

February 22, 1973.

The Assembly met at 2:30 o'clock p.m.

ON ORDERS OF THE DAY

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Hon. Mr. Smishek (Regina North East): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to introduce to you and to the Members of the Legislature, a group of 27 Grade Eight students from the Dover School which is located in Regina North East constituency. They are seated in the Speaker's Gallery. They are accompanied by their teacher Mr. Short. Mr. Speaker, I should like to extend a warm welcome to the students, to express the hopes that their stay with us this afternoon will be informative and educational, that it will assist them in their social studies and that they may be able to remember their visit with us this afternoon for many years to come.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gardner (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to welcome to the Legislature a group of Grade Eight students from Broadview who are situated in the east gallery. They are accompanied by their teacher Mr. Hritzuk. I hope they enjoy the proceedings and their tour of the city and I hope they have a pleasant journey home.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Richards (Saskatoon University): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to introduce to you and through you to the Members of the House, a group of students from College Park School in Saskatoon, accompanied by their teachers Mr. Wright and Mr. Ramsden. I trust that the stimulating level of the debate in the Session this afternoon will endow them with a rich appreciation of our parliamentary institutions.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald (Moose Jaw North): — Mr. Speaker, through you I should like to welcome to this House a group of five ladies that are sitting in the second row of the Speaker's Gallery. These five ladies are representatives of the Saskatchewan Registered Nurses Association. I hope they enjoy their visit here today to watch this Legislature in action.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Faris (Arm River): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to introduce through you and to this Assembly, 12 students from the Life Skill's Course here in Regina, accompanied by Mr. Barseleau and Mr. Butterfield. I hope they will find the deliberations here this afternoon of

interest, and stimulating to them.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, there is an old saying, the best wine is always left until the last. Today I don't have a group of students but I have another group of ladies from the community of Yellow Grass in the Milestone constituency. They represent the West Yellow Grass Institute. They are accompanied by their driver Harold Lansdell. I want to ask through you and the Members of the House to extend a very warm welcome and hope they will enjoy the proceedings this afternoon.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

STATEMENT

Price Increase 1973-74 Crop Year

Mr. Wiebe (Morse): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to ask permission to make a short announcement and also to ask a question of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer).

Just an hour ago, the Hon. Otto Lang, Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board announced initial prices and quotas for the 1973-74 crop year. I am informed the initial price of wheat will remain the same, while the initial price of barley will be increased to \$1.20 a bushel, effective August 1st this year.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wiebe: — This, Mr. Speaker, is a significant 15 cent per bushel increase in the price of 3CW 6-row barley. There will also be a 10-cent increase in the initial price of 2CW oats.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wiebe: — In his statement to the House of Commons, Mr. Lang asks farmers to expand crops in general and in particular encouraged expansion of barley, rapeseed and oat crops. In view of the thousands of extra dollars that this announcement will mean to Saskatchewan farmers, I would respectively suggest that this House heartily commend Mr. Lang for his actions and would ask for the Minister of Agriculture's concurrence.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Messer (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, the statement that was just made is indeed one that I think farmers in Saskatchewan will be happy to hear. I am glad after some 12 months when we first instigated meetings with Mr. Lang to increase the prices of wheat, barley and oats to Saskatchewan farmers, they decided to take our advice, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Messer: — The Members opposite may laugh, Mr. Speaker, but about 10 months ago the three Ministers of Agriculture from the Prairie provinces set up a meeting with Mr. Lang to be followed by several others encouraging him to do so at that time. Had he followed those instructions in the spring of 1972, we would not be facing perhaps what might be a barley and feed shortage in Canada today.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

Returning Officers Appointed

Mr. Weatherald (Cannington): -- Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I should like to direct a question to the Premier. Order-in-Council No. 231 dated February 9, 1973 and signed by the Premier, appoints 47 returning officers for various constituencies in the province. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact no Chief Electoral Officer is appointed for the province, and in view that a major independent re-organization of the constituency boundaries is currently under way, what work does the Premier anticipate that these persons will do other than collect the \$300 per year stipend attached to the job?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Blakeney (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I think it will be well known that the constituency Boundaries Commission has not reported. We must at all times be ready for either general elections or by-elections. Certainly there are a good number of constituencies which I am sure would wish that their current Member sitting opposite would resign so that they might have effective representation in the House.

To answer the question directly, no doubt they will perform the same duties as returning officers did in the year 1970 when they were appointed, when there was no election. In fact it is anticipated that there may well be some duties for returning officers in connection with the new boundaries when they come out.

Mr. MacDonald (Milestone): — We would not hope!

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Well, I am sure Members opposite hope that the returning officer, certainly in Milestone, has no work to do because if he did, the Member for Milestone would be replaced.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — I think that the legislation anticipated that there would be stand-by work, the same work that was done when this idea of permanent returning officers was first instituted, not by our government, by the one which preceded us. It would be anticipated that these people would in the ordinary course of events serve in appropriate instances with respect to time votes, with respect to liquor and in respect to any other votes carried on. I would anticipate these returning officers would carry on

in precisely the same way that their predecessors did, under the government which preceded us.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Requirements in Change of Name Act

Mr. Lane (Lumsden): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, a question of the Hon. Minister of Public Health (Mr. Smishek). As the Minister of Public Health he should be aware of Section 10 of The Change of Name Act. If I may refer to that to preface my question, Mr. Speaker, every person intending to make an application for change of name shall publish a notice in the required form in the Gazette and in one issue of a newspaper having general circulation in the district in which he resides. Has the Minister of Public Health made any changes in the requirements of that Act?

Hon. Mr. Smishek (Minister of Public Health): — I am not quite sure what the Hon. Member is referring to. I have made no changes. The procedures outside of the changes that have been agreed upon in the Non-controversial Bills Committee in The Change of Name Act, the provisions have just been agreed upon by the House.

Mr. Lane: — A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. We then have to ask the Hon. Minister when did the policy change and when did the Government change the policy of this Act, which now allows an individual, and I refer to the Commonwealth of February 14, 1973, where one Joseph Demchuk, also known as Joseph Frederick Dempsey, filed the requisite notice required by The Change of Name Act. I am advised as of yesterday there had not been advertised, the address given by Mr. Dempsey or Demchuk which is Regina. No advertisement has been placed in the Leader-Post at any time. We then ask the Minister when was this change in policy which allows the Commonwealth to become the organ which will allow public notices and completely controvert the intention of The Change of Name Act?

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! I think the Minister is responsible for actions committed by him. But actions of others putting advertisements in papers, the Minister is not responsible for those. Whether it was done with or without the Minister's consent, the Member can find out by discussing privately with the Minister. I don't think this qualifies as questions on Orders of the Day.

Mr. Lane: — Mr. Speaker, I asked him when he changed the policy requiring that Act . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I think he should discuss it with the Minister and get it straightened up. If a Member wishes to base a question on the statement in the paper it is up to him first to ascertain whether that statement is true or not before he poses a question.

Government in Auto Body Repair Business

Mr. McPherson (Regina Lakeview): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I have a very short question for the Minister-in-Charge of the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office, the Hon. Attorney General.

In a news report last evening it was reported, Mr. Speaker, that the Government is going into the auto body repair business. In the past, Mr. Speaker, in the province everyone who drives a car has always been allowed a free choice of where they go to get quality repair work performed on their cars and pick the auto body man. What I would like to know if this choice will still be available to the citizens of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker?

Hon. Mr. Romanow (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to make one thing clear. I believe the news report said, certainly any official release that we put out, emphasized what we called a research centre to look into the costs for the repairs of cars.

Mr. MacDonald (Milestone): — It's a spy system.

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — The Member for Milestone says, it's a spy system. I suppose it is a monitor system in the sense of making sure that costs for repairs for cars are not out of line. I think the people of Saskatchewan would expect us to make sure that the costs that are paid for repairs of cars are in fact the fair and honest prices that we are to pay for them. When we talk about a research centre we are not necessarily talking about a separate Government run auto body shop. That is not a possibility that we are excluding but that is not the nature of the announcement. It may very well be simply a research centre within the Department of the SGIO to monitor costs on a day to day basis, look at new ways of repairing cars, all designed with a view to keeping costs down with respect to repairs.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McPherson: — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. I think the Minister is indicating that the auto body men in this province are not honest and that you can't believe the rates that they are charging. This is what he has indicated to this House.

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — If I conveyed that impression I withdraw that categorically. If you got that impression, I did not say that nor did I intend to say that. I do not say that auto body men are dishonest. I simply say that in order for SGIO to be able to take into account accurately all of the figures of costs with respect to these matters we have got to have better access to information. That is what we are seeking to do with respect to the research centre. That is what I am saying.

Mr. McPherson: — Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Speaker: — You have had a question and a supplementary and that is more than our three usual questions today.

Mr. McPherson: — It is a very short question, Mr. Speaker. Then the Minister is indicating that they are going into the automobile repair business, this is what I wanted to know. You are going into the business and you will indicate where Joe Doe takes his car or any Minister of the Crown or . . .

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, I repeat again to the Member opposite that we have made no decision on this matter of going into the auto body business. To answer the question specifically, would we be telling where the average motorist should go to repair his car. The obvious answer to that would be, no, we will not be telling him where he must or must not have his car repaired, even if we do get ourselves involved in this area.

Mr. MacDonald (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, just a brief question . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I can't permit any more questions. We have had five and three is usually the limit.

CONDOLENCES

Hon. Mr. Blakeney (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, by leave of the Assembly and with the consent of Members opposite, I should like to move a motion in respect of the news which we received yesterday of the untimely death of the former Member, Thomas Russell MacNutt. I should like, Mr. Speaker, to move, seconded by the Hon. Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald):

That this Assembly records with sorrow and regret the passing of a former Member of this Assembly and expresses its grateful appreciation of the contributions he made to his community, his constituency and to this Province.

Thomas Russel MacNutt, who died on February 21, 1973, represented the Constituency of Nipawin from 1952 to 1956. He was born in Saltcoats, Saskatchewan in 1895 and was educated in Saltcoats public and high schools and attended the College of Agriculture in Saskatoon. He was a farmer and later a general merchant. He served in both World Wars and achieved the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel. In France, during the First World War, he served with the Third Battalion, Canadian Machine Gun Corps and from 1932 to 1938 he was the Commanding Officer of the First Battalion, King's Own Rifles of Canada on the Pacific Coast. He attended the coronation of His Majesty King George VI with the Canadian contingent as a member of the King's mounted escort. He was a member of the Canadian Legion and of the Masonic Lodge. In 1949, he was an unsuccessful candidate for the federal election. From 1926 to 1947 he was Secretary-Treasurer of the Rural Municipality of Saltcoats and was also a councillor of the town of Saltcoats for five years and was a member of the town council of Arborfield for one year.

In recording its deep sense of loss and bereavement, this

Assembly expresses its most sincere sympathies with members of the bereaved family.

Mr. MacDonald (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, just a few comments. I should like to associate myself and other Members of the Opposition with the motion just moved by the Premier.

If here was anything about Russ MacNutt, we can say he was an outstanding example of a Canadian who dedicated his life to his community, his province and his country. Russ MacNutt led a very complete life. All of us are aware that he sat as a Member of this Legislature. I took the opportunity to go back and read some of his speeches and I found that he made an outstanding contribution particularly in discussing the agricultural and rural life problems of Saskatchewan.

As a soldier he achieved an outstanding rank which was an indication of the respect and the leadership qualities that he had. As a farmer and a businessman he participated in the economic life of Saskatchewan. As a Secretary-Treasurer and a Councillor of a small community he also participated in local government. I don't think we could ask any citizen of Saskatchewan to make a greater contribution.

I want to say that Members of the Opposition join with the Premier and Members of the Government in expressing our sincere condolences to the family and friends.

Mr. Comer (Nipawin): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to join with the Premier and the Hon. Member from Milestone in extending condolences to the MacNutt family on the death of Thomas MacNutt.

As has been mentioned, T. R. MacNutt represented Nipawin constituency from 1952 until 1956. He was the first Member from the newly created seat of Nipawin. Mr. MacNutt, as was mentioned yesterday, came from a distinguished family in this province, his father being the first Speaker of this Assembly and as well as a Member of the Saskatchewan Legislature. T. R. MacNutt was able to leave his mark on government in this province being the Secretary-Treasurer of the R.M. of Saltcoats for 21 years, a councillor in the town of Saltcoats for five years, as well as being a councillor in the town of Arborfield for one year. He climaxed this active involvement with his membership in this body.

