

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Second Session — Sixteenth Legislature**  
**27th Day**

**Wednesday, March 12, 1969**

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

**ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**1969 PROVINCIAL INTERMEDIATE HOCKEY CHAMPIONSHIP**

**Mr. W. McIvor (Arm River):** — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to inform this House that the Simpson Flyers have won the 1969 Provincial Intermediate Hockey Championship by defeating Wawota 7-5 in the two-game total score playoffs. They came back last night after losing the first game 5-4 and won last night 3-0. I would like all Members of this House to join with me in congratulating them.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**EXEMPTION OF FARM TRUCKS AND FUEL DISTRIBUTORS RE DAMP GRAIN**

**Hon. D. Boldt (Minister of Highways):** — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to announce that the Department of Highways will exempt farm trucks hauling damp grain to dryers and dried grain from dryers to the farm during the spring weight restrictions on Provincial highways, when bans become effective this coming spring. The fuel distributors to dryers and the movement of dryers will also be exempt so as not to interfere with the progressive program of drying grain. Highways with an oil treatment are subject to severe damage during the spring breakup period. I therefore want to caution every farmer, fuel distributors and all those connected with grain drying to exercise good judgment on load weights when using the highway system. I also want to point out that this is a concession made purely to assist the farmer in the drying of damp grain and it does not apply to the normal movement of grain from the farm to the elevators. The road restrictions will apply to all other trucks not connected with the hauling of damp grain.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. C.G. Willis (Melfort-Tisdale):** — Mr. Speaker, I ask the Minister of Highways if this applies only to Provincial highways?

**Mr. Boldt:** — Yes, only to Provincial highways.

## QUESTIONS

### RENTAL CHARGES IN SPECIAL-CARE HOMES

**Mr. W.S. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition):** — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I want to direct a question to the Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald), who is just coming into the House. The question has to do with the answer given yesterday to Question No. 177. This answer says that the rental charges in special-care homes may increase from \$4 to \$44 per month. Is that by any chance an error, Mr. Minister, or will there in fact be some increases as high as \$44 per month?

**Hon. C.P. MacDonald (Minister of Welfare):** — Mr. Speaker, as the Leader of the Opposition knows, the Department of Welfare or the Government of Saskatchewan does not operate any special-care homes in the Province of Saskatchewan. All special-care homes in the province are non-profit homes and therefore each of them submits a budget to the Department of Welfare, which is related strictly to the expenditure of the expenses of operating costs related to death, retirement and so forth and is approved by the Department of Welfare. We have no control over the budgets that are presented except that they are non-profit. Now I'm not sure where the \$44 came from, if there is one in the province that may for some strange reason have increased in that amount or might have been very low in the past and may not have made an adjustment for two or three years, but I could find out for the Leader of the Opposition.

**Mr. Lloyd:** — As a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, I wish the Minister would because this is rather a terrifying increase it seems to me.

### STATEMENT RE AGRICULTURAL CONFERENCE — EASTERN CANADA

**Hon. W.R. Thatcher (Premier):** — Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition asked me a few days ago whether the Government would consider naming a representative from the Opposition to go to the Agricultural Conference which is now being held in Eastern Canada. I have checked this with the Minister and those involved, and we find that the Minister will be the only Member of this Assembly going. The others will be five technicians, if you will, from the Department. Under these circumstances, we would prefer not to have a Member of the Opposition going to this Conference, but I will assure the Leader of the Opposition that, if there are conferences of a major national nature like that Federal-Provincial Conference, we will give consideration to future ones.

## REPORTS OF PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

**Hon. C.L.B. Estey (Minister of Municipal Affairs):** — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day you will recall that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) a few days ago requested copies of the Reports of the Public Service Commission and the Public Service Superannuation Board. Now I have these copies which I will deliver to the Leader of the Opposition, but I find that on investigation that these two reports have not in past years been distributed to all Members of the House. Copies are in the Library, but if there is a Member who specifically wishes copies we will get them for the Member.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I changed the order of procedure slightly here in order to allow another group of students who were on the way to get in the galleries and we will revert to Orders of the Day in a few moments.

## WELCOME TO STUDENTS

**Hon. G.B. Grant (Regina South):** — Mr. Speaker, through you to the Members of this House, I would like to introduce the grade eight students of Massey school, the largest public school I believe in Saskatchewan, in my constituency. They are in the west gallery and they are accompanied by their teachers, Mr. Frazer and Mr. Graham. I'm sure we welcome this large group and wish them a most enjoyable stay. I am very pleased that that Resolution didn't pass yesterday, so I at least got an opportunity to introduce my second class here this year.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. C.L.B. Estey (Saskatoon Nutana Centre):** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to the House through you, a group of students from Buena Vista school who are in the Speaker's gallery, accompanied by their teachers, Mr. Tetreault and Mr. Loy, and a second group of students from St. Charles school in Saskatoon, who are in the east gallery accompanied by their teacher, Mr. Beacon. I am sure we all wish that these young people have a very enjoyable stay with us and that they return to their homes with some appreciation of this Legislature.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. A. Thibault (Kinistino):** — Mr. Speaker, it is an honor and a privilege for me to be able to introduce to you and to the Members of the Legislature a fine group of students from St. Louis school. They are grade eight students led here by their teacher, Sister Robert Marie. Accompanying the students are Mrs. Medric MacDougall, their

**March 12, 1969**

bus driver, Mr. Joe Midosky and I'm sure their trip to the city today will be very educational and so far they have enjoyed it and I know it will be one of the trips that they will remember for a long time. I also want to wish them a safe journey home.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

## **QUESTIONS**

### **RETURNS NO. 4 AND NO. 31**

**Mr. Willis:** — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to ask the Attorney General when I can expect answers to two Returns, No. 4 in which I requested information regarding Public and Private Rights Board, and No. 31 in which I requested information regarding highway capital improvements.

**Hon. D.V. Heald (Attorney General):** — I think very shortly, Mr. Speaker. We did send out a memo yesterday to all of the Departments in respect of Returns that were asked for or ordered prior to the first day of March. I think certainly that the first one comes within that category, so hopefully it will be very shortly on both of them.

## **ADJOURNED DEBATES**

### **SECOND READINGS**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Hon. W.R. Thatcher (Premier) that Bill No. 30 — **An Act to Establish The Saskatchewan Indian and Metis Department** be now read a second time.

**Mr. G.R. Bowerman (Shellbrook):** — Mr. Speaker, further to the introductory remarks that I made the other day, I repeat again, Mr. Speaker, my reluctance to debate the principle of this Bill. I am reluctant because I have not had an opportunity nor have I had the time to establish what I would consider proper communications with the Indian people in my constituency. I have indeed a greater amount of reluctance after hearing the remarks of the Premier in respect to this Bill. I listened intently and I listened expectantly, Mr. Speaker, to hear the Premier or the Hon. Member (Mr. Gardner) tell this Legislature that, as a result of a comprehensive program of communication with Indian people or as a result of an independent study or as a result of petitions or requests made by Saskatchewan Indian people or even because of any intensive or minimal survey which he the Hon. Premier had undertaken, he was as a result thereof now establishing a Provincial Department of Indian Affairs. But the sad truth of the record will show that not once did either of them mention the reactions or the commentary of Indian people to

this new Provincial Department of Indian Affairs. I suggest the record is sadder still, when it is concluded that the reason there is no reaction and the reason there is no commentary by Indian people is because there was no inquiry made and there were no consultations made. In fact there were no opportunities for Indian people to speak their minds in respect to the Bill itself. I would wonder how many, or if any of them, have ever seen the Bill that we are now debating in this House. Perhaps we should have used the phrase made popular by the recent Provincial Premiers and the Provincial Treasurer at the Confederation Conference when they said there was no meaningful consultation. This is the kind of action I have long believed to be the main contributing factor to many of the frustrations and anathema of the minority groups as well as our native Canadian race.

Perhaps it can be better illustrated by a quick glance around these comfortable and impressive Chambers and then to review the Members who sit in these Chambers itself. Not one of us here has ever been confined to an Indian reservation. None of us has ever inherited a social structure that is not majority. Not one of us has obtained our position or our place because we were anything more or anything less than citizens or human beings with a certain dignity and pride in the abilities and God-given rights that we have. Few of us, if any, have been required to suffer the prejudice against minorities. Few, if any of us, were taught that status and promotion came not from serving oneself, but came from one's ability and skill as a provider and protector of others. I say again, Sir, that few, if any of us, are without the inherent urge to capitalize and to amass personal gain, and we simply fail to understand those who don't follow this ideal. All of us are schooled in the measurement of time as a simple equation of the dollar bill or the economic system or by our extremely close scrutiny of a stop watch. Not one of us, Mr. Speaker, has been exposed to the humiliating sting that can come because of a colored skin, and not one of us can speak with the mind of a Treaty Indian or Neheyawuk. So I say for these and other reasons I am not only reluctant but I am incompetent without some meaningful consultation with people of Indian ancestry to decide whether this is a good Bill or a bad Bill. When I say this, I challenge every Member in this House and particularly the Government Members who say that, when they are voting for the Bill, they are in fact representing the wishes of Saskatchewan Indian people.

Mr. Speaker, I want to briefly quote from the early Canadian histories some of the actions that I believe have put us in the position that we are in today. Our position today is a direct result, I believe, of no meaningful consultation and no meaningful communication by white man's government with nations of people that they didn't understand. Because Neestow said that he was sitting on a powder keg with a short and burning fuse, he began to take immediate actions without due concern for the people whom those actions would directly influence. Therefore nations of people that were simply defending a preservation of

**March 12, 1969**

their way of life and simply defending their rights and their lands were sentenced for generations to come to the kind of regrettable actions that chose, as a solution, the relegation of a total human race to isolation and solitary confinement on what we call today an Indian Reservation.

Undoubtedly, Mr. Speaker, early Canadian legislators had a greater justification to think and to say what the Premier has said to justify this Bill, that is, that we are sitting on a time bomb with a fuse getting shorter every day. Therefore I suggest that, from a position of panic and crisis, legislators made their decision without what I have called meaningful consultation or communications with Indian people. Certainly I do not impugn the motives of past legislators nor do I impugn the motives of the Premier and his Government. But I suggest that we should learn from the history of mistakes and not repeat again the gruesome experience of the past. I want to quote some of the writings that appeared in the early Saskatchewan Herald that was published in North Battleford in April 1881, and I quote:

When Poundmaker and his band went south a few weeks ago, they set out in high glee and spoke disgustingly of the life that they were being taught as tillers of the soil. They were successful in killing a few buffalo on the plains and it made them still more independent. Unable to find any buffalo, they were forced to return to the reserve. The proud chief turned on his trail a sad and broken man and now promises to do everything that is demanded of him.

And I suggest, Sir, that these are some of the actions which have led us into the position that we find ourselves in today. I quote again from the Saskatchewan Herald, September, 1882:

Big Bear feels that he is being made a scapegoat by being charged as a troublemaker for refusing to sign the Treaty. He has refused to take treaty money because he wanted to see whether the white man would keep faith. Big Bear refuses to go to his reserve; 25 of the Mounted Police will proceed to Fort Pitt on Monday to take him.

February, 1883, from the same Saskatchewan Herald:

Letters announce with feelings of relief that Big Bear has at least been compelled by force to accept the situation and to give his consent to the Treaty. He will be removed to his reserve.

And I want to go and quote from the Herald from June, 1883. All that this is doing, Mr. Speaker, is pointing out that the number of reservations with which we are dealing today is a result of what I have termed to be a lack of communication and a lack of no meaningful consultation so that we find ourselves in the position that we are in. And I quote from the Herald June, 1883:

Chief Poundmaker claims that, while he has fulfilled his

share of the Treaty agreement, he has not received what was promised to him by the white man.

July, 1883, from the same Herald and I quote:

Piapot still refused to go to his reservation. But he was awakened from his dream of independence by the police force.

August, 1883:

Little Pine and his band, having nothing to depend on, are now selling their horses to buy food, and as they cannot last long they soon will be starving and be glad to settle on the reserve.

I say this was a rather sad commentary to say the least, a sad commentary but one that has continued and continues to have a familiar ring even to the present day. I want to draw on some quotations from the minutes of a conference between the Government of Saskatchewan and the people of Indian ancestry, held in Saskatoon, September 22 to 24, 1964. There were some 60 to 65 Indians and Metis present on that occasion. I say to the Hon. Premier that these were the words that were spoken to his Government in 1964 by the people who were at that conference. I quote from Minute 12:25:

That the information and material gathered from the Provincial Government be taken back to the reserves and discussed with members of the individual bands.

Resolution 12:26:

We have been informed that there will be a meeting of Federal and Provincial officials in Ottawa in October, BE IT RESOLVED that the Provincial Government make arrangements for Indian representation in the provincial delegation.

Resolution 12:28:

Whereas we are in full agreement with the principle of consultation with people of Indian ancestry on matters affecting their welfare, and,

Whereas consultation should be on a continuous process, BE IT RESOLVED that provisions be made for setting up two groups of consultants, one group from the north and one group from the south; these groups to consist of six to eight people each, who are selected by the people in given areas.

This was submitted by the people of Cumberland House.

