

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
First Session — Sixteenth Legislature
28th Day

Monday, March 25, 1968

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

WELCOME TO VISITORS

MR. J.J. CHARLEBOIS (Saskatoon City Park-University): — Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to draw to the attention of all Hon. Members to a fine group of students seated in the west gallery. They are boys and girls from the Wilson school which is situated in Saskatoon City Park-University constituency. They are here under the direction of their teacher, Mr. Balzer. I am sure that all Members wish to join with me in extending to them a very warm welcome to the Legislature of our province and we wish them a very safe journey home.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. D.V. HEALD (Lumsden): — Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure this afternoon through you to extend a welcome of all Hon. Members, I am sure, to 28 students being the grade seven and eight classes from the Village of Pense, a thriving community in my constituency. They are accompanied here this afternoon by their teacher, Mr. Berger and by their fathers who have driven them in, Mr. Downs, Mr. Brunskill, Mr. Jensen, Rev. Miller, Mr. Straub and Mr. Seaberly. This is an annual event, Mr. Speaker, for the students from the Pense school. I know that you would want me to extend on your behalf and on behalf of all Hon. Members, our best wishes to them. They have had an enjoyable day so far, and I know that they are eagerly looking forward to this exercise in democracy which they are about to witness this afternoon. I know that you would want me to wish them a safe journey home.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. H.H.P. BAKER (Regina South East): — Mr. Speaker, I would also like to introduce a group of fine young students from Douglas Park school, grade seven and eight. They are accompanied here by their teachers and their principal, Mr. Young. This school comes here regularly each year and I am sure it is because of the fine direction that they get from their principal. Douglas Park school is one of our newer schools and is in a very fine residential area. I hope that they will enjoy their stay here this afternoon and learn much from the deliberations here and that their coming here will be most fruitful in their activities in their various grades. With that, I add a warm welcome to them on behalf of the Legislature.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: — I would like to introduce to all Members a fine group of students in the Speaker's gallery from the town of Churchbridge, under the very able direction of their principal,

March 25, 1968

Mr. Kania and with their bus drivers and others. I am sure that all Members wish to join with me in extending them a very sincere warm welcome to this Legislature in expressing their wish that their stay here will be enjoyable and educational and that they will have a safe trip home.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: — I do further draw your attention to a group of students, eight in number and two others, under the auspices of the Chamber of Commerce, in Ritchie, Montana. I am sure that all Members would wish also to extend to them a very warm welcome to the Legislature in the Province of Saskatchewan. We ask them to carry our best wishes back to the self-governing state of Montana.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

A MESSAGE FROM HIS HONOUR THE LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR

MR. SPEAKER: — The Lieutenant Governor transmits further Estimates of certain sums required for the service of the Province, for the 12 months ending March 31, 1969. And further supplementary Estimates of certain sums required for the service of the Province for the 12 months ending March 31, 1968, and recommends the same to the Legislative Assembly.

HON. D.G. STEUART: (Provincial Treasurer): — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Thatcher that:

His Honour's message and the further Estimates and the further supplementary Estimates be referred to the Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE

HON. W. R. THATCHER (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I give notice that on Wednesday next, I shall move a motion to provide for adjournment of the House on Tuesday, April 2nd at 10 p.m. to the following Monday, 10 a.m. April 8th. The purpose of this motion of course is to permit certain Members on this side of the Legislature to attend the National Liberal Convention. The Leader of the Opposition has indicated, I think, that he would have no objection to such a motion.

MR. W.S. LLOYD (Leader of the Opposition): — Is this trip necessary?

MR. THATCHER: — And an even more pleasant motion, Mr. Speaker, I would move that on Wednesday next, a motion which will provide for morning sittings hopefully from Thursday, March 28th until the end of the session. This side of the House, or at least quite a number on this side of the House, would also be quite willing to sit Saturdays from now on. We are a bit concerned by the progress that we have been making so far. We still have passed

no Estimates and we yet have two-thirds of the Bills to scrutinize. Mr. Speaker, we are hoping that the Committees which are left can complete their work by Wednesday. If they must sit beyond Wednesday possibly they might sit at the same time that the House is meeting.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. L.P. Coderre that Bill No. 13 — **An Act to amend the Fire Prevention Act** be now read a second time.

MR. W.G. DAVIES (Moose Jaw South): — Mr. Speaker, I have a few brief remarks to make with respect to this Bill. The amendments, first of all, appear to seek a more extensive authority than at present, to do those things that are necessary to bring about a more effective Fire Prevention Program in the province. No one on this side of the House will quarrel with that objective.

Part of the Bill deals with the rights of members of fire departments or other authorized personnel to enter buildings where a fire is in progress or where one has occurred, in the language of the Act, or in buildings or land pertinent thereto. Now, Mr. Speaker, without doing more at this time than to refer to this phrase, I would personally like to have the Minister take another look at this part. Surely some reference should be included to confine the areas that are inspected to goals where the inspections are actually undertaken in nearby buildings and lands where the inspectors may reasonably suspect fire dangers. The words of "pertinent thereto" may mean what they say, which implies that the inspection would be made if thought necessary, only if the buildings were adjunct to that where a fire is taking place or has taken place. Mr. Speaker, it may also mean inspection of all buildings say in a residential block. I am not disagreeing with anything at this point. I would simply want to discover what powers are actually being given in this part of the Bill.

Mr. Speaker, I am troubled by that portion of the Bill which states that no action can be taken against either a municipality or an individual in his public or private capacity for a broad range of acts that are done in the course of fire fighting or in fire inspection. I think that I would be in general agreement that the individual should be protected from legal actions of all kinds which are taken against him by reason of things that were done in the reasonable and I underline that word, performance of his duties. I would like to know, Mr. Speaker, what is meant by private capacity and why is this reference included at all in the Bill.

More serious perhaps is the prohibition against actions directed at municipalities. Does this mean that a private citizen has no recourse where there seems to be some valid reason for the exercise of this right? Why, Mr. Speaker, no action? After all the courts of the province should be competent to assess the worth or otherwise, of the citizen's claim. I say, why rob the citizen of his rights in this connection? Mr. Speaker, these matters should be explained by the Minister when we vote on the Bill this afternoon, if indeed we do vote on it this afternoon. We certainly, and I repeat this, do not

March 25, 1968

have objections to the aims of the Bill, but I believe that he should give us an explanation about the areas that I have raised here briefly.

Mr. Speaker, the Bill also provides an additional regulatory power by the Cabinet. I would also like to know what precisely is intended by the extended powers. The powers would include the naming of a co-ordinator of Fire Emergency Services. Does this position have a relationship to the emergency Measures Organization or what does the Government intend in this whole regard.

The powers of the Cabinet have also been extended to appoint a Fire Advisory Council and to the prescribing of their duties and powers. And I think that we need to know more about this as well, Mr. Speaker. As a general rule, I think the creation of any such council should be stipulated in a separate section, not off-handedly in regulations as it proposed to do here. It should say something explicit about the kind of council and about the duties of the council. Mr. Speaker, we are asked here this afternoon to give the Cabinet a blank cheque in the appointment of a most important provincial body, and I think that the Minister owes us this afternoon some further explanation here as well.

Now actually, Mr. Speaker, we can go into more detailed examination and questions in Committee. I would think, though, at this point that some further elaboration by the Minister might well speed our work on the Bill when it does arrive in Committee.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. A.E. BLAKENEY (Regina Centre): — Mr. Speaker, I simply wanted to draw to the Minister's attention the new Section 6A, subsection 2, and to indicate to him that when the Bill gets into Committee of the Whole, I will be asking some questions with respect to the principles contained in that section and their effect on insurance. As I read the Bill, if three houses were in a line and the house in the middle was burning, and the one on the south end didn't have insurance the fire-fighters might break into the house on the south end in order to fight the fire in the middle house and the poor fellow who owned the house on the south end would perhaps not be able to collect from the insurers. His house is not on fire and apparently any cause of action, which he might have had against the insurers of the middle house, has been barred. Now logically the person to pay for the loss is the insurer of the middle house, the burning house, because he got all the benefit of the actions taken by the fire-fighters. I may not be reading the Bill correctly. I simply want to give the Minister notice of the fact that this sort of question will be raised in Committee of the Whole.

