

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
May 13, 1980

EVENING SESSION

Resolution No. 29 (continued)

MR. G.S. MUIRHEAD (Arm River): — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm not just sure exactly where I left off before supper. The other night we were talking about . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . O.K. That's all right. I won't be very long, five minutes, Mr. Speaker. My motion as you all know is to provide natural gas throughout the province of Saskatchewan. In the 1940s and 1950s this province was able to develop a comprehensive hydro-electric power network. In 1980 it is my contention that we must develop a comprehensive rural gas distribution system. This is why I have introduced the motion that this Assembly recommends the Government of Saskatchewan consider designing and implementing, as soon as possible, a rural natural gas distribution system to extend to all rural residents of Saskatchewan the opportunity to consume natural gas.

Mr. Speaker, it is a well-known fact that large areas of this province do not have access to natural gas. Gas reserves are building significantly while oil reserves are declining. Gas prices are rising at a lower rate, about 75 per cent lower than oil. Future supply prospects are more positive for gas than for oil. Rural energy cost increases related to households will be significant. Mr. Speaker, in the province of Saskatchewan we still have 41 per cent of the towns with no service of natural gas. Eight per cent of the farms in Alberta have natural gas, while in Saskatchewan we have less than 10 per cent with natural gas. Somebody said shame, well I agree — shame.

Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan must harvest our full energy and industrial potential through a rural gas system. Procrastination at this time means missed opportunities for many parts of this province and indeed higher implementation costs for future generations left with the burden of providing essential energy services.

Mr. Speaker, a shared-cost approach has proven successful in the past and in other provinces, with the lion's share of the capital costs originating from the provincial treasurer and the centre of regional planning responsibility resting with municipalities and the local co-operatives. Mr. Speaker, this energy space-filling program would provide all Saskatchewan residents, whether they live on farms, in hamlets, villages, or towns, with home heating energy supplied continually, and would facilitate a wide range of industrial food-related activities throughout the province, such as, irrigation, pumping, grain drying, greenhouses, livestock water heaters, intensive agriculture processing such as alfalfa dehydration, pelleting and lumber drying.

Mr. Speaker, it is so important in the 1980s — this is Celebrate Saskatchewan 1980. Seventy-five years we've been a province, and I think it's time we caught up to the rest of Canada, caught up to the rest of North America. I've travelled throughout Canada and throughout the United States and in other countries of the world; we're behind in Saskatchewan on natural gas getting to the farms, and especially to the small towns and villages and hamlets.

When the last government was in power, Mr. Speaker, there was a different policy, when the gas line went into the town where I lived in 1969, the government paid the full cost of bringing it to the town while the people only had to pay the cost of hooking it up

to the houses. The policy has changes with the present government. That's why you'll find since 1971 there have been very, very few towns and hamlets get natural gas into their homes, Mr. Speaker. Because the policy today is that people have to pay the full shot . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, it's not wrong. The minister says it's wrong. Well, if he votes against this motion then we know he is wrong. He can't possibly vote against it, because the people from Outlook to Elbow three times have asked for natural gas to come down that line. They can't do it because they can't afford it; they would have to pay the full shot.

The minister says I'm wrong, Mr. Speaker. I hope I am wrong. I hope the figures I got from Sask Power are wrong. I hope the statistics they gave me are wrong. I hope the minister is right that they will pay the shot to put the line in from Outlook to Elbow. I just hope I'm wrong. The minister just said I am wrong. I want it on the record that the minister says they will pay the shot. That's what has been holding it up for years.

AN HON. MEMBER: — They have all their money in uranium and potash.

MR. MUIRHEAD: — Yes, I was just going to say that. Thank you very much to the member for Estevan. I was just going to bring it up. I had it written right here. We've spent \$500 million on nuclear development. Now don't get me wrong, Mr. Speaker. We haven't spent the \$500 million yet, but it will be within another year or two. Nuclear and uranium development — just playing around with it. Go ask the people, Mr. Speaker. Go ask them what they'd like to do with that money. See whether they want to hook up natural gas to their homes, or play around the way the minister is playing around with money. Go ask the farmers. Go ask the people in these towns.

Maybe he has it in his town, maybe I have it in my town. But boy, I'll tell you, it hasn't come in since this government's been in power. No way.

MR. MESSER: — . . . served in '71. Now there's isn't one which isn't served.

MR. MUIRHEAD: — Mr. Speaker, maybe he's right; maybe they have put some in. Maybe he's put them in his constituency just like the Minister of Telephones. He sure sees to it that he's getting lots of fibre optic lines put in his area. Maybe it's the same with the minister here.

All I'm saying, Mr. Speaker, this is nothing to laugh about. The members opposite seem to think that this is a little jovial. The motion which I have here, Mr. Speaker, is serious. If the members in Alberta and Manitoba can have it on their farms, why can't we in Saskatchewan? In the 1940s and '50s if they could run power wires all over this province to get power to the homes, Mr. Speaker, I say why can't we run a pipe underground to get this gas to the homes in small town in Saskatchewan? This is not serious and I hope you take it seriously. As I said to one of the members before lunch, I'm sure I don't have to take very long on this debate because I'm sure there's not one man on that side who could stand up to vote against it. They just couldn't do it so I said to the gentleman, you can't vote against it. Who would vote against natural gas services out into the . . . Regardless of the cost, they blow money and this government spends money just like . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, somebody said over there they can't vote against it. They'll vote against any of our ideas but we're supposed to vote with their ideas, Mr. Speaker.

I want it on record that if I'm standing here and the government comes up with something proper. I'll vote with them. When we do the same thing, I want them to vote

with us.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MUIRHEAD: — Mr. Speaker, if the food and agriculture industry is the bulwark of the rural farm and non-farm economies then there is an eminent need to develop a greater access to natural gas. That is why I'm advocating the development of a comprehensive rural gas distribution system and urge all members of this Assembly to support my motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. D.G. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley): — Mr. Speaker, I would just like to add a few comments in support of my colleagues' motion. I think probably what we're asking for on this side of the House is really the extension of the Kelsey-Tisdale program to other deserving areas in Saskatchewan, Mr. Minister. It would seem logical that we in this province who have as I am led to believe abundant resources in natural gas, could very well institute a program such as this where we can supply this gas to the rural areas of Saskatchewan.

The minister says we certainly don't have these resources. We'll wait until he gets on his feet and he can tell us why we have not. Following your debate in this House and listening to you talk in the last session last year about capped gas wells and so on, I am led to believe there is a considerable amount of natural gas in this province which is cheaper than oil at this time, so it would also be quite a benefit to the people if it could be supplied to them. So you say these things are wrong. I'm quite willing to let you get on your feet and tell me why they are wrong. But it just makes one wonder that here in Saskatchewan we have only 10 per cent of our rural farm areas serviced where Alberta has been able to service 85 per cent, (not mentioning that many of the rural areas don't have natural gas and I think deserve it).

I know you are going to say, well, it's going to cost a lot of money but everything is in terms of priorities, as we've pointed out, concerning the uranium development. My colleague didn't mention the money you're spending on land bank which many people question. And perhaps if you really had the interest of rural areas and farmers in mind . . . You know, there's a great economic spinoff from this if you can get cheap sources of energy on your farms. As you well know, you can . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well relatively cheaper than the ones we have today.

We could put some impetus into food processing, into real diversification in agriculture which, if you would take a little advice, is where your government is failing quite badly when you look at other government in western Canada. I think the Minister of Agriculture realizes this. I think he feels very badly that he made the hasty statement about complete graining farming. I think maybe he is going to take a second look at diversification which would help rural Saskatchewan.

It is one thing to stand up and say you're in favor of rural development but let's see some of the policies. We've pointed out power. I remember cutting lines for power in the 1950s when I finished high school I'll give your government credit for that program. It has been well received and has been a great boon to Saskatchewan as it was to all the other provinces.

But I think, Mr. Minister, if you really and truly are looking at some ways of helping rural

Saskatchewan develop the proposal by the member for Arm River certainly merits looking into. I remember the Premier telling us about the capped gas we have in Saskatchewan. He put forth the argument which may be noted that down the trail we'll be using this. But we can't see ahead regarding technological development that's taking place in the society in which we live. I think a very good example the Minister of Telephones will realize this) is the number of changes that are coming upon us in communications. Each day as I sit in this House I hear of something new. Awhile ago we were talking about fibre optics; now we're talking about earth stations and discs and so on. We all know communications are advancing at breakneck speeds.

Down the trail there may be some changes in energy sources, for example, solar energy. As you know we are looking at many of these things. People right now need this help in rural Saskatchewan. We need this diversification in agricultural processing. Maybe you will be wise to look at the suggestions of the minister here and do something about this.

I think I've set out the reasons why I feel this is worthy of consideration. We don't expect you to rush out tomorrow, Mr. Minister, with a new program. But certainly if you're looking for alternatives and viable suggestions, we on this side of the House, think that natural gas distribution to the rural areas and arms of Saskatchewan is a very worthwhile venture that your government should be looking at.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. C.O. WHITE (Regina Wascana): — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm somewhat amused by this resolution. The last of the great spenders, you might call the member for Arm River, quite different than the member for Regina South who wanted to eliminate all the profits of the SPC. Take away the profits; increase the costs; run it into the ground, dispose of it to private interests. I won't go into that though. But it's quite clear to me, Mr. Speaker, that neither the member for Arm River nor the member for Indian Head-Wolseley knows anything about the establishment of operation of the SPC gas system.

The member for Arm River says he has spoken about the expansion of the natural gas system at times, spoken of it to serve all residents of rural Saskatchewan. And because the member for Arm River has spoken of it, therefore it must be possible. If he speaks of it all residents can economically have natural gas. He supplied no data, no calculations at all to support what he suggest or to show it is economically feasible. I didn't expect him to. I really didn't expect him to, you know, because you simply can't provide that type of support. What he's proposing is economically foolish. He's really the mental lightweight on the opposite side.

I want to inform the member for Arm River and his colleagues about the construction of the system and about some of the principles on which the SPC natural gas system was built. You might say the system was started in 1952 about the time Saskatoon was supplied with natural gas. By 1959 all cities had natural gas. By 1964 all of the larger towns and a good many of the villages had gas.

All the communities were to that time served by what you might call standard rates. And for a time thereafter a different policy was followed, based on the idea that the centres without service were too costly to serve at the going rates.

The member for Arm River is in error when he talks about 1969. This was an innovation of the Thatcher government. The Thatcher government in 1965 concluded (and you

can check with the member for Rosthern because Rosthern was one of the first communities served under this program) that these new communities were required to pay higher than the standard rate to get natural gas. A set percentage of consumers in the community had to sign up for natural gas.

Now that policy was followed for some time and then it was modified under the present government. But by 1973 it was quite clear the program was going to peter out. By 1975 there were no more communities served, only exceptional ones have been served since then.

Now I want to give the member for Arm River some figures. Why were no more served? Because it was costing 75 per cent more to serve a customer in 1974 than it had a few years earlier — \$2,000 as compared to about \$1,300.

You talk about the rural electrification system. Now it was costing \$2,000 per customer, rural electrification was approximately \$1,000 and at about 5 per cent interest. The interest was a lot different. It's a very different proposition, Mr. Member for Arm River. Now it really ceased to be economic to serve new communities and farms even using plastic pipes . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, some of it was added. Unless you subsidized prices very heavily gas could not be provided at a cost lower than competing fuels.

Now you may have a plan for doing this; you may have a plan. You may want to terminate the 5 per cent of gross revenue that goes to all the towns and cities. You could take it away and spend it but that won't earn you many friends in urban centres. Now, I said certain basic principles were followed when this natural gas system was built and I want to tell you a few of them.

The first principle was that natural gas would not be treated as a luxury fuel to be priced higher than other fuels because of its qualities. Natural gas would become the fundamental fuel of urban centres in Saskatchewan. To make it the fundamental fuel the price would be set high enough to cover the cost of the system, and at the same time low enough to cause mass conversion by consumers from coal or oil or whatever they were using to natural gas. The price established was roughly 20 per cent below the competing fuel of the day.

I want to put this a bit differently so the member for Arm River will understand. He may not get it the first time. The key to building the system of the SPC was its ability to set rates at a level which would satisfy two conditions: (1) cut rates sufficiently to bring about a large scale conversion to natural gas, and (2) earn enough revenue to carry the fairly extensive system which was going to be built. And this was made possible by circumstances existing at the time. I want to read you a little piece from a report entitled Report on the Economics of Transmission and Distribution of Natural Gas in Saskatchewan, and it says this:

There existed a large and presumably permanent differential between the cost of natural gas and the cheapest alternative fuel for domestic heating.