I suggest that the consistent thread which can be observed in each account that I have quoted is the appeal for Indian people to be recognized as mature men and women who want to make

**March 12, 1969**

decisions on proposals that affect their lives. The process will be a slower one but the process must in fact be undertaken and we must be patient. I venture to suggest that, if the Premier had chosen to listen to the people of Cumberland House, there would not be any doubt or, if any doubt, very little at least today about whether this is a good Bill or a bad Bill for the Indian people of Saskatchewan. Because there has been no continuing meaningful consultation by the Government since the initial conference of 1964, the word of Neestow or the word of the white man has again sunken lower into the credibility gap. I want to make this final quotation from the 1964 conference. Appendix 2 and I quote:

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I am a delegate from the Mosquito, Grizzly Bear's Head Band of the Battleford Agency.

My people are not prepared to make any resolutions or any recommendations at this time, on such short notice pertaining to the Provincial Government proposals.

And I ask, Mr. Chairman, that I take with me all the policies that you outline, and I will sincerely discuss these proposals and policies with my people, and in the very near future we will draw up our resolutions.

And as a delegate I will listen to all matters, and in no way will I stand against the betterment and prosperity of my people.

The voice of Indian people in Saskatchewan has repeatedly said one thing: Listen to us, listen to what we have to say, recognize that we do have ability and skills and that we do have human motivations that can better be interpreted by Indian feelings, Indian hopes and Indian aspirations.

Mr. Premier, if these are the resolutions or the kind of resolutions which you interpret as the fuses on time bomb situations, then I can point you to a solution that will slowly, indeed halt the advance of that fuse. I suggest that you have some meaningful consultation with Indian people and have them before you formally establish the Department which this Bill is intended to do.

Let me briefly quote again from the Conference of 1964, the final report to the plenary session: Item No. 1:

Native peoples are to be consulted throughout and their support obtained if lasting progress is to be achieved.

Speaking of the pending Federal Provincial Ministerial Conference on Indian Affairs, it was said and I quote:

It is intended by all concerned that the native peoples



should be consulted as fully as possible.

That was the Conference held in 1964. Those indeed are fine words and they are not unlike the words spoken on many similar occasions before. But obviously, Mr. Speaker, to Saskatchewan Indian people they were as hollow as the many words that so often have been spoken in conferences of this kind going back to 1881.

Mr. Premier, I suggest that this is the burning fuse. There is mistrust. There is no confidence. There are broken agreements. And there is constant humiliation of being left out of matters of serious consequence. In short, I say that Paleface Brother still speaks with a fork tongue. Confidence must be restored and politicians above all first must go beyond all previous boundaries to assure them that our word is good and that it can be relied upon. It really doesn't cost much money, but it requires impeccable honesty. May I say, Mr. Speaker, that those resolutions, I referred to earlier, from the Indian voices of this province in conference with the Government pleaded with the Government to go slow — to allow time for discussion, and to allow time for decision-making, for resolutions and for response to the grass roots Indian organizations of this province. I believe it is clear that the Government agrees that this involvement should take place and that consultation and communication with Indian people must be had in order that we can obtain a lasting progress. Nowhere have we seen or heard evidence that a conference comparable to the 1964 Conference has since been called. I will wager in fact, Sir, that there have been no official communications with Indian people as an organization or with their representative body, the Saskatchewan Federation of Indians, as a direct follow-up to the 1964 Conference.

In conclusion I must comment on what I believe is added evidence of the wrong approach to a Department of Indian Affairs. It is my understanding that, even before this Bill came to the Legislature, the appointment of a deputy minister was confirmed. I believe it is correct to say that the senior position of the new Indian Affairs Department will be headed by a person from our own social structure. If this situation were to occur in our own social order, we would take it as a personal affront of our ability, of our integrity and of our desire for social recognition. It can no less, Sir, be recognized as such among Saskatchewan Indian people. Mr. Speaker, this appointment makes somewhat of a pretense of the otherwise commendable actions of the Premier to appoint to the Boards of Directors Treaty Indian representation on the senior Crown corporations of this Province, and then to fill the position of Deputy Minister of Saskatchewan Indian and Metis Affairs with a white man.

Mr. Speaker, I have been and I am critical, not of a department as such, but rather of the method by which it has been arrived at. I sincerely regret that commentaries of this kind continue to arise in the ivory towers of the white man's world, and that they do so, while so often those whom such actions

**March 12, 1969**

are designed to aid must sit in silent embarrassment because of the paralysis of a social structure to which they are confined and which alienates them even from the debate itself and to them must go my sincere and humble apologies. I commend the Premier for the activities for which he has undertaken to alleviate disparity among Indian people and our own standards of living, but I am equally unable to commend him for the methods his Government chose to implement this Bill.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, I must of necessity hope for lasting success with all possible co-operation from the people of Saskatchewan which does in fact include the people of Indian ancestry.

Therefore, I must support the Bill in the final analysis.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

### **WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**Mr. R. Heggie (Hanley):** — Mr. Speaker, I beg leave of the Assembly to introduce a school which I was just notified has arrived. Mr. Speaker, I wish to introduce to you and to the House the members of two classes of grade seven from Clavet composite school just east of Saskatoon. There are 48 pupils here with their two teachers, Mr. Derdahl and Mr. Brenholen, and since they are required to leave just as quickly as they can after 3 o'clock, I'm sure the Assembly hopes they've had a pleasant time watching the Assembly in action.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

The Assembly resumed the interrupted debate on Bill No. 30 — **An Act to Establish The Saskatchewan Indian and Metis Department.**

**Mr. H.E. Coupland (Meadow Lake):** — Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this Bill. I want to concur with the remarks of my seatmate, the Member from Moosomin (Mr. Gardner) and the Premier on moving this Bill.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to commend the Government for bringing in this Bill, setting up a new department to look after the needs of our native people. No government, Mr. Speaker, in the history of this province has been more aware and more concerned about the needs of our native people, and this is just another indication that we are prepared to do something about it.

The Government is already opening land up in my area. It has 700 acres at Ile-a-La-Crosse with the bush all piled up now ready to burn and break in the spring. It is going to open at least another 600 at La Loche. These are settlements of almost totally Metis people. There's a contract let for another 1500 acres, a new project being opened, at Green Lake for the Metis. These are just a few of the things this Government is doing for the people of Indian ancestry in this province. Over on the

east side, of course, there is the big Cumberland project and I'm hoping that we can continue to expand these programs. I think under this new Bill that this will be the case.

Another program that I'm very enthused about is of course the Premier's Task Force on Indian and Metis. When I hear the Member from Shellbrook (Mr. Bowerman) talk about the native people not being consulted, they are sitting on this Task Force, they're in the Indian and Metis Branch. They are being consulted. I shouldn't be surprised, I suppose, at the Member from Shellbrook (Mr. Bowerman) because he seems to be opposed to any programs that are proposed by the Government. But I want to tell him that no government has had more consultation with the native people of this province than the Liberal Government.

This department, I hope, will really expand the Indian and Metis Branch that was with the Department of Natural Resources and has been doing a good job. There are a lot of native people working in that branch, and I suppose and hope they will switch over to the new department.

Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly support this Bill.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. F. Meakes (Touchwood):** — Mr. Speaker, at the outset I wish to state that, although I'm going to support the Bill, I'll do it with certain reservations which I will endeavor to spell out before I sit down.

I agree with the Premier when he said the other day that one of our greatest social problems is the economic and human condition of our Indian people. I want to admit that it's easier to look highmost and foremost. I'm the first to admit this. Having said this, I believe the greatest mistake that the white man has made over a 100-year period is that he has always decided what is the best thing to do for the Indian at any given time. Seldom, if ever, has the Indian been consulted. Always the Indian is being told to do this, this is good for you. We know best. I want to submit that if we were in the same position we would resent it too.

And as the Member for Shellbrook (Mr. Bowerman) said, I listened to the Premier closely, and I noted that he failed to say that he or the Government had consulted the Indian people themselves out on the reserves. I appreciate the Task Force but I am now talking about consultation out on the reserves.

Further, in talking to what Indians I have been able to talk to in my own constituency, they seem to know nothing about it. None of them would say that they are in favor of the new department. I want to say that I spent most of my life in association with Indian people. I've listened to them so many times expound their frustrations and their complaints. Time

**March 12, 1969**

after time it comes, "We're never consulted until after the decision is made. The white man again tells us what is best for us, while we have nothing to say in our own likes."

Because of the attitude of Indian people, because Indian people are often so hesitant to voice their opinions and complaints, I'm afraid that once more the Indian people back on the reserves will look at this new department with the same suspicion that they've looked on the Federal Indian Department. In my opinion, and I might say in the minds of most Indians, the Federal Department of Indian Affairs has been a white man's kingdom geared first to make jobs for "Mooneas."

I would hope that the Government in staffing this new department will staff it with Indian people. I have nothing against the gentleman who the Premier has announced will be the Deputy Minister, but, Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Premier, he's not an Indian. I appreciate that the Premier did, by the press reports, offer the post to another man, whom I would have liked to have seen take it, but as far as the Indian goes I'm afraid this will be the first strike against the department. Again I want to urge the Premier to take whatever steps possible that the new department be staffed by Indian people. I believe the success or the failure of this worthwhile effort may well be decided on this issue. It seems to me that in this House in passing this legislation, we're at the forks of a road, and I submit that how this department is started and which fork of the road it takes, are not only important but vital. The Premier eloquently has expressed and spelled out some of the economic human problems of the Indians. Now, I want to submit that the economic problems are important but I believe that the human ones are even more important. We must, as soon as possible, have the Indian people making their own decisions, deciding by trial and by error what is good for themselves.

I now come, Mr. Speaker, to what I think should be the role of this Department. Again I listened carefully to the Premier's remarks. It sounded to me, and I can stand to be corrected, that he envisaged a movement of Indians from the reserves to the urban society. This is okay but I want to suggest that we should also look at making the reserves productive, to supporting those wishing to reside on the reserves.

What I'm now going to say I said in the previous debate but I feel obligated to restate it in this debate. I try and listen to the Indians and from what I hear, I interpret them as saying they would be happier to remain on the reserves. Last fall when travelling through North Dakota I was told about how the Bulova Watch Company has a factory in a town near one of the reserves. The factory does diamond cutting and most of the workers are Indians. Here they have become self-sufficient and still able to live on their own land. This Government boasts of its interest in getting industry into this province. Well, I say let it do something about the situation, even to the point of let it do something about the situation, even to the point of giving incentive to an industry that would locate in areas like Fort Qu'Appelle or Kamsack or Punnichy or Lestock or many others.

I ask why should we only try to force our native people to move into the urban centres?

I can go on and can talk about the things the department should be working on. I hear my Indian friends saying, "Why can't we have old folks homes right on the reserve to care for our old people." Let it be run by Indian people and staffed by native people, in an area such as the Qu'Appelle area with the reserves coming down to the lake. I know there's been some of this done, Mr. Premier, but I emphasize it some more. Why not give the Indians an opportunity with financial assistance to develop resort areas.

I see the PFRA renting reserve land for community pastures and the white man will use the land. Why not agricultural loans either to the bands or to individual Indians to establish livestock herds, feed lots, etc., so that they can make use of their own lands?

I could go on and on citing examples that could make the reserve a more productive place to live. These are the kind of things I hear when I listen to our Indian friends. I repeat again, I see no need to only encourage them to come into our urban society. For too long the white man has tried to reform and change the Indian in the white man's image. In so doing we have destroyed their religion, their culture and their way of life.

The Premier mentioned that since 1965 5,000 Indians had been found jobs, but he intimated that he had no idea about how many had continued to work. Let me tell the Premier that, unless this Government is prepared to spend money for the training of these people before they enter the work stream, the turnover will continue to be great. I'll admit that here there's no clear answer, but, unless they are taught what to expect in their new way of life, they will be no different than we would be. Many will return to the old home and the old environment. Most of them are not aware of the necessity of punching a clock at 8 a.m. and not aware that they have to get up at 7 a.m. to do this. They are not aware that they must put in a five-day week. They have little or no conception of living in a large urban society with all its pressures and with all its discrimination. In my opinion there should be several months of training for this new way of life before they are put to work. Otherwise if they go to work, burn their bridges behind them, become disillusioned with their new life and return to the reserve, it will be much harder for them to try again.

I think the first job of this department is to gain the confidence of the Indian people, Mr. Speaker. This will be hard to do. They distrust white people and I don't really blame them. Our record of fulfilling our promises is awful. Our record of doing something, not to help the Indian but to satisfy the white man, is a disgrace. For 100 years the white man hoped that in time most of the Indians would die off and the rest would vanish into our society but it has not happened. Rather

**March 12, 1969**

now the Indian population is increasing. Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to the Premier that such remarks that he's made from time to time haven't helped the feeling of goodwill between the Indian and the white society. Possibly one of the reasons of the increase of the Indian population can be laid at the door of the white man.

I want to emphasize again that I will be voting for this legislation but I admit that I do it with hesitation. I'm scared that it will lead to further distrust between us, the white man and the Indian, but I say that, if it is to be successful, then I suggest the following things must be done: 1. Politics must be forgotten in hiring and in services rendered. 2. There must be detailed consultation on each program with the Indian people. 3. Let the Indian people themselves say what they want for themselves, not what we tell them. 4. We must be prepared for many trials and errors. 5. We must be completely involved with the Indian people. 6. Be patient at all times and I'll admit that this is not going to be easy. 7. Staff the department with good Indian people.

