 2 – GUARANTEED PRICES FOR FARM PRODUCE

Mr. F. Meakes (Touchwood) moved, second by Mr. W.J. Berezowsky (Prince Albert East-Cumberland):

That this Legislature urge the Provincial Government to immediately request the Federal Government to adopt an agricultural policy that would ensure financial return to provide an adequate standard of living to farmers by guaranteeing prices of farm commodities based on the cost of production and subject to yearly reviews; such prices to be announced early enough each year to allow farmers to plan their current operations.

He said: Mr. Speaker, when I sat down to word the motion that I am going to move, I deliberately worded it hoping that all Members of the House might support it. I did this for two reasons. One is that it is a very urgent matter, the state of agriculture; and secondly, I thought that possibly it might be of some assistance to my Hon. Friends across the way when they are going down to the convention next month. They might be able to persuade the Prime Minister to do something about the plight of agriculture in Western Canada and in particular in Saskatchewan. This is not aimed at one segment of agriculture, farming, but I am going to deal with both grain and livestock. I believe that both parts of this industry are in trouble. Really the question is rather simple. Is the average farmer today getting adequate prices for his work in relation to the rest of the citizens of our province? Is he getting adequate returns on his investment in relation to the other people in the province? Is he able to put by for old age or a rainy day enough to protect it. I looked around, Mr. Speaker, for evidence to build up my arguments and I turned to an article that I found in the Financial Post of May 14, 1966. This is an article by Mr. Gary Carlson, who is an agricultural extension representative on the staff of Saskatchewan Department of Agriculture. This was an article in which he reviews the net returns of a group of farmers banding them together and averages them out. It is a study of 430 farm businesses in detail.

First of all I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that the average investment for Saskatchewan farmers in 1965, was more than \$40,000. The net income average over a ten-year period, has been \$4,600. Now I would like to point out that if only half of the \$40,000 was on a 20-year loan at 5 per cent interest, the farmer would have only in the neighborhood of \$4,000 to spend on his family. ARDA has defined 35,000 Saskatchewan farms as of low income, that is, they sell less than \$3,750 of produce annually. An approximately guide is to assume that about half would be taken for cash operating costs and depreciation. This would leave on those farms a net income of around \$1,800 for the family to live on. Only about 10 per cent of all Saskatchewan farms have over two sections. Looking again at the figures of Mr. Carlson, the average grain-livestock farm of 480 acres provides

February 29, 1968

\$3,800, leaving only \$2,500 for family living over a 30-year period. For example, Mr. Speaker, a \$20,000 loan, amortized over a 30-year period at 5 per cent would mean a yearly payment of \$1,300, leaving only \$2,500 for family living over the 30-year period. What does this farmer receive for his labor? It is what is left after allowing 5 per cent on the investment. This means about \$2,400 a year.

I am going to quote a few of the things in Mr. Carlson's report. He says that the grain enterprises on the grain-livestock farms of 480 cultivated acres or less in the brown soil zone also revealed that costs were exceeding returns. Another thing that he pointed out was that the average total machinery investments as on the present value rather than the original cost, per cultivated acres for all farm management clubs was \$14.43 per acre. It goes on to say that the farm business summary revealed that total farm costs per cultivated acre showed very little change for farms larger than about two sections, in the brown and the dark brown soil zones, both for grain and grain-livestock farms. In the black soil zone where farms are generally smaller, the summary showed total farm costs in cash operating costs, still decreasing on farms of 800 cultivated acres or more in size.

Let us look at what has happened since 1965. And I will quote from the Leader Post of May 13, 1965, dealing with the figures of the Bureau of Statistics Report from Ottawa.

The Bureau reported, Wednesday, its index of commodities and services used by farmers, stood at 281.2 for January, up 4.9 index points from the comparative figure for January, 1964.

The Western Producer of December 15, 1966, says:

Saskatchewan farmers and farm management groups increased production by \$16,000 in 1965, compared with 1963, but ended up with \$400 less for their labor.

It indicates an increase in cost of \$2,000 over a period of three years for the average farm in the management group. Farm business summary for 1965 was based on the records of 405 farmers reported by Jack Drew, supervisor of the division. For example, he said:

Our farms showed an average investment of nearly \$77,000 compared to an estimate of an average investment of \$43,800 for all Saskatchewan farms.