I should like to turn for a few moments and talk about Mr. MacNutt's activity in the northeastern part of this province. He came to Arborfield in 1947 to operate a general store. He was a very active community worker. He was always a hard worker for the Legion. He is well remembered for his great interest in young people. In Arborfield he was an active promoter of what was called the Arborfield Male Quartette. Through his hard work and practice this Quartette of which he was a member became a feature at most social events in the Arborfield district. Mr. MacNutt was also an avid fisherman. Any reason to go fishing was always accepted. It was through his great interest in fishing that he came to appreciate the great tourist potential that there was in northeastern Saskatchewan. As a Member of this House, as has been mentioned, Mr. MacNutt was a tireless fighter for Nipawin constituency. He pressed for roads and drainage in his constituency. His efforts were appreciated, his

requests were necessities. He was also a man who was most interested in the opening up of a road to The Pas from Carrot River, a project which was only recently brought to completion. A fighter for the northeast, a worker for his community and a credit to this province, he served us well.

I am sure that the qualities which this man displayed must today leave thoughts of gratitude which will help to overcome the sadness which his family must endure at this time. I should like to extend on behalf of myself and the constituents of Nipawin our deepest words of sympathy to the MacNutt family.

Mr. Kaeding (Saltcoats): — Mr. Speaker, I should also like to add a few words of condolence to the members of the MacNutt family at this time. As you will know the late Lieutenant-Colonel MacNutt was born and raised in the Saltcoats district in my constituency. He served for many years there as the treasurer to the rural municipality of Saltcoats. Through those years he served the town and municipality well and to the best of his ability. He was an active and enthusiastic contributor to all activities in the community. In 1947 he moved to Arborfield where he purchased a business. During his term of service in the military forces in the First World War he served with the third Battalion forces CMGC in France and was discharged with the rank of Lieutenant. He was active in reserve forces as Officer Commanding of the 16th and 22nd Canadian Light Horse during the 1930s. At the outbreak of hostilities in 1939 he returned to the active army. He served as an officer in the Regina Rifle Regiment, First Battalion, and as Officer Commanding of the King's Own Rifles of Canada. In 1949, Mr. MacNutt followed family tradition and entered into politics. He was defeated in the Federal election in 1947 but in 1952 successfully contested the Nipawin riding for the Liberal Party and was a Member of the Legislature until 1956.

"T.R." as he was affectionately known by his friends and comrades in the Legion, was very active in the Royal Canadian Legion and served in many executive positions, including that of Zone Commander of the Yorkton district. He was a life member of the Royal Canadian Legion and at the time of his death was a member of the Saltcoats branch.

He was predeceased by his wife in 1967 and returned to live with his daughter, Mrs. Cecil Trowell, in the Saltcoats area.

I had an opportunity to meet with him during the 1971 election campaign and needless to say I was unable to convert him although we spent an interesting hour together. Later that year I again met Mr. MacNutt at a Legion Remembrance Day program in Saltcoats and had an interesting evening with him, together with a Mr. Bob Kohaly who is a former Conservative Member for Estevan.

Mr. MacNutt is survived by three children, Charles MacNutt who lives in Saltcoats, Mrs. Mary Trowell of Saltcoats and Mrs. Lorene Graham of Saskatoon. I am sure the House will join with me in expressing our deepest sympathy to the bereaved family.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Hon. Member for

Milestone (Mr. MacDonald):

That the Resolution just passed, together with the transcripts of oral tributes to the memory of the deceased Member, be communicated to the bereaved family, on behalf of this Assembly by Mr. Speaker.

Motion agreed to.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

Motion — Rail Line Abandonment

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. Blakeney and the proposed amendment thereto by Mr. Gardner (Moosomin):

That this Assembly urges the Federal Government that no railway branch line abandonment be considered in Saskatchewan before all the alternatives are thoroughly studied and the social and economic costs to producers, businesses and communities be ascertained and, further, that no abandonments be allowed without the prior agreement of the Government of Saskatchewan and, specifically, that no abandonments be authorized until 1980.

And the proposed amendment thereto by Mr. Gardner:

That the following words be added to the motion: and further that the railroad companies be obligated to:

1. Provide a high standard of service on present lines.
2. Provide adequate maintenance and improvement on rail lines and equipment so that a high standard of service can be maintained.

Mr. Wiebe (Morse): — Mr. Speaker, in my remarks prior to my adjourning the debate on this motion, I had indicated what the real reason for the introduction of this motion by the Premier, and I wish to elaborate on those remarks.

The concern the Premier had for introducing this motion was not for the towns and rural communities that would be affected by abandonment, that concern was not for the social and economic costs that abandonment would have on a producer, on the businesses, on our communities and on our rural way of life, but rather, Mr. Speaker, it was a concern for politics. A concern for the NDP Government and the New Democratic Party, a concern for political gain, a concern for the justification of the actions taken by the CCF Party of which many Members opposite were a part of. A concern to try and shift the blame for the only rail line abandonment that has ever occurred in this province. A concern to take public suspicion away from the NDP and place that suspicion on the Federal Liberals. Mr. Speaker, the Members opposite just don't want to admit that the only rail lines that were ever abandoned in this province were abandoned when their Party was the Government of Saskatchewan. Many of those Members opposite now were sitting in that Government at that time. It is a fact they do not wish to accept, it is a fact that it was a Provincial Liberal Government and a Federal Liberal Government that called a halt and stopped rail line abandonment in this province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wiebe: — They are aware and I am sure the people of Saskatchewan are aware that the only time that rail lines were torn up and abandoned in this province was when their party and Members opposite were the Government. At no time, Mr. Speaker, during that controversy did they rise to the defence of these rail lines. At no time did they rise to the defence of the rural communities and farmers who were affected by that abandonment. Where was their concern at that time? What constructive alternatives did they suggest? What pressure did they put on the then Conservative Government in Ottawa to call a halt to this abandonment? The people of Saskatchewan can answer those questions, Mr. Speaker. The CCF-NDP Government sat on their hands and did nothing.

They finally became involved in this controversy when they realized the political ramifications of what they had allowed to happen. For the past ten years speaker after speaker has tried to shift the blame. They don't want to stand up and admit that it was the NDP that allowed rail lines to be abandoned in this province. They don't want to admit that it was the Liberal Governments in Saskatchewan and Ottawa that called a halt to that abandonment.

The interesting part of this entire controversy, Mr. Speaker, is that during the past 10 years and during the debate on this motion the NDP have not come up with one positive approach to this question. Not once have they put forward any constructive or rational idea or solution to this problem. They have decided to leave things the way they are, all the motion calls for is an extension of time to 1980. They are content to allow rail lines to deteriorate, they are content to allow the services on our rail lines to deteriorate. A number of speakers on their side of the House have already indicated this and have declared that they will not support the amendments proposed by Mr. Gardner. Comments made by Members opposite throughout this debate have been negative. They are content to run down and to ridicule any attempt that has been made by the Federal Government to look into the entire transportation system.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wiebe: — The Agricultural Minister (Mr. Messer) criticized the progress made by the Grains Group, saying that they were studies carried out in the back rooms of Ottawa or in the back rooms of Toronto. I am sure that the Minister doesn't believe this himself. I am sure that he knows that the Grains Group carried out or commissioned detailed studies into practically every aspect of grain storage, handling and transportation.

The Grains Group realized that they must secure the best advice. They realized that studies must be undertaken to fully understand what effect the present system has and what effect changes would have on our social and economic way of life for our producers, our businessmen and our communities.

The studies, Mr. Speaker, have been completed. The western Provincial Governments have had an opportunity to examine the studies. If the Minister of Agriculture disagrees with some of these studies, then it is his responsibility to add constructive criticism and alternatives . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wiebe: — . . . not to tear them apart and to refuse to work together with them. Now is the time, Mr. Speaker, for co-operation. Now is the time to embark on a public discussion in an effort to determine what actions can be taken now and over the long term. Now is the time for the Provincial Government to co-operate and to add constructive discussion. Now is the time to co-operate and decide whether further studies, if need be, should be undertaken.

Just a small example of the Grain Council's determination to involve the producer and individuals in our rural communities, is the co-sponsoring of a two-day Grain and Handling and Transportation seminar to be held in Saskatchewan on March 8th and 9th. It is a Seminar, Mr. Speaker, that is sponsored by the University of Saskatchewan and the Canada Grains Council, designed to provide the opportunity for interested individuals to take part in the decision-making which may effect the very life of this province.

It is necessary for the various organizations, individual producers, rural governments and, yes, western provincial governments to sit down together to assess the fact, to participate in determining the best course of action. Mr. Speaker, we must be able to understand each others' problems.

Where does our responsibility as legislators lie in regard to a question as vital as rail line abandonment and the effects that this entire question can have on our rural way of life; its effect on our economy, its effect on the future of our many towns and farms in this province. Our responsibility, Mr. Speaker, is not destructively to oppose suggestions or ideas, our responsibility is not to refuse to co-operate or to go off on a tangent of our own. Our responsibility, Mr. Speaker, is to find answers.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wiebe: — Mr. Speaker, we must make every effort to take this issue out of the narrow range of both petty party politics and the interests of railways and elevator companies.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wiebe: — We must be prepared to ask that all western provincial governments, farm organizations and most important, the producers, set these petty issues aside and work together with the Federal Government to provide alternatives. To come up with solutions that if changes are required that the grain producer of our rural communities will get the entire benefit of these changes.

There is no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that changes will be required. Steps must be taken to increase producers' returns by reducing the cost of transportation, storage and handling. Last year, Mr. Speaker, this cost amounted to 18 cents per bushel of wheat sold by the Canadian Wheat Board. Savings must be realized in this area and these savings must be passed on to the farmers.

On top of this must be added the cost of the Federal Government's subsidy to the railroads. A way must be found to put more, if not all, of this money into the pockets of the producers by finding and exploring a more economical transportation storage and handling system, one that, again I say, is designed for the benefit of the producers.

Our present transportation handling and elevator system in the West, I think, can justly be called one of the best in the world. Yet, I do not feel, Mr. Speaker, that we can rest here. We must still be prepared to improve upon this system. While it may be the best in the world it is still not the best as far as producers are concerned.

What we have today is basically a system that was based on the ability of the farmer to deliver his grain with horse and wagon. Because of this, our elevators were spaced six to eight miles apart on closely spaced railroad branch lines.

This system, while very effective up to the early '50s needs vast improvements to effect a savings to our producers today. This can be emphasized by the statement made by Ira Mumford, Wheat Pool General Manager, which appeared in the Leader-Post on February 1st of this year, in which he stated that the grain elevator system on the Prairies is wearing out. Half of the elevators were more than 40 years old. Mr. Mumford also said that the old elevators when they become obsolete, won't be replaced, but instead, will be rebuilt in more central locations.

If we are concerned about the rural communities and the effect that rail line abandonment will have on them, we must also be concerned about the effect that the elevator companies are having on our rural communities by the amalgamation and closing down of obsolete and worn out elevators. During the last 10 years, under a Liberal Government in Saskatchewan and a Liberal Government in Ottawa, not one inch of railway has been abandoned, while over four per cent of our elevators in Saskatchewan have been abandoned in each of these years. By the closing of these elevators there has been the resultant loss in jobs and, of course, population.

As I have mentioned earlier, there is no doubt that changes will be required and that the primary beneficiaries of any of these changes, again, must be the producer. But, Mr. Speaker, it is just as vital to emphasize that the social and economic life of the communities affected by any changes in our elevator and rail line system must be considered as well.

This is why, Mr. Speaker, that I emphasize that all levels of government in western Canada, farm organizations must put petty politics aside and work together to find those solutions.

Let's take a positive approach to this question of transportation, grain handling and rail line abandonment. Let's take a positive approach to our rural communities. Let's look at alternatives. Let's not tie ourselves down until 1980.

Mr. Speaker, we must still ensure that if solutions cannot be found that will be acceptable to our producers and ensure or improve our social and economic rural life, that we do not allow rail lines to be torn up. But let us, as well, leave ourselves enough room that if concrete solutions that are more beneficial than what we have now found, that we can implement

these solutions and not wait until 1980.

For example, Mr. Speaker, let's look at our low density rail lines. These are branch lines that carry relatively few bushels of grain and possibly less than 5 per cent of the commercial freight.