I must say, going from my notes, that there are — and I'm sure the Premier will agree — increasingly capable and well-qualified Indian people growing up and getting educated. They are really becoming able young people who are, I believe, capable of being trained into this department. I think that if this is done that perhaps in 20 years from now we'll see great changes for improvement.

In closing, I say also that I think that plans should be made to phase out the department some time in the future. I, for one, will not be happy until every person in our province and in our country receives all the different services of government from the same department.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Meakes:** — Until that time comes, I don't think that we can really call it a just society.

Mr. Speaker, I said at the beginning that I'll be supporting it. I hope, if we can get it off, that it will be successful in alleviating some of those great social problems that the Premier spoke of.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. J. Kowalchuk (Melville):** — Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on the Act To Establish The Saskatchewan Indian and Metis Department, I do so with apprehension and some deep and immediate concern.

The impact of this Bill, Mr. Speaker, is of such prime importance to all of us here and all the people of Saskatchewan, and much more to the Indians and Metis people of Saskatchewan,

Sir, in the light of the great social upheaval here in Canada and in other countries as well, we, on this side of the House, would have thought that, before presenting such a Bill as this, a great deal of communication and consultation with the native Indians and the Metis people would have taken place. Alas, Sir, to the knowledge that I can find, little or no such consultation has taken place. I spent the whole of the last weekend, that was two weeks ago, visiting some of the reserves in my constituency of Melville, Little Black Bear and all the rest of them. And, in spite of what the Hon. Member for Meadow Lake (Mr. Coupland) said, Sir, I didn't find one — and there were many of many different political colors — not one said that they had been consulted in a meaningful consultation with respect to this Bill. I got a chance to talk to a goodly number of Indians. Everywhere I went the story was the same. There was little or no consultation with the Indian people regarding the setting up of this branch. I heard the same stories from people on the reserves and off the reserves as well. Now, some of these people showed resentment and some a bitter disappointment. The fact that these people knew nothing about the appointment of a newly appointed deputy minister of this branch until they had read it in the papers, I think, Mr. Speaker, shows a lack of communication. This is no way to induce confidence, Sir. Is it any wonder then that we are apprehensive? Mr. Speaker, really I am not surprised that this was the case.

The Liberal Government and the Premier have made it quite obvious from other such occasions. They know no other way. At the meeting in Fort Qu'Appelle I remember talking to some of these Indians. The Indian people I met with and they met with Mr. Thatcher for the purpose of asking questions I am sure, but for the most part it was to tell what they wanted. But the meeting wound up by the Premier telling them what he and his Government were going to do.

Now, it's a real sad commentary, Mr. Speaker, that this thing has gone as it has. Yet I am not too surprised. The last year's hospital consultation before closing; also in relation to the consultation with the teachers, it was the same. I'm not too surprised, Mr. Speaker. The most depressing aspect of this occasion is that the result of this type of government's inflexible behavior can lead to real tragic consequences.

A week ago, on Friday . . .

**Hon. D.V. Heald (Attorney General):** — Vote against it.

**Mr. Kowalchuk:** — I certainly will not vote against it. We certainly will not vote against it, Mr. Speaker.

**An Hon. Member:** — . . . never mind . . .

**Mr. Kowalchuk:** — That's right. A week ago on Friday, Mr. Speaker, we heard the Hon. Member for Yorkton (Mr. Gallagher) say that

**March 12, 1969**

things will be done for the Indian people, but it will take a generation to really get at the roots of the problem. Now, Mr. Speaker, anyone with any sense of urgency and immediate responsibility would not make such remarks. Surely the Member for Yorkton (Mr. Gallagher) — and I know he has — must have some knowledge of the seriousness of this situation as there are plenty of Indian and Metis people in and around Yorkton.

Mr. Speaker, some of the answers must be found today as Mr. Thatcher has said the last time he introduced this Bill, not tomorrow, not in a generation's time, but in the immediate future. This Act may be the beginning of closer and fuller relationship between the Indian people and ourselves. These people, Mr. Speaker, have pleaded with us to listen to them. They have repeatedly said so to all of us the last number of years. But, Mr. Speaker, time is running out and the attitude of this Government doesn't help the situation. To go ahead with such important legislation without consulting these people to find what they think, is, in many instances, an insult to them, Mr. Speaker, an insult particularly to their pride and their intelligence. Let me tell you, Sir, they are intelligent. We should have gone out to these people on the reserves, listened to them, heard them out, seen how they live, seen their difficulties at first hand, and let them show their scars and wounds that the white man's society has inflicted upon them. Then, we, as Legislators, would really have been in a position to pass more effective judgment on this Bill with possibly some understanding and some consent of the people involved. We should have shown these people that we, as Legislators, need their advice, that not only do we need their advice and counsel and trust, but I think that they should have counsel, and position, say in that department, so that it could really be called and in reality be an Indian department. Surely, Mr. Speaker, amongst the many Indians of Saskatchewan — and I know of at least a half a dozen or so — there must have been one capable of filling the shoes of a deputy minister.

Mr. Speaker, the most important question that every Indian and Metis should have been asked is this. Do you want another Indian and Metis department? Do you want a perpetuation of the same from the Federal branch into a Provincial branch? Do you want rigid control of your people within the framework of another Indian department? These are the questions they should have been asked. These and hundreds of other questions could have been asked and, knowing the Indian people as well as I do, I think you would have got an answer from them, Sir. But more important they would have been in a position to have some voice in and control of their own destiny.

Mr. Speaker, this Government has made its biggest error in not involving the Indian people enough. Some of what is being offered to the native people in this Bill is very acceptable, but the way it is being offered I'm afraid is not. Maybe in some fields they want equal treatment and equal participation with the white neighbors. Maybe some want municipal consolidation with other rural municipalities. Maybe then, maybe some



would prefer to go it alone. There could be a thousand maybes, Sir, but you have to get out and ask them.

Mr. Speaker, I was asked many questions by these people. Whose department is it going to be? A white man's well-paying, life-long job in this service like the present white man's Indian Affairs at Ottawa? Will it be another white man's bureaucracy? Will the Indian people even be consulted on what they want? These are good questions, Mr. Speaker.

I was astounded to learn not too long ago, Sir, that of the 8,000 or so employees of the Federal Indian Affairs, some two dozen or so are Indians. The rest are white. That is a terrible indictment against the white race, Sir. And what a terrible indictment against that Liberal and Conservative Governments in power then, particularly those in the past quarter of the century and the part they played in the attempt to really do nothing. There was no attempt to make the Indian, the only real native of this country, an active partner in shaping the destiny of this country. Instead these Governments and the people waited for the total and final disappearance of these people. And then today most of us seem to be dumbfounded when the Indian people question our motives. Mr. Speaker, we shouldn't be. These people have every right to be suspicious. Some of the things, which I have said before and which I was told, "Sure, we're suspicious, we have a right to be! Why weren't we told about this department? Our experience in the past has made us deeply suspicious," and so on.

Mr. Speaker, and most unfortunately, and I say this most emphatically, nobody has added more fuel to the fuel of distrust than our Premier has in the past. Mr. Speaker, actions are louder than a thousand words. Mr. Speaker, the time has come to speak with clarity, honesty and humility. The time has come to go out to these people on the reserves and into the homes where they live. The time has come to hear them and to talk with them. The time has come now to begin to prove to them that we, the white people, can be trusted. If we can do that, it would be the biggest hurdle of all and there would be hope for all of us to live together in an atmosphere of understanding and mutual respect. But that time is short, Sir, so very, very short. We, on this side of the House, are going to vote for this Bill, Mr. Speaker, the Bill providing for the establishment of an Indian and Metis Department in Saskatchewan. We're going to vote for it because, Mr. Speaker, we, on this side of the House sincerely believe that we have no moral right to dim even the slightest ray of hope that the Indian and the Metis Department might possibly offer to the Indian and Metis people. Also, Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House hope and pray that the Indian and Metis Department of Saskatchewan will be so administered that the rights and the privileges of the native people will be brought to fruition, will be clearly defined and clearly carried out according to the wishes of the Indian and the Metis people.

Mr. Speaker, I will support this Bill.

**March 12, 1969**

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. J.R. Barrie (Minister of Natural Resources):** — Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak in support of this Bill, I'm really surprised, Mr. Speaker, at the ignorance displayed by Hon. Members in this House.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Barrie:** — As to the communication between branches of this Government and the native people of this province, I believe that possibly in recent months I am in a better position to make an assessment of this much better than some of those that have already spoken. I wish to say that it is abundantly clear to the whole of Canada that the Province of Saskatchewan has taken measures and made progress in trying to do something to solve the problems of our native people, that have turned out to be an example to all the other provincial governments.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Barrie:** — During the last 12 months we have had on numerous occasions representatives from our sister provinces and other parts of Canada come to us in Saskatchewan to see what we had done, to look over our programs and the plans we have for the future and such like. Surely no one could say that the Provincial Government of Saskatchewan and the Premier in particular have not been most interested in this particular problem, because there is much tangible evidence to show this particular interest. I would just like to enumerate one or two while I'm speaking today.

The first thing is that I'd like to remind the Members of this House that the responsibility of the registered Treaty Indians has been, and still is, the Federal Government's, and anything we have done to assist the Treaty Indians has been of course supplemental to the assistance that they receive from the Federal authorities. But his Government has set up in the first place the Indian and Metis Branch of the Department that I have the honor to administer at the present time. This was one of the first moves they made. In that branch I might say that the majority of the employees are people of native ancestry, and they have done a remarkably good job. Without the substantial financial assistance that has been given to the two main organizations of native people in the province, the Federation of Saskatchewan Indians and the Metis Society of Saskatchewan, without the financial assistance that's been rendered to these two organizations by this Government, there would be no such organizations. I am satisfied of that. We have had very close liaison, communication and consultation with the officials of both the SFI and the Metis Society of Saskatchewan, week after week and month after month. And from the financial assistance that we provided them, both of these

organizations have a staff of communication workers, placement officers and contact men, who are constantly on the road travelling throughout the province to Indian reservations, Metis settlements and such like. In addition to this, of course we have the employees of the Indian and Metis Branch, communication workers, we have placement officers, community development officers. These people have worked very diligently. They are competent people and the only thing I can say in this respect, we didn't have enough of them. They have done a remarkably good job. There has been constant communication kept up between the Government of Saskatchewan through the Indian and Metis Branch and the people of native settlements throughout the province. Then, we have, as many of you know, Indian and Friendship Centres established in different parts of the province. If it wasn't for the substantial grants that they receive from the Provincial Government and have received from the Provincial Government, these particular amenities are native people I don't believe would exist today. If they did, it would be on a very minor scale to the present functions they perform.

Of course, one of the main promotions that was brought about to assist these people and help solve the problems was the Premier's Task Force. This captured the imagination I could say in one respect, and brought to the attention of hundreds of people throughout the province the seriousness of the particular problem that this Task Force was set up to try and help solve. The response to this Task Force from every part of the province, from industry, business people, private individuals and such like, was much more than we had ever anticipated. I am very well certain in my own mind that, as time progresses, a great deal will be accomplished within the next few months, within the next few years by efforts put forward by members of the Task Force. I might say in this regard that this Task Force of course isn't composed of all what is generally termed white people, because on the Task Force are some prominent people from the Indian and Metis organizations, for instance, our friend from Saskatoon, Dr. Howard Adams, is a member of the Task Force. So these people haven't been ignored, many of them consulted, and there has been constant communication with them. I am surprised to hear Members of the opposite side of the House complain in this particular regard.

From the experience that we have had, I would just like to mention, before I proceed any further, that one of the main problems, if we are going to accomplish anything with these people, is to have particularly the young people become involved in communities outside of settlements where they have possibly lived for years, and from Indian reservations. I know that the procedure that has to be taken and the transition that has to be made in the lives of these people is something that creates a problem in itself. But in order to get these people out of the areas where there is no gainful employment for them, certain effort has been put forward up until the present time and will have to continue to be put forward in moving these people into an area such as the large urban centres where there is gainful employment. I quite agree that these people

**March 12, 1969**

have to be conditioned and a process has to be set up to condition them in order to take care of the problem they will have in this particular transition. There has to be training, there has to be counselling, there has to be housing and so on. Insofar as this is concerned, I think we have done a relatively good job up until the present time. But it was realized that a branch, a small branch in the Department, such as the department of Natural Resources, with a limited staff, could not and was not able to give the attention to this serious problem and give it on a scale that possibly it deserves.

As a result the decision was made by the Premier and the Government that this should receive the status of a Department and a full time deputy minister to carry on this work. I am certain, Mr. Speaker, that insofar as this new department is concerned, it will be absorbing the staff of the Indian and Metis Branch, people that have had — some of them — three or four years' experience and have a considerable amount of skill and knowledge of the situation, and that this staff will no doubt be expanded. I am quite certain that the native people will be given a preference or priority when the staff is expanded or enlarged. I look forward to see a very decided difference and a great benefit come to not only the native people in Saskatchewan, but all the citizens in Saskatchewan, because this is our problem, not only the problem of the Indian and Metis people. Mr. Speaker, I certainly will support the Bill.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. M. Kwasnica (Cutknife):** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I hadn't really intended to get into the debate, so I just prepared a few comments while I was listening to the Hon. Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Barrie). That's one reason I decided to enter the debate at this time. The other reason is simply that over the weekend I had the opportunity to visit with our native people on two of the three reserves in my constituency. For these two reasons I would like to make some observations. First of all, the Hon. Member for Pelly made reference just a minute ago to the fact that Members on this side of the House were ignorant regarding the consultation the Government had with the native people.