Then just a year later on June 8, 1967, a report in the Star Phoenix headed, 'Farm Costs increased 5.2 per cent over 1966'. Cost facing Canadian farmers in January were 5.2 per cent higher than those of 12 months earlier. What is the problem, Mr. Speaker? Well, I think that an editorial in the Financial Post of December 24, 1966 makes it plain. Its headline is,

‘Money is the issue’.

It is plain that the Canadian farmers are fed to the teeth with their lot in Canada’s economic system. They are getting particularly bitter when critics suggest that more efficiency would solve their income problems.

The reason: In the post-war period, agriculture productivity has risen, on average, 5.5 per cent a year as against 4.1 for all commercial enterprise. But the persistent gap between labor income per capita in agriculture and in the rest of the economy, has not closed. The farmers in short, have been running faster than anyone else and managed to only stay in the same place.

The straight facts are that the cost of production have exceeded the income. Let us look at what has happened to the cost of machinery. In the Western Producer of March 25, 1965, Professor Van Fleet quoted. He calculated that farm machinery costs will annually consume 30 to 32 per cent of gross income and maybe 40 per cent on smaller farms. Why has machinery risen? Now I am going to quote from the Saskatchewan Economic Review which we just received the other day. Implement sales have risen. In 1957 there was \$41,568,000 worth of machinery sold in Saskatchewan. In 1966 there was \$137,017,000 worth of machinery sold in Saskatchewan – an increase of nearly \$100 million. Let us look at the cost of making machinery. Now quoting from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics figure. The cost-figure factors in the Canadian agricultural industry from 1962 to 1965 were: wages 21 per cent of the total cost of a machine in 1962, but reduced by 1965 to 17.2 per cent; salaries in 1962 were 8.2 per cent; but by 1962, reduced to 5.8 per cent; the total payroll, the total cost of labor and machine in 1962 was 30.2 per cent, but by 1965, Mr. Speaker, reduced to 23 per cent; cost of materials in 1962 was 56.1 per cent, but by 1965, it had gone up to a little less than 2.58 per cent. Looking at the Dominion Bureau of Statistics figures on farm machinery, the wholesale price index from 1956 to 1965 had risen from 100 in 1956 to 117.4 in 1965. Then why the higher prices, Mr. Speaker? Costs of labor had been reduced unit-wise; costs of material had gone up only a little bit.

Let us look at the 1965 Massey Ferguson Annual Report. From 1961 to 1965, Massey Ferguson increased sales by 56 per cent. The final profit figure in 1965-66, was up 13 per cent. Again prices rose in 1966, 1967, and 1968. Let us look at the profits again. In 1966, Massey Ferguson made \$49 million net. IN 1967, \$26 million net.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to go on to the cattle industry for a moment or two, if I may. I have here in my hand, a page out of the Free Press Prairie Farmer, dated February 7, 1968, in which they report on a cow-calf enterprise analysis released in Alberta. Mr. Speaker, I went to the trouble of sending for it to the Department of Agriculture in Alberta and I recommend it to all Members who are interested in agriculture, as there

are some startling figures in here. This analysis was based on a study of 98 herds in east and central Alberta. The report showed that with interest at 5 per cent on the enterprise investment, it showed a net return of \$19 per cow. The average gross return per cow was 19.5 per cent of equals \$101.06. This is the annual return per cow. The average total cost of keeping that cow was \$91.77. In other words, just about \$10 a cow of gross profit. Feed costs accounted for 57 per cent of total production costs. Two main factors that affected production per cow were weaning weights and the calf crop itself. The calf crop on the 98 enterprises was an average of 87.4 per cent, which averaged out at 441 pounds.

Several interesting things came out of this study. It showed that, as size of enterprise increased, the gross returns per cow increased and total costs per cow decreased. Labor earnings and labor efficiency were better on larger enterprises than smaller ones. An estimate based on data obtained in both the 1965 and 1966 analyses showed that approximately 175 cows were needed to make a return to labor and management of \$3,000 and a 5 per cent return of enterprise investment. Even though the average returns to labor and management were higher in 1966, 20 per cent of the enterprises studied sustained a loss. The Department of Agriculture, when they picked these 98 farms, chose the farms for their accuracy and completeness of records. In other words they were checking, in this survey, only the men or enterprises that were operating in a complete business-like manner.