HON. L.P. CODERRE (Minister of Labour): — Mr. Speaker, in respect to the question of the proposed new Section 2, subsection A, in the absence of any particular by-law there are no statutory provisions authorizing firemen to enter buildings to extinguish fires except under common law. Where fires occur whereby the owner or the occupant may have wilfully set fire for fraudulent purposes or otherwise or being of unsound mind or some other reasons, and objects to or hinders

a fireman from gaining entry to the burning building, there are no provisions for firemen to properly perform their duties. And our firemen have had situations like that at times. As for the latter question raised by the Hon. Member for Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney), there are also cases where the buildings or the contents of the building are not insured or the building may be unoccupied and the alarm is turned in by a neighbor. Consequently the firemen are in doubt as to their legal rights and feel that they may be held liable for water damage. You can very well imagine a house unoccupied, or one with the contents not insured, and there is a fire in progress, so except under common law they have no right to enter it. In order to prevent the spread of the fire, they should enter that building in order to put it out. The fact that there is no insurance, it is conceivable that under the law that they could sue for damages for water damages although it might have been only a small fire. This is the purpose of this and the Fire Chiefs Association have requested this because they have encountered situations like that in the past.

In regard to the last proposed section, I think that most of these matters can be best dealt with in Committee. This is an addition to the regulation-making authority of the Lieutenant Governor in Council and it provides for a co-ordinator who would co-ordinate provincial fire fighting facilities during a wide-spread conflagration. At the moment there are no fire plans.

These matters, I think, can be dealt with much more clearly in Committee. I think that they are quite self-explanatory in that respect.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. L.P. Coderre that Bill No. 24 — **An Act to amend The Workmen's Compensation (Accident Fund) Act** be now read a second time.

MR. W.G. DAVIES (Moose Jaw South): — Mr. Speaker, as I read this Bill it intends to effect increases for certain pensioners of the Compensation Board, to raise the earning level on which the 75 per cent compensation payments are calculated, to extend the payment periods for dependants who are receiving education and to raise the minimum amount paid for permanent and total disability for those who are under Workmen's Compensation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, to the extent that these remedies are improvements, we on this side of the House are glad to support them. Without straying from the rule and discussing in detail each pertinent section, I must say, however, that we regret that the payment changes that are stated in the Bill are far, far, too meagre, that is, having regard particularly to the sharply increased living costs of recent years. As one simple example, upping the widow's pension from \$110 to \$115 per month, that is by a paltry \$5.00, is surely not beginning to recognize the escalating prices that have occurred since the last increases were made in these allowances, in 1962. I suggest to the Minister that they should be at least three times the amount of increase that he has shown in the Bill.

Mr. Speaker, the Bill might also have raised the ceiling on income to at least \$7,000 and the \$600 figure, reflecting

March 25, 1968

again six years of experience, is hardly enough having regard to all the realities. While we will be most happy to vote for any increase - and these are often small when they come from the Minister - I would like to ask the Minister to consider House amendments by which the general trend of allowance raises and the income ceiling are increased from those that are shown.

Now the second main observation that I have to make this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, is that the Government has been remiss in its responsibilities in overseeing the Compensation Act. The Act provides for a four-year review of the operations of the legislation and also its administration. That review - the last one took place in 1963 - should have occurred in 1967. However, the Government is only acting now in the fifth year, to create the Committee of Review that should have been made last year. By the time the Committee that the Minister says he has constituted, has done its work and made its report, six years will have gone by and the Government will not have had the benefit of its advice until that time.

Mr. Speaker, the Bill to me has the hasty earmarks of the Government trying to take some very limited action to escape criticism for not having had a Committee of Review sit last year to elaborate proper recommendations, which then could have been the foundation on which the Government this year brought amendments to the Act before the House. Now, certainly, Mr. Speaker, if the Government had obeyed the requirements of the Compensation Act by instituting a Review in the fourth year, we should be in a much better position to discuss the Bill before us. I say that under the circumstances the Government must accept censure.

Mr. Speaker, it could also be assumed that the Government, in drafting the Bill in front of us, would have secured up-to-date information on pension matters as they pertained to the Compensation Board and its administration. However, in view of recent correspondence that has been referred to me, it must be doubted that the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) would have been provided with such information if he did indeed ask for it from the Board. Now I think that Members all over this House will agree that pension facts, compensation facts, would have helped us in our consideration of this Bill. Certainly it would have helped us in the consideration of the matters that are integral to the Bill. The Chairman of the Compensation Board, for example, has recently stated in writing that the Board was not in a position to answer queries regarding the year 1967 for legitimate requests for information on the following, and I am going to make reference to these, Mr. Speaker: (a) the number of persons permanently disabled who are receiving pensions (Compensation pensions); (b) the number of widows and dependants on pension in the province; (c) the number of pensions paid to permanently disabled persons (ranging from \$500 to \$3,500); (d) the average age of pensioners in these pension brackets; (e) the number of pensioners who received aid through rehabilitation, training, upgrading and the total cost for all of this work concerned; (f) the number of workers covered by Workmen's Compensation in Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, I ask you to note this one, that the Board is not only unwilling, but unable, to provide the simple information on how many working people in Saskatchewan are covered by Workmen's Compensation. (g) the number of workmen covered by Compensation in each of the assessed classes that the Board has to deal with; (h) the number of plant safety committees in Saskatchewan; (i) the number of such committees with employee representation appointed by employers

and trade unions; (j) the figures showing the number involved in rehabilitation; (k) the number of those returning to pre-accident occupations who were placed in other employment in consequence; (l) who were found to be unemployable; (m) who received training on the job or through schools or cases which are still pending. Finally, the Board does not have information on the increase or the decrease in the accident rate in each assessed class under the Compensation Board. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that these are relevant facts which the Minister should have, which the Board should certainly have set out to get and which to my knowledge have been refused in writing by the present Chairman of the Compensation Board.

So I ask, Mr. Speaker, this afternoon, how can the Minister, let alone the Members of this House, take a Bill of the kind before us for serious consideration when the bare facts on pensions are not available. I have complained about this before and I ask; when is the Minister going to take the steps that are plainly indicated to see that the Board undertakes the production of statistics and information beyond the very meagre and sparse facts that we get in the Board's Annual Report? In an operation that last year spent \$8,721,000, the failure to be able to supply the type of information requested is, I think, absolutely shocking.

Now, to just briefly review my position here, Mr. Speaker. We will support the Bill. We would though like to see the Minister revise some of the payments in it, in an upward direction, for all of the reasons that I have suggested. We would hope that the whole question of Compensation Pensions should be reviewed on the basis of facts which the Board should be asked to produce just as soon as possible. And may I say before sitting down, Mr. Speaker, that the Committee of Review, we are told by the Minister, will be sitting sometime later this year. I would say that he has an excellent opportunity to convey this kind of request to it immediately.

MR. CODERRE (Minister of Labour): — It is not ironic, Mr. Speaker, that every time that my Socialist friends across the floor get up and speak about legislation that they are going to support, they like to offer the moon. They've had 20 years to do some of the work that they now suggest we do, but they didn't move. Now the Hon. Member for Moose Jaw South has the audacity to ask for increases three times the amount that's being offered. In three short years, rather four years, we have taken upon ourselves to nominate and establish a Committee of Review to review the legislation. Then they have the audacity to say that some of the information that they're asking is not being made available. You over there had 20 years to make provisions in the Act whereby this information would have been available to the Legislature. You denied this information on every occasion that it was asked in the past, saying that the information of the Board was privileged.

MR. DAVIES: — Sir, can I ask the Hon. Minister a question?

MR. CODERRE: — Yes, sure you can ask all the questions you want.

MR. DAVIES: — May I ask the Minister why he did not set up a Committee of Review last year when the legislation called for it?

March 25, 1968

MR. CODERRE: — We'll get there in due course. I am saying that you denied the information while you were in the Government. Every time that questions were asked of the Board this information was not made available to this House, because the provisions of the Act are there as such that the Board has representation of labor, management and Government, it is an autonomous Board and is responsible to the Minister of Labour for changes in legislation only. You know that, so don't try every time and fabricate . . .

MR. DAVIES: — Would the Minister permit a question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CODERRE: — You had your opportunity a moment ago to speak. If you had all these ideas why didn't you say them at that time.

I'd like to draw the attention of this House, Mr. Speaker, that the rates that we're offering now are higher than in the greater majority of the provinces in Canada and equal to some of them. They were very niggardly when they were the Government to look after the welfare of our widows. They have the audacity to say that a person who was entitled to a disability pension, a widow's pension when her old age security allowance is due which is there by Federal statute, would have her pension reduced accordingly. Why didn't you speak up at that time? No, they were niggardly, now they are ready to offer the moon. True to the Socialists every time. They do one thing while on this side of the House; they say the opposite on the other side.