Here is a question that we must ask ourselves: Do we want moneys to continue to be paid to the railway companies under the existing Transportation Act to keep a low density rail line? Or do we prefer that these moneys be put to better use to serve our rural communities and our producers.

Let me interject at this point, and I hope the Hon. Members will not misunderstand my objective. I say, again, that I do not favor wholesale or partial abandonment of rail lines, but if changes are to be made, then these changes must be such that our producers and communities will benefit more by that change.

Let me repeat the question that I posed: Do we want moneys to continue to be paid to the railway companies under the existing Transportation Act to keep a low density rail line? Or do we prefer that these moneys be put to better use to serve our rural communities and our producers?

At present, Mr. Speaker, close to \$30 million comes out of our Federal treasury as a direct subsidy to railway companies just to keep our low density branch lines open. I think, Mr. Speaker, that it is time that we stopped looking at our railway companies and start to look at our farmers.

I suggest that it is time that we started to look at what we, as producers, could do with this \$30 million and the benefits that our municipalities and communities could as well receive from the \$30 million. If it became advisable after intensive studies that a particular branch line had to be withdrawn, then the savings in subsidies to the railways and the savings in storage and handling by elevators and rail lines be transferred to the producer, to the municipalities and the communities involved.

This saving could be used in various ways. Some suggestions that I would like to make are:

The savings, for example, in storage and handling could be passed on to all producers of this province. This would be realized in the final grain payment.

The savings realized from the direct government subsidy to railways could be passed on to the producer in the form of one-third to one-half cent per bushel per loaded mile. This would adequately pay for increased cost accrued by the farmer for lengthier hauls and also a return to the producer for his labor and his investment. If all the low density branch lines were affected, the total cost could be slightly over \$10 million. This money could be realized from the savings of close to \$30 million that comes out of our federal treasury as a direct subsidy to railway companies, just to keep our low density branch lines open.

One point that must be made here is that if all low density branch lines were affected by rail rationalization, then this payment per bushel per loaded mile should be made to all

producers in this province.

For the information of Members opposite, the figures which I am quoting are taken from the Report of Grain Handling and Transportation Costs in Canada, which was prepared for the Grains Group and the Hon. Otto Lang.

This report, I might mention, is not in the Legislative library and I would suggest to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) and the Premier that they obtain a copy and also make arrangements to have one placed in the library.

As well, Mr. Speaker, the balance of the savings realized from the direct government subsidy of \$30 million to railway companies could be passed on to the rural municipalities in the form of grants for the construction of superior artery, all-weather, dust-free roads to handle this extra traffic.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wiebe: — As well, Mr. Speaker, maintenance grants should also be made available for the upkeep of these roads.

I must mention that these grants should apply only to the main artery roads, as these will be the only roads affected by this change. The traffic on feeder roads would remain unchanged, as these are the roads that they normally have been using to transport their grain to their original delivery point. This, Mr. Speaker, would not be an extra burden on the municipalities or the Department of Highways.

Here again, the bulk of benefits would come back to our producers, our communities, as they will be served by much superior roads. A joint program, Mr. Speaker, as well should be undertaken by the provincial and federal governments to ensure that there will be no loss of population or economic benefit to our viable communities which are affected by any rationalization. Programs could be undertaken to attract small industry to these communities or incentives could be provided to further expansion of the agricultural industry in that particular district.

These proposals which I have mentioned, Mr. Speaker, are just a few examples of what can be done. These are just a few examples to show that if there is a change, that the benefits derived from that change can go to the producer, can go to the community and can help enhance the social and economic life of Saskatchewan.

I submit as well, Mr. Speaker, that the suggestions I have made deserve and need further examination and study. I feel, as well, Mr. Speaker, that just pumping more money into the present system to maintain a status quo is wrong. I feel that solutions must be found and that the only way that a true and viable solution can be found is by co-operation of this Government with the western provincial governments and with the Federal Government.

I urge this Legislature to recommend that we strive constructively to work together with other levels of governments, organizations and individuals to find a solution that will be beneficial to our rural communities, our producers and our province as a whole. Mr. Speaker, I will support the amendment.

Mr. Meakes (Touchwood): — Mr. Speaker, of all the idiotic nonsense I heard is when I listened to my hon. friend from Morse in the first few minutes that he was talking. I guess I have to be easy on him as he is pretty young. Either that or he has an extremely short memory when he made the statement — and I don't want to misquote him — but I am sure he said the previous government of the first CCF Government, prior to 1964, had done nothing.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Meakes: — I happened to have been a Member at that time and active in it, when we had a special group under the late Russ Brown. There were meetings held all across this province, district meetings. I remember when halls were full of people who were supporting us in our efforts of trying to stop rail line abandonment. In fact I remember one special meeting that burned in my memory. It was held in the city of Regina, in the Hotel Saskatchewan, I believe on November 22, 1963, when that day word came to that meeting that President Jack Kennedy had just been killed. I will never forget that day of the shock on the people that were there. We went on and held that meeting for several hours and it was of no use because people couldn't think of anything else.

But to say that the previous government had done nothing is idiotic nonsense. I might go on and say that as soon as the Liberal Government was elected in 1964, in this province, one of the first things that happened was that group was disbanded and let go.

I could not help but listen to my hon. friend and hear the undertone of accepting anything that Ottawa might suggest. I couldn't help but wonder whether they are already expecting that there will be an election — federal election. At that point the Liberal Party will go ahead and listen to its corporate bosses and let the railways do what they want.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I support this motion overwhelmingly. As far as the amendment is concerned I am going to support it. I am in favor of motherhood and that is really what it is, a motherhood motion.

Mr. Guy: — How about the rest of them?

Mr. Meakes: — I don't talk about the rest of them, I talk for Frank Meakes.

I had thought when this motion was put before the House, that it would go through smoothly, that surely for once, politics would not come out of it. Because I think that this Resolution is far too important for us to bandy around and accusations one way or another. It wasn't us really that started it.

I think that this is one of the most important and dangerous issues facing western Canada, and in particular in the Province of Saskatchewan, that if nothing is done to stop it it can eliminate hundreds of communities.

I think, Mr. Speaker, of a CPR stub line that you and I

know very well, that is the line coming out from Foam Lake through to Wishart. I think that if this were to go, and after 1975 it can go, it is one of the tracks that is on the list. When I think of the investment of human beings and cash in the village of Wishart, I think of the investment of human beings of their whole lives and what could happen if that track comes out.

I think of the social costs that are involved in a place like Wishart. Incidentally Wishart is just 10 miles north of where I lived all my life, I know it very well. I might say that the village of Wishart for many years delivered more wheat, or there was more wheat grown in that area than any other shipping point in district nine of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool.

It is a very interesting story, this railway track, because back about 1925 there were plans for the CNR to build a railway from Yorkton coming out through the Beaver Hills out to about where Wishart is and on through to Bulyea or Nokomis or somewhere down in that area. There was one man known as Charlie Dunning, a man well-known in this province, who one time served in this Legislature, who later ran and went to Ottawa and became the Minister of Railways. He had grown up around the village of Beaverdale just west of Yorkton and the track had got as far as Parkerview in 1925 or 1926, the stub line and it was intending to go on. This illustrious gentleman, as Minister of Railways, and I would like to say before I come to that, through the area that had got as far as Parkerview, was a very poor farming land, but it would have to head out into Westbend and through to the Wishart area and then north of Punnichy. This would have been very productive land, but when he was Minister of Railways in Ottawa, he gave permission for the CPR to put a spur in from Foam Lake to Wishart, this way stopping a through service of railroad from Yorkton on through.

It's a very interesting thing, Mr. Speaker, that that same Hon. gentleman, Mr. Dunning, after he was retired from politics he later became a director of the Canadian Pacific Railway. It's another interesting thing about this gentleman that when you read that book, "Who Owns Canada," one of the 50 men listed was Charlie Dunning and when you look at the occupation he was the only one out of 50 who claimed his occupation as that of a politician.

For the Hon. Member from Morse (Mr. Wiebe) to have said, "We shouldn't get politics into this," Mr. Speaker, the railway system from the day it was built — the day that John A MacDonald signed an agreement to build the railway, railways have been in politics. It's been a political football.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Meakes: — When John A. MacDonald signed that historic contract with the CPR and gave away large grants of land with it, CPR has made more money out of the land than they have out of the railways. For instance they have had many subsidiaries and when you look at Trail, British Columbia, Cominco, in which they got this land for nothing, I say that the railroads have not only a legal, but a moral, responsibility to the people of Canada, to the people of western Canada and the people of Saskatchewan.

I see a real need in Canada for the nationalization of the CPR and to put it into one with the CNR and to see then real

rationalization. I see places like when you drive west from Saskatoon, you see a CNR and a CPR track running in some places only a couple of miles apart, both in competition. This to me is the height of stupidity.

I say that we should be nationalizing and making the two railways an efficient system because I will agree with my hon. friend from Morse (Mr. Wiebe) that there are some inefficiencies. But I say that when we should nationalize the CPR, I don't mean just the CPR railway, I say the CPR and all its subsidies.

All this time, Mr. Speaker, freight rates are rising and I want to put on the records of this House just what has happened in my home town in the last few months. These figures were given to me by the pharmacist in Lestock, showing his freight increases from October 31 to January 16. He says he can substantiate these figures by showing invoices and so, Mr. Speaker, when I am finished I will file this paper on the records for anybody to see. I should like to deal with them. I think, Mr. Speaker, that we cannot discuss rail abandonment without discussing what has been going on. I think some of their ideas were crazy.

I live on the main line of the CNR with one of the best roadbeds there is and going down right alongside the railway. On the highway is a CNR truck, and I think that this is a waste of power, of money, of everything else. Let me come to these figures.

Referring to parcels of freight that the druggist gets from Saskatoon and it comes by truck freight (I won't read it all, I'll read just spot figures all the way down to show the increase.)

On October 31st, 1972 he paid \$2.25 for 85 pounds; on November 14th he paid \$2.25 for 75 pounds, plus a heat charge of 23 cents for at that time it was getting pretty cold; November 27, 1972 – 80 pounds, still \$2.25 with a 23 cent heat charge; then we come to December 12, 1972 – 110 pounds (it suddenly jumps) from \$2.25 to \$3.15 plus a heat charge of 32 cents, plus a service charge of 79 cents. I'll deal with this service charge in a minute or two, Mr. Speaker. We go down to January 4, 1973 – 46 pounds, \$3.15, where he had got 85 pounds for \$2.25 in October, plus a heat charge of 32 cents, plus a service charge of 79 cents and then on January 23rd he had 115 pounds at \$3.15, plus the 32 cents heat charge, plus the 79 cents service charge. What is this service charge for? He can get a 25 per cent reduction if he takes all the risks of these parcels being frozen or broken.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that we must ask the Federal Government to stop dead any changes at this time. I am not even sure whether 1980 is far enough, but I will accept 1980 for the present. We ask the Federal Government and yes, I think provincial governments will have to co-operate with them, in studying the problems — really there have been so many studies that I hate to even say that again — but until a planned action can be taken to stop the wiping out of any railroads in this province, until all aspects are weighted, the aspects of what happens to the investment of — I referred to people in the village of Wishart — and what it can do to our roads, to our village of Wishart — and what it can do to our roads, to our highways, to our grid roads. Because, certainly if railways go out, Mr. Speaker, trucks will have to become bigger. Really

none of our roads, especially grid roads, are geared for this kind of truck travel.

So, Mr. Speaker, I say that in the meantime that all short-term and long-term plans should be made so that there is need of some real rationalization and that it be done on a detailed plan, not haphazard. Mr. Speaker, I certainly will be supporting the Motion and I hope that other Members will see fit to do so also.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gross (Gravelbourg): — Mr. Speaker, I am sure every Member in this House must feel obligated to enter this particular debate for rail line abandonment affects everyone in this province.

Mr. Speaker, let us hope this debate bears fruit. Countless times Members of the NDP Government in Ottawa have led vigorous debates on this matter only for it to fall on deaf ears in Parliament. Not only in Ottawa have NDP Members of Parliament fought rail line abandonment, but also in provincial legislatures and in nearly every election campaign over the past 10 and 15 years.

Mr. Speaker, NDP Members of Parliament, MLAs and NDP workers have gone up and down this province, election after election, warning the people of Saskatchewan what is in store in terms of rail line abandonment.