That situation no longer prevails. The area not supplied with natural gas is by no means as economical to serve as the area already supplied. To be economic to serve a centre or group of farms, the retail price at which gas would have to be sold would be low enough to command virtually the whole fuel market and bring about conversion to natural gas and yet high enough to carry the cost of the system. And this situation

simply doesn't exist for a variety of reasons. But one of the most important, I would suggest, is Alberta. Alberta has continually jacked up the price of natural gas. We get a lot of our natural gas there, and we are paying more for it; you can thank your colleagues over there for the fact or part of the reason this proposal of yours cannot be carried out. And because I feel this proposal is so unrealistic.

MR. C.O. WHITE (Regina Wascana) moved, seconded by Mr. D.G. Banda (Redberry):

That all the words after 'Assembly' be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

commends the Government of Saskatchewan and the Saskatchewan Power Corporation for implementing and carrying out programs which have led to the extension of natural gas to serve all cities, numerous towns and villages and where it has been found economically advantageous to rural areas and Indian reserves as well.

MR. D.G. BANDA (Redberry): — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am certainly pleased to second the amendment proposed by my colleague for Regina Wascana. As one of the members of the Assembly, I am proud of our rural electrification system in Saskatchewan, and am certainly pleased to support the motion put forward. I want to study a little more carefully what the members opposite have said in their spending spree. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

SECOND READINGS

MR. D.G. BANDA (Redberry) moved second reading of Bill No. 03 — **An Act respecting Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, being an Act to amend and consolidate (An Act respecting Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, being an Act to amend and consolidate An Act to Incorporate Saskatchewan Co-operative Wheat Producers Limited).**

Motion to second reading agreed.

RESOLUTIONS

Resolution No. 5 — Interest Rates

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed resolution by Mr. Engel (Assiniboia-Gravelbourg):

That the Assembly condemns the federal government for pushing Canadian interest rates to unprecedented levels, thereby reversing a pre-election commitment to lower interest rates, and causing severe economic hardship for home-owners, farmers, small business people and generally the vast majority of Canadian families living on modest incomes, resulting in higher costs, less investment, more unemployment and thus raising the spectre of a deep national recession, and illustrating the abdication of economic leadership by the new federal government.

and the proposed amendment thereto by Mr. Rousseau:

and that this Assembly also condemns the Government of Saskatchewan for failing to offer economic relief to the home-owner, farmer and small businessman of Saskatchewan during this time of economic hardship.

Amendment negated on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 7

Berntson
Birkbeck
Taylor

Rousseau
Swan

Katzman
Andrew

NAYS — 20

Blakeney
Pepper
Allen
Romanow
Messer
Snyder
Kramer

Gross
Shillington
MacMurchy
Banda
Kowalchuk
Feschuk
Vickar

Rolfes
Tchorzewski
Cody
Koskie
Thompson
White

Motion agreed to.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Bill No. 12 — An Act to amend The Income Tax Act.

Section 1 agreed.

Section 2

HON. E.L. TCHORZEWSKI (Minister of Finance): — Mr. Chairman, I just would like to make a few brief comments on this bill. I will save the member opposite from having to answer questions, since he does not have his officials here. I think some comment should be made on the proposed amendment to The Income Tax Act in order to clarify what the implications of this amendment would be.

First of all, I want to say it is somewhat unclear what the member for Regina South is intending to accomplish with this amendment. As I understand the income tax provision, a taxpayer who is in business may deduct certain expenses incurred in operating that business in determining his taxable income. One of the expenses he may deduct is the cost of tools purchased for use in the business. An individual who is not in business, however, such as a salaried employee, is not entitled to deduct the cost of any tools he may be required to purchase and use in his employment.

I would presume, Mr. Chairman, that the proposed amendment is intended to redress this situation. The member may want to respond to that after my remarks. Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, this bill will not accomplish that objective, and that's the important point I think this Assembly must consider. First, the bill in its present form is proposing that an individual be entitled to a reduction in his Saskatchewan income taxes equal to the cost of the tools purchased by him. This would be in effect a tax credit presumably to be called a Saskatchewan tool tax credit, and not a deduction in determining taxable income.

Second, Mr. Chairman, the bill would not only provide a tax credit for an individual who is not able to deduct the cost of tools purchased by him in determining taxable income, but also for an individual who is currently already permitted to deduct the cost of the tools. And this Mr. Speaker, does not make sense to me. The bill proposed by the by the member for Regina South is logistically, for loss of a better way to describe it, ill-conceived.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, before any tax credit may be implemented, its administration would have to be negotiated with the federal government in advance in the same way the Saskatchewan mortgage interest tax credit and other special provincial tax features were. Mr. Chairman, the Saskatchewan income tax system, as I have indicated on several occasions in the House during the session, is one of the most progressive in Canada and we're proud of that. The tax credits and reductions which we have produced over the past several years have been designed to provide maximum benefits to those taxpayers who are most in need of them; a double tax reduction for a select few, Mr. Chairman, could not be considered a progressive move but that's what this bill would do.

Under the tax collection agreement, Saskatchewan and other provinces are subject to various income tax rules and provisions determined by the federal government, and if, as I perceive the intent, the member for Regina South wishes to put employees who are required to purchase and use their own tools on the same footing tax-wise as individuals who operate their own business, then he should approach the federal government since such a provision would require an amendment to the federal Income Tax Act. Now, this amendment provides indeed some tax credit to employees, but it doubles the benefit to people who are already benefiting by using this kind of an approach. I think it would be unwise on the part of any member of this Assembly to vote for the provision in this amendment proposed by the member for Regina South. And I would encourage and urge the members of this Assembly to defeat this bill on this reading.

MR. P. ROUSSEAU (Regina South): — Mr. Chairman, the argument put forth by the Minister of Finance was very, very weak. First of all, why wasn't this argument put forth before the second meeting? Why was it passed on second reading is the question? Now, he's asking what I would accomplish . . . It's not my fault if you guys fall asleep over on that side, that's your problem, not mine. The minister is wanting to know what I would accomplish by this amendment. Well, I will tell you what I would accomplish by this amendment. I would accomplish what the trades people in this province have been trying for years and years and years to accomplish, and that is to receive fair play and to be treated as first-class citizens, not second-class citizens.

For years they've been saying we have to buy tools, and some of them could buy easily \$2,000 worth of tools per year, particularly in the automotive field. They are buying these tools with tax paid dollars. The minister is trying to pass the buck to the federal government. Well, I'm not a member of parliament; I'm a member of the Legislative

Assembly. My only approach and my only source to approach is this legislature, certainly not the federal government.

You say the only possible way of putting this amendment through is through a tax credit. I don't care how you do it. That's your problem. I really don't care how you do it just so long as you are prepared to give those people in this province, who are having to pay and buy those tools out of tax paid dollars, that break. Now we are not the government and I'm not the Minister of Finance, so it's not a problem that I'm going to concern myself with. It's one problem that you're going to have to concern yourselves with.

You've passed second reading on it. We're not into committee of the whole on it and for you to change your position at this time . . . Well, let me ask you what you think is going to happen with all of the trades people in this province if you decide all of a sudden that you're not going to treat them as first-class citizens.

You say the businesses who already receive this benefit would benefit twice. I don't know how that could come about. I don't know how, on a tax form, a business could claim in two places and not be obvious to the tax auditors or the tax inspectors. That doesn't make too much sense to me. If he's going to make one claim as a deduction as a business, he's made it. He can't claim it a second time. The inspectors aren't blind, and if the businessman is dishonest, there are rules, laws and regulations to prevent that. So that, obviously, is a cop-out and is really an excuse. You don't make any sense on that at all.

Mr. Chairman, the tradespeople in this province for the first time have a ray of hope that perhaps they will be treated fairly, and be allowed (because as I say, it has passed second reading), that tax deduction they should be entitled to. Why should an individual who earns his living as a mechanic or an electrician or whatever trade he's in, have to pay to purchase those tools out of tax paid dollars?

The Minister of Industry and Commerce was in the automobile business a short time ago. He knows the number of times the Saskatchewan Motor Dealers Association has lobbied the government for this amendment to The Income Tax Act. He knows that. He was there. And they are still doing it today. As a matter of fact that convention is being held right today in Saskatoon. And they know that this bill has passed second reading. If you want to take it away from them, you take it away from them. But you pay the consequences. I tell you today that if you take this away from them now that you've already approved on second reading of this particular amendment, it will be unfortunate.

Mr. Chairman, I would certainly, sincerely hope those members opposite will take a different view than to do a flip-flop on this amendment. Vote for it and approve it as a tax deduction. I don't care whether you call it a deduction. I don't care whether you call it a tax credit. I don't care how you handle it, but give them the benefit of being able to apply these costs, these expenses against their income as anyone else is treated, as businessmen are treated, as professional people are treated, as corporations are treated. Give them the same privilege, the same right, the same fair play.

Why are you trying to discriminate? Why are you trying to treat them as second-class citizens? If the way the amendment is written isn't to your satisfaction, write in your own amendment. You write an amendment to it, but give them that right. Give them fair play.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Mr. Chairman, just for the benefit and information of the House and the member opposite, it's not only the question of the way the amendment is written. The fact of the matter is what such an amendment, no matter how it's written, is going to do . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, it provides some benefit to tradespeople, but it will provide a double benefit to those people who already are benefiting under the present federal income tax legislation. Now, is this what the member wants? Now, let me just comment on one remarks which the member for Regina South made. He said, I don't care how you do it. Now, that's an unfortunate reflection of the attitude and irresponsibility of the members opposite when they propose an amendment to this House. It's irrelevant to them (it appears from his comment) whether the amendment makes sense, whether it workable, just as long as they do a little bit of politicking in the House to put something on the order paper then say, I don't care how you do it even if it's impossible.

Now, I really have to question that kind of approach. The best solution to this is one which has been encouraged by this legislature over a number of years, which we can still encourage, namely that there be an amendment to the Income Tax Act of Canada. There was such an amendment. The most recent was one in February 1966, which I picked up in some of the research which I was doing on this. This Assembly unanimously passed a resolution which read:

That this Assembly urges the Government of Canada to amend the Income Tax Act to permit exemptions of costs incurred in the purchase of new equipment and instruments used by workers in their employment.

Now, if the member opposite wants to put that kind of resolution on the order paper I'd certainly want to consider supporting such an approach because it then would make some sense. But as it is here now, as I have outlined in my first remarks, it is not workable; it cannot work and all it would do is provide a double benefit, in the main, to people who already are getting some of the benefit. So the tradespeople would through their taxation, be subsidizing those business establishments which would get the double benefit. I think that is wrong and therefore I think as I have indicated earlier we should defeat the bill as it is.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Chairman, the minister again refers to the double benefits to the businessmen. Which businessman submits a separate income tax form? It's the same tax form that you submit federally which goes to the provincial tax . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Absolute nonsense is what we're saying. One individual or business cannot claim a benefit twice . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, that's not what I am saying. Mr. Chairman, if the Premier wants to get into the act, I'll be happy to listen to him on his points. I'd be very happy to let you join us.

The minister also mentioned my attitude suggesting that I don't care. Well all right, let me rephrase that. If you don't know how to do it, I'll come and help you. I say I don't care how you do it and that's exactly what I mean in that way. I don't care how you go about getting it done as long as you get it done. I care whether or not you get it done, but how you do it, Mr. Minister, that's your department; that's your job. Now, if you want my help I'll be glad to spend days with you to find a way of doing it. To sit there saying it can't be done is absolute nonsense. You're able to give the renters in this province tax credits. You're able to provide all kinds of benefits for various people through tax credits. Well, just come up with a way of doing it for these tradespeople who are being treated like second-class citizens in this particular way.

If you can't do it with this bill, do it with any bill you like. Do it however you want to do it. Amend the bill the way you want. Are you telling me your government is not prepared, not concerned and not interested in seeing that fair play exists with the tradespeople of this province? Is that what you're saying? The Minister of the Environment says, that's right.

I'm pleased to hear that's what you think of the tradespeople, you don't care. They can be second-class citizens and pay for these things out of tax paid dollars. That's interesting.

You say there's only one way of doing it through the federal government. Let's get it done if you can't do it this way. You come up with an amendment to this bill. You tell us how it should be done. You know the intent of the bill. You know what we're trying to accomplish. You know how the people of this province want this bill passed. You, I'm sure, have had phone calls and representations by the people of this province respecting this bill. People who have voted for your party are saying, not any more unless they pass this bill, because it's money out of their pockets. If you want some help, Mr. Minister let me know and I'll come and give you a hand.

MR. R.A. LARTER (Estevan): — Mr. Chairman, can I ask the member who has been debating? . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — No, you can't ask him.