MR. DAVIES: — May I asked the Minister, Mr. Speaker, on what occasion outside of this Government term of office that information was refused on Compensation Board matters.

MR. CODERRE: — You should know, you were in the Government at that time. Every question asked in the House had to be withdrawn or was turned down. You know yourself that there is no record in this House when a question has been denied.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. C.L.B. Estey (Minister of Municipal Affairs) that Bill No. 27 — **An Act to amend The Local Improvement Districts Act** be now read a second time.

MR. E.I. WOOD (Swift Current): — I'm very sorry, Mr. Speaker, I didn't realize that we were going to come to this one next, I thought we'd be coming down the line.

In regard to The Local Improvement Districts Act, Mr. Speaker, what I have to say is of very little consequence at this time. I have looked at this Act and I do think that the sections of it can best be discussed in Committee of the Whole. I do not see anything in the principle of the Bill that I would care to speak on at this time.

HON. C.L.B. ESTEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — Mr. Speaker, as I pointed

out on the second reading, the amendments to this Bill merely set up a system which we would hope will bring the rural municipality provisions applicable to the LIDS.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. C.L.B. Estey (Minister of Municipal Affairs) that Bill No. 28 — **An Act to amend The Industrial Towns Act**, be now read a second time.

MR. WOOD: — Mr. Speaker, in regard to this Bill at this time, I wish to speak in opposition to the principle of the Bill. In so doing it may be necessary for me to make reference to several of the sections in the Bill, but I do not wish my remarks to be interpreted as a discussion of this Bill section by section, because you will plainly see, Mr. Speaker, my purpose is to direct attention to the principle of the Bill and not to the clauses. Section 2 of this Bill deals with subsections (3) and (6) of Section 9 of the old Act which we are asked to repeal. These sections, Mr. Speaker, have to do with the paying of assistance to Industrial Towns (that are termed as Industrial Towns) in regard to helping to pay for the salary of a town manager. The section as it is now in the Act says that the Minister must help pay the salary of a town manager if he appoints one. Subsection (6) of the same section says that he must help to pay the manager if such is appointed by the council. You go down to Section 4 of this Bill which says that subsection (3) of Section 16 is repealed. Under this subsection (3) of the present Section 16 of the Act it says that the Minister may grant assistance to help pay for a plan that has been ordered by the Minister. Section 5 of this new Act says that "The Lieutenant Governor in council may by order, on the recommendation of the Minister and subject to such terms and conditions as may be specified in the order, make such grants, loans and advances and give such guarantee as are considered necessary or expedient for the purpose of providing for the implementation of any provisions of this Act or for assisting in the establishment or development of an existing or new industrial town." This takes the place of a section, Mr. Speaker, that said, subject to the regulations, the Minister may do such and such.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not approve of the principle that was set forward here. Under the old Act the Minister was acting in accordance with strictures that had been laid down in the legislation. It said that the Minister must do so and so and according to the legislation the Minister may do other things. This Bill we have before us takes this all away. Whereas in Section 25 of the old Act the Minister might do certain things according to regulations, this is now taken away and the Lieutenant Governor in Council may order so and so. Instead of the Minister doing certain things under the Act as set out by regulations it is now taken entirely into the hands of the Lieutenant Governor in Council. I am sure that he should be able to continue to do these things, especially if they are outlined by regulation.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that this House has a responsibility to the people of Saskatchewan. It is a fundamental fact in parliamentary democracy that the Legislature has control over the actions of the Government, that the Government be not given a free hand to do exactly as it wants with no controls whatsoever between sessions. I think it is a very sound principle that the

March 25, 1968

legislation be written out by the Legislature to give guidance to the Lieutenant Governor in Council between sessions. I think it is very good that we have policies clearly defined to outline how the Minister or the Lieutenant Governor in Council may conduct affairs of the Province between sessions. I think this is what we had in the earlier Act. We had sections here that said that the Minister or the Lieutenant Governor may do such things. But these are being repealed. The section that says that the Minister may do certain things subject to regulations is also being repealed. In the place of this we just have one section that says that the Lieutenant Governor in Council may by order do these things, practically anything it may wish to do in regard to this whole Act. I do not think this is the kind of legislation that should be passed by this House. I think, Mr. Speaker, we should have legislation that outlines, gives powers to the Executive Council, gives powers to the Minister to carry out the will and intent of the Legislature under certain lines and by certain policies that are laid down. If the policy cannot be contained in full exactitude in the legislation it should be set out in the regulations that the Lieutenant Governor in Council may use one policy, not one policy in one instance and another policy in another instance. I think these things should be laid clearly by legislation and regulation and the Government of this province should carry out along standard lines of one policy to fit every case. I don't think we should have one type of policy in regard to one part of the province and at the whim of the Executive Council that they have another policy in regard to another part of the province. I am not saying that they may do this, but this is the type of legislation that is contained in this Bill before us. I think with these few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I will have to say that I will be opposing this legislation on second reading.

MR. ESTEY: — I think on second reading I explained the purposes of the amendments to the legislation insofar as Section 25 is concerned which was referred to by the Hon. Members opposite. It was found in the opinion of the Government that the old Section 25 was too restrictive. We were of the opinion that we couldn't make guarantees to Lanigan for instance, and Jan Lake. We were of the opinion that we couldn't make grants for other than administrative purposes which we will obviously have to do in the case of the town near Jan Lake.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. D.G. Steuart (Provincial Treasurer) that Bill No. 43 — **An Act to amend The Fuel Petroleum Products Act** be now read a second time.

MR. A.E. BLAKENEY (Regina Centre): — Mr. Speaker, when I adjourned this debate I had already pointed out the difficulties which this Bill would bring to farmers, who for the first time are going to have the fuel used in their field equipment subjected to a fuel petroleum tax. I don't think I need to repeat the arguments which I advanced at that time, except only to say once again that this is a particularly inopportune time to place taxes on the cost of producing farm products. I think all of us know that Saskatchewan agriculture is moving into a critical time. Informed opinion suggests that the critical year for farm income will be 1969. Export sales are uncertain; the future of the International Cereals Agreement is in doubt; the final payment on grain is

likely to be small. In addition, farm product prices have declined in a number of other important areas besides cereal grains since mid-1967. We have already noted that the prices of wheat have declined some 21 cents between May of 1967 and January of 1968. Since February of 1966, hog prices have dropped from around \$42 to about \$24.50 per hundredweight. The price of choice steers has dropped from \$30 last September to about \$26 per hundredweight now. In short, Mr. Speaker, this is a particularly inopportune time to place any additional burdens upon Saskatchewan agriculture. I won't say more about this, because other Members on this side of the House will comment on this particular aspect of the Bill. I simply want to mention two other groups of people who will be particularly hard hit by this Bill and by the whole complex of taxes which are being levied by the Budget and the Bills following the Budget.

One group I want to mention are the commercial travellers. If we consider what a commercial traveller does to earn his living we will see that the activities of the Government seem to have been cunningly designed to tax very nearly everything that a commercial traveller does in order to earn his living. A commercial traveller spends probably \$1,000 a year on the capital cost of his car, and he's going to have to pay an extra one per cent on that item. He will travel perhaps 35,000 miles a year burning perhaps 2,000 gallons of gasoline and this is going to cost him an additional \$40. He may spend - and I am using some very conservative figures - \$100 a month on hotel rooms, and on that amount of \$1,200 a year he will pay an additional \$60 because of the new tax on hotel rooms. He buys some meals on the road, some restaurant meals, and he may buy ten meals a month which exceed \$2. That's really a conservative estimate of the number of meals of \$2 and over that he might buy. And this will cost him an additional \$12 or \$15 in tax. He or his employer must pay an additional amount to license his car, perhaps \$5 or \$6 there. He pays an additional dollar for his driver's licence. The whole list of taxes adds up to perhaps \$110, \$120, \$130 extra a year for the commercial traveller. I don't include in this calculation any additional sales tax on oil or on tires or on the multitude of other things which one must buy in order to operate a vehicle and travel on the road. I think it will be seen that the complex of taxes which has been applied, and I haven't mentioned any additional costs by way of his cigarettes or his alcohol or any other accoutrements of his trade. Travellers are an abstemious group of citizens I am advised by the Provincial Treasurer. This being the case probably we ought not to include liquor taxes in the calculation. I haven't mentioned anything about additional cost of car insurance. In short, Mr. Speaker, almost everything that a commercial traveller is forced to spend money on has been increased by an additional tax. I wonder whether or not the Government might not see its way clear to relieve the burden in some particular respect on the commercial traveller. I don't know whether the gasoline tax is the right place to pick, but it may be that the Government can find one of the many taxes which it has increased this year that it might relieve so far as commercial travellers are concerned.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

March 25, 1968

The next group of people who are hard hit by this that I want to mention, Mr. Speaker, are the taxpayers in the urban centres. The city of Regina for example now uses in its Engineer's Department some 85,000 gallons of diesel fuel and some 300,000 gallons of gasoline, and in its Transit Department it uses 4,000 gallons of gasoline and some 376,000 gallons of diesel fuel. The tax at two cents a gallon on all of this is going to run up to something over \$15,000 a year.