The people of this province, Mr. Speaker, are aware of Federal Liberal Government's and are aware of Federal Conservative Government's plans on abandoning rail lines. The people of Saskatchewan are aware of recent agricultural policies our Federal Government has imposed on these people year after year after year. The people of the province are aware of Task Force reports on agriculture which want to remove family farmers off their land in support of corporate farming systems.

An Hon. Member: — Oh, shame on you Liberals!

Mr. Gross: — Finally, the people of this province are aware that on January 1, 1974, if allowed by the Canadian Transport Commission to go ahead, 4,156 miles of railway will be abandoned in the Prairie provinces, with 2,436 miles of that total to be in Saskatchewan.

An Hon. Member: —Edgar Benson says, "Go ahead."

Mr. Gross: — Mr. Speaker, it is very clear where we as a provincial NDP Government stand. Everyone knows where our Federal NDP Members stand, but, Mr. Speaker, we don't know where our friends opposite stand.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gross: — Nowhere, Mr. Speaker, has our friend Mr. Steuart, the Leader of the Opposition, and his little bank of merry bootlickers ever made their position clear in this province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gross: — Never have they marched up and down this province saying that they are totally against "Fire Sale Otto," Trudeau and the former John Diefenbaker Government in terms of rail line abandonment. Never, Mr. Speaker, have they made a human cry for the salvation of rail lines in Saskatchewan so that Saskatchewan does not fall in the hands of a corporate agrarian desert.

Mr. Speaker, I ask Members of this House, where does Mr. Steuart and his band of friends stand?

The Liberals claim . . .

An Hon. Member: — In front of the mirror.

Mr. Gross: — . . . they have concerns about rail and freight policies. They have stood up and said freight rates are too high in Saskatchewan, and we agree, Mr. Speaker, but the problem just doesn't stop with freight rates. One must look at the total problem. One must also take into consideration the problem we are debating here today — probably the most contentious problem that will affect this province's total life style and future.

Mr. Speaker, it must be a very touchy position right now being a Provincial Liberal Member. Their friends in Ottawa are saying, "remove and destroy two out of three family farms," and that party politically has gone along with such nonsense. Then, Mr. Speaker, the 'Feds' are asking them to turn around and face another dilemma and say, "Remove 2,400 miles of rail line in Saskatchewan."

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, it must make it very hard for Members opposite having to go to the people election after election and tell the people they do have a conscience and they are concerned.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, I find it very ironic when one thinks back to the last Federal election campaign. Liberal bootlickers running around with little badges and slogans saying, "I care." If they do care, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that Davey Steuart and his supporters grab the first plane to Ottawa and on bended knees plead with their tin gods that no more insane programs be levelled on western Canada.

Mr. Speaker, what will be the impact of such a move? Well, costs will increase to the producer for a great deal more trucking will be required at the expense of the farmer. Along with increased costs to the producer there will be requirements for improved roads and highways, that are existing structures and that will have to be restructured. We will soon find that grid roads, oiled surfaces, will be no substitute for the paved surfaces that will be required. But, Mr. Speaker, I ask you who will pay for these new improved roads and highway facilities that will be required? Will it be the Federal Government? No! Will it be the Canadian National or Canadian Pacific? No! I don't think so, Mr. Speaker, I think the people that will be forced to pay for it will be the producers of this province and the producers of the Prairie Provinces.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gross: — Another effect, Mr. Speaker, will be a loss of taxation revenue that will be soon experienced by towns and rural municipalities due to low assessments on farmland when the railways and elevator facilities are closed. There will be no end to bad effects in this agrarian community that they will suffer in the days after January 1, 1975.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to bring light to a problem that I have in my own constituency in terms of rail line abandonment. If someone was to take out a map of the Province of Saskatchewan and look approximately 15 miles southwest of Swift Current, you will find a little town called Burnham. The town of Burnham is surrounded by very productive Saskatchewan agricultural land. You will also note that at Burnham it is the last point on the Gravelbourg subdivision of the CNR. That little town, Mr. Speaker, in the months of November and December had the rails pulled up in front of the two elevators at Burnham. It is also interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that the subdivision of the CNR is slated for closure in 1975.

An Hon. Member: -- Don McPherson's fault.

Mr. Gross: — Right! But then, Mr. Speaker, one good question. Why is the line closing in front of the elevators? And it is not even January 1, 1975. Well, upon checking with the CNR they tell us that the line is now no longer economic and the cost to rejuvenate the line would make it uneconomical.

Mr. Speaker, in the very strongest terms, I say that this is an abandonment by default.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gross: — Mr. Speaker, when one talks with the people in that area you soon find out the type of maintenance that has occurred on that particular section of line from Neidpath.

I have here, Mr. Speaker, a letter from one of the elevator agents from Burnham and I quote:

As far as I know the CNR sectionmen were only in Burnham three times in 1972.

This is the type of maintenance the CNR is famous for.

Mr. Speaker, not only has this point been left to deteriorate over the years at its own pace, but I note with concern, that a train has not come into Burnham since mid-December 1971. Yet, Mr. Speaker, grain handlings in that particular area in the crop year 1971-72, totaled 410,000 bushels. But how many bushels were those two elevators to handle because of the poor service given them at that point? They handled 135,000 bushels, somewhat less than the 410,000 bushels that area was capable of handling. This shabby type of service, Mr. Speaker, forced the farmers of that area to haul their grain either to Neidpath or to Swift Current.

I have in my hands from the local farmers in that particular area three or four pieces of documentation, the amount of dollars more it costs them to haul either to Swift Current or

Neidpath. This document, Mr. Speaker, is from Edwin Linklater of Burnham. In the document he points out that he is now hauling his grain to Swift Current. He hauls a total of 14,632 bushels annually. His truck hauls 200 bushels. Last year he made 73 trips. The number of return miles per load was 28, total miles covered was 2,045. Taking 2,045 miles and at a conservative figure of only 10 cents per miles for a truck of that size, he comes up with a total handling cost to himself, the producer, of \$204.50. But when we compare what his costs would have been if he was hauling to Burnham, we find quite a different example. His handlings still remain the same at 14,632 bushels, has the same 200 bushel truck hauls the same number of loads, 73. What is the difference in the mileage? He looks at only one mile hauling to Burnham, whereas he was hauling 28 miles to Swift Current. Total miles, Mr. Speaker, that he will haul in a total year, 73, cost per mile 10 cents a bushel, one mile away from his total handling of \$7.30 — \$204.50 versus \$7.30. Mr. Speaker, that is the difference in terms of cost to the producer.

Mr. Speaker, we can go further. We can cite cases such as the Middlemisses and the Stolhandskis and the Lightfoots and the Lightbodys and so on. They all represent the same type of problems that they are now facing at Burnham. Thanks to rail line abandonment.

An Hon. Member: — How much . . .

Mr. Gross: — Considerable, \$71,000 was their quote. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that they reconsider their policy of rail line abandonment. I suggest that Mr. Steuart and his friends at their earliest convenience rush down to Ottawa, talk to Otto, advise him of the ill-conceived plan of rail line abandonment. And also advise them that they should support this motion when it comes to vote.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Mostoway (Hanley): — Mr. Speaker, in talking about rail line abandonment the Liberals say that there was no rail line abandonment when their regime was in power in this province. But I do want to point out that they are right; the opposite really happened. I want to zero in on a local situation at Allan, where as I said, the very opposite happened. We had a mine go up there which was already served by a people's railway, the CNR, which belongs to everyone. And, of course, the CPR had a line not too far away so they made application to the proper authorities and they were granted the privilege of putting in a line to the Allan Potash Mines. One that was incidentally already served, as I mentioned, by the CNR.

An Hon. Member: — . . . behind that?

Hon. Mr. Mostoway: — Oh, yes certainly, he was behind that. Everyone knows that. We have no hesitation in saying that we know that the Provincial Government was behind this deal. That the Provincial Government and the CPR, this giant corporation, friends of theirs were in a sort of a plot, whereby they duplicated services just so that they could make profit, and for no other reason. So gentlemen, yes, you can take credit for the very

opposite of rail line abandonment. And it is something that I really figure you should be ashamed of because it is really the people of this country who are going to have to pay for that. Taking it away from the CNR and giving it to your friends the CPR.

I support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Faris (Arm River): — Mr. Speaker, I was filled with amazement by some of the remarks by the Hon. Member from Morse (Mr. Wiebe). His suggestion that because the CCF was the Provincial Government at the time of the last rail line abandonment made them responsible for that abandonment are completely out of accord with the facts.

Even the Member from Morse should know that permission for rail line abandonment comes from the Federal Government; that the British North America Act, that is the written constitution of Canada, gives railways and transportation to the federal responsibility. It is a federal matter and if he were going to be exact in this matter, he would admit that there was, in fact, a Conservative Government at that time. Now I know that they don't want to criticize the Conservatives, their good friends down there in Ottawa but this was their responsibility. At this time they want to add an amendment that suggests that they are concerned about the maintenance of railways. This is really interesting because the Liberals are the Government right now and they have been for the last number of years and they are responsible right now to see that the railways are maintained. They haven't been maintained. We have had example after example of this fact. And the Federal Liberals right here and now are responsible for it. The Members opposite want to know whether or not we can support the amendment. I suggest the Members on this side of the House could, in good conscience, support the amendment, but I suggest that the Members opposite could not because it would be strictly hypocritical.

One other point I want to make and that is the Member for Morse suggests that right now we have one of the best grain transportation systems in the world. And I think this is true. But I fail to see how we can go along with the Federal Liberal Grains Group by suggesting this would be improved by removing one-third of the track. The Member from Moosomin (Mr. Gardner) really has led us into great confusion on this matter. He mentioned that prior to the last Federal election I had sent to all Members, both sides of this House, a map that indicated which lines were going to be abandoned. Now he didn't know what the Ross Report, which this map came from, had to do with Otto Lang. But of course the Ross Report is the report done for the Grains Group which was established by Otto Lang. And it's in the long tradition of the Task Force on Agriculture, the LIFT Program and the Grains Group Report on transportation. He should know the connection and the people of this province should know the connection. When he receives this map, what does he do? He studies it and he comes up with what amounts to a defence of this proposal. He says, "Look, the town in which I live was a town which was abandoned some years ago." His major point is that it really hasn't harmed us at all. I am not surprised that he should say that because one of the

sub-studies of the Ross Report for the Grains Group did a study of that very line. And they said the same thing he did, that is that the towns along that line hadn't been harmed any too much. Now if you know which line that is and how far it was between that line and the presently existing lines you can see why. Some of those farmers might have to haul three or four miles farther. Some of them might not have to haul farther at all.

But I say whether the Member for Moosomin intended it or not, he is suggesting to the people of this province, he is suggesting to the people in Ottawa, go right ahead with this rail line abandonment. That's his suggestion. And if the people of this province are confused as to the attitude of the Members opposite, I suggest that they should look to this year's agriculture critic. I don't know what last year's agriculture critic would say, I don't know what next year's agriculture critic would say. But I know the Member for Moosomin has led the people of this province to think that he is suggesting that rail line abandonment is all right.

Well, I have done a little study on what rail line abandonment would do to people in my constituency. And I want to tell you the prospects are not good if this goes ahead. The Grains Group proposal which suggests that lines should be abandoned right up that line running all the way from Dilke up through Simpson, up through Watrous and so on, now this would result in a financial disaster for the people of this area. It would cost the farmers in the one Rural Municipality of Big Arm over \$1 million in lost land values. In fact, as some of these farmers would have to haul from 30 to 40 miles, it would decrease the value of their land. The loss of assessment has been calculated in that one RM of Big Arm to be over \$213,000. And at a very conservative estimate of the kind of land values that reflects, the loss would be over \$1 million in that one rural municipality. Not only that but the citizens of that RM would have to pay an extra \$16,000 in taxes every year due to the loss of elevator and railway assessment. Not only are they forced to carry an extra burden of costs, but they have these extra taxes laid on their back at the same time. In addition they would have to share in building a new heavy duty grid road system. And then they would have to buy either new larger trucks or pay for haulage at increased rates. They would have to pay those increased rates because when the rail line is taken out the element of competition between rail and trucking is removed and the trucking rates could go up very easily and very quickly. In other words the local farmers would bear the share of the saving that was to be made by the CPR. I don't think that farmers of my district owe the CPR anything. But I think the CPR owes the people of this province a great deal.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Faris: — It was many years ago that they were given some \$25 million and some 25 million acres of choice land to build this railroad. And out of those gifts the CPR has built a financial empire. I want to suggest that if the CPR now wants to give up the service, the rail service that they have promised, it should also at the same time give up that financial empire.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Faris: — Mr. Speaker, there is much more I would like to say in regard to this matter. I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 3

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Thorson that **Bill No. 3 — An Act to amend The Industrial Development Act** be now read a second time.