Now, Mr. Speaker, these few figures that I have put before the House, it seems to me, show: 1. that for both grain and cattle, agriculture is sick; 2. that I don't think that any Provincial Government can cure these ills, and I am not aiming my remarks at the Members to the right. But I say this, if farmers are to survive, we must have action. Either the prices of production must be rolled back or the prices of the produce must go up. Agriculture in my mind, Mr. Speaker, must be subsidized. I think that we have plenty of precedents for this. Governments in the past – and I am not at this point being critical – have subsidized manufacturing with tariffs. So, Mr. Speaker, I say that, if agriculture is to be a healthy and vibrant force in our society, these things must be done. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that this Resolution may be supported unanimously.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. W.J. Berezowsky (Prince Albert East-Cumberland): — Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to be able to stand up in my seat and speak on behalf of all the farmers that I represent. I am sure that all Members in this House will have something to say, because many of them at least on our side of the House, do represent rural communities. We find that the agricultural industry, as pointed out by my colleague (Mr. Meakes) who has just spoken, is sick. I will not speak for a long time, but in

the short time that I do intend to speak, I would like to point out some of the reasons why I think that agriculture is sick and urge that something must be done to correct the situation.

In spite of the fact that governments have encouraged higher production in the farm sector of our economy and the use of better and more efficient farming methods, yet the industry as a whole has been suffering deterioration. I think this is generally recognized. The loss of world markets or lack of world markets simply means that grain is not being sold at the best possible price. It also means that surpluses remain in our elevator systems and in our farm granaries. The lack of guaranteed prices simply means that the agriculture industry is in effect on the verge of bankruptcy and something must be done by governments, which are presumably servants of the people, to correct this situation. Farmers must recover somehow the cost of production and, in situations such as this, no amount of incentives or bonuses to increase production appears to be of any particular value – I am speaking to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) – I know he has a difficult job. The surpluses mount but the prices go down. The ultimate result is that the farmers must seek some other means of livelihood to survive. This is why so many in my part of the country have taken to the woods, as the Minister from Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) mentioned in another debate. Many have taken jobs in industry and moved into the cities to find work with pay in order to survive. I think it is a sad thing when you travel across the northern part of Saskatchewan and see old homes, where people lived, raised families, being empty today. I may have said on a former occasion, and I say again now, that north of my community in Meath Park that is about half a township of land we find only two or three farmers remaining and the rest are gone, and with them of course you have the problems that they brought into the cities and to the urban communities. I do not think that the large landowner has suffered to the same extent, but I am certain that the farm incomes of the one or the other have gone down. It may be true that in some parts of Saskatchewan farms have not felt the pinch, as they have felt it in my part.

Until very recently and even now, farmers were being challenged to increase production by governments, by this Government and by other people. This, of course, was understandable because conditions were favorable for the farmer for some time, at least in the last five years or so. Investment in our country was strong, employment was good and money was easily available. There was a good demand for food and primary products at the time. Nevertheless farm incomes were low simply because costs have increased and the farmers have no control over that. Production was increased and had to be increased, so we bought fertilizers, sprays and other necessities for the farm. We had to increase capital costs in order to be more efficient, we had to borrow money, and all of this cost the farmer a considerable amount of effort. The markets of the USSR and China were unusually large for a time and they were encouraging from 1963 to 1967. I don't know what it is going to be like in the future. None of us really knows, but they are taking less wheat

February 29, 1968

now. With high production and those good markets farmers were in an optimistic environment, and with what appeared to be a sympathetic government in Ottawa, we felt that there might be some hope of improvement, particularly in that part of the country where we went into the oil-seed production, such as rape. It was very encouraging until the price of rape went down to a point where it is not profitable to grow rape anymore. Now this optimism, as you can see, Mr. Speaker, has disappeared with low prices and apparently low production and lack of markets. This pertains not only in the production of grain but also in livestock, and in poultry and in eggs.

I will remind the Hon. Members here that I said on previous occasions that our farmers to a great extent depend on cream and upon eggs for livelihood. How can they make a livelihood when the assistance is now being removed from cream, unless they are large enough producers? As for the small farmers, who need to sell eggs, about the best they can expect at the present time is 15 cents a dozen. You can buy eggs in my community right now for about 15 or 18 cents a dozen, whereas it costs about 35 cents a dozen just to pay the cost of production. This is a very deplorable state of affairs, particularly in my area.