MR. LARTER: — Well, would you mind moving across the floor so I can ask you some questions?

AN HON. MEMBER: — You can ask them right there.

MR. LARTER: — O.K. Would the hon. member for Regina South permit a few questions? O.K. As business people through the years we've been able to deduct the depreciation on our tools, our building and everything, for income tax purposes. Do you believe that the mechanics or the plumbers, who have depreciation on their tools, etc., through the years, should have the same rights as the man in business?

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Chairman, to answer the hon. member for Estevan, I go a step further on that point. The businesses have not only been allowed depreciation on their tools, but have been allowed a total write off of tools up to \$150. I think that is the amount, at least it was. It might be higher. The Minister of Finance could probably answer that question. But there is a total write off of up to \$150 and depreciation on amounts over the \$150. And it's exactly the point I've been trying to make — businesses can do it. Individuals who need those tools for their employ and for their work should be given the same privileges.

MR. LARTER: — Mr. Chairman, could I ask a few more questions of the hon. member for Regina South? Would you permit another question?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Yes.

MR. LARTER: — Would you not think it feasible that this government, after completely supporting you on second reading and believing that it's a good bill, could take the

Saskatchewan portion of the income tax and allow a mechanic or plumber (or whatever he is) to add the price of his tools or the depreciation to his expenses and deduct it from the Saskatchewan portion of the income tax? Do you not believe you could do that without having an income tax credit?

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Well, Mr. Chairman, the question is very interesting simply because the government has found ways and means of being able to deduct certain tax credits from income tax. For example, I mention the renters tax credit, the home improvement tax credits and so on and so forth. Now if they are able to do that for segments of the society as benefits to the taxpayers, then I say the same kind of policy or regulation could be used in the case of tools. The member for Rosthern has just mentioned another example, the Saskatchewan mortgage interest deductions and property tax credit that is allowed. You have found a method of being able to apply that to the income tax of the individual. Now if that can be done there, I see no reason why the expense could not be deducted on the income tax.

MR. LARTER: — Would the member for Regina South permit another question? Mr. Rousseau, do you not feel a tradesman in Saskatchewan is entitled to be very right as a man in business in this province to get all the breaks as far as depreciation and expense? He's gone to the expense of better educating himself on a trade. He's giving a service to the people of this province. Do you not feel he should be treated as an equal? If you do, do you not feel the government should work out a formula to give this man the break he deserves?

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Yes, Mr. Chairman, in reply to the hon. member's question. We talk about education for mechanics. Mechanics today in the Kelsey Institute in Moose Jaw spend a five-year apprenticeship within the dealership and Kelsey Institute. They work at very low wages for many years simply because the cost of the two or four months per year are paid for out of their pocket, again non-deductible from income tax. Then the members opposite also indicate it would be a very difficult thing to administer because businessmen would claim twice. Well, as I said earlier, that is an excuse because it is on the same form.

Now the professional, the doctor, the lawyer, who is not a businessman or not a company, will spend whatever number of dollars per year on tools or instruments of his trade and is allowed to deduct that from his income. How is it done there? It can be done there. Why can it not be done for the mechanic, the electrician, the carpenter, the plumber and so on? The farmer is allowed to deduct on his, so why not the tradesman?

MR. LARTER: — Does the member not feel though that with the strong support given by the government on second reading in the principle of this bill, that by now doing a flip-flop, they have completely discouraged all tradesmen in this province? And probably that \$500,000 donated to the government's party will shrink considerably in the future?

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Nothing would please this side of the Assembly more than to see that particular thing happen. I've forgotten what the first part of your question was — oh yes, the second reading. Yes, I totally agree with the member for Estevan. The bill passed second reading in this House. Last Saturday night I spoke with an implement dealer from the south of the province who indicated to me at the time that he had three mechanics and two of them were NDP supporters. They saw the story in the newspaper and asked the dealer about the particular bill. He then asked me about it. He told me Saturday night that if the government defeated this bill in committee of the whole or in

third reading, they'll never be supporters of the NDP again. I say that in all sincerity. A dealer from the southern part of the province indicated to me in exactly those terms; unless this government is prepared to support and pass this bill he is through as an NDP supporter.

HON. W.E. SMISHEK (Minister of Municipal Affairs (Urban)): — Mr. Chairman, it was curious that the hon. member for Regina South, in answering the questions from the member for Estevan, made reference to home improvement tax credit. As minister in charge of the housing corporation, I am curious about that tax credit because I've never heard about it. I'm sure the people of Saskatchewan would be interested in what is meant by a home improvement tax credit, because that's a new tax credit which he has invented. Could he tell me how it works and to whom it applies?

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Chairman, I don't know why the Minister of Urban Affairs wants to be facetious about this bill. I may have erred in the terminology. Mortgage deductibility, I believe, is the bill, but I believe there are two or three areas of tax credits which are available. If you want to be facetious about the seriousness of this bill, Mr. Minister, then go ahead and be facetious about it. I'm not familiar with the terms, and I accept whatever criticism you want to offer in that respect.

MR. SMISHEK: — Mr. Chairman, I'm serious about it. He made reference to home improvement tax credit.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order, order! Home improvement tax credit doesn't have anything to do with this bill anyway.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Mr. Chairman, I only have one question for the member who sponsors the bill. I really am concerned about the duplication it would create. I know the member opposite, along with his colleagues and the people who helped him draft the bill, has carefully thought through the legislation before us, otherwise it certainly would not be here because it has some pretty widespread implications. My only question is since the bill would provide for an individual, who is currently permitted to deduct the cost of his tools, another deduction of a similar kind, what is the solution the member opposite has to propose which would prevent that from happening? In order . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . The member for Estevan shouldn't get so excited because I think it's important to have an answer to this question. In order for this Assembly to consider seriously this bill, if it indeed is serious, I think we should know the answer to that question.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Chairman, I don't know what the minister is really talking about. You're obviously not talking about a limited company. You're talking about a business which is unlimited or individually owned. Mr. Minister, I'll ask you the question: how can they . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — Tell him it's not in the public interest to give that answer.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — I'd like to repeat the solution my colleague just handed me. He said, 'Tell them it's not in the public interest to answer that question.' that is typical of what we usually get from the government opposite.

Mr. Chairman, the minister is asking a legitimate question, and I'm going to attempt to answer him. In the case of an individual who owns this own business — not a limited company — if he is claiming twice on an expense it would be quite obvious on the tax

form he is submitting. He is not submitting two fax forms; he's only submitting one. So if he is going to claim it twice it would become obvious. It would be something which would be noticed immediately by inspectors. If it's a company tax form he's submitting as well as a personal one, one of them has bought the tools. Either the company bought the tools or the individual bought the tools. One or the other can then claim. So I don't know what your problem is. It seems like a very simple solution to me to strictly put it on the one form of the tax return to the government. As the member for Souris-Cannington says, it's a cop-out. I think I said that earlier and that's exactly what it is. You are stuck with it and don't know how to handle it. Obviously you haven't done any research into it or investigated the possibilities of it. Otherwise you would have had some answers by now. I have, and it's possible.

HON. N. VICKAR (Minister of Industry and Commerce): — I would like to ask the member for Regina South a question too. The member made the statement in his remarks a little while ago that an employer, in the equipment which he buys, is allowed \$150 in depreciation value and then a total write off. Can you explain to me where you get this information and how it's derived?

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Yes, I would be very happy to explain it to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. I think you have been put off business for a while. In the case of a business, if a tool costs \$150 or less you can write it off totally. If the tool costs \$500, you depreciate it, so much a year. So there's an allowance made . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, no that's the way it is. The government has set an amount saying you can write off anything up to \$150 for a particular tool. Anything over that (say the tool is worth \$500) then you depreciate it at, I believe 30 per cent a year. Does that answer your question?

MR. L.W. BIRKBECK (Moosomin): — Mr. Chairman, notwithstanding some of the obvious difficulties which we are having on this side of the House on the role of government, we're fast learning. Another 10 minutes and we'll be right on top. I would like to ask the hon. member for Regina South a question and maybe it's unfortunate that I came in this late. He's pretty good at answering the questions. But I ask this question seriously.

Mr. Member for Regina South, would you not say that for the members of the Assembly to vote against this particular bill now, after having given it second reading, would be clearly discriminatory against one of the primary skilled labor factors in the province of Saskatchewan; one of the trades, the skilled trades which is most essential to the province of Saskatchewan? So to vote against it, taking away some of the advantages which would be given to them through passage of this bill, would be clearly discriminatory against them. A similar analogy would be where for instance a young lady selling cosmetics is able to write off her travelling expenses and part of her apartment because it's supposedly used for business purposes and so on and so forth. That's just a lady who picks up and starts selling cosmetics of any description, Mr. Member, but this is not along those lines at all. What we are addressing ourselves to here, as you are certainly through this bill, is a write off or an exemption to one of the most primary skilled trades in the province of Saskatchewan. For any member, would you not suggest to vote against it would be clearly discriminatory?

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I had indicated earlier that it would certainly be discriminatory for the government at this point in time to vote against it.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Hypocritical.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Hypocritical, they would do a flip-flop. There is no question about it. But you have brought up a point, Mr. Chairman, which I would like to touch on: the mere fact that it is well-known today that there is a shortage of skilled trades people in the province of Saskatchewan. The mere fact that there is, should make this a very important amendment to this government to consider, for the simple reason that it could encourage more people to enter into the different trades and to learn the skills which this government is saying today there is a serious shortage of.

MR. KATZMAN: — What is the amount the average mechanic would spend per year on tools, normally?

MR. ROUSSEAU: — You're talking about an automobile mechanic? The average would probably be somewhere between \$700 and \$1,000. I might add that many mechanics in this province today, and I think the Minister of Industry and Commerce would agree with me, would actually own today some \$15,000 to \$25,000 worth of tools which they have bought and paid for. The insurance on these tools is very, very costly. That also is not a deductible expense against income.

MR. KATZMAN: — What percentage of that \$700 to \$1,000 would be totally written off in the first year? How much would they have to average over?

MR. ROUSSEAU: — I would say 95 per cent of the tools would be under the \$150 amount and would be written off the first year.

MR. KATZMAN: — Would the major tools all then be purchased by the employer rather than the mechanic?

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Yes, that's correct.

MR. N.E. BYERS (Kelvington-Wadena): — Mr. Chairman, the bill may have a lot of merit but section 2 doesn't allow, I think, what would be a very popular move. The bill is not really all encompassing. The do-it-yourselfers produce about \$40 million worth of goods and commodities in Canada in a year. In reading this bill I do not interpret section 2 to include the do-it-yourselfers who have a sizable investment in tools and equipment. I therefore regard this provision of the bill as very deficient because it doesn't acknowledge the investment of the do-it-yourselfers. Initially I did not oppose this bill but because, in my mind, it doesn't go far enough, I'm having second thoughts about the support I will give for the bill.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Chairman, I don't really know, and I'm not going to accuse him of trying to be facetious about that question. Let me answer it in this way. He says \$40 million from do-it-yourselfers in Canada. If Saskatchewan takes its share of that, it would mean about \$160,000 . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, I'm sorry, \$1.6 million, 4 per cent.

However, it also indicated it doesn't include the do-it-yourself purchaser. I personally within the last three years bought about \$8,000 worth of power tools. I'm a hobbyist. I wasn't thinking of myself when I wrote that bill. I am not interested in getting that deductibility myself. I was concerned about the trades people in this province we are short of, skilled trades people. Let's encourage them; let's see they get some credit, some benefits and stop treating them as second-class citizens.

Section 2 of Bill 12 negatived on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 11

Berntson	Rousseau	Duncan
Birkbeck	Swan	Andrew
Larter	Muirhead	McLeod
Taylor	Katzman	

NAYS — 26

Blakeney	Gross	Rolfes
Allen	Shillington	Tchorzewski
Bowerman	MacMurchy	Cody
Smishek	Mostoway	Koskie
Romanow	Banda	Johnson
Messer	Kowalchuk	Thompson
Snyder	Feschuk	Engel
Kramer	Byers	White
McArthur	Vickar	

Section 3 negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — We need a motion to the House. We've defeated the bill basically so I'll call on the minister.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a motion, seconded by the Minister of Telephones (Mr. Cody):

That this committee report that Bill 12 not be proceeded with.

Motion agreed to.

The committee reported progress.