I simply want to point out that there is a substantial cost simply in the extra cost of petroleum fuel. There would also be additional expenses due to the increase in sales tax. I won't mention that on this debate, Mr. Speaker. I simply want to make this one plea. In the past it has been the custom to grant a refund on petroleum fuel tax burned by city vehicles on city streets. This has applied where the gasoline or diesel fuel in question has been burned and the ordinary tax has been paid. The custom has been for the municipality to apply to the Provincial Treasurer and get a refund of all of the tax that has been paid. I want to ask the Provincial Treasurer that he continue this custom and that the refund not be confined to the 15 cents spread, but that the two cents additional tax be included in the refund as well so that all of the gasoline burned by the city of Regina, or the other cities, in their own equipment on their own streets be refunded in the way that it has been done in the past. If the Minister can see his way clear to ameliorate the harsh effects of this tax in the way I've suggested with respect to urban municipalities and in some way which his ingenuity will suggest to him in respect to commercial travellers, then I think that the effects of the tax will be lessened, except of course the deleterious effects on agriculture which will be the subject of further remarks by my colleagues.

MR. J.A. PEPPER (Weyburn): — Mr. Speaker, as one who has lived for some 47 years on a farm and has been actively engaged in farming activities during the whole period of my life thus far, I feel that it is not only my duty but it is also my strong desire to oppose this tax increase of two cents per gallon, especially on farm fuels, that might be used by any implement or motor requiring it on the farm today. This to my knowledge is the first time in Saskatchewan that any Government ever put a tax on the farm fuel to be used in producing our agricultural commodities. This is an added expense which when farm income is not gaining accordingly, is certainly going to be frowned on. It is definitely a step to curtail any profit that our farmers might be able to secure in their farming operations. The margin of profit and loss, Mr. Speaker, today in a farmer's operation is so small or narrow that another tax such as this two cent raise in gas and diesel fuels can quite easily put him over on the red side of his balance sheet, thus putting him a greater depth in debt.

When the Government, Mr. Speaker, made it possible for the farmer to use purple gas in his truck some two to three years ago it was accepted with mixed feelings. True enough it worked as a convenience for many farmers. I would say it was more of a convenience than what it actually saved the farmer in dollars and cents. But I would like to remind them now that our Liberal Government now seems to feel the necessity of placing a two cent per gallon provincial tax on farm gas and diesel fuel. This advantage if there was any of burning purple gas in the farm trucks has certainly been thrown out the window. Who says that

this two cent increase is the first step only and will be the only step on a tax in this manner? This convenience is now going to be paid for because the two cents per gallon will certainly increase the price cost of farm operations in all motors that require it. Whether they are gas or diesel motors, tractors, combines, self-propelled swathers, motors that you require to run your grain elevators, these are all used for agricultural purposes, plus the extra two cents per gallon in all sizes of farm trucks, both gas and diesel and your two cents per gallon in the operating of your family car. This to me, Mr. Speaker, certainly shows the great concern that the Members opposite try to profess that they have in our farming people and the manner and extent in which they are helping our agricultural industry today. The Members opposite, Mr. Speaker, brag about the large amount set aside in the Budget for the building of highways and declare that this must be made possible by the increase in gas tax and that those using the highways must be prepared to pay for them in this increase in taxation. I am afraid that our farmers will not be happy by a tax being placed on their farm fuels, which will be used to supply power in working their implements that never even drive on these highways in order to finance the building of them today. Now there are a few Members sitting opposite, Mr. Speaker, farm Members, I must admit there are a few, but we have the Member from Cannington (Mr. Weatherald), the Member from Yorkton (Mr. Gallagher) and the Minister of Agriculture. I am anxiously waiting, Mr. Speaker, to see them rise in their seat and defend this Government for imposing this tax on their neighbors back home. It will be interesting to hear them explain the reason, when they meet their farmer friends back home, for placing this extra two cents per gallon burden on each one of them, who we all know are already burdened beyond what they can endure. This Government, Mr. Speaker, the same Government fought the election in 1964 and again in 1967 with the firm promise of tax reductions to our citizens especially our farmers. Now look at what it is doing. It has the audacity to place a new tax on farm agricultural fuels that have never been taxed before. Let's take a look at some other Provinces and the manner in which they respect their agricultural industry and the farmers who work their soil. Let's examine the gasoline taxation and its application to fuels used for agricultural purposes across Canada, in 1967. Take a look at Newfoundland. Its general rate increased from 19 cents to 20 cents a gallon on April 1, 1967. The exemptions include gasoline used in tractors, used for agricultural purposes. We have in Nova Scotia gasoline, 19 cents; diesel fuel, 27 cents, but exemption for farm services. Take a look at New Brunswick, gasoline, 18 cents; diesel fuel, 23 cents, exemption to farmers; Quebec, where their gasoline is 16 cents, their diesel fuel, 22 cents, refunds for tax and gasoline used in farm tractors; Ontario, getting closer to home, gasoline, 16 cents; diesel fuel, 22 cents, which was just raised recently, but the farmers receive full refund; our neighboring province of Manitoba, gasoline 17 cents; motor fuel, 20 cents, but exemptions for farm machinery and farm trucks; Alberta, your gasoline 12 cents, your diesel fuel, 14 cents, exemptions for agricultural purposes; British Columbia, gasoline, 13 cents, motor fuel 15 cents, but there's a whole range of other uses including tractors for off-highway use and these are subject to a one cent tax. In our Province of Saskatchewan, if this Bill is passed, the tax will be raised, the gasoline from 15 to 17 cents, your diesel fuel from 18 to 20 cents, no exemptions for farm services including farm trucks in this imposition of this 2 cent levy. The exemption has been in the past and now when this 2 cent levy comes on April 1st it will affect all of the farm implements.

March 25, 1968

Now, Mr. Speaker, our farmers in Saskatchewan are taking issue with the Government and are asking us as the Opposition to take a firm stand in opposing this Bill, that if it is passed will increase their expenses in operating their machines on their farms. And it will increase it in a magnitude beyond any reasonable figure. So I would like at this time, Mr. Speaker, to table a resolution that was sent to me from the Wheat Pool delegates of District 1 and I quote:

Whereas we feel that we have made the case quite plain in the past that the farmer has been caught in the cost-price squeeze and whereas our gross farm income has decreased in the past year quite drastically, therefore be it resolved that we, the delegates of district 1 strenuously oppose the 2 cents per gallon tax on farm fuels levied by the Saskatchewan Government.