So it is obvious that there has been evident suffering among small farmers for a long time. I have said so in this House for a number of years. The larger owners and producers who have ready access to lending institutions only now are beginning to realize that they too are far from being in as profitable a situation as they thought they were. Now I don't usually go into many figures because I think the facts speak for themselves, but I notice a report very recently in the press, I have it here. It gives a false impression to the public of Canada, and I think it is our job in the Legislature to try and correct this kind of impression. This is what it says in this report. I presume the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) is quite aware of it, it was in the Star Phoenix sometime ago. It says: "More for fewer." This is true, but it leaves a wrong impression because it only refers to gross farm income. Now I will read the whole paragraph; it's not very long.

More for fewer. Gross farm income in 1968 is expected to be \$100 million more than the estimated \$4 billion, 400 million earned in 1967, according to Federal and Provincial agricultural officials. Figures show the number of farms has decreased to 422,000 in 1967, from 623,000 in 1951.

You should do something about that, Mr. Minister. We used to be criticized about this kind of thing. Really I don't think it is your fault anymore than it was the fault of the former CCF Government, I think it is the fault of the system of the whole outlook of Liberal Governments that bring about such conditions. Now I go on and read:

Estimate for 1968 is that another 12,000 will disappear.

This is very important. It looks like we are really going out of the business of farming.

Officials say most of the increased revenue is eaten up by the purchase of new machinery and by higher costs of land and credit.

This is something no doubt other Members will discuss, and so I am not going to go into that. It does point out what is happening to farmers and yet leaves the impression, "Oh, boy. The farmers are going to make \$100 million more than they made in 1967." Well, I would like the Hon. Members to just take a pencil and take this average of 422,000 farmers and divide them into \$4 billion, 400 million, you'll find that the average income is only \$10,300. This includes, of course, the very large farmers and it includes the very small farmers. Up in our country we have very few farmers that have that kind of a gross income; it is much less. It is my experience with their income tax when they deduct depreciation, I find that many of them, including myself, are running into deficits. Now you can't go very far with deficits. Take a few years and you have to move out. This, I think, is the main and real reason why so many of our people have moved off the farms. And of course they must get jobs in pulp mills or wherever they can.

It is obvious that even with this \$100 million because of increased price of things, that farmers must have such things as fertilizer and sprays as well as high interest rates from the bank, so that actually their net income could be less. I wouldn't be surprised if there would be very little left for the farmers in Saskatchewan after they are through selling their grain and cattle or whatever else they may sell. And so it's no wonder, Mr. Speaker, that the Saskatchewan Farmers' Union has said the same thing, that rising costs of production have created the dilemma for farmers.

They have urged the Government to do something to overcome the economic ills in the agricultural industry which affect us. No wonder that ARDA estimates that 60 per cent of Canadian farms are below poverty level. Now you take that, don't accept my word for it. We hear all kinds of figures, and we find all kinds of experts telling us that farmers are doing well, that they are well off. Take the figures, as I say, from ARDA and you will find a comment in the Free Press on January 17th. It is quite a headline – 'ARDA Estimates 60 Per Cent of Canadian Farms are Below Poverty Level.' Now where does poverty begin when 60 per cent are below poverty level? That's why I say, when Members here get their facts, I don't think that one of them would object to voting for this Resolution asking the Federal Government to do something about guaranteed prices for farmers. If you add to this, of course, that the farmers' grain deliveries are down by about 38 per cent according to press reports, it becomes understandable why another 12,000 farmers are going to leave farming in this coming year. This is a sad situation indeed.