SECOND READINGS

Point of Order re Bill No. 63

HON. R.J. ROMANOW (Attorney General): — My point of order is that proposed Bill No. 63 is out of order because it calls for an expenditure on the public purse. I directed your attention to Sir Erskine May, page 752 where the issue of expenditure initiated in this kind of a matter is reviewed, and the heading says:

TESTS USED TO DETERMINE WHETHER EXPENDITURE INVOLVES A 'CHARGE'

. . . In order to constitute a charge upon public funds, expenditure must be (1) new and distinct; (2) payable out of the Consolidated Fund or the National

Loans Fund (in this case we're talking about a consolidated fund); (3) effectively imposed. (He states further that a charge must be new and distinct.

Then he elaborates the principles of it. I shall not take the time of the House to elaborate the further setting out of points I have made.

If you look at this bill, Mr. Speaker, you see what the proposed bill attempts to do. Under section 5 it would allow for the appointment of an assistant auditor, a new position, not presently provided for. Under section 20 it would give the auditor the discretion to decide himself the size of his staff. That also is a charge on the public purse. Section 22 which is an entirely new position, will enable the auditor to hire experts to assist him. That is a charge on the public purse, consolidated fund.

Under section 4(3) this would increase the auditor's salary by \$13,000 a year, enough to pay for a new secretarial or clerical position — now \$44,000 apparently, and could go as high as \$56,900 or a senior deputy position. Section 9(2) would create a new duty to the auditor which would require more staff in order to direct independent audits of Crown corporations.

Section 13 would authorize the auditor to perform inspection audits. Under section 17 of the proposed bill there would be the special assignment required by the Assembly and as given to the auditor by the public accounts committee.

Mr. Speaker, I say by every yardstick of Sir Erskine May and Beauchesne's, the key tests, namely that I would motive a new and distinct charge upon public funds payable out of the consolidated fund and effectively imposed, are met. Accordingly the bill is out of order.

MR. SPEAKER: — Are there any further comments on the point of order?

MR. R.L. ANDREW (Kindersley): — Relating to the Attorney General's point of order, Mr. Speaker, the question first of all is with regard to the assistant auditor. I was cognizant of that fact, but right now in place in Saskatchewan we do have an assistant provincial auditor. However, that person is not named in The Department of Finance Act but is still there. It's still the same person, so I submit that does not carry with it an additional cost for the public purse by necessity. The question with regard to the additional work by the provincial auditor is presuming the present audit staff (and I think that is the whole point, Mr. Speaker) does not have to be increased to handle this given situation.

The other point raised by the Attorney General related to the crown corporations. Well, of course you know if we in fact had the auditor do all the Crown corporations, which is not the case now, as it is done by an outside auditor who charges probably more money rather than less money to do that audit, that money would not necessarily then be required. Therefore, looking at it in the whole context of what the Attorney General says, there is nothing in this bill that would call for additional money out of the provincial treasury to handle this bill.

Now, should a time come along (and that's true of any bill and it's certainly true of The Department of Finance Act now) when the auditor would require additional money should he require additional staff as the government grows, clearly that is there as well. So I suggest what we are talking about here does not require any further expenditure of money and clearly that is the rule under this legislature and under Erskine May.

If we look at it from a realistic point of view, Mr. Speaker, as long as a private member's bill does not require additional money . . . If we're going to be so sticky and so critical at that point in time, I suggest what we are doing with that type of ruling is unduly restricting the opposition from making what I suggest is a valid bill, a valid suggestion, something all members of this Assembly should look at. So what we're talking about is not additional money, Mr. Speaker. The same budget is there for the provincial auditor there's no additional money. I suggest for that reason the bill is in order.

MR. SPEAKER: — The Attorney General and the hon. member for Kindersley have raised some interesting but rather conflicting points of view about the orderliness of the particular bill. I think I am going to avail myself of some more time to look at this bill. I'll ask the bill to stand on the order paper and will attempt to have a written decision back to the House next private members' day.

MR. W.J.G. ALLEN (Regina Rosemont) moved second reading of Bill No. 102 — **An Act to amend the Lord's Day (Saskatchewan) Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, I want to make a few brief remarks on this bill before moving second reading. I want to explain to the House the purpose of this particular piece of legislation and what this piece of legislation will do. It will do two things. The first thing it will do will be to allow the holding of exhibitions and the charging of admission at those exhibitions on Sundays, if a local municipality passes a by-law to do so.

I should point out to the House, and I am sure many of the members are aware, there are many fairs that do not operate on Sunday. The problem is that these fairs are operating illegally and the law as it stands now has not been enforced in a number of instances. I think if there were complaints, however, the law would have to be enforced and these fairs would have to be shut down.

The second thing this bill does is repeal section 11 of The Lord's Day Act that prohibits municipalities from making by-laws to allow for horse racing and pari-mutuel betting on Sunday. This provision, in other words, Mr. Speaker, if passed, would allow local municipalities to provide for horse racing and pari-mutuel betting on Sundays.

I know, Mr. Speaker, there are certain members of the House who favor this legislation; there are others who oppose it. May I say, Mr. Speaker, I certainly respect the views of all members on both sides of the House on this particular topic. But I want to make a few arguments if I can, Mr. Speaker, to those who would oppose this legislation.

My view about going to exhibits and attending horse races is that these are recreational entertainment things to do. Some people enjoy going to picnics. Some people enjoy going to parks. Some people enjoy going to football games. Some people enjoy going to movies on Sunday. I think some people might enjoy going to fairs. They might enjoy going to horse races, Mr. Speaker, on Sunday.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Do you think any of them go to church, Bill?

MR. ALLEN: — Now, I know there are those who would argue that horse racing is gambling, betting is gambling and gambling is morally wrong. My argument, member for Moosomin, is this. I believe that if something is morally wrong, it is morally wrong on Monday; it is morally wrong on Tuesday and on every other day of the week. We, as a society, have deemed that horse racing and going to exhibitions on every other day of

the week is morally right for those who want to do it, because we haven't any laws to prohibit people from doing that. That is my first argument, Mr. Speaker. To those who would say it is morally wrong, I say it is morally wrong on every day of the week and they should bring forth legislation to outlaw this activity on every other day of the week.

Mr. Speaker, if betting on horse races is morally wrong because it is gambling, what about lotteries? What about provincial lotteries and gambling? We, as a government and as an opposition, I suppose, and every other province in Canada run the biggest shill in the history of gambling, because if there is ever a sucker bet, it has to be a bet on a lottery. We say that is all right, but for my neighbor to go to the race track and bet a few dollars on a horse race on Sunday is morally wrong. My argument again: if gambling is morally wrong, it should be morally wrong in every kind of gambling. It should be morally wrong on every day of the week.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ALLEN: — Mr. Speaker, this bill does not compel anyone to go to a fair on Sunday. This bill does not compel anyone to go to a horse race on Sunday. If we have agreed that as a recreational activity on other days of the week people who want to go, can go, who are we to say that people who want to do this for recreation on Sunday by an act of the legislature may not. Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm bringing in this bill and I have a bit of support for the bill. I want to read just a resolution that I have from the Saskatchewan Association of Fairs and Exhibitions (SAFE) which includes the cities of Weyburn, Estevan, Swift Current, Moose Jaw, Regina, Yorkton, Melfort, Saskatoon, Prince Albert, Lloydminster, and The Battlefords. And what they say on this is:

That six of these fairs are presently operating on Sunday, however it is SAFE's understanding that under the present legislation a complaint from any citizen registered with the proper authorities would result in the closing of that fair on that day, causing very considerable financial losses for everyone concerned. It is for that reason SAFE has unanimously approved a motion requesting an amendment to The Lord's Day (Saskatchewan) Act which would allow these communities to operate an agricultural fair, including horse racing with pari-mutuel betting on Sunday.

Now, who are these people, Mr. Speaker? Who are these people who would pass this kind of a resolution? Are they people with no moral fibre? I don't think so. I think the people that would pass such a resolution are community people. I think the people in The Battlefords Agricultural Society are ordinary men and women like you and me, who know their community, who know the mores of their community. They would pass such a resolution. And I would like to lay on the Table, Mr. Speaker, for perusal of the members the resolution that I read and the letters of support from The Battlefords, Moose Jaw, Lloydminster, Regina, Saskatoon, Swift Current. I would like to lay those on the Table at this time. I'm sure hon. members will be interested in looking at who has written in support of this legislation.

I would also lay on the Table, Mr. Speaker, a brief from the Horsemen's Benevolent and Protective Association that deals with the question of horse racing. I'd like to lay that on the Table as well. Now, I want to wind this up because I know other hon. members have things they would like to say on the bill. I would like to say I have tried to work with all members of the House on the bill, kept them informed of provisions of the bill and sought their advice on it. It's going to be as I understand it, a free vote.

But before we take that vote, I'd like hon. members to decide what we're doing on second reading. What we're doing on second reading of this bill is deciding on the principle of the bill. And what is the principle of this bill, Mr. Speaker? The principle of this bill, I believe, is local control, local autonomy.

Mr. Speaker, by passing this bill we're not saying the Kelvington Agricultural Fair will operate on Sundays. We're not saying the Indian Head Exhibition will operate on Sundays. What we are saying is that we feel the people of Indian Head and that town council are better able to decide what is acceptable morally, given the mores of that community. They are better able to decide that than are we in this legislature.

MR. BIRKBECK: — What if they decide to open a bar and apply for a licence from your government?

MR. ALLEN: — I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we should do those things within the law, and we are not expanding this law. We should try to do those things, which affect the mores of a community, within the law as much as possible. Far be it from me, Mr. Speaker, to pass a law which tells the town of Indian Head they have to operate their exhibitions on Sunday. Far be it from anyone else to tell the town of Indian Head they cannot.

I move, Mr. Speaker, second reading of Bill 102, An Act to amend The Lord's Day (Saskatchewan) Act.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. J.A. PEPPER (Weyburn): — Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words in opposition to the proposed amendments to The Lord's Day (Saskatchewan) Act.

I know there are many people in this province who favor, I guess you would say, loosening The Lord's Day (Saskatchewan) Act, but, I also know there are many citizens who are opposed to further erosion of this act. It is difficult to determine which group is in the majority, but even if those who want to preserve The Lord's Day (Saskatchewan) Act as it is are a minority, it is important that their views be heard in this legislature.

I am sure the people of this province will go along with the proposed amendments if they are passed into law, however, I do think members should keep in mind that there is a great depth of feeling over this issue among those who oppose the amendments, and any vote for change, Mr. Speaker, should come only after very serious consideration of the consequences. I think, Mr. Speaker, that members should consider why we have a Lord's Day act in the first place.

I believe we have a Lord's Day act because we feel collectively, as a society, that Sunday should not be just like the other days of the week. There seems to be fairly general agreement that Sunday should provide an opportunity for rest, spiritual renewal, spending time with one's family when that is possible, and, of course, recreation. But, Mr. Speaker, what kind of recreation? Recreation which is no different from that enjoyed any other day of the week, or recreation which is controlled by some restrictions because it is occurring on the Lord's Day.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am concerned that if we keep chipping away at The Lord's Day (Saskatchewan) Act, we will soon have Sundays which will be no different from the other days of the week — Sundays where the rules of the rest of the week apply to

recreation and commerce, and the only noticeable difference from Saturday is that fewer people are working and some are going to church. I realize that there have been many changes over the years, and what is considered acceptable and desirable on Sunday has evolved over the decades from the strict observance of the Lord's Day to a more relaxed observance where most types of recreation take place.

But even with all those changes, Mr. Speaker, I think we have managed to maintain a Lord's Day which has a distinct feeling about it — a day that has a distinct atmosphere of rest and renewal for most people — whether or not they take part in religious observations.

The Lord's Day Act has played a part in creating and maintaining Sunday's special atmosphere and that is why we must exercise extreme caution whenever we are tempted to amend it.

We must be very careful, because every time changes are made in The Lord's Day Act, it seems to me that we end up with more change than we bargained for.

I will try to give an example of the sort of unforeseen changes which might take place if these amendments to The Lord's Day Act are approved.

What will happen if, once the amendments are in place, municipalities decide to remove any restrictions which may have applied to horse racing on Sundays? That in itself will be an innocuous change and certainly enjoying horse racing on Sundays is not different from enjoying the many other sports and recreational activities which now take place on that day. But, how long will it be, Mr. Speaker, before there is pressure for changes to gambling and liquor legislation so that horse racing on Sunday can be governed by exactly the same regulations which apply to it during the rest of the week? That is what I hear.

If that happens, Mr. Speaker, the amendments which loosen the application of The Lord's Day act will have resulted in other changes which seriously undermine the spirit of the act, and threaten the unique character of Sunday which I spoke of earlier.

I don't want to see that happen because I don't think we can go much further in eroding either the spirit or the letter of The Lord's Day Act without destroying it altogether.