So may I conclude my remarks, Mr. Speaker, by urging all Members to reconsider this, what I say, unfair tax that would add extra cost to our farmers and extra expense to the production of our agricultural products if it is passed. It is unfair to penalize these people who are carrying on our main industry and who already are taxed now beyond what they can endure. I urge you to defeat this Bill and in so doing you will have provided a little incentive for our farmers to carry on this important industry of agriculture.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. J. MESSER (Kelsey): — I also rise to speak in opposition to Bill No. 43, in opposition to a Bill that is further going to tax petroleum products in the Province of Saskatchewan and in opposition particularly to the tax on farm petroleum products. This is a tax that has never before been levied against Saskatchewan farmers as my Hon. Colleague from Weyburn (Mr. Pepper) has said. There is only one other province in the Dominion of Canada that taxes farm petroleum products and that Province is British Columbia, where the farming industry is relatively small compared to ours in Saskatchewan, and there it is only a one cent tax. But here in the Province of Saskatchewan we find that, if this Bill is passed, there will be a 2 cents per gallon tax and in some instances as high as a 10 per cent increase in the petroleum products used by the farmer in Saskatchewan. Conservatively this will apply to over 100 million gallons of purple gasoline and it will also apply to somewhat more than 80 million gallons of diesel fuel. This will again conservatively bring in an additional revenue to the Province of Saskatchewan some \$3,750,000 in revenue. If you average it out by the average farm in Saskatchewan, the average farm will be paying somewhere in the neighborhood of \$60 per farm. In order to do this, Mr. Speaker, it means that every time the farmer operates his tractor in the field he pays a tax toward highway construction. Every time he operates a self-propelled swather, a combine, a truck in the field, or an auger or any diesel or gasoline consuming motor on the farm, he pays a tax towards highway construction. To put that another way, Mr. Speaker, it means that for instance this spring, out of the 82,285 farms that we have in Saskatchewan who will be operating approximately 120,000 tractors which will in all probability consume about an average of 4 gallons per hour, they'll be paying the Government of Saskatchewan 8 cents per hour to operate those tractors. It means on an hourly basis that total farmers in the Province of Saskatchewan will be paying somewhere around between \$9,000 and \$10,000 in revenue

to the Provincial Government. Now the farmer being rather an industrious worker in the province at that time of year in particular, he probably will have these tractors running somewhere between 10 and 12 hours a day, in a lot of instances longer than that. This means that the Government will extract from the farmer an additional revenue through taxes on farm petroleum products somewhere in excess of \$100,000 per day. The farmer in this province cannot afford that particularly under the present agricultural economic situation that he is in. Now this will not only apply to the time when the farmer is doing his spring work or his seeding, it applies when he is summer fallowing; it applies when he is taking his crop off and during the harvesting season and the fall of the year. Now I could see some justification for a tax like this, if the farmer was doing all his work up and down the highways in the province, but in every one of these instances, his machinery is not even operating on highways. I'm not saying that a farmer shouldn't contribute something to the construction and maintenance of highways in the Province of Saskatchewan, but it could certainly be on a more equitable basis than what this is. On top of that, as has been pointed out by other colleagues of mine on this side of the House, the timing is very, very bad for an additional tax, if a tax was justified.

Economically, the position of farming in the Province of Saskatchewan is not good; it is not good in other areas of Canada, but other areas of Canada are not further burdening the farmer with farm petroleum taxes. We have small quotas in the province which have put the farmer in the position of being relatively short of cash. In other areas, due to poor crops, farmers do not have grain to deliver. They find that they are in the same position with relatively short assets in regard to cash. In the Province of Saskatchewan, the price for rapeseed has dropped some 50, 60 or 70 cents. The future for flax is not good, putting the farmer in a doubtful position in regard to what his prospects for an equitable income for next year will be. The world grain sales are half or less than half what they were a year ago. He doesn't have an International Wheat Agreement and on top of that there are some agricultural experts making predictions that perhaps for the 1968 crop year, unless we have better than average rainfall during the year, crop prospects may be poor. But regardless of whether they are poor or a bumper crop, the markets for the sale of his crop are not here and the prices are not desirable.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I'll take the Provincial Treasurer's word for it when he says that the increase of the 2 cents or 10 per cent on farm gasoline will not completely override the saving that he has by burning purple gas in his farm truck. I think I'll agree with him there. But we have to remember that this is an entirely new tax in an entirely new field. In comparison to the 17 cents or 20 cent tax that we pay on highway fuel now, 2 cents is going to look relatively small in additional budgets. If tax increases are warranted, this is going to be a field where taxes are going to be applied and in the future we may find farmers paying 5, 10 or even higher cents of tax per gallon than what they are now. I know that there are many farmers in my own area of the province that cannot afford it, I know that most farmers in the entire province cannot afford such a tax. If it happens that these taxes are increased to preposterous sums as is very likely, I could only term this as another deterrent tax, a deterrent tax because the farmer cannot afford to pay the additional tax. He will curb his production, consequently deterring him from a reasonable economic

March 25, 1968

living, and it will further be another addition to the worsening of the farming economy in the Province of Saskatchewan. Because of these points and points that my colleagues have pointed out and will be pointing out after me, I cannot support this Bill. I fail to see how the Members sitting opposite have any justification in supporting it for their agricultural members in the constituency, and I would close in urging them to vote against this Bill as we will on this side of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. F. MEAKES: — Mr. Speaker, I waited hoping that some of those Members across the way who represent farm constituencies might get up and protest too or give the reasons why they are prepared to support this Bill. I rise with strong feelings that I must not support it, knowing that if I didn't it might well not be safe for me to go home. I know that on weekends that I have returned to my home since this first announcement of this increase was made in the Budget, that I've had people, farmers of all political beliefs, telling me to be sure and oppose that 2 cent increase in cost of farm production. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that this Bill proves what I have said for many years that really the Liberal party has little sympathy for the farmer, that this Bill is just another piece of the callous disregard that this Government has for the farmer and its problems. It is a new tax, Mr. Speaker, and it is a new tax which I would oppose for this reason, if for no other. It is a new tax and as the previous speaker said, although it's only 2 cents and I'll deal with that 2 cents in a moment or two, it is what may happen in the future. It is starting down another road of taxation. One of my friends the other day, who incidentally didn't support me in the last election, when I returned home, pointed out to me what this tax would mean to him. He said, "I am just an average farmer. I burn about 10 tanks of fuel a year, both diesel and gas." He said, "This is \$100, for a 500 gallon tank at 2 cents a gallon is \$10 and 10 tanks is \$100 extra." He said, "What does this mean to me?" He said, "I have been in the cost-price squeeze and I've been finding it terribly hard to make ends meet." He asked, "What does this extra \$100 of tax mean to me? Well it means for one thing that I'm going to have \$100 less to possibly buy children's clothes. I had hoped next fall to buy a new swather. This means that it will be \$100 less that I might have put towards that swather. For years I have been having trouble paying my municipal taxes on time." He says, "This again is \$100 that might have gone towards taxes which I won't be able to have. This coming year my son is going to university. Fees have already gone up and this is still \$100 that might have gone to the University. Being a municipal councillor, (He went on to point out what it meant to the RMs), I'm convinced that this tax will mean that there are less taxes paid on time, less farmers will be able to pay their taxes on time. It will mean more interest that the municipalities will have to pay."

Mr. Speaker, I come back to where I stated what this Liberal party and this Liberal Government are doing to agriculture. And I ask myself the same question as I've asked two or three times in the House: where our Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) was when this Budget was being drawn up? I go back to some of the things that he used to say when he was in Opposition and I'm going to quote just a couple of them and not very long ones. On page 481, February 28, 1964, the Member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley said in part and I quote:

The budget speech says the government has been particularly concerned about the province's smaller farmers. Well it's about time they became concerned. After 20 years of CCF-NDP government, by the Minister of Agriculture's own admission, 50,000 farmers have been driven off the land. The minister says it is because of the cost price squeeze. I suggest this government must take a full share of the blame for the added costs of production. They have allowed land taxes to go up by four times, increased the sales tax by two and a half times, increased the gasoline tax, in fact they have allowed increase in 600 items, plus finding 600 or more new ways of increasing cost of services. All of which have reflected on the lack of the ability of the smaller unit to continue under this pressure.

Mr. Speaker, if that was the case in 1964, how about now? And incidentally there is around another 12,000 farmers who have left the farms since 1964. Certainly this added cost on production will be bad and again I say on smaller farmers in particular. I have a lot of small farms in my constituency, especially in the north and eastern side. These farmers are already on the ropes and struggling to make both ends meet. This added tax is just going to be another added burden. Mr. Speaker, I would also like to put on the records a quotation of Senator MacDonald who was then the Member for Moosomin. And he said this on February 24, 1964:

But there is a new definition for a dime in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. It is that part of a dollar that is left after you have paid your provincial taxes.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, to this House there is a new definition for a penny. That is that last penny this Government will take from the people of Saskatchewan. I certainly cannot support this motion or this Bill. As the previous Member pointed out, not one other province with the exception of British Columbia has had any tax on farm fuel. I want to point out also that this 2 cents increase in fuel is not going to just mean 2 cents; it is going to mean more than that because naturally the fuel that is being transported out to the farmer, out to the towns and villages and then to the farmer, is going to cost more because the person who drives that truck, as I'm sure the Hon. Member for Shaunavon will agree, will have to have more money for the operation of his truck. So it's not going to be a 2 cent increase, it's going to be more than this.