Mr. Grant (Regina Whitmore Park): — Mr. Speaker, the other day when I was speaking on this Bill I made mention of the fact that the Board of SEDCO had served a very useful purpose in its role as a money lender in this province. And under The Industrial Development Act one of its other roles was that of making grants to manufacturing industries. I can't just recall to what extent that role was filled but in any event in 1970 there was a further Bill passed known as The Industry Incentives Act, which extended the assistance to manufacturing industries to smaller centres of under 35,000. The amount was tied in with the number of jobs created and there is a forgiveness feature in that Act. Since then the reference in that Act to manufacturing has been removed and last year we had The Industry and Commerce Development Act passed. Under this particular Act there is a very wide definition of business. And almost any kind of business would qualify for a grant. Also in this particular Act, there is provision for the making of loans and this would be administered by the Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation and then there is provision for grants. But it seems that the only grants that are provided for are those related to tourist promotion and the likes of that.

There are restrictions under the regulations of this particular Act that the services under the Act shall not be authorized to a business enterprise relocating within Saskatchewan unless the enterprise is expanding and can demonstrate that it cannot expand or continue to operate successfully in its present location. Also the services of the Act shall not be authorized to a business enterprise where adequate facilities or services already exist in the market area or where the services may result in a deleterious economic effect upon competing Saskatchewan enterprises. I might say that with the passage of the amendment proposed to The Industrial Development Act, the only provision for grants will be under The Industry and Commerce Development Act. And the reservations just cited, I think, calls for the collaboration with a group such as the Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation. I am not sure of the makeup of the corporation now but in past years it has been composed of businessmen, successful businessmen, and their advice in my opinion is most important. The amendment proposed, I don't think, can be opposed by the Opposition because all other authority under this particular Act has been removed and it really is a tidying up amendment. Nevertheless it removes any reference in any act to using the Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation in any respect except for the making of loans.

I can visualize a situation where the Minister would decide

to make a grant to the business and ultimately the business might become involved with the Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation through an application for a loan. It seems to me that there is some considerable advantage involving SEDCO in screening and assessing these grants so that a determination can be made as to whether a grant is in order or whether a loan would probably be more appropriate. The complete authority is left in the hands of the Minister to make these grants, and I for one, am suspicious of the judgment of all Ministers when not using the services of advisory groups such as SEDCO and particularly if civil servants are advising the Minister on the pros and cons of accepting or rejecting a grant.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the Minister would give some consideration — I am sorry he is not here today — give some consideration to incorporating some device into The Industry and Commerce Development Act so that the services of SEDCO can be used in the determination of making grants. As I said the particular amendment is merely a tidying up one and there is no point in us opposing it because it is not going to develop my contention any further. So with those reservations we will be supporting the amendment.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

Bill No. 19

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Messer that **Bill No. 19 — An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Crop Insurance Act** be now read a second time.

Mr. Weatherald (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, I only want to reiterate two observations that we made the other afternoon when this second reading was before us. One was the manner in which the Government unceremoniously served notice on several crop insurance agents in the province and we felt that their work for the Crop Insurance Board deserved somewhat better treatment. The other point that I wish to reiterate that was made the other afternoon was simply, Mr. Speaker, that we feel that the type of plan that we are going into now will obviously be much more expensive than had been the previous plan and we exhibit some concern about the move toward full time salesmen working for the Government rather than the old traditional role of having various people around the province that live right in the community serving various farmers with crop insurance. Mr. Speaker, we do not wish to hold this matter before the House to any great length.

We did have one other person that would have made a few comments but considering the fact that the Minister is here this afternoon, I think we are willing for him to go ahead and make his concluding remarks, unless there is someone else. I am only speaking for our side.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Mostoway (Hanley): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a few remarks concerning the crop insurance program. Now I am particularly concerned about wildlife damage, particularly the damage caused by migratory fowl. Now I realize that farmers can get this sort of insurance through SGIO or this Crop Insurance Board, and I also realize that there is Federal Government participation to a certain extent here. But it is just my suggestion, and I know that it's echoed by many of my constituents in Hanley

constituency, that quite possibly anything to do with crop depredation, the whole gamut of that area, come under the influence of the Crop Insurance Board and that eventually certain adjustments are made so that they can have all the coverage that they want and not limited coverage such as the case is now.

The reason that I say that is that the Crop Insurance Agency which is now looking after that or part of that, can handle it better. They have the facilities, they've got the administrative personnel and they've also got the field men as opposed to insurance agents who, for the most part, live in communities small and large. It has the field men who are a lot closer to the farmers, they are very often farmers themselves, they can visit, they know one another. I think for that reason it can be a better program.

Also, I think if things of that nature could be handled through one agent it would avoid a farmer having to go to the field man for some insurance, going to the SGIO agent for another type of insurance. I think it would be handier for the farmer. And, of course, under the Department of Agriculture where they could co-ordinate things, it would be better.

For that, Mr. Speaker, I should like to urge the Minister and Government to ask the Federal Government for more financial participation particularly insofar as migratory wild fowl are concerned because it is a federal responsibility. And in the past it seems to me a lot of farmers have really been taken to the cleaners on this account.

I'd also like to mention that I think it might be a good idea for this Government, particularly the Department, the Crop Insurance Board, or Government in general, to explore the possibility of inviting Ducks Unlimited to participate to a certain extent in such a program. If you go out to the areas where they have been active you will hear some comments from farmers and the comments seem to say that they should be participating one way or another insofar as damage is concerned.

I heartily agree to the motion and support it.

Hon. Mr. Messer (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, in closing debate on the amendments to The Saskatchewan Crop Insurance Act, I should just like to make some brief response to some of the statements, or probably more accurately, some of the accusations that were made by some of the Members opposite in regard to the Government's decision to change the operation of the Crop Insurance system as it was operating in Saskatchewan.

As they well know, crop insurance in the past was sold by agents in the province in the areas the previous government had extended crop insurance to. And, in fact, as was pointed out by Mr. Weatherald, some of those agents did a very good job of selling crop insurance. I think he noted that he knew of agents who had sold 104 contracts, another that had sold five contracts. I don't know whether that was done in one year or whether that was the total contracts that he had sold as an agent under the crop insurance program. But I can assure him that I can give him many agents and probably three and four times as many as he can come up with who have sold literally no contracts or one or two or three or four or a half a dozen. They were in no way

attempting to canvass farmers or bring to the attention of the farmers the benefits of the Saskatchewan Crop Insurance Program. In most instances all of those agents were taking on another side line to a business they had already established in a community, hoping that it would bring them in some more income. I don't criticize them for that but even though the Crop Insurance Board continued to impress upon them that there was need to get out and advertise and promote crop insurance, in many instances it was never done and fortunately it was never done at the expense of the farmer because he didn't really realize what the benefits of crop insurance really were.

Now we have undertaken some tremendous programs of change in the Crop Insurance Program. The Members opposite are aware of them and I think in most instances they agree with them, the fact that it is extended to all areas of the province now. The fact that it covers nearly all crops in the province with the exception of some limited specialty crops and we will be including those in the next few years. The fact that the coverage has been increased, the fact that we now include quality as well as quantity; the fact that we also have included spot loss for hail this year. This means that we have a program that we think is of benefit to every farmer in the Province of Saskatchewan and we think that there should be people, representatives of that Crop Insurance Program discussing this with farmers out on their farms, in their kitchens, over their kitchen tables, rather than having farmers come to an agent in some centralized centre in Saskatchewan. The only way that we are able to do that is by appointing field men to carry out those duties and those tasks.

Other provinces have tried it. Manitoba, I think, is a significant example. The United States crop insurance program has used the field man system and has used it most successfully. We, recognizing that there are merits in doing this and also recognizing that it has been attempted by other people, have decided to convert a large area that is now serviced by crop insurance to a field man system.

Agents were not fired in wholesale manner by the Government. We simply told the agents what our intentions were in order to provide a better and more improved method of moving crop insurance to farmers and that if they wished to participate they could apply for a field man position and if they were the kind of agents that the Member from Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) had referred to, who had been aggressive and had sold crop insurance and believed in it, they would then be accepted in the field man position. If, on the other hand, they were the kind of agents that hadn't sold any policies or only sold three or four a year and, in fact, had not shown any evidence of being aggressive about the selling policies of crop insurance, it would be highly probable that they would not be appointed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member from Hanley (Mr. Mostoway) has brought to our attention the possibility of including wild life under the present crop insurance program. To a limited extent we are doing that now. We have had some discussion with the Federal Government with regard to co-ordinating the programs that the Federal Government is involved in, programs that the Department of Natural Resources used to be involved in, in regard to crop loss through water fowl and the like of that. I think we are not all that far away from also integrating into the crop insurance program coverage in those areas. All in all I think we have made some tremendous progress in improving the crop

insurance program and I think that in the next year or two we shall see the majority of the farmers in Saskatchewan participating in the program and I think receiving direct benefits from it.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 30 — An Act to amend The Watershed Associations Act.

Hon. Mr. Messer (Minister of Agriculture) moved second reading of **Bill No. 30 — An Act to amend The Watershed Associations Act.**

Hon. Mr. Messer: — Mr. Speaker, in speaking to Bill No. 30 an Act to amend The Watershed Associations Act, I believe that it is necessary to quickly review the concept of this legislation and to focus on the deficiency which gives rise to the need for this amendment.

The Watershed Associations Act provides a legal basis for co-operation of two or more agencies with mutual interests in the conservation and use of the water resource of a single watershed. The objective of the legislation is to permit agencies to co-operate in the conservation, maintenance and development of water resource to the benefit of the agencies and the people that those agencies represent. Three watershed associations have been formed under the Act. These associations are known as, 1. Jackfish Lake Watershed Association; 2. Moose Jaw Creek Watershed Association; 3. Nut Lake Watershed Association.

While the term "agency" is defined rather broadly in the Act, in actual practice agencies have included corporate bodies with taxing authority such as cities, towns, villages rural municipalities and other functional organizations such as irrigation districts and conservation and development area authorities. The agencies constituting a watershed association appoint members to the board of directors of the association. The board of directors is in turn charged with the responsibility of levying an annual charge against the member agencies to raise funds for projects and programs to be carried out by the watershed association. The Act provides that upon application of a board of a watershed association and with approval of the agency concerned, the Minister may recommend to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council that the membership of the association be altered in accordance with the application by the addition or withdrawal of the agency as the case may be.

The principle of the legislation is good but it does not provide for the possibility of an agency wishing to become a member of a watershed association and having a legitimate right to become a member of a watershed association to appeal a decision of the board of the association if the applicant is to become a member or withdraw as a member whichever the case may be. In other words, there is now no provision for an appeal procedure. And this is a significant deficiency in the existing legislation.

Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 30 to amend The Watershed Associations Act provides the required appeal procedures. Under this amendment an agency which has been refused permission to join or withdraw from an association may appeal to the Minister and on recommendation of the Minister to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-

Council. The Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may uphold the decision of the watershed association board or may, in fact, instruct the board to admit or permit the withdrawal of the agency concerned as the case may be. An appeal procedure is considered essential to take into account changing local circumstances in local government and community organization in a watershed and also to take into account changing patterns and needs in regard to the use and conservation of the water resource of a watershed. It is entirely reasonable to expect that new agencies may be formed in a watershed which is controlled by a watershed association and these new agencies may wish membership in the association and representation on the board. Certain circumstances could exist where the existing membership of the board for a variety of reasons may not be entirely justified in refusing either admittance to or withdrawal from membership in the association. Under these circumstances in the interest of fair and just local administration of the water in a watershed it's absolutely essential to provide for an appeal procedure.

Mr. Speaker, for these reasons I have given, I recommend that the Bill before the Legislature be approved and second reading by given.

Mr. Weatherald (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, this Bill is rather complicated and I believe I am going to need a little time to study the Minister's remarks.