Let us just pursue this a little further. He said there was consultation with leaders in the upper echelons of the SFI and other Indian organizations. Good. But the type of consultation that really bears fruit, I feel, is right down at the reservation level with each chief and his council, or several of these together at one point. This is the kind of consultation we on this side of the House are talking about. Did the Government Members go to the reservations to meet with them personally with each one?

**Hon. W.R. Thatcher (Premier):** — I've been on your reserve, yes.

**Hon. D.V. Heald (Lumsden):** — I've been on more reserves

than you ever have!

**Mr. Kwasnica:** — Now, I would just like to bring to the attention of this Government some of the points that were raised by these people on Poundmaker Reserve, and Little Pine, on the past Sunday. These are some of the things that they were saying, and I want to bring them back to this House and this Government. I think some of the comments made are extremely constructive, and that is why I want to offer them to you at this time. Before I do this, I would like to mention that I think the Members from Shellbrook (Mr. Bowerman), Touchwood (Mr. Meakes) and Melville (Mr. Kowalchuk) have so far expounded well the problem with this Bill. Coming back to the meeting held Sunday past, the first point made after the people saw the Bill was, “We’ve never heard of it before, we’ve never seen it. They haven’t consulted us, the Government has not consulted us.”

They said perhaps it would be better, after I pointed out that perhaps a million dollars would be spent on this new Indian and Metis Branch, they said, it would have been much better for the Government to spend this \$1 million and set it into a type of development fund for the people, a sort of a bank, where they might be able to, for example, borrow money for a machinery co-op, or for farm herds, or land development, or even for recreation centres which are so badly needed on the reservations. These are some of the ideas the people in my constituency expounded.

Then they had some reservation about the Section in the Act which said that the Department was going to engage specialists and consultants. Here the fear was, will they be white? From somewhere else? Outside the province or from the Federal Department? They said, and said very strongly, that the consultants should be the Indian chiefs, the council members of each reservation. These are the consultants that they are asking for. They were afraid that this Department might just be another referral department where they will go in to talk problems over.

They also pointed out that they felt that they in the northern portion of the province, as far as reservations were concerned, felt that the southern reserves are much more informed, and get much more notice than the reserves further north.

In response to the Premier’s statement, when he made his opening remarks on the Bill, that part which said that — I quote from the release in the Leader Post — or the nature of the Premier’s remarks was that natives leave jobs after a short period. They tried to explain that really, when a native leaves his reservation to try to seek employment in the city, it is no easy task for him to go with \$5 or \$10 in his pocket, even though the job may be waiting for him there, to come to a big city, get a place to stay — if he can find one without discrimination — and within a week or two when the payment for his

**March 12, 1969**

work isn't forthcoming, if he is paid by the month, he has run out of cash, he has no place to go and no one to turn to so therefore he returns back to the reserve. This is the type of explanation they offered.

Well, I hope that this Government will pay attention to some of the comments that I have brought from my constituents in regard to this Bill. Since this Bill may well be, if properly handled, a real help to our native people, I will support it. I wish the Government good luck and hope that the Bill will be a tremendous success.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. E. Kramer (The Battlefords):** — I have only one comment to make and that is regarding the statement made by the Hon. Member for Pelly (Mr. Barrie), other Hon. Members and the Premier that there has been consultation with Indians. When this Bill was first mooted and introduced, I welcomed it and I think I still do, but with some of the reservations that have been mentioned here by other speakers.

Completely by accident, Mr. Speaker, I happened to be in the Beaver Hotel in North Battleford in the dining room on the 1st of March. There was a dinner meeting, supper meeting if you wish, of several leaders of the Indian Bands of Northwestern Saskatchewan. As I walked out I stopped and said hello to some of the chaps I knew. The first thing that was asked me by one of the chiefs was, "What is going on with this new Indian Department?" Well, I said, "Sir, I know very little about it. I was of the opinion that you people knew all about it." These people to a man and woman said, "We know nothing whatever about this and we think we should have been consulted and we are not pleased with the fact that we were not consulted." I can only relay to the Premier and with no malice whatever, what the opinion of a pretty representative group of Indians from Northwestern Saskatchewan was and what they told me. I told them that I would be pleased to hear from them, I don't have Indian reservations in my constituency, I would be pleased to hear from them further what their suggestions are, and that they should write directly to the Government or to the new department when it is set up, to get more information. These are the facts as they were related to me by a group, a representative group of chiefs, and other executive members of the bands from that area. It would seem to me that there is some cause for worry. I would suggest to the Government that there are still a few people around who are advising in all departments of Indian Affairs who really don't have much more interest in Indian Affairs and Indians than General Custer had. I think there ought to have been more communication. The evidence of one cross section is proof to me that there was not sufficient consultation and you have started out on the wrong foot in not consulting to a greater extent with the Indian leaders.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. A.R. Guy (Minister of Public Works):** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words in support of this legislation, as I represent a constituency which has more people of Indian ancestry than any other constituency in this province. However, I must say that I have never seen so many Members with so much apprehension and concern and yet end up supporting a motion.

I am quite sure that the Member from The Battlefords doesn't have to apologize for being in the Beaver Hotel in North Battleford, I am sure the Manager of the Beaver Hotel wouldn't appreciate the comment or the thought that his Member has to come into this Legislature and apologize for being in the Beaver Hotel on any particular day or any particular date.

**Mr. Kramer:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. This hon. gentleman cannot get up on his feet anytime in this House without casting innuendoes. I did not apologize — I want to make this clear — I did not apologize for being in the Beaver Hotel. I simply stated where the meeting was, in the dining room, the coffee room of the Beaver Hotel. I don't know what is wrong with this man's head. He can't hear and he can't articulate when he does hear.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! If a Member is going to raise a question of privilege he should state the question, and let it go at that without making dispersions against anyone else.

**Mr. Guy:** — I think the fact that he was so quick to get back to his feet shows a little sensitivity there. Maybe the manager of the Beaver Hotel is a Liberal, I don't know, and that's why he didn't want to be seen in the hotel on this particular occasion. However, this is neither here nor there I suppose. One thing that is important is the fact that the Members opposite are going to support the motion and yet they do everything in their power to skirt on the fine edge of not wanting to support it because, as they say, they don't think that this Bill is going to work. Well, I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, that if this legislation doesn't work there will only be one reason, and that will be because the Members opposite will be out there on the reserves and in the Indian and Metis settlements undermining it to the best of their ability.

In my very first speech in this Legislature back in 1960, I spoke about the problems that faced the Indian people in Saskatchewan and particularly in the North. I pleaded with the Government of that day to do something positive about these problems. I must admit that my pleas fell on deaf ears. A few very feeble attempts were made by some agencies on their own with no objectives and no direction, and they failed to do anything positive to alleviate the problem that faced our Indian people, Welfare handouts became the answer to each and every

**March 12, 1969**

problem when Members opposite were the Government. They talk about consultation. I want to remind Members of this House about the lack of consultation when they gave the Indians a vote and when they gave the Indians the right to purchase liquor. These were things that were long overdue. I am not suggesting the Government was wrong, but they did not consult the Indian people because there were several chiefs who came to us in the Opposition and said, "We don't know whether this is good legislation or not. This Government has never even come to us. They never told us they were going to bring this legislation in." I remember many of the Indian chiefs coming to us in the Opposition and saying this purchasing liquor may be a good thing, but, until the Federal Acts are changed, so that we can take it on to a reserve, all that will happen will be that we'll be picked up in the back alleys. And that is just exactly what did happen. But the Members opposite had no concern for that. They didn't consult with the chiefs or anyone else. So when you talk about lack of consultation their record in this regard can't stand up to the light of day either.

We suggested at that time when we were in the Opposition that employment, social and economic integration in the mainstream of our life, provision of better housing, power, sewer, water, roads, air fields, and other services and increased educational opportunity and greater development and wiser administration of our natural resources were needed, if the Indian people were going to get a break. But these ideas were foreign to Socialist philosophy and it was not until 1964 when the Government changed that my plea for consideration of these people were listened to by a Liberal Government. I am pleased to say that immediately after becoming the Government the Premier and his colleagues began grappling with the problem. I want to tell this House today that there is no Premier in the history of Saskatchewan, in fact there is no Premier in the history of any province in Canada, that has spent as much time and as much effort visiting Indian reserves and the people in the Northern settlements, listening to their problems. Then he came back here and put forward programs that were for their advantage. This is about the best form of consultation that you can find when the head of the Government and his colleagues go into the local councillors and the people, pat the children on the head and ask them how they are doing in school. I don't know of any better consultation service that can be provided than our Premier and other Members of the Cabinet whose Departments deal with Indians have carried out for the last four years.

The creation of the Task Force was an important step to bring all public and private agencies in contact with the problems existing. And with the recommendations anticipated I suggest that the next logical step was the creation of an Indian and Metis Department. Nowhere have the results of this new interest in Indian people been more obvious than in Northern Saskatchewan. I can't agree with one of the Members opposite that said that Indian and Metis in Northern Saskatchewan had



had not received the attention that they had in the South. I think it is probably the other way around. I think the Member from Prince Albert East-Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) will agree with me in this regard. The former Government couldn't employ Indian people because they couldn't create jobs, and they refused to develop our resources. Paralleling the work done by the Metis Branch has been the achievement of our Government in bringing a pulp mill into production, bringing several mines into production, all of which provide job opportunities for our native people close to their natural setting in Northern Saskatchewan. There was nothing like this available when the people across the way sat in the Government benches. Northern Saskatchewan has undergone a new awakening since we became the Government. As I mentioned, jobs are now available as we develop our natural resources which lay dormant for so long. Communities are coming to life again. New schools have been built in all settlements and there has been a greatly increased emphasis on education for our Indian people. Last year, many of the schools operated by Indian Affairs were taken over by the Provincial Department of Education, so that education provided to our Indian students will be on a par with that provided to other provincial students. At the same time, we have recognized the need for a special curriculum for Indian students. A meeting was held in La Ronge the other day of the northern teachers local to discuss curriculums that are geared for the people of Indian ancestry in Northern Saskatchewan, rather than the Tom sees Spot, Dick and Jane primers and readers that are used in the southern part of the province. We have increased the number of upgrading and basic literacy and trade courses. These have all given the Indian people new incentives and new hope that they will be able to compete with the white population for available job opportunities. The construction of air strips at Fond du Lac, Wollaston, Stanley and other northern points has improved the communication between these points and the rest of Saskatchewan. They are no longer isolated for long periods of the year. The Indian people have the opportunity to have improved health and educational services as well as to move back and forth and get into the main stream of Saskatchewan and Canadian life. Roads are being pushed into the wilderness bringing the settlements closer to job opportunities and mining developments. The pulp mill has provided thousands of jobs which were formerly unavailable. Housing programs and provision of sewer and water in some settlements have been started. By this we are attempting to provide a standard of living for these people equivalent to what you would find in other Saskatchewan communities. The establishment of the Northern Power Company, subsidiary of SPC, to provide power to Indian people in the many communities where up to now the only power available has been to government personnel and white people in the settlement. We are pleased that welfare payments in Northern Saskatchewan are down, that people are working at good pay, so that their dignity and pride can be restored.

But last of all, Mr. Speaker, on this side of the House we realize there is still a great deal to be done, but at least we can say we have tried. I believe that the remarks by Members

**March 12, 1969**

opposite today will not go over very well with people of Indian ancestry, because they do recognize our sincerity and they are seeing results instead of the promises that were being made, when the gentlemen opposite were on this side of the House. They are seeing action for the first time. I am sure that this action will continue under the new Indian and Metis Department, and for that reason I am very pleased to support the motion.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. W.J. Berezowsky (Prince Albert East-Cumberland):** — Mr. Speaker, I have been asked by the Hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) to say a few words, so I am glad to accept the challenge. I have just listened to the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) and I agree with many things that he said about development in the North. But one thing he did not say, Mr. Speaker, that most of these developments that you have now were started by the CCF government.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — When we took over in 1944 — the Premier should know this — because he has boasted about these very same things that we were doing in Saskatchewan. We built some 28 schools in the North at settlements where there were no public schools. We built hospitals in the North. We built air strips in the North. Yes, at Stony Rapids, Lac La Ronge and other places. We built roads, as you know down to Uranium City, from Bushell on Lake Athabasca. We built hospitals at many points where they didn't exist before. We did these things and, if the Government now carries out the programs that the CCF started some years ago, then I commend the Government for doing so because it certainly would have failed completely in responsibility had it not at least carried on the original CCF programs.

I could go on and on talking about schools, hospitals and roads and other projects like the Hon. Member has done. But the important problem is not that. The important thing, Mr. Speaker, and gentlemen opposite, and friends on this side is this: you are setting up a Department of Indian Affairs and the question is whether the native people who are concerned want a Department of Indian Affairs? It is essentially that question. In view of the things that you have told us, Mr. hon. gentleman from Athabasca, you can carry on without a Department of Indian Affairs, you could also do it another way. You could take a million or a million and a half and set it up as the Hon. Member from Cutknife (Mr. Kwasnica) mentioned, set up \$1 million as a special fund to help improve the situation among our native people. You could do it that way. Indians have people with good education, they have men with suitable training, they have men with the desire to serve their own people, and these are the people that could do the job with all this money. But you didn't do it that way.