Mr. Speaker, much has been said about the cost-price squeeze on agriculture and I'm not going to go into this any deeper than to say this again, that this is just one more thing that this Government is adding to make it more impossible for the average farmer to make ends meet. I suggest that this is one more straw that is going to break the camel's back, that is going to drive more of the small farmers off the farms. I think it's a bad Bill, it's a Bill that should be opposed by all Members of this House. I say again I'd like to hear some of the Members from across the way either explain why they are prepared to support it or I would hope that they would stand up and say they will oppose it. I certainly am going to oppose this Bill, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

March 25, 1968

HON. A.C. CAMERON (Minister of Mineral Resources): — Mr. Speaker, I came from a rural constituency. I live in one of the, if you want to call it, lower assessed, and some refer to it as the depressed, areas of Saskatchewan. I am conscious of farm problems and farm needs but I think it is a strange performance we are witnessing now. I recall coming into the House moving resolutions to assist the farmers, one that the Government of the day remove the mineral tax on farm land. I said that they don't know whether they have minerals or not. Whether there are or whether there are not minerals, they had to pay their mineral tax each and every year. If they didn't pay it, the minerals which the farmer owned was forfeited to the Crown. We pointed out year after year that thousands of farmers in Saskatchewan had lost their mineral rights to the Crown because they were delinquent in their mineral tax. We pledged that one of the first acts we would do, would be to remove the mineral tax on farm land, not only to save the farmers the tax, but to assure them that from that day forward no farmer would forfeit his mineral rights to the Crown. We did that.

We believe that farm trucks like farm tractors are a necessity in the farm operation. Thus we pledged to treat farm trucks the same as we treat farm tractors. Therefore we passed resolutions in the House or attempted to pass them, asking the same Opposition, when they were the Government to exempt farm trucks from the tax or in other words to permit farmers to use purple gas in their farm trucks. Like the opposition to the mineral tax, the Government of the day opposed this. They opposed granting the farmers the right to use tax-free gas in their trucks. Why, they ask, where is the money coming from? They said it would be abused, it would be granting farmers privileges which were not granted to other people, to carpenters, welders, electricians, to city people. They called it a hoax and a political bribe. They opposed the removal of 15 cents per gallon on every gallon of gas used in a farm truck. They were in opposition then. They opposed the mineral tax, they opposed the removal of 15 cents a gallon on the farmer's truck and today they are still opposing. They are opposing the imposition of 2 cents per gallon farm fuel. I think there is some reason why we should look at an imposition of tax on farm fuel. No one likes to pay increased taxes; it runs against human nature. But I'm surprised that an official Opposition formerly a Government should have been so violently opposed to reduction in taxes when they were in the Government.

Now the Member from Touchwood (Mr. Meakes) had a great deal to say about small farmers. He said for one farmer it would cost him \$100 more per year because of 2 cents a gallon on farm fuel. I think that is a pretty good-sized farmer when it would cost him that amount. But he neglected very conveniently to give on the same balance sheet the saving to a farmer of his 15 cents per gallon which he burns in his truck. If you take the estimated savings to the farmer, in his exemption of taxes on the gas he uses in his trucks, they totalled up to \$4 - \$5 million. The Government of the day at that time estimated \$7 - \$8 million. It is running \$4 - \$5 million. One of the Members said that the imposition of the 2 cents tax will get \$3 3/4 million. Well then I would ask you to ask your farm friends if they would exchange their position today and go back to the NDP tax, when they'd have to pay 17 cents per gallon on gas in their farm trucks in order to be exempted of 2 cents per gallon farm fuel. Someone made the statement that this is only the second Province in Canada that is taxing farm fuel.

He said the other is British Columbia. I want to inform the Hon. Member that Alberta is putting on a 3 cent tax on all fuels used in farm trucks and farm machinery, farm tractors and farm combines. So in that regard we are not out of step with oil-rich Alberta. They conveniently forget to mention other tax concessions that were granted to the farm areas.

I have in my constituency just two isolated instances that I could mention. I checked them just the other day. Last year we took in some rural roads, RM roads, into the highway system. One in one municipality, one in the other. The upgrading and gravelling and stock-piling on these roads this year will save one RM 8 mills and will save the other RM 10 mills. Formerly taxpayers would have to pay this. They forget to mention the ease on farm taxes when we moved to equalization grants which have relieved a great burden of building rural roads from the back of the rural farmer. They forget to mention the homeowners' grant. They conveniently forget to mention these other matters which aided greatly in assisting the farmers in meeting their tax obligations. They neglect to show to farmers today that not only have municipal roads and grid roads been taken into the highway system, not only are equalization grants manifold increased, but likewise that the policy of maintaining and re-gravelling the grid roads, of snow removal, of constructing all-weather access roads to every occupied farm is a great tremendous advantage to farmers and is a program which they wanted. I don't think that anyone should be led to believe that farmers as responsible citizens are not prepared to pay their share of the improvement in the rural parts in roads and municipal services. Therefore even with the imposition of this 2 cents a gallon tax on farm fuels they would not exchange in my opinion exemption of the 2 cents on tractors in turn to revert to the policy of paying the full gasoline tax on farm trucks. When we are looking at this we must look at the whole bundle of wax and not individual items. I would say again that is interesting now to consider when they were the Government, particularly the former Member for Elrose, who belonged to the Farmers' Union organization. The Farmers' Union presented a request asking that the Government of the day exempt farm trucks from the gasoline tax. He supported this resolution of the Farmers' Union. He came down as one of their delegates. Shortly afterwards he was appointed Minister of Education and when we tried to get a resolution through the House, asking the Government to exempt the farm trucks from purple gas, where did he stand? Shoulder to shoulder with his colleagues who stood up, each and every one of them, and voted against it. This is the treatment they received in those days.

MR. D.W. MICHAYLUK (Redberry): — Nonsense!

MR. CAMERON: — The Member from Touchwood (Mr. Meakes) talks about this as the last straw that breaks the camel's back. I want to deal with that at a little later time, Mr. Speaker. I would now ask leave to adjourn the debate.

MR. J. MESSER (Kelsey): — Would the Hon. Member answer a question? Sir, where do you see any justification in increasing the farm petroleum tax in Saskatchewan simply because Alberta is going to increase theirs on April 1st, when their tax is only 20 cents per gallon compared to 17 cents on ours on fuel? On diesel fuel it is only 14 cents in comparison to 20 cents in our province. What justification is there between the two provinces?

March 25, 1968

MR. CAMERON: — May I answer the question? First, let me point it out clearly to this young Member that I didn't try to justify Saskatchewan in what Alberta did. I was correcting an error which you made before when you stated that British Columbia was the only province which has a tax on farm fuel. Alberta is putting a tax on farm fuels.

Debate adjourned.

SECOND READINGS

HON. W.R. THATCHER moved second reading of Bill No. 64 — **An Act to amend The Liquor Board Superannuation Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, I think this Bill will be completely non-controversial. It compliments similar Bills which we passed last year. Somehow we neglected to look over The Liquor Board Superannuation Act. The proposed amendment will authorize the Liquor Board's Superannuation Commission to purchase debentures issued by the World Bank, for the investment portfolio of the Liquor Board Superannuation Fund. Hon. Members may recall that last year the Federal Government as a matter of policy asked us if we would introduce this legislation. We did it for other boards and commissions, but somehow neglected this one.

The World Bank makes loans to its member countries for developing projects such as electric power, transportation, irrigation, communications, education, and water supply. The Bank finances most of its loans by borrowing in the capital markets of the world. I would ask Hon. Members to note that the proposed amendment does not commit the Commission to purchase World Bank securities. The decision to invest in World Bank securities will depend upon its effective yield in relation to other high-grade securities on the market, diversification of the investment portfolio and other factors which are taken into account in the normal investment management of public funds.

I commend this Bill, Mr. Speaker, to the attention of the House and I move second reading.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

MR. THATCHER moved second reading of Bill No. 56 — **An Act to amend The Liquor Licensing Act**

He said: Mr. Speaker, this Bill in essence provides housekeeping amendments to the present Liquor Licensing Act. Section 3 is required primarily because of the recent integration of the three Armed Forces. Really what it does is substitute the words 'Canadian Armed Forces' for some of the other designations that were there. Section 4 was requested by the Saskatchewan Hotel Association. Today, beer can only be sold when a customer is seated at a table. Some of the rural hotels came to us and asked for this amendment. We are proposing to allow for the sale of beer at a stand-up or sit-down counter immediately in front of the dispensing bar. In other words an individual or customer instead of having to sit at a table, will be able to go up to the bar where the beer is being dispensed. This is to assist the licensee in giving more efficient service during low-volume periods in the beverage room. We are informed that

this provision will be of particular benefit, as I said, to the owners of small hotels in the villages and towns of the province. The provision will allow the licensee or his employee to efficiently serve his customers at the counter, rather than requiring him to walk across the room to serve them at the tables. This should be helpful, we are told, when there are only two or three customers in the establishment.