One or two points that I would bring up at this time are that it does appear that certain powers are being given to the Minister. While I want to consider it in some length, I would at this time simply comment that it does appear that powers being given to the Minister to have a group go into the watershed association against their will and this could also well involve a certain amount of financial contribution or financial involvement on their part which may or may not be to their liking at that particular time. It is because of this possibility, and I outline it as a possibility, because I haven't really studied his remarks this afternoon because I believe this is a fairly complex matter. Because of that, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

Bill No. 32 — An Act for the Prevention and Suppression of Disease among Bees

Hon. Mr. Messer (Minister of Agriculture) moved second reading of **Bill No. 32 – An Act for the Prevention and Suppression of Disease among Bees.**

Hon. Mr. Messer: — Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 32 now before us repeals the old Apiaries Act. The new Act represents a more logical structure of the provisions retained from the former legislation and includes additional provisions to take into account new technology in the apiary industry and the need for increased attention to the production of a uniformly high quality product which will meet with the approval of the consumer. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that care must be taken not to over look the increasing role to be played by the honey production industry in Saskatchewan and in its economy today.

Saskatchewan has approximately 1,200 registered bee keepers who in 1972 produced approximately 8.5 million pounds of honey valued at about \$2.5 million. Due to the increasing demand for

honey on the world market, the price of honey has risen from 20 cents per pound in 1971 to 30 cents per pound in 1972. It is anticipated that 40,000 additional pounds of honey will be needed over the next 12-month period.

For the past two years we have been effectively selling honey on the world market. Japan has been one of our major customers. The market for honey in Japan has expanded rapidly during the past two years and it would appear that this increasing demand will continue for some time in the future. Saskatchewan produces an extremely high quality of honey and is in the position to capture a large share of the increasing markets if quality and quantity of production can be maintained. All of the honey produced last year in Saskatchewan I am told has now been sold.

At the present time Saskatchewan is experiencing an expansion in the beekeeping industry. The increase in rapeseed and forage crop production which is taking place provides the industry with excellent honey production conditions. The abundance of these crops has brought an influx of beekeepers from other parts of Canada and even the United States. However, adequate legislation is necessary to protect both new segments of the industry from the spread of disease which can materially reduce production efficiency. New techniques and new management practices which affect the control of disease place emphasis on the importance and urgency of new disease control provisions in this legislation. The increased mobility of beekeepers with the province and into the province from other regions of Canada and the United States emphasized the importance of more substantial measures to ensure that bee diseases are not imported into the province and that they are not spread from one apiary to another within the province. Certain bee diseases spread rapidly throughout a region if uncontrolled and can in fact bring economic disaster to producers who are involved in that area.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to note that the new Act also provides minimum standards of sanitation in premises where honey is extracted, handled, packed or stored for sale and the like. Up to this time, no regulations existed requiring minimum standards of sanitation in premises where honey was being processed for direct sale to consumers. Regulations made under The Vegetable and Honey Sales Act apply under circumstances where honey is being sold through commercial channels. However these regulations under The Vegetable and Honey Sales Act do not apply in instances where producers are selling direct to the consumer.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is therefore necessary to provide for the enforcement of minimum standards of sanitation in the beekeeping industry to protect the consumer from the sale of inferior products. The legislation being introduced at this time will provide for the enforcement of such minimum standards. The content of this legislation, Mr. Speaker, has been thoroughly discussed with the Saskatchewan Beekeepers Association and the members of this Association are wholeheartedly in support of the provisions of this Act. Saskatchewan beekeepers are clearly of the opinion that these measures are necessary for the protection of themselves and for the protection of their industry. They understand the relevancy of these measures to the expansion of both the domestic and export markets for honey.

I feel obliged, Mr. Speaker, to add a few comments to illustrate that further development of the Saskatchewan honey industry is consistent with our department's objective of intensification for Saskatchewan agriculture. Of great importance to the farmers of this province and to our rural communities is the fact that the production of honey utilizes very little of our land resources but adds very significantly to the overall returns per acre. Honey production is the icing on the cake in many parts of the province and as I have mentioned, it contributes significantly to the economic well-being of large numbers of producers, a significant number of urban centres and the rural community in general. I, therefore suggest, Mr. Speaker, that while the honey production is not a major segment of our agricultural industry, it is nevertheless a very significant contributor to the livelihood of many Saskatchewan residents. Mr. Speaker, this new Apiaries Act is worthy of the unanimous support of the Members of this Legislature.

Having said these brief few words, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of this Bill.

Mr. Gardner (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, I might say at the outset I tried to get the Hon. Member for Moose Jaw, Mr. MacDonald to handle this Bill because it deals with diseases and he is the health critic and it deals with bees and he is a veterinarian. He felt that it was of such complexity that I should look after it myself.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gardner: — We know that many of the people in Saskatchewan are interested in Bill 32 because a lot of them have been stung by the NDP. Not only that they are a foul brood.

We have examined this Bill and we agree that a new Act is needed and overdue and we have no objection to the provisions of this Bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Robbins (Saskatoon Nutana Centre): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a few comments with respect to the Bill and recommend support from the Opposition, obviously it is a honey of a Bill.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

Bill No. 24 — An Act to amend The Radiation Health and Safety Act

Hon. Mr. Snyder (Minister of Labour) moved second reading of **Bill No. 24 — An Act to amend The Radiation Health and Safety Act.**

Hon. Mr. Snyder: — Mr. Speaker, as part of the move which involved the integration into the Department of Labour of the Occupational Health Branch, formerly in the Department of Public Health, responsibility for The Radiation Health and Safety Act was transferred to the Department of Labour last year. When this statute was first introduced as The Radiological Health Act, it attracted relatively little attention and seemed to be regarded as a piece of legislation directed towards the needs of the future.

Within the context of the provisions of the Act, however, the future in the form of a technologically oriented society has assuredly arrived. The significance of The Radiation Health and Safety Act today can be measured in terms of a marked increase in the number of potential radiation hazards in the light of the multiplicity of uses of radiation equipment that have been developed over the last number of years. Somewhat paradoxically, however, this fact has tended to cause public alertness to the dangers of radiation to become less sharp as exposure to radio-active materials and situations become more and more commonplace. I suppose, Mr. Speaker, that this is just another reflection of the age old adage that familiarity breeds contempt. In any event this kind of reaction points out the obligation of government to take action designed to ensure that legislative mechanisms operative in the field of radiation health and safety afford a maximum possible to persons who work in occupations involving contact with radiation and to the public at large also.

The purpose of this Statute is to extend a measure of health protection to persons exposed to radiation. It also makes provision for the safety of persons in connection with the operation and the use of electrical and mechanical components of radiation producing equipment and associated apparatus. The Act stipulates that all radiation equipment shall be manufactured, used, handled and tested in a manner which will prevent unnecessary exposure to radiation. It specifies that only qualified operators shall be in control of radiation equipment and provision is made for government consultative services with respect to radiation installations and for a radiation health and safety committee to advise the Government with respect to radiation health safety measures and codes of recommended practice. In addition, the Act deals with the minimum age at which a person may be employed in particular occupations and conditions under which pregnant women and those in the reproductive age group may be employed.

In absolute terms, Mr. Speaker, the amendments represented by Bill 24 which is before us are rather minor in their nature, but its implication, I think, is quite far-reaching with regard to the involvement of a hazard prevention program to keep pace with the emerging health and safety requirements of the latter part of the 20th Century. One result of the passage of the amendment which is before us will simply be to complete officially the transfer of responsibility for The Radiation Health and Safety Act to the Department of Labour. At the 1972 session of the Legislature, the Act was included in a list of statutes recorded in The Department of Labour Act to be administered by the Department of Labour, but the requisite amendments were not made in The Radiation Health and Safety Act itself in order that that change might be accomplished. Since the Act deals partly with the health and safety of persons engaged in occupations relating to the use of radiation equipment it is properly the concern of the Occupational Health and Safety division of the Department of Labour.

A second change in the Act will have the effect of requiring hospitals to have plans of X-ray facilities approved by the Department of Labour in the same way that industrial radiological facilities are required to receive prior approval. One section of the present Act stipulates that no person shall establish or alter radiation installations used for industrial purposes without having submitted plans to the approval of the Minister. Such approval will be granted only if the installation is deemed

not to constitute a danger to the health of any person. The amendment then that is before us will remove the specific reference to industrial installations thereby making the provision universally applicable. Under the proposed amendment then architects' plans and equipment lay-out diagrams covering new installations or major alterations will henceforth be reviewed by officers of the Department of Labour for radiation health features. Suggestions for improvements can be made before construction is commenced and in this way, Mr. Speaker, costly and time consuming alterations can be avoided. In the past when plans have not been submitted in advance it has been necessary for some modifications to be ordered in hospitals following on-site radiation surveys of new installations resulting in waste of effort, waste of material and waste of money. It should be pointed out in this connection that the amendment will assist the establishment of a computerized information system being developed for radiation surveys which people in the Department tell me will then provide that base reports will be registered for approved plans of installations and radiation placement equipment. This will eliminate the need for detailed and repetitive verbal description.

The third feature of this Bill before this Assembly involves a device to make available to the Minister the necessary advisory expertise indicated by the enlarged responsibility which is implied by the Act. The legislation presently assigns to the Minister the power to appoint a radiation health and safety committee whose function it is to provide expert advice on all matters falling within the review of the Act. The committee's membership currently consists of: two diagnostic radiologists nominated by the College of Physicians and Surgeons; a therapeutic radiologist nominated by the College of Physicians and Surgeons; a medical practitioner specializing in pathology or internal medicine, nominated by the College of Physicians and Surgeons; a physicist experienced in radiation physics and two officials of the Department of Labour. It is now proposed that the Act be altered slightly to reduce the number of diagnostic radiologists on the committee from two to one, as was originally the case. At the same time the amendment empowers the Minister to appoint additional members who could contribute expert advice on such areas as non-ionizing radiation which would include, laser beam microwaves and the like, as well as the practical handling of radiation equipment. This measure which has been agreed to by the Radiation Health and Safety Committee itself would allow for the introduction of other fields of expertise on the committee and would preserve a better balance between the College of Physicians and Surgeons, membership and others while avoiding the committee becoming overly large and unwieldy.

Mr. Speaker, the result of this amendment can be termed I believe as a tightening up of the legislation which will facilitate the more efficient administration of the provisions aimed at safeguarding the public welfare. Moreover it is hoped that it will be instrumental in the development of new solutions to the problems presented in the escalating use of radiation equipment. Needless to say, the application of these legislative tools can only be truly effective with the recognition by all of our citizens that the promotion of safety and health must be taken seriously.

Accordingly, I would earnestly solicit the wholehearted co-operation of Saskatchewan people in the fight to come to

grips with the multiplying health and safety risks inherent in the modern technological setting. I move second reading of this Bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald (Moose Jaw North): — Mr. Speaker, may I first say that we on this side of the House agree totally with the principle of The Radiation and Health and Safety Act.

I think we have demonstrated this fact over the years by amending, enlarging and strengthening this Act. It was a Liberal Government that brought the administration of the Act under the Occupational Health Branch.

It has been only in recent times that we have become aware of the real dangers inherent in the use of radiological equipment and radioactive substances. The public's awareness is shared by members of the various health professions and by other professionals involved with the use of radiation. Committees of these professions have long been involved with studying the problem and have made recommendations regarding the safety of the public. I would add that through my profession I am intimately involved with radiation in a practical sense. I assure you that I am very aware of the effects of abusing radiation equipment. Therefore, I repeat that I am totally in agreement with the principle involved in The Radiation and Health Safety Act.

However, a proposed change in this Act as outlined in Bill 24 disturbs me. There is now the Radiation Health Safety Committee, this Committee must now consist of five experts and two departmental people. These five experts must truly be experts and criteria for judging their expertise is stated clearly in Section 10, as the Minister has read. As a matter of fact, the physicians must not only be duly qualified as specialists, but they must then be recommended as qualified by the College of Physicians and Surgeons. These provisions for establishing the Health and Safety Committee assure us that such a Committee is truly qualified to carry out its duties as outlined in this Act.

Amendments presented in Bill No. 24 reduce the number of experts in the Committee from five to four. However, the amendment will give the Minister of Labour the right to add one or more members to the Committee. The problem is that there are absolutely no criteria included in this proposed amendment as to what the qualifications of these ministerial appointments should be. It simply states that the appointments must be persons. There is also no limit to the number of people who may be appointed.

Explanatory notes state, and the Minister just said that this amendment allows the Minister to appoint other experts, so that other fields of expertise can be on this Committee. I think that if the Minister feels that other fields of expertise should be included in the Committee, then he should provide us with legislation that would provide for his appointing of certain specified experts.