We have been reminded many times in this year of Celebrate Saskatchewan that this is the time to honor our past, take stock of the present, and look to a bright future. In doing these things, one cannot help but re-examine the traditional values on which Saskatchewan society has been built to see how they apply to our present situation.

It is true that we have a great deal of new-found wealth and sophistication in Saskatchewan. It is also true that our population is becoming more and more urbanized as the years go by. But, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if we are not leaving something valuable behind if we get into too big a hurry to copy what is going on in the trendier urban centres of Canada.

It seems to me that some of the important traditional values upon which Saskatchewan society is built, such as family and community life, must be jealously guarded in the years of rapid growth and the years of prosperity which lie ahead of us. So I say, surely within the framework of those values which are considered worth preserving, that there is a place for some special observance of the Lord's Day beyond merely closing a few

businesses on Sunday.

I have already said I am not advocating that we go back to the strict observance of the Lord's Day. That has been modified over the years. But I do think that throughout Saskatchewan's 75 years, there has been a recognition that we need a day each week which is not like the others. The Lord's Day Act has reflected that recognition.

The amendments do attempt to provide for the fact that urban areas might want change faster than rural areas by leaving the option to change to municipalities. That is commendable I suppose, Mr. Speaker, but I am still left with that uneasy feeling that loosening the provisions of The Lord's Day Act will open the gates to unforeseen changes which will affect all municipalities whether they are urban or rural.

Mr. Speaker, I have just tried to point out that I am not so much concerned with this particular change or that particular change as I am concerned with the direction we appear to be going. Changes that are all in the same direction do not necessarily mean progress. They can also mean a blindness to what is worth preserving.

I believe Sunday is still the special day it ought to be in Saskatchewan and The Lord's Day Act has helped make it that way.

In closing I urge all members to reflect carefully on what may be lost if we erode the act any further before voting on these amendments. Because of my personal views, Mr. Speaker, on this matter and because of the deeply felt view of many of my constituents, I know from my remarks you will see I am not supporting the amendments.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. N. VICKAR (Minister of Industry and Commerce): — Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in support of Bill No. 102 — An Act to amend The Lord's Day Act. The changes this bill recommends will enable the associations in Saskatchewan to legally operate fairs and exhibitions on Sunday. At these fairs and exhibitions the organizing associations may hold games, sports, contests, may employ people to do any work needed at the exhibition, and may sell goods and services. Mr. Speaker, I feel it is time these changes were made. I am convinced that these changes can and will be of substantial benefit to the province.

Sunday is becoming more and more the main day of the week for family recreation activity. Changes in the act will increase the organized recreational activity available on Sunday, and will also contribute to the province's economy. Mr. Speaker, I would first of all like to discuss the economic benefits that will result from these changes.

Most exhibitions and sports days are organized at the local level. The returns from those activities also remain at the local level where they are used to support sports, recreation, and cultural activities within that community. For example, in my constituency in Melfort, the Melfort agricultural society offers a four-day agricultural fair. The proceeds from this exhibition are used to maintain meeting rooms, banquet facilities, show rings, barns, grandstand and concession facilities. These facilities are well used by the community for a variety of events, besides the exhibition, ranging from the RCMP musical ride to 4-H achievement days, from ball games to wedding dances, and, yes, even the Shrine Circus.

The Melfort Agricultural Society is not unique in this way. The community associations

which operate our exhibitions and sports days consistently use their profits from these events to provide the needed facilities and services in their community.

By amending The Lord's Day (Saskatchewan) Act we expand the access that groups such as these have through money generating activities. We therefore strengthen them and enable them to better serve their communities. Mr. Speaker, if these groups were not part of the Saskatchewan scene, there would be a tremendous void in our social and recreational services — a void which governments would have to fill. The changes in The Lord's Day (Saskatchewan) Act proposed in Bill No. 102 will support and strengthen these community organizations.

This bill will ensure that important services and facilities will continue to be provided without government intervention and the inevitable taxpayer commitment that follows. Mr. Speaker, by legalizing Sunday exhibitions and sports days with horse racing, ball games, and other recreational events, Bill No. 102 will contribute to the employment in the province. Because it is an excellent day for recreational activities, I am sure that Sunday will be a very big and busy day. Therefore, there will be more work for trainers, jockeys, pari-mutuel operators, box office staff, concession operators, grounds men, maintenance men and for scores of other workers who are employed at these concessions.

Mr. Speaker, individual Saskatchewan citizens in dozens of provincial service businesses will feel the benefits of including Sunday in the days when exhibitions and recreational events can be held. As an example of how big a business exhibitions are, I can give you the following figures: in 1977 the total payroll for 11 Class A and Class B exhibitions in the province was \$2.75 million; \$850,000 of this amount was for horse-racing salaries. In Regina alone they hire approximately 400 people for the exhibition and employ an additional 120 people for pari-mutuels. When you consider the other major exhibitions and horse-racing meets, that is a large number of man-days of employment.

Mr. Speaker, it is important that we view this issue realistically. Sunday rapidly is becoming the main day for family recreational activity. More and more families have both husband and wife working. They find Sunday to be the only day when work and chores are done and they can relax together with their children. Even if both parties are not working outside the home, most people who are employed during regular working hours cannot take time to attend weekday recreational events.

The fact is clearly supported by the current trend of holding sports days, community picnics and the like on Sunday. Mr. Speaker, this is happening now in direct contravention of the existing legislation. It is happening because Sunday is the day of the week when these events will be well-attended.

I feel it is time to change the law to reflect the changing trends in our society and to enable community groups to organize these beneficial, enjoyable events on a legal basis. Exhibitions and fairs are traditionally family events with activities which appeal to all age groups and all interests. I cannot feel that making these events legal on Sunday would in any way be unwholesome or disruptive to our society. Citizens may easily attend the church of their choice in the morning, then go on to a community-based recreational activity in the afternoon. Both activities can be attended as a family until and should be viewed as family-based. I believe, Mr. Speaker, the changes in The Lord's Day (Saskatchewan) Act which Bill 102 proposes will be beneficial to the people of our province in both social and economic terms. I therefore will be supporting the bill.

MR. H.J. SWAN (Rosetown-Elrose): — I rise tonight to say I wholly support what the member for Weyburn was saying. To begin with, this is The Lord's Day (Saskatchewan) Act we're dealing with. For that reason, what we should be looking at is whether or not the amendments to the bill will improve what's happening on the Lord's Day. I don't see an improvement occurring because of opening the race tracks and opening pari-mutuel betting. You know and I know this will detract from the attendance at church on Sunday, even by the people who normally attend. It will draw away the youth in particular and I don't see this as the right way to go.

I believe that Saskatchewan and Canada have been known as a Christian province and a Christian nation. If we proceed to whittle away at The Lord's Day (Saskatchewan) Act until it has no meaning. I think we take away from the Christian nation we are supposed to be. I would encourage this House not to pass this group of amendments to The Lord's Day (Saskatchewan) Act but rather to hold the Lord's Day as the Lord's Day. Let it be a time of worship, a time for families to get together, a time when we pause from our busy lives (and I think all of you will agree that they're busy) to remember we have a church background, we have a time to worship, and to remember why we're here.

I couldn't believe what I was hearing when I listened to the Minister of Industry and Commerce take this as an opportunity to create employment. You show me the number of people anxious to find jobs on Sundays. There are some places where, because they are essential services, people must work on Sunday, but I know of very, very few people who relish the idea of having to work on Sunday. I think that the fewer jobs there are for Sunday, the better off most of us will be. Let the people have that Sunday, and I believe the same number of dollars will be spent at the race track or whatever on whichever other day of the week you choose to hold those events.

I haven't found that it's been a problem for most people to attend exhibitions and fairs and so on. Most of them find the time. In most cities there's a special day when the citizens who must work in the city are given time off to attend their local fair. I think that happens in rural Saskatchewan as well. And in most of our small towns, the day the community fair is held the stores and business of that town take the day off. They close down and it's a holiday for the town.

So I don't believe what we're hearing here is fact. I believe all of us should vote wholeheartedly against this bill and let the Lord's Day be exactly that a day of worship, a time when we pause from our busy life and take time to worship, a time to be with our families, and a time to regenerate and be prepared for a new week.

HON. G. MacMURCHY (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, I am going to oppose this bill. I wish to indicate that I hope I'm open with respect to the Lord's Day to look at and consider arguments. I have considered the arguments put forward in the legislation and in the debate so far with respect to support for this bill. Based on those arguments, I simply can't support the bill. I want to indicate to the members here why I want to indicate this in terms of how I am going to vote. I'm not necessarily asking any other member to vote the same way that I am going to vote, because I think on this issue a person should decide himself how he should vote.

The bill puts forward basically two arguments, Mr. Speaker: (1) it provides autonomy to communities, and (2) there is a demand for this legislation.

With respect to the first argument, Mr. Speaker, I was minister of municipal affairs for four years. At no time, up until about a year ago, did I hear from municipalities a request for this kind of autonomy. I was with those municipalities at public meetings involving, not all of the community, but a large segment of the community. At no time did I hear any request for this kind of local autonomy. There has been no request made to me on behalf of municipalities that they should have autonomy to decide whether there should be a fair on Sunday with horse racing and pari-mutuels.

Where is the request coming from, Mr. Speaker? Of course, the request is coming from the exhibition people and the race horse people. That's accurate, I think. Those two organizations as such are making the request. I think in fact it narrow down on the racing side to the thoroughbred and standard-bred people who are making the request. They argue, of course, that Sunday is a family day, a picnic day, a recreation day and a participation day. I question, Mr. Speaker, whether that means for them participation, or whether that means for those making the arguments, work for themselves and work for the people who surround them. I don't know whether work is the same as participation.

The argument also that they put forward is this will increase the revenue. The hon. member might say if a thing is morally proper on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday and Saturday then it's morally proper on Sunday or vice versa. Well it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, there is some question in my mind whether in putting forward the arguments as the exhibition associations, the fair people and the horse people do that this will increase revenue, they are therefore putting the argument that we should expand Sunday into these areas for one thing and one thing alone and that is profit — profit from the racing, profit from the betting because that's where the profits come from in racing. They also argue that this increased revenue will flow into the restaurant business, where there should be a bar. All the people will be there and they will be hungry, they will be thirsty, particularly after all this betting on the horse races, therefore we should have a restaurant and we should have a bar!

Mr. Speaker, it obviously follows that with all these people there who are participating and betting (after all, there's no difference between putting a \$2 bet on a horse and buying a \$2 ticket on the Western Canada Lottery, which I don't support either) with all that going on, it becomes obvious, that we should have the casino open on Sunday. When I don't hear requests from the communities, the municipalities, the councils and the mayors, in a four-year period, for this kind of autonomy and when I see the request for this coming forward from people who only focus their attention on profit, I cannot support the legislation.

MR. A.W. ENGEL (Assiniboia-Gravelbourg): — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to speak against this amendment to The Lord's Day (Saskatchewan) Act. I have several arguments to make in support of my decision to speak against it.

When I first looked at the bill and what was introduced I thought, what has happened in the past? I decided to dig out some of the Debates and Proceedings where The Lord's Day Act has been discussed in years gone by. I think one of the most interesting debates which this House had, and possibly the longest one, was in 1965 when legislation was introduced by a private member. The legislation was called permissive legislation. It had many things in common with the legislation with which we are dealing today. In fact, I would like to draw to the attention of members present some of the things which were said that night.

The private member, a Liberal member who then represented the Estevan area, Mr. I.H. MacDougall, moved second reading. He said:

I want to point out to members of this Assembly that this bill is simply permissive legislation. It will allow a municipality, meaning cities, towns and municipalities and so on to pass by-laws to allow Sunday sports.

It has so much in common with what we have here today, and the reasons and arguments are so similar I think it is worth reading to see what happened during that debate. He continued to say:

Now as it is pointed out in the bill, the hours of these sporting activities will be set by law, and sporting contests which include football, hockey, baseball, bowling, stock care racing, motorcycle racing, a contest of this nature, will be allowed between the hours of 1:30 p.m. and 6 p.m. Other sporting events (he goes on to repeat and this is the interesting part of it), such as horse racing, dog racing, boxing and wrestling and the like will not be permitted under the terms of this bill.

Why do you suppose he was against horse racing at that time? What really has changed in that time? I would like to refer to just one more member, I never asked him or talked to him about it. This member is still sitting here today. I've know the member to be one who makes some wise decisions but I've never really considered him a prophet. But he made a prediction, Mr. Speaker, and let me read what he said. Then I'll tell you who said it. I think it's only fair:

I am, however, concerned about the extension of commercialism. The Minister of Industry and Commerce tonight talked about the advantages of this change in The Lord's Day Act because of the commercialism. This member said he is concerned because of the extension of commercialism. I am wondering whether this is really not the thin edge of the wedge. Where might this lead us? Will the extension of Sunday sport in the commercial field lead us into the next step of opening to other shops and other business on Sunday.