Then the Hon. Member from Meadow Lake (Mr. Coupland) got up in the House and started boasting about the things that this Government was doing and he said that Indians trust them. And the Hon. Member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy) said, "The Indians trust us. Therefore you can't vote against us, you must vote with us." This is not the case, Mr. Speaker. The Indian and Metis do not trust this Government. The fact that they did not get Indian support in the last election proves that they don't trust them. And if you want to know more of why they don't trust the Government, then I will tell you that it is because of the record of this Liberal party in the past which still lives in the hearts and memories of the Indians of the North. Let me give you an example, Mr. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart). You asked me to get up and say a few words and I did.

**Hon. D.G. Steuart (Provincial Treasurer):** — I didn't mean that.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Well, I am sorry you didn't mean it because you are going to get it now. I want to tell you this: In 1943 it wasn't the CCF, it wasn't the Conservatives, it wasn't anybody else, it was the Liberals who gave private leases to Tom Lamb and to the Hudson Bay Company in the Cumberland area some 22 townships, all told. They dispossessed the people of trapping rights, they dispossessed these people completely and handed their resources to these entrepreneurs, required for a living. They handed it all over to the Hudson Bay Company and to Tom Lamb. And it wasn't till seven or eight years after I got elected — and I fought for years for this right of those people and I thank the Government of the day — that they agreed to negotiate arrangements with the Hudson Bay Company to return the land that was under lease in some 15 townships and gave it back to the people at Cumberland House. We told Tom Lamb we would not renew his lease because the original rights belonged to the native people of that area.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — You talk about them trusting this Government. Setting up an Indian Affairs Department does not mean that they are going to trust you at all. I will tell you why they won't trust you. Had I known that I was going to speak I could have obtained a voluminous list of statements by leaders of Indian Affairs. I picked one up from today's paper. Shall I read it to you? I know that it isn't going to help you, Mr. Member from Athabasca. It isn't going to help but you are going to listen to this anyway. The Indian groups had a meeting at Grand Forks not so long ago and one of their important leaders was a person by the name of Mr. Battle. This is the kind of language that they were speaking ever since you have been talking about Indian Affairs. You just listen to this. Mr. Battle said and I quote:

There should be no special agencies to deal with a group of people on racial grounds.

**March 12, 1969**

And I too would resent it if this Government or any other government set up a special agency for Ukrainians or others. I would resent it because we are all Canadians and we don't need special departments. It goes on again. He told the meeting, I quote:

Provincial Governments should administer services to Indians just as they would to any other citizen. Nowhere do we find the full extension of Provincial services which, I believe, is a prerequisite to equality.

I agree again.

Among the differences that have set aside the Indian people is the attitude of the Provinces, their refusal of Provincial services to Indians may be more of a piece of political history than one of constitutional law. Indian rights are deeply affected by this business of separate services from different sources. There is no question in my mind that separate, even if equal, facilities are an abrogation of human rights.

Mr. Battle said in an interview that there is nothing in the constitution from preventing Provincial Governments from assuming the administration of services to Indians. In many areas there was a duplication of Provincial and Federal services, one government serving Treaty Indians, the other the remainder of the population. Mr. Battle said that Indian Affairs could be more efficiently administered from the Provincial level where there are similar services in similar fields.

The reason that I quoted this, Mr. Speaker, is to tell you what Indians say. This is what every Indian and every Metis says, including Dr. Howard Adams who is on your Task Force. He will tell you the same thing, so leave them alone.

I am going to tell you, Mr. Attorney General (Mr. Heald) . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — What is the name of the publication and the date of issue.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — It is in today's issue of The Leader Post. I just got it a few minutes ago.

Now I am not going to argue, Mr. Speaker, that we haven't got a problem. We have a problem. It is economic, it is social, it is cultural and I would like to see this problem solved. I am glad that some of my Indian friends have jobs, some in the pulp mill who come from Montreal Lake, but others have not. It is a crying shame that these people can't get jobs and this is something that you should be doing instead of spending money on a Department of Indian Affairs. Now let's just take a look how this whole idea of the Department of Indian Affairs came about, and I think that the Member from

Athabasca (Mr. Guy) admitted how it came about. I recall very well some of his statements. It is only four, five or six years ago — I can get Hansard to show it to him what he said — that he got up in the House and suggested that, when they became the Government, they would set up a Department of Indian Affairs. At that time there was no consultation between him and the Indians. This was his pet idea and he has bamboozled the Premier and the Government into believing that he is right, and I say, Mr. Speaker, that he is wrong.

**Mr. I.H. MacDougall (Souris-Estevan):** — What's bamboozle?

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Well, whatever it means. I am not an Anglo-Saxon and I try to speak English as well as I can and I hope that you can understand what I say. Fooled, I would say.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — He is the same man who is responsible for persecuting Malcolm Morris who used to work for the Department of Natural Resources, who was the leader of the native people in Prince Albert, in the Friendship Centre. This is the same Minister who is responsible for telling the people in Prince Albert that if they didn't get rid of their leader they would not get a grant. This is the kind of government that they say the Indians can trust. Well they will not trust them, I assure you!

**Mr. Steuart:** — I did that.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — You mean he didn't persuade you to do that. Then you are both just as bad and just as stupid.

**Mr. Steuart:** — He was a Communist, Bill, and we had no use for him.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — So you want to get into a debate about Malcolm Norris. I will tell you that whether he was a Communist or a Fascist, or anything else, he was a man who loved his own people and who was willing to give his life for his people. These are the kind of leaders that you must have, to raise and lead these people where they want to get.

Anytime, Mr. Speaker, that one mentions somebody that the Government doesn't like, who is trying to do a good job, it has to brand such person a Communist, or this or that. It is disgraceful and shameful for people who believe in democracy to use those kind of tactics.

Well, I think I can commend the Government for having this Task Force and trying to find out what is happening, for having a group studying the communities and advising on community development, but I must remind the Government that this was not

**March 12, 1969**

the Government to initiate this idea. We were also first in bringing people here to study the conditions in the North and on the reserves and in giving reports to the Minister of Natural Resources. It was this Government who sat in the Opposition that belittled these ideas. It was this Government who got rid of this branch of government that we had which studied community problems. Now the Liberals say, of course, that they are studying it through the Metis Branch. That is fine with me and I won't criticize that. I think it is a good program. But why is it always that when we did something it wasn't recognized and it was always bad, but what you are trying to do is always so good and perfect.

Now I have some ideas as to what should be done. When we talk about Northern people and think what we should be doing to help them to get to where they want to go then we must recognize that it just isn't economic problems. Economic conditions in the North are very, very bad and I think that the Government should see that every person who is able to work should have a job of some kind and that he should not be cut off from welfare till a job is found and not just for the sake of cutting them off. First of all jobs must be provided for native people so that they could make a living. When I talk to the native people they tell me the only reason that they are on welfare is because they have no jobs. This is the area that the Government should do something about. I am sorry to see money being set aside for a department, when this money could be used in re-establishing these native people in the North. When I think of native people in the North, I also think of white people because they live just as poorly as do the native people.

Now, this Government is setting up distinctions and it is going to set up another branch. I wish it well but I don't like it. I was asked how I was going to vote. Well how can I vote?

**Hon. W.R. Thatcher (Premier):** — Vote for it.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — I wouldn't vote for it just because you are legislating a department. The only reason that I would vote for it is that there might be a thread of a chance that for once in the history of the Liberal party something decent might be done. And that is the only reason.

I agree with what other Members have said. If you are going to establish a Department of Indian Affairs surely to goodness you can find responsible native people to head that Department. Surely to goodness you can find workers for that Department who will be interested, who will dedicate themselves and do the kind of job that must be done to raise the standards of native people. But in addition to the economics of the people, there is the cultural angle. I am glad to see the Member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy) say, "Well we are providing a new kind of curriculum." But I will ask you this: in this

new curriculum how much will be there to give dignity and respect to the native people? Will you be teaching native languages at all? This is supposed to be Canada. They were the indigenous people in this country when the white people came here. What are you going to do in the schools? Are you going to allow them to learn their own language? Of course you are not going to do that. You are going to change from Tom, Dick and so forth, to what? Will the books tell about the boy who goes out hunting or something like that? Fine, but you are still not considering the real issue that the Indians have and it is this. They feel that they have been ostracized, they feel that they are somebody, they feel that they must have a spot on this earth. So anything you have been doing has not covered that particular aspect. There is something that you should have left to the Indians. If they decided to teach Cree instead of English that is fine, that is their decision, and you would be getting somewhere. If you are going to have a department of white people telling them what you are going to do for them, I am telling you that you are defeated before you start. This is not a small problem, because in the North — and I am not just guessing — there must be between 20,000 to 25,000 people, human beings like you or me, who have suffered for 200 years or more under the Hudson Bay Company and under Liberal Administrations. These people have all kinds of problems and they haven't got the resources to help themselves.

Well I shouldn't take up anymore time. As I say I didn't prepare a speech, but I am just trying to answer some of the things that have been brought forward. I would like to say this: In my opinion you are setting up a Department of Indian Affairs and we can't stop you as you are the majority. You think that it is right, so the hail shall fall on your heads not on ours. We will co-operate with you because we are white like you. But I do hope that you will consider carefully. If you can find \$1 million for a department, please find another \$1 million to provide jobs, to provide schools, to provide health services for those people who are in need as they need it more than we do. Provide for people the things that human beings need, and you will find that you will find some of the answers. Because I think that there may be a thread of hope in that department for the Indians, I will vote for the motion and the Bill.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. A. Thibault (Kinistino):** — Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to say that I will support the Bill. I want to say that it is not a sin on this side to support the Government or the opposite side. We do that once in a while when we think that it has a case. We are not ashamed of it at all, that is what we are here for. There are too many in this House who think that, if one sides votes this way, we have to oppose it regardless of what you try to do. That is not what I am here for either.

I would like to say at the offset that there are certain

**March 12, 1969**

things that I want to touch on. One is the question of what was referred to a moment ago that we did not consult with the Indians when we gave them the right to vote. I cannot let this go by because I did have a meeting on the Indian Reserves and consulted with them, before we gave them the right to vote and before we gave them the right to have liquor. I did consult with the Indians in my constituency. I am going to tell you some of the things that they said. As far as the right to vote, they were very undecided. They said that it is the Queen's decision that, if she wanted to give them the right to vote, they would see what they could do about it. But I felt that by giving them the right to vote they would be standing on the same level as we are. You cannot expect a group of people to live in our society and say, "You have the right to vote, and you do not have the right to vote." This is the reason that I voted in favor of giving them the right to vote, and it is our Government that brought this legislation in. In Ottawa it was John Diefenbaker's Government that brought in the legislation to give them the right to vote. The Liberals were in the background for almost 50 or 100 years and never gave them the right to vote.

Now we have to go to these people and make them a part of the scheme of things. Had we not given them the right to vote, they would still be sitting out there not being heard. A cry in the wilderness, that is what they would be.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thibault:** — As far as giving them the right to use liquor, I did go on the Indian Reserve and discussed it with them. I said, "Look, you are getting liquor anyway and you have to pay bootlegger's price for it." One Indian got up and said, "Mr. Thibault, you don't know anything." I am not afraid to admit when I don't know anything. One Indian got up — there were about 75 to 100 people at that school — and said, "Mr. Thibault if you said that we have to give our money to the white man, we have to give our wives to the white man, we have to give our daughters to the white man and then we get our liquor, you would be telling the truth. Then you would know something." I said that I would give them the right to vote and I would vote in favor of them buying their own liquor. This way they could keep their wives and daughters.

This is the kind of reception that I got and I could swear to it. Yet we have a Premier that comes along and talks about their breeding habits. I think that we have to have dialogue with these people if we are going to make them a part of the scheme of things. They are God's children just like we are. If any of you Members haven't spent a few days on an Indian Reserve and have not gone into their homes, I suggest that you do. When you brought this Bill before the House, I went to the Indian Reserve and talked to them about it, as they hadn't heard about it. They said that they would like to have at



least one-third of the staff in this department, staffed by Indian people. I think that the Deputy Minister, if it is possible, should be of Indian ancestry. I think that we have to give them a chance to solve their own problems and by so doing, Mr. Speaker, when I get up on this side of the House to support a Bill, as the Member from Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky), there may be a shred of a chance to make things better for them.

I think that we have to have dialogue with these people. Let us not get them confused anymore than they are now. They don't trust us and I agree with them. I was told more than once that they did not trust the white man. My answer was, "I don't blame you after what you have gone through." Let us try and gain their confidence and we will be able to get along a lot better.

With this, Mr. Speaker, I haven't prepared a speech. I just speak from a few notes. It is one of my handicaps, but I say what I think.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. W.R. Thatcher (Premier):** — Mr. Speaker, this Legislature is a political forum and I think that on most Bills and most legislation, we should be political. We should play politics. But I do suggest to Hon. Members on both sides of the House that this is one instance where perhaps we should leave politics behind. This is one subject, now and in the future, with which we should try to cope on a non-partisan basis.

Therefore, this afternoon by using great restraint, Mr. Speaker, I am going to try and not be political, much as I have been tempted in the last few minutes.