February 29, 1968

Now a few more facts just in case there are still some doubting Thomases, I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that according to this Government's estimates, a farmer would have to have about 75 steers a year to make \$1,000. I refer you to Saskatchewan Farm Outlook for 1966 – I believe I'm correct. Of course if I am not the Minister can correct me and tell me what these figures mean. We have them here and I could just run over them very briefly. It points out that in a cow-calf enterprise, eight calves per cow, you would have to have 50 cows on a farm to make \$1,000. To make say \$5,000, which is about the average income for people expected today, you would have to have 250 cows on your farm. We don't have these kind of farms up in our part of the country. We have average of 20 or 30 cows at the best. Take a cattle-feeding enterprise. Feeding 140 days, to make \$1,000 requires 70 to 75 steers. Hon. Members can read this for themselves. Again how many steers to you have to have to make \$5,000? Then you can go on and take the figures for hogs, food, milk and cream. To return \$1,000 to labor requires 20 to 25 cows at peak prices. In other words I would have to milk 20 to 25 cows to make \$1,000, I would have to milk 100 cows to make \$5,000. This is something that the average public doesn't quite realize, the difficulties that the farm population is in. The sheep industry is not any better. I like the idea of sheep. I've heard the Minister was trying to get people to go into sheep raising because they say that it is the most profitable. But how profitable is it? The Minister's own report says to make \$1,000 to labor requires some 290 to 310 ewes, unless his figures are wrong. And what about egg production? Well to make \$1,000 you have to have from 1,200 to 1,600 layers and that would be selling eggs at around 30 or 35 cents. What about the farmer up there in the north that only gets 15 or 18 cents right now when eggs are yet scarce? Later on they will be selling for 8 cents a dozen. These are problems we face. The question is: what are we going to do about it? I think we have come to a point that we must ask the rest of Canada to share in this very, very tragic situation, or there will be no economic survival of the farmers as we know them. I say to my private enterprise friends opposite that, if private enterprise Governments continue to uphold the theory of supply and demand as they do, then they must see to it that subsidies or some kind of guarantees are paid to farmers. If farm costs go up and up and up and with no controls of any kind, then you will have to see that guaranteed incomes of some kind are assured farmers, or the industry as we know it will completely disappear. I can tell you this and I can warn you about it that, when the small farmers and middle-sized farmers disappear, then you and the people of this country, the consumers, are really going to cry out because you won't buy eggs for 25, 30 or 40 cents a dozen. You won't buy butter at 67 or 72 cents a pound. You won't buy cheap beef and pork or anything else. You will pay the price the big corporations want, which will then tell you how much to pay, and it will be based on the price which is going to be not on a loss, as it is today, but on a profit basis. Then the people of Canada will cry out! I suggest another reason. Whether you believe in private enterprise or not, in order to

safeguard your own self you should support this Motion and ask the Dominion Government to do something about the request.

There is an imbalance between production of wheat, poultry, hogs and cattle. The Minister has argued that we should shift over from one to another or get into more mixed farming, in order that we may come out in the black. Well, even so I don't think it's possible anymore, because that is exactly what we have been doing. Some of the farmers from our part of the country have been in mixed farming. When they find that they can't make it on hogs or poultry or other efforts, they go back to producing wheat. When you take these same figures, you find that you can still make \$1,000 on an income on the basis of about 200 acres of wheat, and so everybody is going into wheat. Where we will end up I don't know. This is all I really wanted to say today. There will be other speakers I am sure who will say it better than I can, but I will urge every Members of this House to give serious thought to the agricultural situation and to remember that the agricultural economy is really sick. It is doubtful if we can pull out of it, unless the Federal Government steps in to do what is expected of any government to do and that is, to guarantee farmers a decent income. If course, I will support the Motion which I seconded.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. J. Messer (Kelsey): — Mr. Speaker, this Resolution is important. Because the Province relies heavily on agriculture for a stable and economic position, and also because under the present conditions the farmer is economically and agriculturally not well-off, I would like to speak on this Motion but at a later date. Consequently I now beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

ADJOURNED DEBATE

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. W.G. Davies (Moose Jaw South for Return No. 10 showing:

Whether married women employees are permitted, under the Pension Benefit Act and Regulations, the option of securing a refund of pension contributions upon termination of their employment.

Hon. L.P. Coderre (Minister of Labour): — Mr. Speaker, in regard to this question I wish to add thereto the following in order to clarify the question more completely:

Where a married woman does not have the option of securing a total refund of pension contributions upon termination of her employment:

- (1) The interest she obtains in the employer's contribution to the pension plan?
- (2) Whether she can receive as a cash refund any portion of the value of both her own and the employer's contributions?

I move this amendment, Mr. Speaker, seconded by Hon. Mr. Grant (Minister of Health).

Mr. W.G. Davies (Moose Jaw South): — Mr. Speaker, just a question of order here. This appears, as far as I can see, to be a new sentence. The amendment is that this be added. Now it seems to me that it here appears as a sentence, and if it appears as a sentence it is not a proper amendment at all. You would have to strike out the period, I presume, add a semicolon and go on with the words that are included in the amendment. But to include it as a separate sentence I suggest to you would make the amendment out of order.

Mr. Speaker: — Now just a minute, the Clerk has amended a portion of this and I will read the Motion to you as it would read if it was amended:

Whether married women employees are permitted, under the Pension Benefit Act and Regulations, the option of securing a refund of pension contributions upon securing a refund of pension contributions upon termination of their employment.