He said it was a thin wedge in a door. Tonight the member for Weyburn said, it's opening a gate. We've really broadened it.

That by the way was the Minister of Urban Affairs' prediction back in 1965. Fifteen years later he was right on; that little wedge in a door has turned into a broad gate that is opening up permissiveness.

I would like to present under two broad points my own personal objections to The Lord's Day Act from the standpoint of a churchgoer. The first point I would like to raise is the matter of a priority on the Lord's Day. The observance of Sunday as a special day is a priority with me and with my family, and with many people the same goes. Rather than an order or a rule or a regulation, to me it's a choice and a priority.

The Bible says, 'Seek ye first the kingdom of God.' That aspect of the first is what I would like to talk about, my individual intention to worship, my personal desire and intention to seek God first on Sunday. I'm not speaking about the right and the wrong activities that are taking place on Sunday, or whether it is morally right to do it on Friday and not morally right to do it on Sunday. That's not the point I'm trying to make. It's the activities

that intrude on my individual priority of purpose of the Lord's Day. This is where I would like to make a second point, Mr. Speaker, that follows very closely on the heels of that.

Speaking on the principle of the bill in particular, opening up The Lord's Day Act to include other activities that one would normally do on other days strikes hardest at a Christian who wants to be involved in his community — an exhibition, a celebration or whatever that is to be held on a Sunday, a community event. The churchgoer then has to make a decision. Do I, as a community-minded person, get involved in this community function on a Sunday, or do I exercise my first priority in my decision?

We are therefore placing before that individual person the aspect that he has to make a choice. The scheduling of events for an open day on a Sunday takes place then the person says, why don't you take an interest in community affairs, not realizing that a minority are asked to violate the principles of their priorities. I would like to make this point very clear, Mr. Speaker. There is a distinction between casual recreation and organized local fairs and exhibitions. I'm not saying that this priority applies to a regular exhibition that's held by a travelling group that comes in. I'm not so sure of how much of the commercial value of that stays in this province. Those who were involved in the debate in the past indicated their actions would not open the door further and that they were just making a certain allowance for an object. Their predictions were right on when they said we're continually broadening what's happening on the Lord's Day. Now we're asking for nearly a wide-open Sunday. We're trying to pass the buck as the Minister of Agriculture said, to a group of people in our society that I'm not so sure want to make a decision on what should happen on the Lord's Day.

We're not only saying to the local people, pass a by-law, but they also have to make an intention. Here we are, one seat member decides to go one way and one another way, and it might be the case right down the line with many members of the House. It's an open vote. Yet when we go back to our communities, we're separated and it's not a problem because we are not from the same community. But we're saying to the people back home, you make the decision, we can't do it here in Regina. I think that is another reason I feel strongly about this. Our Sundays are busy. They are cluttered up.

Just yesterday, maybe many of you heard, somebody from the safety council gave statistics on farm accidents. He was recording how many more farmers and what percentage of farmers are involved in a accidents who work seven days a week compared with those who take a day a week off. Even from a straight accident-prone point of view, I think people need a day off and we should have a special day. The seventh day is a good day.

Maybe we should do as they do in California and take Wednesday off or another day. Just a year and a half ago when we were travelling to California, we didn't quite make it to our relatives' place and we stopped overnight in Sacramento. We landed there on Saturday night, December 22. The next day was Sunday; you would have never believed it was Sunday. The parking lots and all the shopping malls were full. The traffic was jammed. Sunday has become a commercial day down there. Maybe it's profitable. The overall business they do, I don't think is one iota more than they would do if they did it in six days. But it spoiled their Sunday and I think we're going in that same direction. There are many other reasons which could be developed to show we should take it easy on amending The Lord's Day Act. I think this amendment is not making Sunday a better day. I would vote in rejection of this motion to make these amendments and I would urge my colleagues to do the same. Thank you.

HON. MR. G.R. BOWERMAN (Minister of the Environment): — Mr. Speaker, I want to make a few brief comments in support of those who will oppose the bill. I find it very difficult to oppose the idea that local decision making should be allowed and provided for as they bill seeks to do, and that the responsibility should be placed not in this legislature but in the municipalities of the province. There are some merits to that. Normally I would find myself in support of that general thrust, but I cannot do so with respect to the objectives which are included in this bill and with respect to the things which I think will be brought about as a result of the passing of the bill.

I want to subscribe whole-heartedly to the remarks of the hon. member for Weyburn regarding his respect and his observance of the Lord's Day. I find myself in agreement with those sentiments and every day I find it increasingly difficult to take that view and to hold that view in a society which seems to want to rush headlong into the kinds of activities which I think will be provided for in the amendments to The Lord's Day Act. I think it's one thing to make a case for opening up the act because we now gamble on Monday or Tuesday or Wednesday, and if that's morally acceptable, then it's morally acceptable on Sunday. I think that's not an argument. I think what we're attempting to deal with here are amendments to The Lord's Day (Saskatchewan) Act and what we do on Sunday, whether or not we should be doing the same kinds of things on Sunday as we're doing on Monday and Tuesday and Wednesday. I think that's the gist of the principle behind The Lord's Day (Saskatchewan) Act when it was brought into being in the first instance. And so I think that argument is not a valid one.

It is another proposition to make a case on the basis of those who want to use the Lord's Day for economic gain and for the development of industry and commerce. I find it rather an obvious contradiction, I would think, between the bill and one recently sponsored by the hon. Minister of Labour who is proposing we have two consecutive days off and one of those days should be Sunday. Now we're proposing we should have industry and commerce on Sunday so we can put people to work on Sunday. It doesn't measure; it doesn't fit with may approach to the Sabbath.

I suppose the issue we must address is our interpretation, our understanding, our response, and moreover, our belief about the Lord's Day. Whether we want to do the same things on this day as we do every other day of the week is the question I think we must address. It is the question being posed here that all of us must recognize, whether or not we agree. In fact much of the reason for the settlement of our land was that our forefathers sought a land and a way wherein they might exercise their beliefs about the Sabbath, or the Lord's Day as it is referred to.

Mr. Speaker, I find we must, I suppose, face that issue. I think we face squarely the issue of our Judaeo-Christian history and our tradition on this issue. I think it's not completely relevant to say, well, because we do this on other days, because we function in a certain way on other days of the week, we should do it on Sunday as well, I think that evades the real issue.

I think the real issue is trying to come to grips with what we believe, in how we respond and how we govern ourselves with respect to the Lord's Day or the Sabbath, whether or not those values once held are now invalid and, if so, what are the implications for our day and the future of our generation? Mr. Speaker, I don't want to go on at length, but I am convinced our traditions have not been wrong. I am convinced our forefathers, in seeking this land sought it for a purpose. One of the purposes was that they might have freedom of worship; they might exercise their beliefs and traditions in a reserved Sunday. I am convinced our traditions have not been wrong and that adhering to those

traditions will yield more value in the generations of the future than it will if we set them aside at this point in time. So, Mr. Speaker, I indicated at the outset I would be opposing the bill. I will stand with those who will be opposing the bill.

MR. R.L. ANDREW (Kindersley): — First of all, I would perhaps go off the debate a bit. I believe this type of debate is healthy and quite frankly I would wish first of all to commend the member for Regina Rosemont, I think it did take a fair degree of courage quite frankly to bring this motion before the Assembly. I think it is a proper and healthy thing for the legislature to have private members bills.

Having said that, I agree with the statements made by the Minister of the Environment. Quite frankly, if we were to follow the logic of the member for Regina Rosemont that because gambling is legal on all the other days of the week, then why shouldn't it also be valid on Sunday, or be legal on Sunday. I think if we're going to do that, we have to carry the logical extension to our liquor institutions. If they are legal on Monday and Tuesday, should they all be open on Sunday? I think this is the same thing we are voting for here, if you make the logical extension, that is exactly what you are going to be voting for.

I also agree with the member for Weyburn and the member for Rosetown-Elrose that we are chipping away at the Lord's Day (Saskatchewan) Act. I don't say that in any pompous way as a great churchgoing person because that is not true in my case. But I do think it is important. I would make only one further statement — I think one of the most important statements I heard made this year. It was the Easter message of Pope John Paul II. What he basically said is that we are moving quickly toward a godless society. That doesn't speak on this motion of The Lord's Day (Saskatchewan) Act or the amendment of it, but I say to all members, I think it is something everyone should give consideration to prior to voting on this motion.

HON. D.F. McARTHUR (Minister of Education): — Mr. Speaker, I want to speak in support of this bill and in support of the member for Rosemont in advancing this bill. I've listened with interest to the debate. I do think it is important, in suggesting that one should support this bill, to point out first of all that supporting this bill does not deny the fact that the Lord's Day is a special day, we recognize it as such. I would be the first to agree that Sunday should be recognized as a special day of rest. It should be recognized as a special day of spiritual renewal. It should be a day which provides a special opportunity to have time with one's family and loved ones.

But what is being proposed here is an amendment to an existing bill. It does not radically alter the nature of function of the Lord's Day within our society. Some of the members have made reference to the Christian values and the spiritual values that we recognize in our society and the importance of the Lord's Day in recognizing those values.

I believe all those things are quite valid and acceptable but I think we should be careful not to confuse those particular points with the question being raised with regard to this particular bill.

First of all, we are talking, Mr. Speaker, about a bill to amend The Lord's Day (Saskatchewan) Act. The original bill is a bill which provides certain exceptions to the Lord's Day Act of Canada. What we are doing here is slightly altering the exceptions already provided for within the Saskatchewan Lord's Day Act. The act is itself an act, the purpose of which is to provide exceptions to the Canada Lord's Day Act.

So the question here is not whether or not we should provide exceptions to the Lord's Day Act of the Parliament of Canada, but rather exactly what the nature of those exceptions should be. Now, that's not, in any way, to detract from the importance of arguing what the nature of those exceptions should be but I think it is important to recognize that point first of all. By the very nature of the bill we are amending, we are recognizing that there are exceptions and those exceptions are legitimate and valid without challenging the fundamental spiritual values of our society or without challenging the fundamental role that the Lord's Day plays within our society.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that in looking at the bill which the hon. member for Rosemont has advanced, it is important to note that it is quite consistent with the existing Saskatchewan act which, as I have said, is a provision for exceptions. It is quite consistent with the act because it is dealing with the questions of additional forms of entertainment that may be recognized as being legitimate on the Lord's Day.

We already have in our existing act a provision for a variety of forms of entertainment. We have provisions for indoor theatre, musical programs, ballet, dancing, opera, rodeo or horse shows, mechanical rides of fairs and amusement parks, moving pictures and so on. It's well-known that we have already provided for those. Mr. Speaker, what this bill does is extend those exceptions to prohibited activities on the Lord's Day slightly, to cover exhibitions and the associated activities which go along with exhibitions. So, Mr. Speaker, we are here dealing with entertainment and with a slight broadening of the concept or definition of entertainment. I have heard hon. members speak of the dangers of liquor being brought in on the Lord's Day, and the dangers of other types of activities being permitted during the Lord's Day.

Mr. Speaker, the possibility of those things being approved at some future date is in no way enhanced or detracted from as a result of passing this bill. The question of permitting the serving of liquor on the Lord's Day is a question which would still have to be fully dealt with. I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that the passing of this bill in no way advances the likelihood of liquor being permitted on the Lord's Day, any more than did the original legislation which was passed. I say to you then that we should not, as a result of this bill, fear other things that we may do because I think we'll have to debate and decide upon those other things in the same way as we decide these. So I urge hon. members to look at the case for this particular bill on its own merits, to include only those things which in it and to make a decision on that basis.

For my part, Mr. Speaker, I feel that the forms of entertainment which are being proposed as permissible under this bill are not really substantially different from the forms of entertainment which are now already provided. It broadens them slightly and I think we can still as a society fully recognize the Lord's Day. We can still fully recognize the spiritual values associated with the purposes of the Lord's Day even with these slightly expanded forms of entertainment. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that it has not been the exemptions already in The Lord's Day Act that have in any way led to a deterioration in spiritual values within our society (if that is indeed what is happening, as some hon. members have stated). I say to you that the causes run much deeper than the already existing exemptions, so I don't think you can make a case that these additional exemptions would further undermine the spiritual values of our society. I think the reasons for that kind of undermining in our society run much deeper than whether or

not we slightly amend The Lord's Day (Saskatchewan) Act.