This legislation should be specific. If it is not specific then I suggest that the criteria for choosing the other five

experts should be deleted. It seems to be bit of a farce to have specified qualifications for five members on the Committee and then open up membership on the Committee to anyone the Minister decides should be on it, or might enjoy an appointment to the government Committee.

It should be remembered that among other detailed duties and privileges that this Committee now have, they also have the duty of dealing with any matters relating to radiation health as the Minister may decide. This Committee does have power and the responsibility. As I stated I am very aware of the problem and I respect the responsibility that is entrusted in the Radiation Health and Safety Committee.

For this reason I am not prepared to see expertise diluted as could be the case at the whim of the Minister. The Minister of Labour has assured us that his amendment will allow for the appointment of experts in other fields. However, assurances are really not good enough.

First of all the Minister is not necessarily qualified to judge the expertise of professionals. 2. The Minister has not made it clear that the so-called experts are even to be in the field of radiation health. 3. I think, we in the Opposition, can be forgiven for not relying on ministerial assurances when they introduce bills.

The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) gave us assurances last year when he introduced The Natural Products Marketing Act and that Minister did not live up to his word. Therefore, in the future and properly so, I think that we should be assured only with what is written into the legislation, that we will ask the Government to write their intentions into the Bill.

As written, Bill No. 24 could lead to abuse by political appointment by the Minister. In fact, the five specified experts on the Committee could find themselves outnumbered by political appointments. I don't believe this to be the purpose of the amendment, but I think that specific legislation is much better than legislation that simply gives the Minister the power to act as he sees fit.

It is possible that the people whom the Minister wants to add to the Committee are lay people. I don't feel that lay people should be representatives on this Committee. The Minister has the opportunity to appoint lay people to the Occupational Health Council. If the Minister wants lay people to investigate Radiation Health and Safety he can instruct the Occupational Health Council to look into this matter and to deal with it. This Council affords lay people the opportunity to become involved with radiation health and safety.

There is some argument, of course, in favor of placing all industrial safety provisions and programs under one department. Of course, this has been done under the umbrella of the Occupational Health Act. This very Act has the power to enquire into radiation health and safety. If the Minister so desires he can make the old Radiation Health and Safety Act, a rather redundant exercise by simply handling over responsibility to the Occupational Health Council.

However, I should rather think that radiation health and safety is a special case and it is a little different and

broader in implication than other industrial health and safety problems.

I think that last year when we dealt with The Department of Labour Act, we included this Act under the Department of Labour. I think, possibly we should have second thoughts about this. I think the rationale for placing the Act under the Department of Labour is a little less obvious.

The understanding of the effects of radiation and the hazards of radiation are of a special kind. This matter should not be lumped in with all other kinds of industrial hazards. The problem of radiation deserves special attention and, therefore, I think we might consider that The Radiation Health and Safety Act should be left with the Department of Health.

Mr. Speaker, as the Bill stands I will oppose it, but in opposing it I want to make it clear that I do agree with broadening the representation on the Committee. I hope that the Minister will consider this when we are in Third Reading and possibly bring in some amendments to be a little more specific. If there are specific criteria laid down in this Bill, for the new positions, then I will support it. I suggest that if specific criteria are not established for all members of the Committee then the existing criteria in the Bill would become a farce.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I will be opposing the Bill.

Hon. Mr. Snyder: — Mr. Speaker, just a few brief comments in closing debate on this particular Bill. I can't help but think that the Member for Moose Jaw North is tilting at windmills a bit when he suggests — if I am quoting him properly — “Political appointments to this particular Committee.”

First of all I don't see the Committee as being one which will have attached to it any amount of remuneration of great significance. And, secondly, I don't see it as a prestige appointment in any way. What I see is the gathering about the Department of some people with some real expertise in a variety of fields and the adjustment that was made to the Committee was done with that idea in mind, and with that idea only. I think it unfair for the Member to suggest that there are some ulterior motives in the establishing of a committee and reducing, for instance, the number of diagnostic radiologists from two to one.

Frankly, the only reason and the simple reason for this reduction, of one diagnostic radiologist was because the Committee felt that with two diagnostic radiologists on the Committee one was duplicating services of the other. It was thought to be beneficial to the functioning of the Committee to have a broader base and to provide the opportunity to bring more expertise to the Committee than was presently available as it was constituted in the past.

For the Member to suggest that we should lay down in the Act some specific criteria related to the future appointments, I think is really an unfair suggestion in light of the fact that it is unreasonable to expect that we will know of all our future requirements. He has intimated in his own remarks that times and circumstances cause the manner in which we operate, to change significantly from time to time. The only reason that

can be applied in this particular instance for leaving it rather open-ended is to provide for that kind of running room in order that when new circumstances arise that may require some expertise in a certain field, there will be an opportunity for those kinds of appointments to be made.

With those few remarks and with the assurance that there is no ulterior motive in leaving it open-ended to that degree, Mr. Speaker, I would encourage all Members to support the Bill.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

Bill No. 26 – An Act to amend The Fire Departments Platoons Act

Hon. Mr. Snyder (Minister of Labour) moved second reading of **Bill No. 26 – An Act to amend The Fire Departments Platoons Act**.

Hon. Mr. Snyder: — Mr. Speaker, the Bill before this Assembly represents an amendment to The Fire Departments Platoons Act, the responsibility for which was transferred to the Department of Labour from the Department of Municipal Affairs on January 7, 1972.

The reason for the transfer centres on the fact that the Act in question deals in large measure with the collective bargaining procedures and working conditions which are applicable to Saskatchewan's firefighters. It therefore more logically falls within the jurisdiction of the Department of Labour where it can be integrated in departmental activities associated with the Trade Union and The Labour Standards Act.

It is an important statute, Mr. Speaker, in that it applies to a group of working people who are engaged in the provision of a very vital service to the Saskatchewan community. The presence of a well-trained and properly equipped firefighting force continues to be essential to the welfare of communities everywhere.

The existence of The Fire Departments Platoons Act is an acknowledgment of the need for special legislation, both to ensure appropriate working conditions for members of the fire department and also to afford the public an acceptable level of fire protection services.

The Act regulates the hours of work, the weekly rest periods and the final collective bargaining procedures of full time firefighters in every city in Saskatchewan of 10,000 population or over. The Act has not been amended for some years, Mr. Speaker, and it has become outdated, unrealistic and inappropriate when measured against the changes in equipment and conditions produced by modern technology.

A number of complaints about the weakness in the legislation have been received by the Government from individuals and from individual fire departments. In addition, the Saskatchewan Firefighters Association has made representation on a number of occasions to have certain key clauses of the Act changed.

Before drawing up this amendment, Mr. Speaker, the Department of Labour arranged for special consultation with the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities, the cities of Regina and Saskatoon and as well, the Firefighters Association.

Mr. Speaker, the Government has made very effort to make certain that the amendment will meet the needs of the groups who

are governed by the legislation that are affected by it.

One clause of the amendment which is before us removes all reference to the three platoon system. This measure, which has the unanimous agreement of the Saskatchewan Firefighters Association, the Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association, is intended to bring the Act up to date with current practices. All of the city fire departments in Saskatchewan, in common with those across the country, have established their operations on the basis of the two platoon system.

The latter system is said to be preferable in terms of the encouragement of greater efficiency in firefighting operations, inasmuch as it facilitates a more cohesive and integrated fire department. This is because the existence of only two platoons allows firefighters to work and to train together to a much greater extent. The increased morale, the development of more effective training methods, the reduction of absenteeism and the improvement of fire protection facilities at reduced costs, have all been attributed to the introduction of the two platoon method.

Accordingly, the amendment will have the effect of establishing the two platoon arrangement as a universal standard throughout the province. It will also legalize the situation under which fire departments have changed from the three platoon system to a two platoon system by the collective bargaining agreement without referral to the electorate as was technically required by existing legislation.

Another proposed change in the Bill involves the hours of work of the members of the city firefighting forces. The present Act strictly limits the hours within a 24-hour period and leaves no room for negotiation. The amendment would introduce some flexibility with regard to daily hours, while at the same time protecting the firefighters by specifying the maximum length of a shift and the maximum average work week.

Under the amendment one platoon shall be on day duty for a maximum of 10 consecutive hours in each 24-hour period and the other shall be on duty for night work for a maximum of 14 consecutive hours in each 24 hours, with the weekly maximum not to exceed an average of 42 hours per week.

In this connection, I might point out, there is a general acceptance of the fact that the shift system presently in use makes it impractical to establish the 40-hour week for firemen and they are accordingly exempt from the Labour Standards provision and have been for some time.

The third major feature of Bill No. 26 is the addition of a new clause to come to grips with the kind of situation under which firefighters are assigned additional duties which are not directly associated with the suppression of fires. One of the most significant clauses of The Fire Departments Act is one which provides for arbitration proceedings to settle collective bargaining disputes between a city and its fire department.

Under the terms of the Act, however, this provision was applicable to full time firefighters assigned exclusively to fire protection duties. The members of one fire department in Saskatchewan, namely, Yorkton, were denied the right to arbitration under the Act because under the terms of collective

bargaining agreement they had accepted additional duties which were unrelated to their primary firefighting function.

The amendment will restore the protection of the arbitration clause of the legislation to all cities and their fire departments, specifying that the relevant section will apply to departments which have heretofore been assigned additional duties. This is only fair, Mr. Speaker, when one considers that the firefighters have voluntarily given up their right to strike in their local union constitution in return for the right for having access to this kind of binding arbitration to resolve their disputes.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that the only attempted solution to deal with the problem that the amendment has put before us, which was conceived by the previous administration, was the imposition of Bill No. 2 which was used to head off the threat of work stoppages by firefighters.

Mr. Speaker, we don't need a Bill 2 and this amendment really demonstrates the availability of effective alternatives with the application of a little common sense. It is our belief that the amended Act will represent a streamlined piece of legislation, which will serve to preserve the legitimate bargaining and arbitration and, which at the same time, will make adequate and appropriate provision for the protection and safety from the ravages of fire.

I would move second reading of this Bill, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Carlson (Yorkton): — Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I enter this debate in support of the amendment to The Fire Departments Platoon Act.

The reason that I am particularly interested is that this legislation is largely as a result of the situation that presently exists in the city of Yorkton and more specifically of the assignment of extra duties to firefighters, which has in the past, denied them the right to arbitration.

At the present time the firefighters in Yorkton are not covered by the Act simply because they have agreed to take on some extra responsibilities other than firefighting. These extra duties are mutually agreed to prior to the time that the city reached a population of 10,000 people and, therefore, the Act did not apply at that time.

The firefighters do not complain about performing these extra duties such as repairing parking meters or water meters, collecting money from the parking meters and selling bicycle licenses.

They do, however, object to the fact that they are not governed by the arbitration section, which only applies to firefighters whose duties are exclusively concerned with fire protection and fire prevention.

I should like to make a few comments about the assignment of extra duties for firefighters.

First of all, a firefighter's primary responsibility must

be fire protection and fire prevention. The taxpayers of our cities are paying for fire protection and they deserve the best possible. If other duties are included they must not interfere with the fire departments' ability to provide good fire protection for our citizens.

If extra duties are to be assigned to firefighters, that would require them to be far removed from the fire hall, for long periods of time, then we may as well revert to the old system of a volunteer fire brigade. The men would not be ready and prepared to get to a fire in a hurry. And I just want to say that in most cases the first 10 or 15 minutes are crucial. If there are people trapped in a burning building, it is most important to get there before they are overcome by smoke inhalation, or before the fire has progressed to the point where it is a high risk or impossible for the firefighters to get in to save people involved.

The second reason why it is imperative to have men and equipment on the scene as soon as possible, is that it is quite often possible to confine a fire and extinguish it, if caught in time. Far too often by the time the men are at the fire it has progressed to a stage where the firefighters must direct all their energies and attention towards protecting adjoining buildings.

The suggestion has been made, Mr. Speaker, that firefighters could double as law enforcement officers. Let me start off by saying I am totally opposed to this suggestion. The old saying, "If you give them an inch, they will take a mile," I am sure would hold true if this were started. Before long, we would see a totally integrated force of firemen and police officers. I am sure that the problems that would arise are obvious. If somebody wanted to rob a bank they could first start a major fire in the opposite end of town to draw the attention of the integrated force, then proceed with their job, with highly increased chances of success.