Now we will start at the amendment.

Where a married woman does not have the option of securing a total refund of pension contributions upon termination of her employment:

- (1) The interest she obtains in the employer's contribution to the pension plan.
- (2) Whether she can receive as a cash refund any portion of the value of both her own and the employer's contributions.

Now I think the amendment is relative to the Motion. If striking out the word "what" and putting in the word "the" and putting an "s", and in the final subsection 2 taking out "can she" and inserting the words "whether she can", if that is the meaning of the Member that moved the Motion in the amended matter, I find the amendment is in order. Do you want me to read it again?

Mr. Davies: — No, Mr. Speaker. I find some difficulty, as I think you may have had initially, in comprehending just what the amendment wanted to do.

Motion as amended agreed to.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Hon. G.B. Grant (Minister of Public Health) that Bill No. 2 – **An Act to establish the Alcoholism Commission of Saskatchewan** be now read a second time.

Mr. G.T. Snyder (Moose Jaw North): — Mr. Speaker, when I adjourned the debate on second reading a week ago tonight, I hadn't had the opportunity to study the Bill in any detail. Since that time I have had the opportunity to read through it and I see no particular reason why it shouldn't receive the endorsement of those of us who sit on this side of the House. There are a number of features of the Bill that are not particularly clear to me, probably because of my limited knowledge of law, but I believe that these matters can be best dealt with in Committee when we get into clause by clause discussion. An additional comment that I would make at this time, Mr. Speaker, is to repeat the warning that this piece of legislation runs counter to the proposal mentioned in the Throne Speech that provisions would be made to provide for the advertising of beer and wine in Saskatchewan new media during this session. With an eye to consistent approach to what was described in this Throne Speech as "a critical social problem" I find it difficult to believe, Mr. Speaker, that the Members can support both pieces of legislation in good conscience. To support the Bill that is before us, I suggest, is to recognize a problem and a social ill; to support the other I suggest is to ignore it. The legislation before us, I believe, represents an enlightened approach to the promotion of research into preventative programs, treatment, rehabilitation, counselling and information services. As I understand the Bill, Mr. Speaker, it may establish, conduct, manage and operate clinics for the treatment and observation of alcoholics. It may enter into agreement with hospitals, with universities, schools and other institutions for the purpose of research and treatment. It may make grants to institutions for the purpose of providing these services. I am happy to support the Bill in principle, Mr. Speaker, and I expect my colleagues on this side of the House will be likewise. I commend the Minister for taking this initial step to create this body. However, it must be observed that to provide the services described in the Bill is to reconcile the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) to part with sufficient cold, hard cash to assure that this Bill is not just another piece of legislation on Saskatchewan Statute Books. Too often in the past, in recent years in particular, Mr. Speaker, we have seen statutes provided in the Province of Saskatchewan, we've seen money voted in the Estimates only to find a year later, Mr. Speaker, that this money has largely gone unspent for the purpose for which it was provided. So I suggest, if the next step is made in a meaningful way, that is, the provision of sufficient money to carry on a meaningful program, that this measure represents a useful and commendable approach, and I'll be happy to support the Bill in principle, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. W.E. Smishek (Regina North East): — Mr. Speaker, I want to make just a few observations. I join with my colleague in endorsing in principle the Bill that is before us. When we look at the problem of alcoholism, we all realize that it affects big people and small people. It's a problem that affects both men and women, the wage earners and farmers, managers and janitors, no matter what group of people. We know that in the North American continent, we know that in Canada, we know that in the Province of Saskatchewan the problem is on the increase year by year. I want to remind this House that the former Government did take some useful measures by establishing a Bureau of Alcoholism. The Bureau did a lot of excellent work and I would like to pay tribute to the people employed by this Bureau, who gave leadership in studying the problem and proposing some solution.

The idea of a commission is perhaps an appropriate way of approaching the problem but it is also important, Mr. Speaker, for us to establish a commission that is going to be composed of people who are interested in the problem facing our community. And it is also important, Mr. Speaker, to make sure that that commission is going to have adequate funds to do the job required.

When we look at the profits that are made by the Liquor Commission, some \$21 million and compare it with the paltry sum that was allotted in the past to the Bureau of Alcoholism to do research work and to put into being effective public education programs, it is, I submit, somewhat of an indictment of our society that we are interested in the profit from the liquor, but we are not prepared to spend any money to speak of in curing the problem that liquor creates. The people we owe a great deal of debt to, who have been doing a good job are the AAs. To them, a good deal of credit is due.