This particular department has been set up with no ulterior motives. It has been set up to co-ordinate all the departmental activities having to do with Indians or Metis. It has been set up because we think it can do a job more effectively. As I have listened to the various Members of the Opposition, they seem to have had two complaints. Some have complained bitterly. But, Mr. Speaker, you will note that when they were all through, they all said, "Of course I am going to vote for the Bill."

The first complaint seems to have been that there has been a lack of consultation with the native people. Mr. Speaker, surely after all these years, 100 perhaps, we don't need to have consultation to know that jobs are needed for Indians. That is what this department is designed to help and find. Surely after all these years, we don't need more talk and more conferences to tell us that education and upgrading are needed for our native people. Surely after all these years, we don't need more consultation to tell us that decent housing is needed for our Indian people.

March 12, 1969

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Thatcher:** — Surely we don't need more conferences to know that this Government has to give some kind of leadership in providing better living standards. Surely we don't need consultation to tell us that we need to bring power, telephones, and roads to our Indian Reserves. I say, Mr. Speaker, that in the last 100 years the great complaint of the Indians with the white man is that all we have had is talk. This department is designed to try and bring at long last some concrete action.

Some of the Hon. Members claim that we are going ahead without consulting the Indians. I think that I have visited in the past four years as many reserves as most Hon. Members in this House. The Hon. Member for Melville (Mr. Kowalchuk) took exception to the proceedings at one Indian Reserve which I visited. Why, he said, "the Premier went down to Fort Qu'Appelle and instead of letting them ask questions, all he did was talk." Let me tell you, Sir, that I was invited to that reserve by 12 Indian chiefs and many of the councillors. I went to meet with that group at some considerable inconvenience. I spent a whole morning with them, and about all that I did was to answer questions. I think they were interested in what I was trying to tell them, because at least they asked me back a second time. I was there only two weeks ago. I have never to my knowledge refused to go on any Indian Reserve when I was invited. I have even gone sometimes when I haven't been invited. I can tell you that when this session is over I will continue to go out on Indian Reserves, discussing with these people what we are trying to do for them. We have called Indian conferences on numerous occasions. Only a week ago we had sent a letter out to every Indian Chief in this province, inviting them to come in to the next meeting of the Indian Task Force here in Regina on March 28th. We have repeatedly called our Metis people together and their representatives. I have met them downtown, I have met them here. We have also consulted with them. There are some difficulties. I remember one conference we had last fall. The Metis Association asked us to call it, and we sent out word all over the province that we would help bring in these Metis representatives. We offered to pay most of their expense. The Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Barrie) carried out fairly elaborate arrangements, and when we got to the conference only 14 people showed up. So there are difficulties. The next conference, and there is one being held very shortly will be organized by the Metis people themselves. I expect that we will have more people show up.

The second main objection that I have heard from Hon. Members opposite was that we should have appointed an Indian Deputy. Let me tell you, Sir, that we looked for six months for an Indian or a Metis Deputy who would have the necessary qualifications for the job. As has already been pointed out, we did offer this job to Dr. Howard Adams who is a PhD Professor at the University of Saskatchewan. I had Dr. Adams in my office after a meeting of the Task Force. I said, "Doctor,

anyone can complain, but can you find solutions. Why won't you take one year off from the University, and come and tell us how you think this department should be run." We told Dr. Adams that we would give him carte blanche in running the department. The Doctor, as many Hon. Members know, has only recently returned to Saskatchewan and he felt that, having been at the University only for a year or more he did not want to take time off. I am not blaming him. I have a high regard for the ability of Dr. Adams. The department looks forward to using him in a consulting basis in the months ahead. I do regret that he didn't feel it possible to take on this tangible position where I think he could have been a real help to the native people.

We looked all over this province and all over this country for a native who could be a deputy and we couldn't find one. Finally, because we wanted to get the department moving, we appointed Mr. James Sinclair. Mr. Sinclair became a Civil Servant in the days of my hon. friends opposite. I think that he will make a good man. We didn't inquire about his politics. We hired him because he was one of the top men in the North who has worked with Natural Resources and with Indians, and we are impressed with the job that he has done so far.

I perhaps, have some doubts about this department as well as hon. friends opposite. We don't say that this is the final answer. As the old farmer used to say, "You can fill the trough with water, you can lead the horse up to the trough, but that doesn't say that it is going to drink." Now perhaps it is something like that with our natives. We can provide them with the opportunities, and we must provide them with the opportunities, but we cannot say for certain whether or not they will take them. This Bill is a genuine effort to help, and I hope that it will work.

I don't know if there is anything else that I should say today. The Hon. Member for Prince Albert East-Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) said, speaking about native people in his own constituency, that there were a few jobs that had been provided. However, he said that it was a crying shame that the rest of them haven't got jobs. I agree! That is why we are setting up the department, and we hope that it will work. That is why I think that you should vote for this Bill. The Hon. Member also said that he didn't believe in setting up a department which would segregate or help one race. Well, I would partially agree with him. On the other hand, we must remember that if we just let this problem drift along as far as native people are concerned nothing at all will be accomplished. This department hasn't been set up to discriminate against the natives, quite the contrary. This department has been set up to help the natives. If there is any prejudice, it is prejudice in favor of our Indian people. We will have to watch this department work over the years to gauge its effectiveness. I have a letter on my desk from the Hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. I think there are two fields that the Indian Agency has been successful in — that is the former Indian Agency. The farms appear to be working, also housing. Do you know that within the past few

**March 12, 1969**

weeks it was reported that 11 houses had been found in Prince Albert. Here Indians were taken out of tents and shacks and moved into houses and employment was found for them. This report the Minister gave me a few days ago. As I say in Prince Albert we have now purchased 11 houses. One house was given to a man called David Carrier. He works for Burns and Company now for the amount of \$380. That man has 12 children. He had been living in a one or two-room shack apparently. Another man who was given a house was Doug Smith. He has obtained a job now in a bakery for \$306. It is not very much but it is better than he had been getting. He has 11 children. So for the first time I think we are starting to be able to bring adequate housing to these people, and I hope that one of the major priorities of this new department will be to expand housing. I say to Hon. Members opposite, whether you have trepidations or not, this is a step which should be taken by the Legislature and I am pleased that the House is going to give it unanimous consent.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division:

**YEAS — 53**

Messieurs

Thatcher	MacLennan	Davies
Howes	Heggie	Meakes
Boldt	Breker	Berezowsky
Cameron	Leith	Romanow
Steuart	Radloff	Smishek
Heald	Weatherald	Thibault
McIsaac	Mitchell	Whelan
Guy	Gardner	Snyder
Barrie	Coupland	Michayluk
Loken	McPherson	Brockelbank
MacDougall	Charlebois	Baker
Grant	Forsyth	Pepper
Coderre	McIvor	Bowerman
Larochelle	Schmeiser	Matsalla
MacDonald	Lloyd	Messer
Estey	Willis	Kwasnica
Hooker	Wood	Kowalchuk
Gallagher	Blakeney	

**NAYS — 0**

Messieurs

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. J.C. McIsaac (Minister of Education) that Bill No. 58 — **An Act to amend The School Act** be now read a second time.

**Mr. Kwasnica (Cutknife):** — Mr. Speaker, in rising to

take part in this debate on Bill 58 — An Act to amend The School Act, I would just like to comment briefly on a few of the principles involved in the Bill that we on this side of the House have some slight misgivings about. First of all, a word about the spring vacation which is being set five days immediately following the third Sunday in March. Now I agree that this will make planning of the spring term much simpler because the vacation is fixed. But the Minister in his discussion on second reading failed to even mention what happens to Good Friday and Easter Monday. Will they now be school days because of the new set spring vacation or not? He made no comment and I wish he would in closing the debate.

Secondly, this Act has in it a completely open-ended clause stating that a school board may operate its schools, as it sees fit in regard to the length of school day and week, and the terms and vacations as may be approved by the Minister. Now I'm all for sound and necessary change in education and agree that there is nothing sacred about the lock-step, rigid scheduling of the school year. I believe that if schools want to apply the semester system this is good. I believe that we could get greater and more efficient use of our school plants, if we would make the school day more flexible and run schools on two shifts a day with two different shifts of teachers and pupils. And if need be, Saturday could well become a school day as well, if the public would stand for it. However, regarding this Bill, two major future trouble spots must be brought to the attention of this Assembly, or possible trouble spots.

First, by leaving this open-ended clause, there is no limit to the length of the teaching year which has traditionally been around 200 teaching days. I ask the Minister what is to stop a somewhat persistent school board saying to a particular teacher or all its teachers, "You are now being paid on a 12-month basis, even though it's a 10-month salary, so we expect you to stick around for July and August and teach a class or two." After all, even after The Teacher Salary Agreements Act of last year spelled out in plain English that the new salary scale was to be retroactive July 1, 1968, some Boards had the audacity to suggest that the Act didn't really say that and suggested a salary scale that should be retroactive to January 1, 1969. The point is that, if an Act states plainly that the salary should be retroactive to a certain date, some Boards turned around and offered something else. In this Act under debate this clause is too open-ended. There isn't even a suggestion as to what it might be. So, Mr. Minister, I hope that none of this type of thing arises because of this open-ended type of legislation.

Secondly, in the same regard, the original School Act states that with the consent of the teacher, the Board may keep the school open during the whole or any portion of the Easter vacation. Mr. Speaker, the original Act at least suggested consultation with the teacher. This Bill doesn't even suggest that the teacher has any voice in the decision-making process regarding length of day, week and holidays. Even to an impartial

**March 12, 1969**

observer, this smacks of a bit of hard-fisted tactics and surely this Government by now must be aware of the touchy situation it's in regarding teachers in the province. All I'm suggesting here is, let school boards and teachers and parents decide and agree how to schedule the school year and things will work out in the best interests of all concerned. If this isn't done, there will only arise greater confrontation, confusion, frustration and disunity in Saskatchewan's already somewhat confused and misguided educational system.

Mr. Speaker, the principle in this Bill and I find most offensive is the principle of permitting school boards, at their discretion, to charge a fee in respect of each pupil attending kindergarten classes. The idea that children are only ready for reading and learning at age six or six and one-half is founded on a rather poor obsolete American bit of research. Starting the tailoring of young children at age six is like ordering a made-to-measure suit at a tailor's and having it cut off at the knees. A child's development right from the cradle is important. There is probably an optimal time when a child is self-stimulated to learn and there is definitely a danger in waiting too long and holding the child back. Observe, Mr. Speaker, how keen and excited youngsters are in grades one, two and three. But by the time they reach high school many of them seem to have had their eagerness knocked out of them. Some children need oral work desperately in conversational preparation before they start school. These children desperately need some education or pre-education work before age six. Realizing the definite need to incorporate kindergartens into its public school system, Saskatoon has approved the development of a program to reinstate kindergartens into the system beginning in 1969, in support of a motion passed by that school board that kindergartens be reinstated as an integral part of the system's educational offerings. Mr. Speaker, the Saskatoon public school trustees must be commended on their approach to kindergartens as must any other board which believes in the same philosophy. It is their honest opinion that kindergartens must become part of the total educational process in the province.

I believe it is time that this Liberal Government and the Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac) took some positive leadership in this regard to do everything in its power to make kindergartens an integral part of the school system as a basic right of every youngster. Why does this Government want to place an extra financial burden on those who need or desire kindergarten training? What a penny-pinching philosophy for a Minister to pursue, by absolving himself of his full responsibilities in the field of education, and by placing the burden of kindergarten costs on the shoulders of school boards, which, in turn, place the financial burden on the parents of pre-schoolers, many of whom cannot afford to pay for kindergartens, which should rightfully be provided for at no cost to the parents. However, Mr. Speaker, this is the price the people of Saskatchewan must pay for electing the Liberal party to govern our province. This is just another tax on education and another example of short-changing education. This Government

has been skimping on operating grants to schools and increasing examination fees. This Government has increased correspondence school fees. It has removed the 25 per cent grants for school buses. It has added the 2 per cent per gallon tax on fuel used for school buses. It has reduced grants to Lighted School House Program. It has increased university tuition fees consistently. It has reduced grants for school libraries. It has reduced grants to science equipment. It has called a halt to building of school auditoriums. I could go on and on, and now it proposes to charge for kindergartens, picking on the pre-schoolers as well.

Mr. Speaker, the original School Act under Section 213, revised in 1953, stated that a fee for kindergartens could be charged not exceeding \$1 per month for each pupil. That was the year that the CCF Government was in power, a humane government. In short, at that time, nothing was charged. That's what I propose the fee for kindergartens working within school systems should be today, nothing.

There is still another principle in this Bill that warrants some comment and that is the principle that bars teachers from running for positions on school boards within the salary negotiating area. You know it's amazing, Mr. Speaker, how quickly this Government acted when the Saskatchewan School Trustees' Association passed a resolution at its annual convention last fall asking the Liberal Government to amend The School Act immediately to prevent an active elementary or secondary school teacher from the holding office of school trustee within the boundaries of the negotiation area in which he is employed. Three months since the resolution, and the amendment is already before us today.