The point I am making is that we must have full time firefighters available at all times. Other duties assigned to firemen must not interfere with their duties as firefighters.

This legislation will allow those departments which are not doing other duties to continue but still be included under the Act. This is the intention of adding subsection 16 to Section 10, but at the same time it doesn't open up for the assignment of other duties for other fire departments.

Mr. Speaker, I think this Bill is a good indication that the Minister of Labour and indeed this Government is responsive to the needs of minority groups in Saskatchewan. I will indeed support this legislation.

Mr. MacDonald (Moose Jaw North): — Mr. Speaker, I want to tell the Minister I am going to support this Bill. I realize that the two platoon system is in use by all the fire departments in Saskatchewan, in Saskatchewan cities over 10,000 population. The system is well accepted and quite effective. Provisions in this Bill therefore are to update the legislation in light of today's common practice.

I do find some inconsistency from the Minister of Labour in

his explanatory notes in dealing with Section 4. He states that the amendment provides some flexibility while protecting firefighters by specifying maximum shifts and providing that the maximum average hours per week can't exceed 42. The shift system presently in use makes it impractical to reduce the hours per week to 40. I agree it is impractical. But those of us on the Business Committee, I think the Member from Gravelbourg (Mr. Gross), will tell you this, have been told by people in every town and city that we have visited, that the 40-hour week is not always practical. When the Minister of Labour (Mr. Snyder) implemented the rigid 40-hour week last year, he was told of a good many cases where the 40-hour week would not only be impractical but would prove to be a real hardship. Now the Minister says that the 40-hour week is impractical. So he won't enforce it on the fire departments. Well I agree but I would suggest that the Minister take a look at a number of other instances where he has imposed the rigid 40-hour week requirements and that they are proving very impractical also.

Why should fire department workers be treated differently than many other workers. Why should the employer in the case of the municipal government be treated differently than many other employers. This attitude of the Minister is rather contradictory. I would suggest that any business establishment that operates seven days a week, 24 hours a day, or any agency that provides seven day, 24 hour a day service, finds that 40 hours a week are impractical and a hardship. Other services such as city transit also would find it very convenient to work 42 hour weeks. I just hope that this sentence in the explanatory notes represents a change of attitude of the Minister from the rigid stance that we have seen over the last couple of years.

I do have some reservations, Mr. Minister, about including management personnel in the bargaining unit. It is my understanding that the chief and the deputy chief will be eligible for membership in the bargaining unit. This would seem to be a little contradictory to the accepted practice, by having management people in an employee association or an employees' union. This provision can receive some further study when we deal with it in the Committee of the Whole. At this time I would support the Bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Snyder: — Just a word or two. I rather think, Mr. Speaker, that the Member for Moose Jaw North (Mr. MacDonald) was out of order when he was referring to the application of the 40-hour week in various communities about the province. I really don't believe it can be closely associated with the Bill that is before us. But I should like to comment very briefly in reply to his suggestion in the event that it requires a reply.

I would point out to him initially, Mr. Speaker, and to the House, that the Department of Labour has been flexible in the application of the 40-hour week and has issued a number of ministerial permits which have provided for the averaging of hours under special circumstances. I think the Member knows that we have provided ministerial permits on a number of occasions to a number of business establishments which provide for the averaging of the hours of work over a 4-week period amounting to not in excess of 160 hours. Another set of permits provide for the averaging of 80 hours over two weeks or 120 hours over

a three-week period. In addition it will be known that because of the particular and critical nature of the work and/or the service provided by the implement dealers throughout the province we have provided for an averaging of hours in order that the total number of weeks worked multiplied by 40 shall be averaged throughout the year and in this way, I believe that the rural community and the business community generally have adapted to new conditions and new circumstances with a minimum of problems.

I am somewhat at a loss to know what the Member draws attention to when he is talking in terms of enlarging the collective bargaining unit by including managerial people. I am sure that is not the intent of the Act. I should be pleased to discuss it with him after. I believe that was a reference that was made when he spoke on second reading. If there is some controversy or misunderstanding in that connection I should be pleased to discuss it with him.

I think it is a good Bill. It is one that has been in the wings for some time. It is one that has caused concern to urban municipalities in particular and the Firefighters' Association and we think that the legislation goes a long way to clearing up difficulties that have been inherent in the Act for some years. I would ask all Members to support it.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

Bill No. 25 — An Act to amend The Fire Prevention Act

Hon. Mr. Snyder (Minister of Labour) moved second reading of **Bill No. 25 — An Act to amend The Fire Prevention Act**.

Hon. Mr. Snyder: — In general terms, Mr. Speaker, this Bill can be described as a housekeeping amendment but at the same time it must be recognized that it will form a significant part of an important piece of legislation, The Fire Prevention Act.

This legislation is designed to promote safety as it relates to human life and property. It also regulates the storage and the handling of flammable liquids and governs the approval, the sale, installation and maintenance of oil burners, oil burning equipment and appliances using inflammable liquids as fuel. The programs administered under the Act by the Fire Commissioner's office of the Department of Labour include a program of fire inspection, of various classes of buildings, a program of licensing wholesalers, distributors, installers and servicers of oil burners, the preparation and education and practical programming in fire prevention and fire protection, the training of volunteer firefighters in the province, fire and arson investigation, the approval of plans and specifications of public buildings and the recording of information on fires in the province.

Let me take a moment then briefly to run over the amendment, Mr. Speaker, to provide a little of the rationale and background for the amendment.

The Fire Prevention Act specifies that certain installations and equipment must meet with the approval of specific approval agencies, such as the National Research Council, the Canadian Standards Association, the Underwriters Laboratories of Canada and so on. One minor wording change in this connection has been made necessary by reason of the fact that the organization formerly known as the Factory Mutual Fire

Insurance Companies is now known as the Factory Mutual System. The list of agencies included in the definition of and term approved in the Act will be open-ended in the proposed amendment to include any testing laboratory acceptable to the Fire Commissioner. Since this definition was first included in the Act other laboratories have been established or may be set up in the future which will have the capability of making tests which are equally suitable to those carried on by organizations specifically included in the legislation at this time.

The amendment would accordingly assign to the Fire Commissioner the power to designate approved laboratories without the need to amend The Fire Protection Act each time a new agency measured up to our standards.

Another clause of this Bill clarifies the power of the Deputy Fire Commissioner when the office of the Fire Commissioner is vacant or when the Fire Commissioner is absent. Two years ago it may be remembered that the previous Fire Commissioner passed away and his deputy was appointed as an acting Fire Commissioner. Because the Act didn't cover this kind of a situation, the authority of the acting Fire Commissioner to accept appeals and to conduct a fire commissioner's inquiry was questioned at that time.

The Act will now contain a clause similar to that in effect in other provinces which spells out that the Deputy Fire Commissioner may act in the place of the Fire Commissioner when the latter is absent from his office for any reason, such as illness, holidays, attendance at meetings and so on, or when the position of Fire Commissioner becomes vacant.

Mr. Speaker, The Fire Prevention Act presently includes a section dealing with the power of the Fire Commissioner to investigate the cause, the origin and circumstances of any fire in which property has been destroyed or damaged. Under this section in practice, general investigations are carried on and in addition in certain circumstances a Fire Commissioner's inquiry is held.

Some confusion has arisen with regard to the distinction which is to be made between an investigation and an inquiry. As a result it has been posed that one section of the Act concern itself with fire investigations and a new and separate section be added dealing with inquiries. This should eliminate ambiguities and doubt which have been raised with respect to the intent of the present section.

The procedures associated with the calling of a Fire Commissioner's inquiry are described in the Act. The right to be represented by counsel was also added to the inquiry section to protect the rights of individuals testifying at an inquiry. The Fire Commissioner will be empowered to appoint a competent person residing in any area to conduct an inquiry.

Another change incorporated in Bill No. 25 involves the type of receptacle permitted to be used for the storage and handling of up to 10 gallons of gasoline or other flammable liquid. The receptacle is presently required to be of metal construction, colored red, capable of being tightly closed by use of a screw cap. Saskatchewan, I am afraid, is one of the few existing provinces which prohibits the placing of small quantities of gasoline in approved plastic containers. The

legislative restriction to the use of metal receptacles only has prompted a number of complaints from wholesalers and retailers and the travelling public. It has now been determined that approved plastic receptacles can be just as sturdy and safe as metal containers and the amendment will accordingly allow the use of tested and approved plastic receptacles.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the amendment is intended to correct an oversight which occurred when The Fire Prevention Act was amended in 1968 to authorize fire inspectors and local assistants to issue correction orders to oil burner installers who have installed faulty heating equipment or appliances. At that time no provision was made for a penalty against the installers who failed to comply with such orders. This is rectified in the penalty section.

I think it is fair to say, Mr. Speaker, that The Fire Prevention Act will now be more consistent with new requirements of present day fire protection and investigation services. In addition some of the ambiguities preventing the effective enforcement in administration of the Act have been eliminated. I would move second reading.

Mr. MacDonald (Moose Jaw North): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to lend my support for what appears to be a very good Bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — We have a couple of questions which can certainly be dealt with in Committee of the Whole.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

Bill No. 07 – An Act to amend The Department of Labour Act, 1972

Hon. Mr. Snyder (Minister of Labour) moved second reading of **Bill No. 07 – An Act to amend The Department of Labour Act, 1972.**

Hon. Mr. Snyder: — Mr. Speaker, this Bill represents a minor amendment to correct an oversight in The Department of Labour Act. I think it will be known that in virtually all of the departmental acts, provision is made for the appointment and the payment of advisors and consultants. However there has been no legislative authority in existence in the present Department of Labour Act and the amendment which is proposed rectifies this oversight.

Additionally the proposed amendment provides for the appointment of mediators from outside of the department for payment of their services and expenses in connection with services which they provide and special duties which they perform related to industrial disputes. It will be remembered that last summer during the construction difficulties that Dr. Ken Pugh from Alberta was engaged by the Department and in addition Mr. Gib Eamer from Saskatoon was also used as a special mediator. Under those circumstances it wasn't possible to pay for their services out of the departmental budget, instead a special warrant was required. This corrects the difficulty which is involved in this connection. This is a minor housekeeping amendment which will bring into force the provision which will make more convenient the provisions of The Department of Labour Act and I would move second reading.

Mr. MacDonald (Moose Jaw North): — Mr. Speaker, I should just like to say that this amendment will allow, of course, for the hiring of people by the Department and I hope that it will provide for hiring of people who can mediate during the closed period of a collective agreement and help prevent disputes. Of course, this is going to have to be done by people who are accepted by both management and labor. These people can be of no value unless they have the complete trust of both sides in a dispute and I hope that some of the people that the Minister will hire will fall into this category.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

Bill No. 4 — An Act to amend The Marriage Act

Hon. Mr. Smishek (Minister of Health) moved second reading of **Bill No. 4 — An Act to amend The Marriage Act.**

Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Speaker, there are two amendments in this Bill, both of which are concerned with marriage licences. The Act, Mr. Speaker, presently authorizes the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council to appoint marriage licence issuers. There are approximately 30 marriage licence issuers appointed each year requiring an Order-in-Council to be made, as licence issuers are appointed or cancelled. It is believed that this is a function that could be carried out quite properly by the Department and by the Minister of Public Health without requiring the orders to be made by the Executive Council. It is, therefore, proposed that for the future the appointments be made by the Minister.

Mr. Speaker, the Act also provides each licence issuer will pay the Director of Vital Statistics \$4 for each marriage licence form he receives from the Director. He may then charge \$5 for each form he issues. The end result is that the marriage licence issuer receives only \$1 for each form that he issues and considering the fact that he has to send it in to the Department and pay 8 cents postage that leaves him a net of 92 cents. From time to time individual licence issuers have complained, and I think properly, that the remuneration they receive for issuing licences is far from adequate. It is agreed that this is the case and I intend to take appropriate action to have their remuneration increased. The proposed amendment in this regard provides for the amount payable by the issuer to the director for each form and the fee that the issuer may charge for each licence issued be fixed by regulation made by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. This kind of provision is advantageous and provides more flexibility than the existing provision which is in the statute. At present there is a \$5 limit on fees. By enacting this amendment as the costs go up it will not be necessary to amend the Act. Changes in fees can be made by regulation.

Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of this Bill.

Mr. Lane (Lumsden): — Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Opposition I can't see any reason whatsoever why I am speaking on this, being the only single Member over here and secondly, we certainly cannot oppose the Bill.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:28 o'clock p.m.