So for these reasons, Mr. Speaker, we will be prepared to support the Bill in principle. I think there are certain individual sections that need some clarification and perhaps strengthening. But in principle we do endorse it. We will be particularly interested in making sure that the commission, which is appointed, will be a commission representative of people from all walks of life.

I know that within the ranks of the trade union movement this problem has received a fair bit of attention. We have been trying to work with industry on the problem. We know that alcoholism is a cause, in many cases, of loss of employment. I don't believe that any employer who finds employees with this kind of a problem believes that dismissals are necessarily the answer, although I appreciate the employer's problem. But at this stage unfortunately very few people, very few industries have given attention to establishing cures for the problem. I know that many employees have this problem. It is also recognized within the managerial groups that the percentage of alcoholics is much greater than within the wage-earner group. I do hope

that the Minister will invite labor and management on the commission that may be appointed.

At the same time while I'm supporting the Bill in principle, Mr. Speaker, I would like to also pay tribute to one man in the Province of Saskatchewan, who a few years ago convened a conference in this province where a broad study was given to this problem of alcoholism. I refer to David Cass-Beggs then the General Manager of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. Since that first conference convened in this province under his leadership we have been receiving more information and perhaps doing a little more about it than previously. So in principle, Mr. Speaker, again I support the Bill.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Debate adjourned.

SECOND READINGS

Hon. G.B. Grant (Minister of Public Health) moved second reading of Bill No. 1 – **An Act to amend The Vital Statistics Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, this Bill contains some minor amendments relating to procedures to be carried out by the Director of Vital Statistics because of the person having changed his or her name. Section 21 of the Act now provides for appropriate notations to be made on the birth and marriage records of any person whose name has been changed under The Change of Name Act. The Change of Name Act of this Province came into force May 1, 1933. Prior to that time, persons changed their name by deed poll. There's presently no provision in The Vital Statistics Act for notations to be made on the birth and marriage records of a person whose name had been changed by deed poll in Saskatchewan prior to May 1, 1933. We had been requested to make legislative provision in this regard and we have concluded that amendments for this purpose are indicated to accommodate the occasional person who may have changed his name prior to May 1, 1933, but who is presently unable to obtain a birth and marriage certificate containing his name as changed. In these cases the name set out on any birth certificate, issued by the Vital Statistics Division, can cause practical difficulties for the person involved. In the past, the Vital Statistics Division has considered the making of notations of a change in name on its birth and marriage records as being discretionary. The amendment, providing for the making of these notations by the Vital Statistics Division to be discretionary rather than mandatory, is being proposed so that the provisions of the Act will be consistent with the actual practice. The revision of clause B of subsection I of Section 21 is being proposed for clarification purposes only. Proof of the change of name could not be sent by the Director of Vital Statistics outside Canada, because he would usually not know the office or person to whom the proof should be sent. The revision merely clarifies the point that

February 29, 1968

proof of change of name is to be sent out of the province by the Director, only where the person who has changed his name was born or married in another part of Canada.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

Hon. D.V. Heald (Attorney General) moved second reading of Bill No. 4 — **An Act to amend The Companies Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, I think, in explaining the principle of this amendment, I could do no better than to read a letter which I received from Mr. R. James Balfour, who is chairman of the Legal Committee of the Canadian Petroleum Association, Saskatchewan Division, which gives the explanation for this amendment.

The Legal Committee of the Canadian Petroleum Association, of which I am Saskatchewan Chairman, has requested that I bring to your attention the necessity for an amendment to The Companies Act to bring it into line with certain realities of the oil business. Section 4 of The Companies Act prohibits an association of more than 20 persons from carrying on any business having gain as its object, unless it is incorporated under the Act. Unitization agreements, as commonly used in the oil industry, have the effect of creating associations which often have more than 20 members. It is the opinion of our committee that such groups carry on business for gain and therefore are in breach of the provisions of the Act.

Similar remedial provisions have been enacted in Alberta and British Columbia, and they enclosed a copy of the British Columbia amendment which appears to fully cover the situation. Because the continued activities of such unitized operations in Saskatchewan might be jeopardized by this illegality, the industry would appreciate an amendment being passed here. This amendment, Mr. Speaker, accomplishes what has been requested by the oil industry.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:25 o'clock p.m.