Mr. Speaker, I also wanted to raise the point that some reference has been made to the fact it provides the local municipalities with the option of making the decision, and some members have suggested that we should not be passing the buck in that sense, or passing the responsibility on. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, the point of local decision-making does not in itself in my view justify or condemn the bill. It is simply an additional safeguard for a very important and sensitive kind of matter which permits some degree of reflection of local feelings and concerns with respect to this matter. So I think that does strengthen the bill, although it does not per se justify it. Obviously the question is one which extend beyond that of local decision-making or local authority.

I say, Mr. Speaker, in closing that I think it's important to recognize that the question here is opening up some additional options with respect to participation in entertainment activities. It does not compel anyone. I think, Mr. Speaker, that when we are looking at a question like this, there is a question of the freedom of choice of an individual involved here. I think that while we do obviously restrict that kind of freedom in many, many ways, the proponents of the argument should, if we do restrict that, ensure there is something clear and unequivocal which established that this is somehow different than what is already restricted or not restricted. So I say, Mr. Speaker, that I don't think the argument is so strong to differentiate the activities which are associated with exhibitions and fairs from other types of permitted entertainment). As to say that we should continue to restrict access to fairs and entertainment. Mr. Speaker, I will be supporting this bill as I have indicated.

HON. E.B. SHILLINGTON (Minister of Culture and Youth): — I want just ever so briefly to rise in support of the bill, the amendment brought forward by the member for Regina Rosemont. I may say by way of opening that I never go to horse races. I've been to one in my life in Vancouver. And I probably should confess, when true confessions are in order, that I went to a dog race in South Dakota and that's it.

Notwithstanding the fact I have no interest in going to horse races. I'm prepared to support the amendment because I have a number of constituents who are. For them it's a legitimate form of recreation, a legitimate form of entertainment, and I think there's nothing wrong with it.

I may say in opening, Mr. Speaker, I would hope probably in vain, our society has reached that stage of enlightenment where morality on this sort of an issue would be an individual matter. I would hope our society would take the view, on the sort of an issue, that whether or not I go to a horse race really doesn't affect other people. Surely that's an individual matter. I grant you that's not universally accepted. Even if it isn't, surely, Mr. Speaker, morality is not a matter for the minority. And I would argue that only a minority of people in society take the view of Sunday I have heard expounded here by so many.

I ask the members, who want to protect Sunday, those version of Sunday they want to protect? I recall when I was a boy, I grew up in a rather strict household — on Sunday, no cards, no dancing, no movies. We stayed dressed in our Sunday-go-to-meeting clothes all day, and it was the dulllest day. If that's your version of Sunday and that's what you're trying to protect, then I think this bill may make some sense. It's a very rare person who observes Sunday that strictly these days.

The majority of people, if they observe Sunday, they observe it as a sort of half-day

event. They go to church in the morning and then in the afternoon pursue any variety of recreations. They may go on a picnic; they may go for a drive; they may go visiting; they may go to a movie in the evening. I don't frankly see the difference between going to the horse races in the afternoon and going to movies or for that matter going on a picnic for this group of people.

Or are you protecting the version of Sunday which I suspect is probably the majority view and that is that it isn't really particularly a religious day at all? I did a quick calculation of the churches in Regina. If a majority of people went to church on Sunday I don't know where you'd put them, but you wouldn't put them all in the churches because there isn't anywhere near enough room for 50 per cent of the people in Regina to go to church.

I ask again whose version of Sunday are you protecting? If you're protecting the majority view of Sunday, then I suggest that horse racing is not inconsistent with it. The view that Sunday is a religious day and a day only for religious activities is, I submit, the view of a minority of people.

The member for Kindersley said gambling wasn't the issue. I submit gambling is the issue. That's what we're really voting on. My colleague for Regina Elphinstone, the Premier, tells me it was in 1965 that this legislature approved Sunday sports. What differentiates horse racing from baseball, I think is the fact that you bet on horse races and you don't on baseball, at least you don't do it openly. You may, but it's not done openly. That's not the purpose of the sport. I think if we object to this particular sport (and it's known the world over as a sport), it's because it's gambling.

I say again with respect to minority and majority views, the vast majority of people in Saskatchewan see nothing wrong with this form of gambling. My seatmate spoke of casinos and horse races almost in the same breath. I suggest you're mixing two very different kinds of gambling. Only a very small minority of societies around the world permit casinos. Very, very few do because they cater to an addictive gambler, one who bets, yet when he loses bets again and bet heavier. Such betting as lotteries and horse races doesn't cater to that addictive gambler who bets and then waits to see the result — he waits some length of time. But a majority of societies around the world permit horse racing, only a minority permits casinos. I submit also that what we do here will really have very little effect on how the Lord's Day is observed.

Sunday sports were brought in some 13 years ago. I don't recall seeing a great difference in the attendance at the church. I went to the day after Sunday sports were allowed, but I am sure there were those who argued it would be the desecration of the Lord's Day and people would stop going to church. I was, if not an elected member, at least close to government when it allowed movies on Sunday. I didn't see any difference the day after movies were allowed, or the month after or the year after. I recall allowing liquor to be served with meals on Sunday, and the same arguments were made, Mr. Speaker, this would be the end of the Lord's Day, a desecration of the Lord's Day, the young people would stop going to church and so on and so forth. Frankly, I don't think it affected church attendance or the observance of the Lord's Day in the slightest. I'll say the same with this. Whatever vote is taken here today will not affect the observance of the Lord's Day at all.

I go back to the central point made by the member for Regina Rosemont, which I think is the best one — this is a local decision. We should remember we are a relatively senior level of government. I think we altogether too often pass laws without asking ourselves

whether or not it's really needed. We keep laws on the books without asking ourselves whether or not we really need this law. There are two things we should always ask ourselves, Mr. Speaker. Do we need this law? If we do, are we the appropriate level of government to do it? We very rarely ask those questions and we should. I would make the argument (I think it's irrelevant to the fact) that we don't need this law, but if we feel we do then surely we should ask ourselves the second question, is this the appropriate level at which to make this decision?

I suggest to you that different communities may take different views, and they should have the right to organize their communities and their community activities in the way they think best. If Regina, and I suspect Regina would allow horse racing on Sunday, takes the view that horse racing is O.K., it should have the right to make that decision. If Elrose or Rosetown, or Weyburn take the view that horse racing is not appropriate, all well and good, leave it to that council and to that community to make that decision. The central point of this bill is that it's a community decision and I think that is appropriate.

One of the lessons I've learned in provincial politics is that communities are different. They have different personalities. They can be as different as two different people. Regina is a different community from Saskatoon, Kinistino is different from Carnduff. These different communities with their different personalities should be able to organize their own community lives in such a fashion as reflects their views and their morality.

So for these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I support the member for Regina Rosemont and the amendment to the bill.

MR. G.S. MUIRHEAD (Arm River): — Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak against this bill. I suppose that it surprises you that I vote against this bill, Mr. Speaker. I'm glad this is an open vote. I'm a Progressive Conservative, and I feel whatever conviction I have is my wish and my will. That's the way the people of Arm River look at it. I have been contacted by a number of people in my constituency regarding this bill. There are a large number of race horse people in my constituency, Mr. Speaker. They contacted me and we discussed this bill. They said they hoped it would go through, but we do not expect you to vote for this bill. That made me feel good because they respected my stand.

I think the point we are missing here, Mr. Speaker, is . . . I've been watching the older members get up; they know what the Lord's Day means. They know what it means. They haven't forgotten. They've watched the moral decay which has happened in this country, in this province, in the latter years. They know. It's the younger members who have gone astray and aren't watching. The only older member I've seen here is the Minister of Industry and Commerce and I was very, very disappointed in his views, especially when he said, we can go to church on Sunday morning and go to the races in the afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, I say to you, to the government and to everybody in this House — anyone who goes to church, who believes in going to church at all, must believe in the Scriptures. They must. And there was a bill that came a good many thousands of years ago; it was from Moses. He made a bill which was a long longer lasting than the bill that came in this House today. Moses said Sunday is a holy day and thou shalt keep it.

AN HON. MEMBER: — The seventh day, the seventh day.

MR. MUIRHEAD: — I know. Mr. Speaker, I believe Sunday is a holy day, and I say to

everyone in this legislature that we should keep Sunday holy.

I'll tell you what's happening to everyone in this province, in this world, today. Their consciences don't bother them any more. I can remember as a young lad (I would say the older members who spoke here today will remember the same thing) when no one in my community did anything on Sunday, other than their necessary chores. And then I can remember a threshing machine starting up in the back. They wouldn't put the threshing machine up at the front of the road. It would be in the back where no one could see them. And then, as days went on, their consciences didn't bother them any more.

A good friend of mine, just a few years ago, worked on a Sunday for the first time. He said his conscience bothered him so much he just couldn't stand it. He couldn't sleep at night. But the second Sunday wasn't quite so bad. The third Sunday didn't bother him at all. So this is what's happening. We're slipping into moral decay. And this is just one step closer.

I understand the Premier is against this bill. I'm not sure, but I've heard this. I know that I believe the statement our leader made — God comes first, the family second and politics third . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . And that's a good place for them.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Highways took my train of thought away, but I'm going to get it back in a hurry. We know how the Minister of Highways is going to vote right now.

I'm not going to say much more about this, but I feel very strongly that if we as a government have to vote this bill in or out, we are on the wrong track. Because Sundays are slipping morally all over the world fast enough without the government having to make legislation to push it further. My feeling is that government does not have to do this, people will do these things on their own.

I agree with someone who spoke here tonight. He made the statement that there's only so much money the gambler is going to spend. He can spend it just as easily in six days as he can in seven. He is only going to spend more. If you open up Sunday horse racing and Sunday gambling, he's going to be that much more short of money. There will be that many more people in the city of Regina who are going to lose their wages on Saturday and go back on Sunday to see if they can't get them back. Then they will lose some more and have to go on strike on Monday.

Mr. Speaker, for these reasons I will definitely be voting against the bill.

MRS. J.H. DUNCAN (Maple Creek): — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. At the onset I would like to say I will be supporting the amendments as proposed by the member for Regina Rosemont. Many things have been said during this debate tonight. I believe that probably more than anybody, our churches realize the type of world we are living in today. Our churches have also seen a great many changes brought in, or amendments brought in to The Lord's Day (Saskatchewan) Act, so probably today the act really has little or no relevancy.

I can say that my church is important to me but I do not believe that horse racing with pari-mutuels on a Sunday will really affect myself or my family. I might add also, Mr. Speaker, that both my husband and I enjoy the horse races. But what I think is important is that the churches also are trying to keep up with changing times and it's indicative I

think of the things the churches themselves are accepting nowadays which probably were unthinkable not so many, many years ago.

I think Sunday still is a family day. I know any organization in which I am involved in my own home town each fall gets a letter from the ministerial association requesting that should we have functions on a Sunday we hold them off until 1 o'clock in the afternoon, and we do observe their wishes. I think that's indicative of the church's realization that Sunday no longer is just a day of rest but with various functions going on that we are permitted as citizens or as members of churches to worship in the morning and perhaps have a family outing in the afternoon.

I think we allow so many other things on Sunday. I see personally not great difference between going to a hockey game and betting two bits with the fellow next to me or going to a curling game or whatever, as opposed to going and watching a sport that many of us enjoy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. P.P. MOSTOWAY (Saskatoon Centre): — Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a few words in regard to this bill. First of all, I want to say I will be in favor of the bill and the amendments which will more or less bring Saskatchewan in line with the other provinces of Canada. But what I wanted to say is that this legislature may certainly effect an erosion of the act, but the legislature cannot effect an erosion of the Sabbath. That has to be left to individuals and the families and society as a group. That will not be done by this body.

I wanted to say one other thing in regard to the strict observance of the Sabbath in its severest terms if I may put it that way. A number of years ago, many years ago in the United Kingdom they had such an era, the era of Cromwell, where they demanded strict observances of the Sabbath to the T. You couldn't smile on a Sunday, the bottom of skirts was six feet below the ankles. You name it. You couldn't chew candy on Sundays. They even cut out all the things we associate with Christmas. They said, none of that. And when Cromwell died after imposing these strict regulations on the people, what did they do? They shouted out with joy when he died. That's exactly what they did.

I wanted to say, Mr. Speaker, in this day and age there are things which really affect society and bring it down to a low level, such as TV that would make you wince, so I'm told, magazines which should not be (and these magazines appear in all provinces, all states), the era of marital breakdowns (and I make no judgment in that regard), the violence, the crime, the rape, the drugs. Now I ask you, Mr. Speaker, if permitting horse racing, enjoying fairs, watching exhibitions of art (possibly of school children, on the walls at exhibitions) is going to downgrade our society. I believe not, Mr. Speaker.