As I say, we were asked by the Hotel Association for this amendment, and we can't see anything wrong with it. Section 5 has also been requested by the Hotel Association. Today liquor can only be sold in dining rooms with entertainment after 9 p.m. if an equal amount of food is sold with the drinks.

We have been informed that this does work some hardship on some of these establishments, or at least according to them, and this section modifies such a requirement. It proposes that dining room licensees who are providing programs of live entertainment may sell liquor with or without food in the evening hours when the demand for meals diminishes. The licensee will still be obliged to have food available upon request at all times.

Section 6 under certain circumstances will allow a licensee upon receiving written permission from the Commission to serve liquor in an area adjacent to the premises. Again, we were asked to introduce this provision by the Hotel Association. I think that there are a few of the hotelmen who have in mind something similar to the beer gardens in Europe during summer months. In other words, they want to be able to serve liquor in a small room outside, adjoining their premises. We are informed that this provision was tried and used extensively at Expo 1967. Apparently they were well received by the public.

In Section 8, we are proposing amendments to the Act, which will make it an offense for a person who has been requested to leave an outlet for any reason to re-enter the outlet on the same day. The reason for this amendment is to permit a licensee to bar an individual from his business establishment whom he knows to be a consistently heavy drinker or who has conducted himself in an offensive manner.

The same amendments will provide that no person may remain in an outlet after being requested by the licensee to leave. There is nothing, of course, to prevent the customer from discussing his conduct with the licensee and undertaking to improve his manners before being allowed to re-enter the premises.

Section 10 of this Act provides for an increase in certain fines under the Act.

Now as I have indicated, Mr. Speaker, these amendments can be described as housekeeping provisions. They are introduced to improve the standards of our licensed outlets in our province and to improve the conduct of the individuals who patronize them. May I say that Saskatchewan can be proud of the standard of most of the licensed outlets in our province. Year by year they are being improved. One only needs to look at the facilities that are available in the city of Regina to realize that Saskatchewan has many outlets that are as good as, if not better than any place else in Canada. The standard of entertainment is excellent, and food served to the patrons is usually first-class.

March 25, 1968

Mr. Speaker, I think most questions on the Act could probably be better answered in Committee and so I move second reading of this Bill.

MR. F. MEAKES (Touchwood): — Could I ask the Premier a question before he sits down? He didn't mention Section 9. Does this mean that cards can be played or can't be played? I haven't the legislation before me.

MR. THATCHER: — Yes, they can be played.

MR. F.A. DEWHURST (Wadena): — Mr. Speaker, I think this Bill, once again, is in line with the other Bills we have seen in the past four years. It's opening liquor outlets pretty wide and in many places, I think, too wide. I feel that when we put all these together and see that there are liquor stores being closed, giving the private outlets to drugstores or implement sheds or wherever have you, and then see the provisions in these Bills, I think that we are travelling pretty fast along the road of more liquor. We see our accidents going up in the province, and statistics show that a good many of the accidents are due to too much alcohol being consumed by the drivers.

I think that we should have a little more care on a lot of these Bills. You know, when I see the way the Government has taken three years in bringing in these Bills, it reminds me very much of the story of the fellow who had the liquor outlet. One section here especially states that, if a person is asked to leave, he must leave, and it doesn't say if the reasons have to be just and proper; as long as they are asked to leave they must. But one of these outlets had got a trained bear and they had this bear for a bouncer. An Indian fellow came in and the beer parlor vendor didn't want him to have any more beer so he just pointed toward the Indian and this bear went to throw him out. A few minutes later the Indian came back in and kind of straightening himself up said, "That's the trouble with these Liberals, give them a fur coat and a little bit of authority and they think they own the place."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DEWHURST: — I think that is the way it is here. Now that the Liberals have a little bit of authority, they are going wild on the liquor and I think we should be very cautious. I think that we should look at these clauses very closely in Committee.

MR. W.S. LLOYD (Leader of the Opposition): — If I can be out of order before you catch me, may I say how pleased those of us on this side of the House are to see sitting behind the rail in our House, the Member for Pelly, the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Barrie).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LLOYD: — We extend to him our welcome back to the House and our best wishes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

HON. C.P. MacDONALD (Minister of Welfare) moved second reading of Bill No. 20 — **An Act to amend The Child Welfare Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, in moving second reading of the amendments to the Child Welfare Act, I would like to bring to the attention of the House that there are three essential areas where amendments are being proposed. I would like to dwell very briefly on the first, because I think it is one that is of interest to most Members of the House as well as to the people of Saskatchewan. It is the amendments in relation to religion.

First of all I would like to point out that Child Welfare Services incorporate the principle that a child's religious affiliation is determined by its natural parents. Some Provinces, for example British Columbia, do not mention religion in adoption legislation, but in practice respect the principle in the selection of homes for children. Other Provinces, and Saskatchewan is among them, have always had legislation dealing with religion in child placement, believing that it is the function of law to protect human rights of both parents and the child. Some parents have a very strong religious faith and this is something very positive that they wish to give their child. In our Child Welfare Services we have a dual role, first to reflect the concern of parents, and second to protect primarily the rights of children. Due respect must be given to the expressed religious designation of the parent, but when every effort has been made to match the religious faith designated for the child, then we move to the next stage and try to achieve the child's right to a good home with loving parents. In other words we subscribe to the conviction that religion be not a sole barrier in the adoption of children, all other factors being equal. In 1966, the Province of Alberta enacted legislation which in effect says that the placement of children is no longer governed by religious faith designated by the parent, after one year of trying to match religions. The time factor is questionable and an arbitrary and artificial limit in that often exhausting efforts to match religion might involve more than a year in some cases, and less in others. Historically in this province in May, 1966, the religion of a child was determined by the faith of the parent, the father in the cases of legitimate children, the mother in the cases of illegitimate children. The amendment in 1966 clarified the parent's right to two choices, either to designate a religious faith to the child, Roman Catholic or Protestant, or to state that the parent did not wish to designate a faith. This legislation restricts too rigidly the rights of some children to a permanent home. More flexibility is required in order to fulfil our dual obligation to natural parents and to adopted children.

In moving second reading of these amendments I feel it is important to explain very briefly the principles involved and the changes proposed. First, the basic position of this amendment is that the child shall not be deprived of an adoption home because of a difference of religion only. This means that, when there is no home of the child's faith available and there is a home available of a faith other than that of the child, then this child could be placed for adoption even though the religion of the child and the home is different. Second, the legislation is worded in such a way that the judge does not change the religion of the child, but that he waives the requirements of that

March 25, 1968

section of the Act dealing with the placement of a child as pertains to religion. This permits the parents to raise the child in a faith dictated by their conscience and the welfare of the child. I think this is an important element of the legislation. Third, it is also important to recognize that the original intent of the legislation remain. This changes not merely the opening up of the adoption legislation to permit indiscriminate placing of children without regard to the child's faith. Instead it is attempting to alleviate the situation where an adoption home would be denied a child because of the religious requirement of the Act. To ensure this principle the revised legislation makes mention of the fact that the child can be placed for adoption in a home of different faith, only after reasonable effort has been made to find the child a home of his own religion. The last basic principle, I think, involved in the Act is the fact that the legislation also states that this decision be left in the hands of an experienced and responsible person. This person is designated in the Act as the Director of Child Welfare.

This amendment I believe will assist in solving some of the dilemmas which child placement agencies now face. Perhaps two concrete examples might enlighten the House. First when the above conditions have been satisfied, a child, living in a foster home whose religion differs from that of the foster parent, could now be adopted by these foster parents. Second, agencies sometimes have children in foster homes that are not being placed for adoption because there is no home available for them. I think of children particularly that are beyond the age of seven or perhaps multi-family children that are looking for an adoption home. Once again after the conditions of the Act have been met, the child could then be placed in a home that is available, regardless of the religious differences. I want to stress that these changes are remedial in their intent. It is intended to provide for these children who are not covered by the present legislation. The legislation is guaranteeing the right of religious groups and at the same time enacting legislation to protect the child from being denied a home solely on religious grounds.