The real concern here is whether all citizens should have the right to stand for election or whether certain groups should be denied that right. I feel that no group should be prohibited from holding public office. Whether the public wants to elect a teacher to the school board should be left up to each citizen to decide when he marks his "X". I hope that this Government isn't that naïve that it thinks it must protect the public from itself. Some argue that there would be conflict of interest when a teacher serves on a school board, but there is also conflict of interest for every trustee. When the board makes a financial decision, it affects every ratepayer, including the trustees themselves. We don't deny either teachers or trustees the right to sit in the Saskatchewan Legislature even though Provincial legislation markedly affects both teachers and trustees. And many school boards, I submit, Mr. Speaker, would benefit greatly from the vast knowledge and background of a teacher on the board, knowledge of school plant, equipment, innovations, necessary curriculum changes, attitudes of students and the reaction of the teachers themselves. All of this knowledge could only be of benefit to a school system. And I want to impress upon this Assembly that if any teacher runs for a school board position with merely an axe to grind, perhaps say, teachers' salaries for example, he is not worthy of that

**March 12, 1969**

position and the public would soon vote him out.

Mr. Speaker, if it were not for a few progressive principles of this Bill, I would be voting against it. However, it has some merit and I'll support it.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. J. Kowalchuk (Melville):** — Mr. Speaker, my hon. colleague from Cutknife (Mr. Kwasnica) has already submitted a few comments and some objections to this Bill. I don't intend to comment on all of these except for four areas of it. I wish to say that making it possible for the Unit Act, especially that Section pertaining to elections, to coincide in as many Sections as is possible with the Municipal Act, is a step in the right direction. I also want to say that the lifting on the ceiling of the interest rates on the sale of school debentures, although regrettable in the fact that it will make it necessary to greatly increase cost loads to the taxpayers, nevertheless was necessary at this time, since school boards in many instances could not delay a building program any longer. Mr. Speaker, as long back as I can remember I can't ever recall building programs being delayed costing less money. The longer the delay, the greater the cost.

Mr. Speaker, because I have had some experience as a teacher and latterly for almost 10 years as a unit trustee, I am suggesting that the Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac) take another look at that Section of the Bill dealing with the teacher as a trustee. Now I realize, Mr. Speaker, that that Section of the Act, as it was, had to be repealed or amended, but I had hoped that that Section would have been amended in a different manner. Mr. Speaker, I also realize that the Trustees' Association had asked for this change, but, Sir, I would suggest that solutions often offered in the heat of strife and dissension should receive very careful thought before action on any point or recommendation from either side, the teachers or the trustees. Mr. Speaker, in the interest of better relations between these two bodies of people, both so vital to the education of the youth of our province, it might have been well to amend that Section in another way without seeming to take a partisan approach. Mr. Speaker, I am just throwing out this suggestion in the hope that it might be a beginning of strengthening of teacher-trustee relationship instead of this continual downhill deterioration. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister reconsider the inclusion of the new amendment, as it is now, and amend that subsection 270 of The School Act in a manner of benefiting both trustees and teachers. That subsection in the Act states that a teacher shall not hold the office of school trustee in the district which he is employed as a teacher. Mr. Minister, Mr. Speaker, this probably was a good Section when considered in the light of a district and a separate school district, whereby one teacher as a member of a three-man board could have much influence particularly on such matters as his own salary. Mr. Speaker, in a negotiating area if an Act was properly amended,



this possibility could almost be totally safeguarded — it has already been pointed out that the old School Act stated that a teacher shall not hold office in a school district in which he is employed — Mr. Speaker, by adding an amendment stating that a teacher may be elected to the position of a local board of any school within an negotiating area but he shall not act on any salary negotiating committee on local boards or within the salary negotiating area in which he resides. In that way he may be barred completely in negotiating teachers' salaries, either for the teachers or for the trustees. Yet he could participate in all other ordinary matters in the operation of a local board. I realize, Mr. Speaker, that there are other points of contention in many other areas of administration, involving other financial expenditures relating to the teacher indirectly. These, Mr. Speaker, are of a minor nature, keeping in mind that in nearly all cases other members of the board in the majority hold the balance of power. The fact that they, the teachers, would be excluded from bargaining on either side would be, in my mind, placing them in a neutral position and thus excluding them from an area that they should not be in and probably rightly so. Mr. Speaker, I'm not arguing that point. This is a suggestion that I believe has merit, Mr. Speaker. I know of a number of teachers who were elected as school board members and who taught schools in neighboring towns or cities. Now these teachers were very valuable and active members of these boards to which they were elected. Their experience as teachers was valuable in decision-making on these boards; their viewpoint often adding a different outlook than that of a person who often sees things from the viewpoint of a trustee only. These are citizens of a community, Sir, who live and work and play and raise a family there; who participate in school and church affairs; who have a real interest in their schools as much as the next person and should in all fairness, I think, not be excluded from participating in their community and especially in the work of the school boards. Surely, Mr. Speaker, we shouldn't be denying some 12,000 citizens of Saskatchewan the basic citizen's right of participating in the school affairs of the province. I feel that total participation in the educational field is needed. I think that this can be done with the proper kind of amendment, Sir. If this is possible, I would like the Minister to give it serious consideration in third reading.

My colleague, the Member for Cutknife (Mr. Kwasnica) has commented at quite some length on that section of this Act dealing with the amount of fee charged for children in kindergarten and the freedom for boards to charge what they consider to be the right amount for this service. Mr. Minister and Mr. Speaker, I need not review the many different points, already so well expressed on that matter by the Member for Cutknife, as to why we should accept total financial responsibility for kindergarten education. All the newest findings point out the fact that children's reception to learning is exceptional and keen at three to four years of age. Let's not turn back the clock, Sir. Let's proceed with new, wise and imaginative programs including an investment in the very young. Surely we

**March 12, 1969**

have a rich province and we can provide a few dollars to continue and expand the kindergarten program. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that the Minister will give serious thought to some of the suggestions that I have made. We shall probably be bringing in some more of these suggestions and others in third reading because the Bill has a lot of good changes. I shall support the motion, Sir.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. A.E. Blakeney (Regina Centre):** — Mr. Speaker, I simply want to add one very brief word. I support the views of the Member for Melville (Mr. Kowalchuk) with respect to the intended Section 270 and the fact that the exclusion ought to be confined to excluding a teacher from being on the bargaining committee representing the trustees. If that view is not accepted by the Government I would still ask the Minister to look with a good deal of care on Section 270, as it is now drafted because, as I read it, it is really exceedingly onerous and very unfair. It says, “A teacher employed in a district,” it does not say “A teacher employed by a district,” but “in a district.” It will be observed that all sorts of teachers are employed in the Regina district. They include, for example, the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) who I suspect is still a teacher as defined in The School Act. I suspect the Member for Biggar is a teacher. There are in Regina all manner of people who still have teaching certificates and that is a definition of a teacher. Indeed we have at least one on the Board of Education and maybe more, maybe a couple on the Board of Education who are teachers as defined in the Act. They are employed in Regina, they are not employed by a Regina School District, but they are employed in Regina. And I think that a reading of that Section would suggest that, if they are in fact a teacher, and if they are in fact employed in a district though not necessarily by the district, they cannot be a school trustee. I am sure this wasn't intended and I request the Minister (Mr. McIsaac) to look at that relatively small point. I thought I would draw it to his attention now so that when we raise it in Committee he will have advance notice.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. J.C. McIsaac (Minister of Education):** — Mr. Speaker, in rising to close debate on this motion, I would just like to make a few comments at this time and I will deal with a number of the other points that were raised by Members opposite when we get into Committee of the Whole on this Bill.

The Member for Cutknife (Mr. Kwasnica): the first point he raised had to do with the spring vacation period in whether or not Good Friday and Easter Monday were still statutory holidays. Certainly Good Friday is and to my recollection Easter Monday is spelled out as a statutory holiday. That Section has not

been touched. There has been no change in that regard.

He also, Mr. Speaker, went on to comment in effect on the wide possibilities and wide powers, if you will, with respect to the clause dealing with rescheduling and rearranging of classes, hours and so on, and I would agree with his observation in this regard. I think the best answer I can give here is the one I gave earlier. Because of the difficulties of spelling out all of the possibilities that may be worked out, and all of the various suggestions in other jurisdictions, and all of the trial systems, if you will, we thought it better to leave it this way for the first year or two certainly, to see what varieties or possibilities come to our attention. The length of the teaching year, the 200 day aspect of it is not or will not be affected. I can certainly assure him of that. I've discussed this with locally employed superintendents and our provincial superintendents that in any proposition they send or submit to the Department in this regard, that it be accompanied by assurances that it has been discussed with the ratepayers, with the parents and certainly of course with the teaching staff. Obviously no changes could come about of a major nature in this regard without the full co-operation and full consultation of the staff. Again I suppose we could put something in to ensure it, but on the other hand I haven't yet seen any way we can legislate this kind of co-operation. I am sure that we will get it and certainly I can assure him that any proposals we look at in this regard this will be one of the key points we will look for.

Mr. Speaker, the Member from Cutknife (Mr. Kwasnica) and also the Member from Melville (Mr. Kowalchuk) made some references to the changes with respect to the kindergarten classes. I would ask them to reread the old Section and the proposed Section in this regard because I am quite satisfied from listening to the Member from Cutknife that he has misinterpreted the Section as it is proposed. Section 213 now reads, "Kindergarten classes may be established in any town district." We have taken out the reference to town district, "and a fee therefore may be charged not exceeding \$1 per student." We have taken out any reference to any specific figure as such, so there is very, very little change here. I think he is also well aware, and I can tell him, we did do some rough calculations on the cost of implementing kindergarten across the province. It is something like \$7 to \$8 million that we are going to be looking at between both local and provincial support. While he is well aware, and I am sure all Members are, more and more school boards are making kindergarten classes available with the direct help and aid of the board or indirectly. We are not yet in a position to launch into compulsory kindergarten classes in this province.

The Member for Melville (Mr. Kowalchuk) as well as the Member for Cutknife (Mr. Kwasnica) and latterly the Member for Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney), had some comments on Section 270. I can only say here, Mr. Speaker, I will certainly look into the point raised by the Hon. Member from Regina Centre because, as he said, if the words 'in a district' means anyone with a

March 12, 1969

teacher's certificate in a given district, it certainly was not and is not the intention of this Section. This Section is a very, very slight change from the previous Section that has been in this Act for many years. As a matter of fact my officials tell me — and last week talking to the superintendents who were in the city — that there are two, possibly three teachers in the province who could be affected by this amendment. So it is a very, very minor change from present practice and the present principle and the present policy. Now we can debate that one if you wish, but I suggest again that the change is not nearly as great as was indicated by Members opposite.

So with these few comments, Mr. Speaker, I believe the other points raised can be best dealt with in Committee and accordingly I will move second reading.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Hon. D.G. Steuart (Provincial Treasurer) that Bill No. 52 — **An Act to provide for Partial Refunds of Estate Taxes to Saskatchewan Estates** be now read a second time.

**Mr. R. Heggie (Hanley):** — Mr. Speaker, as I said last Friday, the general intent of the partial refund of the estate taxes legislation covers three main points. First, it is designed to stop or at least slow down the outflow of capital from Saskatchewan. Secondly, it is designed to protect the break up of the family farm upon the death of the owner. Thirdly, it is to try and ameliorate as much as possible the double taxation on Saskatchewan citizens. As farm land prices go up so do the estate taxes for farmers. Since farmers' assets are mainly in land, the average farmer, because of his heavy investment, lives modestly during his working days but dies with a sizeable estate. In other words a farmer gives up much in the way of daily pleasures during his lifetime in comparison to the average worker or businessman. It seems unfair that in addition to being a heavy payer of taxes during his lifetime, he becomes a heavy payer of taxes by way of estate taxes upon his death. This Estate Tax Bill before this House deems to correct this situation. Now I do not agree with the speakers on the opposite side who say the Bill is merely a concession to the rich. We are merely following the Alberta experience, and the Alberta experience has been apparently successful. I can only repeat what I said last Friday, there are very few millionaires in Saskatchewan. If we can continue to encourage them to keep the situs of their estates in Saskatchewan, there will be a greater surplus of investment monies on hand in banks and trust companies for the development of our province. This is the real meat of the Act. Further, the ease of administration of the proposed Act is guaranteed because the Province accepts the rules and regulations of the Federal Estate Tax, and all meanings and interpretations of words and phrases are the same. It follows the Dominion Act in almost every detail and thereby will obviate the need for a lot of duplication. The timing

and scheduling follow the estate tax almost entirely.

Now there is much being said about the new Federal Estate Tax Bill and there is much being said both for and against it. I don't think it is a matter which I have to enter into in the limited time which I intend to speak, but I merely want to point out to the Members of this House that this Bill was inevitable. It was on its way to be put on the Statute Books of this Province regardless of whether we have the old Federal Estate Tax Bill or the new one. It is designed to be complementary to any estate tax bill which is in force through the Federal Parliament. If it is a matter of holding farmers' estates here in this province — and for that matter it applies to a wider range of people than farmers — but the farmers are the economic group in this province which would feel the need of this type of legislation. Whether any other provinces pass the Act or a similar act besides Alberta or Saskatchewan is something which we don't know, but I really don't think that this is going to make a great deal of difference because the real object is to hold the situs of the person's estate in this province. Our main competition of course will be with British Columbia where the largest part of our expatriate farmers go. But whether the B.C. Government will be constrained to pass such an act no one can tell at this time. That province certainly has its share of the senior citizens and over-age people so that whether it would feel the need to do this and surrender its taxes for this purpose is an unknown quantity.