I too want to point out, as some hon. members have, our family goes to church. We go to St. Philip's in Saskatoon. I want to say I believe that in the final analysis God is going to judge a people not by the laws they make, but as to whether or not they observe the Ten Commandments and whether in society, collective or individually, there is compassion, charity, the protection of minorities, and whether or not they obey or they adhere to the golden rule seven days a week, not just one. I certainly will be supporting the amendments, Mr. Speaker.

MR. KATZMAN (Rosthern): — Mr. Speaker, I join in this debate. Really what the amendment does is repeal section 11 of the old bill. It allows horse racing and horse

racing meets and boxing and other exhibitions or contests on a Sunday between the ours of 1:30 and I believe 6:00.

Right now there is some horse racing going on Sundays but it is not pari-mutuel racing or that style of racing. It is racing maybe at a horse show where each of the fellows who has a horse put up \$10 and the winner gets the jackpot. That's not barred by the rule, and that's called fun horse racing. There are sporting day events, ball games and so forth.

But what will happen with this legislation? Two things: we will now have exhibitions running full fledged on Sunday; the gambling with all the rest. There are only two race tracks in the province which have pari-mutuel now. They are the city of Saskatoon and the city of Regina. The only people who are going to benefit are the race horse people (a self-interest group), the Government of Saskatchewan and the race tracks. How do they benefit? The horse racers have one more day a week to race on, the government has a little more tax they collect from the pari-mutuel window (in some cases they lose more than they collect, I understand), the exhibition boards will have one more day to include revenue rather than a cost day with no revenue. The exhibitions are closing in their revenue rather than a cost day with no revenue. The exhibitions are closing in their grandstands as Saskatoon did. They'll have restaurants; they'll ask for permission to serve liquor, so therefore we'll have liquor served on Sunday at the race track during pari-mutuel betting, and some comment came from the back row here on this side that it's comfortable. I can remember being at Blue Bonnet race track in Montreal on an evening where you sat and enjoyed a meal and watched the races in the middle of February. It was rather interesting in the cold weather.

But, Mr. Minister, the bill open up The Lord's Day Act one step further. The benefit that is suggested by the member who moved the bill was racing. The only two places that benefit are Saskatoon and Regina. Nobody else can get racing if they want it because the way the pari-mutuel set-up is rigged and the racing days are allotted by the federal government and so forth, nobody else can get in to get the benefit. But they can have exhibitions. That's how it affects them.

What will happen is a small community, pick any one you want, will be told by the fair operator, the fellow who runs the rides and the casinos, we'll come to your town but only on Sunday because we have other places to go. And they're going to force that town to say, if we want a fair, it has to be on Sunday. Right now the town isn't forced into that position and they will be forced. The small communities will be forced to have the racing and the gambling on Sunday because the operator who owns all the equipment will say, I won't come except on Sunday because I'm booked three days over here and I'm booked three days over there but I'll fit you in on Sunday, so if you want a fair you have to run Sunday. That's one of the things that will happen. I am concerned that against the will of the people in the area, because they want a fair, they will be forced into Sunday by somebody who operates the games, the rides and all the rest of that.

Sports days have been geared on Sundays and have not hampered the society because there is always a kinship of a sports day. It's a friendly meeting of the clan in the neighborhood and they're usually local. But the racing on Sunday, the forcing of small communities to accept something they don't want because that's the only day they can have it, and the only two places that benefit are Saskatoon and Regina and nobody else benefits. . . In fact the only two groups that benefit are the thoroughbred and the standard-bred racers because nobody else can get on a race track in this province. The other people who want racing days can't even be accepted because the two organizations, the Regina Exhibition and the Saskatoon Exhibition who own the

Saskatchewan Jockey Club who run the race days, won't let anybody else on. So we're only talking about a very narrow group when we talk horse racing — thoroughbred, standard-bred. Regina race track and Saskatoon race track.

Mr. Speaker, I can't support his bill and I'm a horseman and have been very involved in the horse industry. I don't think it's the best thing for the industry from my years of involvement (in fact I've even spent some time on the track as a track steward). I don't think it's the best thing. I suggest that maybe we should have a second look and this legislation should die on the order paper rather than go any further, Mr. Speaker. If it comes to a vote, I cannot support this amendment. I will have to vote against it.

HON. A.E. BLAKENEY (Premier): — I speak as the member for Elphinstone. This is a free vote and I speak not as Premier but as member for Elphinstone.

It seems to me that we have in this province a pluralist society. If we were ever in any doubt about it, we have had all our doubts removed after hearing different points of view put forward here tonight. I think we ought to recognize that while we call it the Lord's Day, it is not everybody's Sabbath. It's not the Sabbath of everybody in this province. It's not eh Sabbath of everybody in this legislature. It is therefore not surprising that some people would suggest that activities might take place on Sunday which I, who might have different upbringing, would think unusual and perhaps in appropriate. Having said that, as the member for Shellbrook has said, we are the legatees of an essentially Christian religious and cultural tradition. People have made reference to the Ten Commandments, and one of them, as the member for Arm River has already indicated, is remember the Sabbath day and keep it holy; this is certainly the ethical precept which underlies The Lord's Day (Saskatchewan) Act. It seems to me that precept has considerable value for our society, even for those who may not accept the religious implications of it. Whether or not all, or even a majority in our society, are churchgoers, whether or not they accept the precepts of organized Christian religion, the precepts have found their way into the ethical and legal framework of our society and are still valuable.

One of those aspects of our society which has come to us from this tradition, and which I value very much, is what I might call the traditional Sunday. Obviously many things happen on Sunday which would not have happened in my boyhood and, I suspect, in the boyhood of some others. But we still have a Sunday which is a very far cry from the open Sunday which we can see in some other societies. I recall on many occasions visiting a close relative of mine who lived in the United States at Christmas time, and I must say it bothered me somewhat to see all the stores open on Christmas Day. Obviously this is not quite relevant to what we are talking about, save only that it was an open society which did not observe the Christian holidays.

I freely concede for those who have already made the point, that we have activities now on Sunday and there's no great distinction to be drawn between the activities which we now have and the activities which are suggested by the proposed amendment. It is not so much that any particular activity is desirable or undesirable, rather that another one is added and that we have to look at the totality of what is happening. I am of the view that if we add more and more activities to what I have called the traditional Sunday, we are moving more and more rapidly to the open Sunday which I think would be an undesirable change in our society. I am firmly of the view that the pace and rhythm of a society which has a day of rest and respite from commercial activities is a much more desirable pace than the pace of a seven-day commercial society.

It has been suggested that no one (I think the phrase was) has to go to the fair on Sunday. That, unfortunately, is not the case. If you have activities, employees are needed to carry on those activities and those employees, if they are to keep their employment, will simply have to go to the fair on Sunday whether or not they wish to do so. And I think we must understand that the more activities we create for Sunday, the more people we cause to take part in those activities, whether or not they desire to do so.

I am not of the view that this particular addition will necessarily cause any particular major harm. My thrust is rather that it simply adds to or simply has us going one more step in a direction which I think is on the whole undesirable. It is clearly a difficult judgment. I see hon. members attempting to wrestle with the issues as they see them, as will be clear from my remarks. I have reached the conclusion that the amendment will be undesirable. I propose to oppose the amendment.

MR. D.G. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley): — Mr. Speaker, I have just a few comments to make. I've been wanting to mention these to the Minister of Agriculture for some time. I think tonight would be a suitable time. They pertain to the horse racing scene in Saskatchewan. What I have to say comes close to what my colleague, the member for Rosthern, was pointing out. I don't know if the Minister of Agriculture is aware of this at the present time. I think you realize I come from a constituency that has perhaps one of the largest number of racing stables in this province. I have no less than about 15 or 16 standard-bred farms in Indian Head-Wolseley, some of the biggest ones in Saskatchewan.

The situation today, Mr. Minister is that there is no place for standard-breds to race in this province. We are celebrating Saskatchewan and standard-bred racing is perhaps one of the real things of our heritage. It is the type of thing for which a person can train his own horse.

We ought to look at this legislation to see the root of the legislation. Really, the root of this legislation comes from the two cities, Saskatoon and Regina, from the jockey club and the thoroughbred racing associations, which have these tracks tied up at this time. I have nothing against thoroughbred races. I love to go to them myself. But this is the situation. If you look throughout the United States, the states just south of us and in other provinces, you will see that the quarter horse men are racing. They are going to be racing. They have formed an association in Saskatchewan. You are going to see the Appaloosas racing. They can't get on the tracks in these two cities.

I just wonder when there is such a mixed feeling in this Assembly, if that isn't the route we shouldn't be taking. I realize our racing facilities in Saskatoon and Regina are not up to par with some of the other areas, but perhaps if we opened this up, improved our facilities, allowed different types of racing which would appeal to different people, we would not necessarily have racing on the seventh day.

I wonder, as did my colleague, if it is the cities of Regina and Saskatoon which want racing on Sunday (and I'm not so sure it is the citizens of these cities; I think it's the vested interests which are pushing this), maybe that should be the decision of those areas. But should that group be dictating by legislation to the other areas of the province of Saskatchewan which, as the member for Rosthern says, have no hope of having pari-mutuel racing, none whatsoever? I wonder if there isn't an alternative, and that alternative being to improve the racing facilities that are here, expanding them so

we can have these other types.

I feel strongly for the standard-bred because that was the original type of racing here in this province. I also feel for the quarter horse and the Appaloosa man. I just want to mention this and debate with the minister. I know he will take serious consideration and will look into this. That's all that I would like to say, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ALLEN: — Mr. Speaker, I know everyone is tired and I'll be very brief in winding up the debate. First of all I would like to say I think it has been a good debate. I think the points put forward by all members have been good points.

The comment made by the member for Arm River about older members being opposed and younger members being in favor, I don't think is necessarily true. I think, Mr. Speaker, there are younger members who will oppose this and older members who will vote in favor. I think what it really boils down to is perhaps, as the premier said, a religious tradition and what your traditions of religion are. I'm not a bible-thumping kind of person, and I've never used religious arguments particularly to back up my political arguments.

I've never said to anyone — God, number one; family, number two; number three — as the hon. member for Arm River has. But I would say that I don't consider myself an irreligious person. I've gone to church every Sunday all my life, except when I was sick. But perhaps, I come from a different tradition than other members of this House.

I don't disrespect the tradition, because the tradition has been an integral part of this province. But if what the people who oppose this bill say is true. I can't imagine any municipality allowing fairs, exhibitions and horse racing on Sunday because these people are not irreligious either. They know the traditions of their community. They know the mores of their community. I believe those people are better able to decide in their own communities than I am. That's the reason I bring in this bill.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would remind members that we're talking about the principle of the bill. It's unfortunate the member for Regina South isn't here, because I've had an opportunity to work with him on it. And I know I've had earlier support from the member for Indian Head-Wolseley and the member for Rosthern. There are problems, I guess, with the bill now because they feel they can't support it. I say to them, as I say to other members of the House, if members have ways they think they can improve this bill and it doesn't go against the basic principle of the bill, I am certainly not adverse to entertaining those kinds of amendments. I'm willing to listen to them. But let's vote on the principle of the bill. The principle is who is better able to decide the mores of a community, that community or us? Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of this bill.

MR. SPEAKER: — It's not often in this House a Speaker has to contemplate the possibility he may have to vote. Obviously, I can't make any comments in support or in opposition to the motion, but I think I may be permitted one selfish observation. At the conclusion of the debate I want to say I feel like I think a Speaker should feel at the end of a debate.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 22

Allen	Mostoway	Johnson
Smishek	Banda	Nelson
Romanow	Feschuk	Thompson
Messer	Byers	Solomon
Snyder	Vickar	Berntson
Kramer	Cody	Larter
McArthur	Matsalla	Duncan
Shillington		

NAYS — 13

Blakeney	Engel	Muirhead
Pepper	Birkbeck	Katzman
Bowerman	Taylor	Andrew
MacMurchy	Swan	McLeod
Rolfes		

MR. ROMANOW: — Before you call it 10:00 o'clock, if we could just get one quick second reading off on the next item. I think the opposition has been advised and have no objections.

MR. P.P. MOSTOWAY (Saskatoon Centre) moved second reading of Bill No. 110 — **An Act respecting the Funding of the Pension Plan for the City of Saskatoon Police.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief. As many of you know an agreement was signed between the city of Saskatoon and their policemen some time ago. In order for that agreement to become effective or valid, this bill is necessary. With those few words, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 110.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

The Assembly adjourned at 10:25 p.m.