The second amendment of The Child Welfare Act is I think a basic and important principle. It relates to the appeal process after adoption proceedings have begun, refinement and clarification of the appeal process after a child has been committed to the Minister of Welfare. The proposed amendment will allow the natural mother the right to reconsider and possibly reverse her decision to give the child up for adoption within a reasonable time limit. In proposing this amendment we are taking into consideration the fact that perhaps after a mother of an illegitimate child has been relieved of the stress of pregnancy and has already had the child, she may wish to change her decision. This proposal will also protect the rights and good faith of prospective adopting parents after the child has been placed with them, after this reasonable period of time has occurred.

The third amendment relates to group homes and is merely housekeeping in order. Group homes have been developed in Saskatchewan over the last few years and are being used effectively for a variety of functions, although only one home serves only one function. Various group homes provide the following services, receiving home, holding or detention, care of infants, retarded children, generalized group treatment of teenagers, or

intensive treatment in a small unit. Since development of this type of resource is very recent. The Child Welfare Act does not provide adequately for the licensing or development of regulations for group homes. Present regulations are in effect under The Welfare Act but only apply to the children placed by the Director of Child Welfare. This should be extended to group homes, so that they can be licensed as group homes irrespective of who develops them. I would urge all members to support this Bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. R. ROMANOW (Saskatoon Riversdale): — Mr. Speaker, I want at the outset to make it clear that I am speaking from my own personal convictions and my own personal views on this matter. To put my position quite clearly on the record, I want to commend the Minister and the Government for what I consider to be a very good and very progressive piece of legislation. I think the remarks made by the Minister (Mr. MacDonald) on the question of religion are very appropriate and I agree with him that this can only serve to advance the unfortunate plight of many of the young children that are now put up for adoption. There are, however, in speaking on second reading of this Bill, two matters that I would like to draw to the attention of the Hon. Minister and the Government and the Members of this House.

Firstly, the matter that the Minister refers to as group homes, and the matter of being a housekeeping amendment. I want to say again that I think the development of group homes, as the Minister has indicated, although a new process, is a very acceptable and a highly desirable feature of the Child Welfare legislation. I assume that when the Minister speaks of a group home, really what we want to be doing here in Saskatchewan is moving toward increased development of such places as Warrendale and the like in Ontario, that all of us know about. And I think it is proper and a very enlightened approach by the Government to set up homes that will allow the children, who are put up for child welfare or for emotional and various other problems that they are brought under this Act, opportunity to move freely or as freely as possible in the society, in the community at large. I think it is important that they be given the facilities and the opportunity to receive the maximum professional care on a very intimate personal basis.

I think the group-home concept is a very good concept in that regard. What I am concerned about though - and I don't mean this is any partisan way - is the question that group homes ought to be more than just a matter of a housekeeping amendment. I would have hoped the Hon. Minister (Mr. MacDonald) would have elaborated somewhat on exactly what the policy and the future course of this Government are going to be with respect to the increased development of groups homes. For my part, I would liked to have seen, and I hope perhaps later on in closing debate he will correct me or perhaps make a clarification of this point, I would like to have seen the Government announce some brand new active program for the development of these group homes. Something like Warrendale. Let's see if we can get something of this nature going in Saskatchewan, particularly in the case of juvenile delinquents under 16 years of age, Mr. Speaker, in cases where the judge, having found a person, a juvenile delinquent, has nowhere to place that juvenile

March 25, 1968

delinquent and has to either incarcerate them in adult court after due procedure or move them to another province. Now what I would really like is that the Government take active consideration of this proposal and perhaps, in summing up in second reading, the Hon. Minister might give us some clarification of the Government's intention in this regard. I want to repeat that it is my view that the utmost of importance be placed on children under 16 years of age who find themselves in this very unfortunate situation.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, I am concerned about the appeal process that the Minister (Mr. MacDonald) has introduced in this legislation. I appreciate that it is basically a decision of the government and I suppose one each Member of this House has to make individually, on choosing between the rights of the states, or, if you will, the Minister and the Government, as opposed to the rights of the mother and the individual. There is always that very fine line, Mr. Speaker, where you have to draw judicially the interest of the state, that is to say, make sure that the adoption procedure goes through, then, once the decision has been finally made, that there is no alienation or no upsetting of that particular decision. I can see the problem and the dilemma of the Minister and the Government in that regard. At the same time there is the interest of the mother. Frankly, I am concerned that the 30-day appeal is just insufficient time. I think the Minister has attempted to incorporate the very admirable feature of giving a mother of an illegitimate child, or any mother who has any interest in this area, a 30-day period to really reconsider her own position. Her financial position may have changed. Her social position may have changed. Her emotional outlook may have changed. An although I don't pretend to be any expert in this matter, it seems to me that 30 days as between these two choices - the interest of the state and the interest of the individual - is coming down in favor of the interest of the state. I am not sure on this, I stand to be corrected by the Minister or the Hon. Attorney General (Mr. Heald) but my brief perusal of various other statutes indicates, for example in Alberta, that the waiting period is something as much as three months. In fact it may even be six months. I don't know where that line is to be drawn but I do know that as far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, 30 days is just simply not enough. After all, we are dealing here - I am sure all Members will agree - with that very delicate, emotional, that very personal decision of the mother, a decision also that will affect for probably all of life's time the adopted child. And I don't think that a 30-day appeal period is just sufficient.

Mr. Speaker, those are the two comments that I wanted to specifically draw to the attention of the Minister (Mr. MacDonald). I now wish to conclude by saying that the Bill is a positive and progressive one. There are some other matters that I think I should like to speak on. Since they tell me that practice makes perfect, I would now beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

HON. D.G. STEUART (Provincial Treasurer) moved second reading of Bill No. 47 — **An Act to amend The Industrial and Cost Accountants Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, the purpose

of this amendment is to change the name of The Society of The Industrial and Cost Accountants of Saskatchewan to The Society of Industrial Accounts of Saskatchewan. A resolution passed by the Society of The Industrial and Cost Accountants of Saskatchewan authorized the changing of the Society's name, and the Society requested the Government to amend The Society's Incorporation Act and the Government agreed to propose this amendment to this session of the Legislature. It is the opinion of the Society that reference to its memberships as Cost Accountants was not representative of the knowledge and qualifications of its members. It was felt by the Society that the words "and Cost" should be deleted from the name in order that the general public and industry may not be misled by the rather limited meaning of the phrase "Cost Accountant." The Act is also being amended to reflect the change in the name of the national body. The old name was The Canadian Society of Cost Accountants and Industrial Engineers. This name has been changed by federal statute and the new name of the national body is The Society of Industrial and Cost Accountants of Canada.

With this brief explanation I move second reading of this Bill.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE

HON. W.S. LLOYD (Leader of the Opposition): — Before we adjourn the House may I rise on a question of privilege. My question of privilege has to do with the rather considerable handicap which Members are experiencing because of the work going on in the halls along which our offices are situated. My colleague from Moose Jaw made reference to it awhile ago. I don't know what the situation is right now, but when I came from my office earlier this evening, it was necessary to crawl under and through two sets of scaffolding. I understand that the hazard is even worse at this time because they are plastering up above. This has been going on for some time. One evening last week I left my office and I had to try three different doors before I could find one that wasn't barricaded. I would like to, Mr. Speaker, ask you, Sir, on behalf of the Members, to investigate whether or not in your opinion this is compatible with the proper functioning of the Members. I am particularly concerned that the Library, this evening for example, is completely inaccessible. If Members had wanted anything out of it, it just wouldn't be there. I think it should be checked.

HON. A.R. GUY (Minister of Public Works): — In reply to the question I think the Hon. Leader of the Opposition recognizes that this work to be done is going to cause some inconvenience. It is being done during the evening so that there will be less inconvenience to the least number of people. During the day, when people are coming from down town on business and your full staff are here, we have tried to accommodate them as well as possible. We do recognize that there will be some inconvenience. I'll look into the matter and we will try and cause just as little inconvenience as possible.

MR. LLOYD: — My point remains, as I was asking you, Sir, I realize and we are quite prepared to put up with some inconvenience,

March 25, 1968

although I think tonight it has reached the point where it is completely intolerable.

MR. SPEAKER: — Well I think it is possible to take this matter up with the correct authorities with a view to seeing what can be done in connection therewith.

The Assembly adjourned at 9:59 o'clock p.m.