In conclusion I want to repeat what was said again in debate last Friday, that among the general population, the general farming population represented, as I see it by their reeves and councillors, this is very, very important legislation. Wherever you go one is asked the question whether this Estate Tax Bill is going to become final legislation at this session. It follows that it must be important legislation to this group of people or there would not be such an interest in it from day to day. I, therefore, Mr. Speaker, will support the Bill with a good deal of enthusiasm on its second reading in this House.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. J. Messer (Kelsey):** — Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak in the second reading of this Bill, I first must comment briefly on what the hon. gentleman from Hanley has just said. He first of all made reference to the three main points outlining why this Bill was a good one. The first one he stated would be to stop the outflow of capital from the Province of Saskatchewan. I can't see any real realistic way as to how this is going to happen. My understanding especially with people, who reach retirement age and they have made their fortunes whatever size they may be in the Province of Saskatchewan, is that they leave the province for one main reason, and that is to get into a better climatic condition in order to enjoy the latter years of their life. The estate tax rebate in no way is going to change that. They are going to leave under any circumstances.

**March 12, 1969**

The second was to try and protect the family farm or the small farm in the province. None of the Members opposite have to date brought forward any statistics that would show that this indeed is going to protect the family farm.

He also mentioned the third reason as being to stop the double taxation that is now occurring in the Province of Saskatchewan. I would suggest that perhaps they take a look at the present taxes and alleviate the farmers from the suffering they are burdened with by the present taxation and not the taxation after death.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Messer:** — He has said that the farmer gives up much during his lifetime and he is certainly entitled to have it after he is dead or his family is. It doesn't make too much sense, Mr. Speaker.

Now, our proposal, which unfortunately was not accepted by this House when it was introduced, was a proposal which made provision for rebate for all estates up to and including the \$200,000 limit. This would have been desirable mainly because it was making provision for the passing on of family farms in Saskatchewan without the danger of estate tax being an additional and undue hardship on these farms. It also provides the same means of transferring other small businesses from father to son, or from father to daughter, or daughters and sons, without creating undue hardship in the repaying of estate taxes that may be assessed against the business enterprise. The primary reason for having the limit set at \$200,000 was so that the family farms or smaller businesses within the province would truly have had an opportunity of surviving in whatever business they have been involved. If the limit was not there they would have had undue hardship, the competition from larger businesses that were inherited by future generations without the paying of the estate tax, or at least if after this Bill, the rebate of 75 per cent would have put them in a better position in being more competitive in relation to their smaller business. These larger businesses would, as I have said, be in a much better position to crowd out the smaller industry and smaller farmers in the province.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier (Mr. Thatcher) has tried his best to sell the impression to the Saskatchewan people that the rebating without limitation is needed to protect the family farmer or the small farmer in this province. The interpretation he and his Government give is that in the Province of Saskatchewan it isn't unusual for family farms to have estates of \$50,000, \$100,000 or \$150,000 or even \$200,000 of capital investment that would be assessed against these farms. I can agree with the Premier and his Government up to this point, Mr. Speaker, but when we get to a \$200,000 figure or over we are no longer involved in family farms in the truest picture nor are we involved in small businesses. Very few people in Saskatchewan

will amass a fortune of money in excess of \$200,000. I was a bit disappointed that the Premier could not bring forth examples of farmers, at least individual farmers, or family farms that would be suffering undue hardship under the present Federal Estate Tax legislation. He did however, Mr. Speaker, bring forward, and it is a well known fact in the Province of Saskatchewan, two people who are not farmers, that of Mr. Berry and that of Mr. Kramer. I may not be well informed but I would not include either Mr. Berry or Mr. Kramer with the family farmer in the Province of Saskatchewan. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I had not acquainted them in their business enterprise in the Province of Saskatchewan to be associated with the farming field at all. I don't know if the Premier was trying to flatter the average family farmer or the average small businessman in Saskatchewan by associating him with the people of the wealth of the Berrys and Kramers or not, but I can, however, assure him that any relationship they have, it certainly isn't on the earning power nor the net worth of their estates. I found it very disappointing, Mr. Speaker, as I am sure the people of Saskatchewan did, that the Premier (Mr. Thatcher) would talk in support of his Estate Tax Rebate Bill mentioning the small farmer in Saskatchewan as the primary reason for the introduction of this Bill, yet fail to bring forward one single, solitary example as to how and to what extent the farmer of Saskatchewan may be affected under such legislation.

The Hon. Attorney General (Mr. Heald) has left the same impression with the people of this province that it isn't unusual for farms to be valued at a \$100 or \$150,000 value, and that the rebate this Bill would provide would solve the problems of the wives, and sons and daughters of the deceased farmers. Under these circumstances, Mr. Speaker, if a farm of \$150,000 value occurred and an estate was left to the wife, by the Attorney General's own words, sons and daughters, which would mean at a minimum two daughters and two sons, the estate tax would be nil in some cases and very little in others.

For the Members' satisfaction, I would like to give some examples of estates created in the province and what the outcome would be in regard to the value of the estate taxable. In each case these are estates that would be valued after taxable estates of \$100,000. An estate left outright to the widow and on her death equally among her adult children where the number of children is — one, under the present law the tax would be \$15,160, under the proposed law it would be \$13,200, actually a reduction in the tax assessed against that estate. In the case of two children, under the present law it would remain at \$15,160, the proposed law it would be reduced to \$10,800. If there were three children, in the present law it will still be maintained at \$15,160, under the proposed law it would drop to \$8,700. It dropped down in every instance under the new legislation where it maintained the same taxable sum under the old legislation. Another example would be an estate left outright with half to the widow and half divided equally among the children and on the widow's death her estate is divided equally among the children. Again this would be a taxable estate of

**March 12, 1969**

\$100,000. Under the present law if there was one child surviving there would be \$6,200 assessed against that estate; under the proposed law there would be \$3,000. In the case of two children, under the present law it would stay at \$6,200, under the proposed law it would drop down to \$1,500. If there are two or three or more children there would be no tax assessed against the estate; under the present law it would be maintained at \$6,200. There is one further example, Mr. Speaker, an estate left outright to a widower, again \$100,000 estate, and then equally among his adult children where the number of children is — one, under the present law \$21,400, under the proposed law \$26,700 — an increase in this instance. If there were two children, under the present law it would be maintained at \$21,400, under the proposed law it would fall to \$23,700. If there were three children, under the present law it would be \$21,400, under the proposed law \$21,000. Any children over three the present law maintains a \$21,400 assessment, under the proposed law it would drop.

Now, Mr. Speaker, other Members opposite have also failed to bring forth any conclusive evidence of proof as to what extent it is going to help the farmer or small businessman in Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, according to the 1966 census, there are 69,962 commercial farms in the Province of Saskatchewan. Their capital was valued at \$4,579,690,000, this is total capital value. Of these commercial farms only 3,336 had a total capital value of \$150,000 or more. Out of nearly 70,000 farmers, Mr. Speaker, only 3,336 had estates that would be in excess of \$150,000 total capital value. If the family farm is to be passed on to the immediate family it would appear that the only people that would be concerned with the possibility of paying estate taxes would be the people who had capital value in farms in excess of at least \$100,000. This percentage I would say, Mr. Speaker, is going to be considerably lower than that which the Government is suggesting at the present time. I say this, Mr. Speaker, because out of the total capital value of these farms there is going to be in the neighborhood of at least 25 per cent of their gross worth of capital value that is going to be in debt to that farm. The debt will necessarily have to be deducted from the total value of that estate. This would drop the farms on an average at least to \$100,000 or much lower.

It seems Mr. Speaker, that the present Government is doing its best to lead the farmer and businessmen into believing he is more wealthy than he actually is. Statistics I have gathered show that the majority of Saskatchewan farms are going to be well below \$100,000 gross value in estate. Is the Government doing this so that it may appear justifiable to increase charges and further tax the farmer and businessman or is it just totally unaware of the financial standing of the people of this province, or, Mr. Speaker, is it only to reimburse large sums of money to the relatives of few who live in this province, those who would have estates that would be far greater than the \$200,000 limit which we suggested? I would suggest that over 95 per cent of the people in this Province of Saskatchewan are going



to have estates far below that limit, Mr. Speaker, these are the reasons why we moved to have such an amendment brought in, it was so that the family farmer, and the small farmer and the small businessman in the true sense may be able to survive, because without such a ceiling we are going to have the expansion and encouraging of corporation farms and the continued disappearance of small businessmen and farmers in this province.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Messer:** — This will apply especially to the smaller urban and rural communities of this province. According to Mr. Benson in 1967, out of 150,000 estates in Canada, during that year only 6,184 had to pay any estate tax at all. This would seem to show that it is indeed the minority of people who have to pay estate tax and with such a ceiling of \$200,000 it would be much, much less in number and dollars of tax of those who would be paying estate tax because of this 75 per cent rebate that they would be eligible for. Keeping the Federal Estate Tax figures in mind and the results of the rebating in Alberta, \$1.5 million was rebated to only a handful of people and one-third of that \$1.5 million going to one person, there appears to be very little danger to the small farmer and businessman in Saskatchewan suffering from hardship. Once a \$200,000 ceiling is included in the Bill this would have solved the problem of the small farmer in Saskatchewan. Then we would have been truly protecting the people in this province that we should be protecting. However, because there are certain benefits in this legislation that is brought down I will support this Bill on second reading.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. E. Kramer (The Battlefords):** — Mr. Speaker, I want to say just a few words on this Bill. The Premier (Mr. Thatcher) and this Government have made much of their intention to provide this legislation in order to save family farms and family businesses. Now as far as I am concerned we have watched throughout the period that this Government has been in office. We have watched its performance and especially last year after the Treasury had been raided right down to the last penny, we saw it in action and we saw where the real concern for the farmer was. After it had made its giveaways to big business, to various companies from outside this province, it showed its true colors when it placed taxes on every possible thing it could for the farmer and the average working man. Now it is trying to drag out this red herring. Mr. Speaker, and to try to kid the public that this is for the public that this is for the farmer and the small businessman in Saskatchewan. I want to suggest once again that nothing could be further from the truth. This Government has no more concern for the farmer and the small businessman than a billy goat has for the seventh commandment. If this was their real intent no one on either side of the House could do anything but give the measures their whole hearted approval. Certainly it is proper

**March 12, 1969**

and necessary to give consideration to family farms and businesses, to bona fide Saskatchewan residents in this province, who inherit modest estates and in many cases help through their lifetime in the building of that estate. Everyone in this House knows of situations where sons and daughters have contributed to building up a farm or business. Certainly I know of many who are thinking today in terms of \$200,000 estates and you certainly cannot class these people with the wealthy. There are many farms and businesses that would be seriously crippled for some time if these farms or businesses were called on suddenly to pay out the estate tax from that estate. In many cases there would have to be a liquidation of capital assets in order to make the payments. This action would cripple the productivity of the business or the estate for some time and any reasonable person will recognize that, while the assessors might place a fairly high value on an estate today, there is no guarantee that four or five years hence the value of this land or business may be reduced to 50 per cent or less of today's value. There is no doubt in my mind that an estate of this size would continue to be a better taxpayer and continue to be more productive in other ways, if it was not slashed through the imposition of an estate tax. The 75 per cent rebate is proper and feasible up to this point. However, one cannot accept the statement of the Government that it is concerned with this area or with this relatively low income contributor.

Once again I question the priority of this Liberal Government. Every major move it has made since taking office has been to the advantage of the wealthy with greater and greater burdens of tax placed on the lower income groups. Therefore, I suggest, that we cannot accept the Premier's or the Provincial Treasurer's expressed concern about the family farm and the family business. The Premier and his followers know very well that the greatest portion of this rebate will go into the hands of a very few wealthy individuals with estates ranging all the way from \$300,000 and beyond the million mark. Once again we are witnessing some of the Thatcher brand of Socialism which is Socialism for the rich. It seems a bit too hard to believe that their expressed concern for the average citizen is sincere when they are prepared to give millions away over a period of years to a handful of the wealthiest people and at the same time impose taxes on farm fuel, deterrent fees and many other impositions that were placed on the people of Saskatchewan last year by this Government to the tune of \$35 to \$40 million annually. It seems a bit difficult to believe that this Government is sincere when it is prepared to strip the estate of a mental patient down to the last \$10,000 in case of a surviving spouse and down to nothing as far as the children are concerned through legislation passed in this House more than a year ago. Mr. Speaker, this is typical Liberal philosophy. The Ottawa Government gave an example of this not so long ago with its Social Development Tax, when it passed legislation that forced you to pay two per cent up to \$8,000. But if you earned more than that or up to \$20,000, you paid no more, no more than the man or woman earning \$8,000. What did the Minister say at that time, what did he say at the time, Mr. Speaker? He said,

“Well, you know, you cannot tax these people because these wealthier people, these people making a higher income, may leave the country.” So it taxes the captives, and this is exactly what it is doing. Mental patients receive the same treatment here, and their families, they are captives, they can’t get away. They can’t get away from the clutches of this Government. This Act has exactly the same priority. The wealthy can go down to the Bahamas and get off scot free, but mental patients’ estates are stripped down to the last ruddy penny by this generous and sympathetic Government.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:30 o’clock p.m.