

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Third Session — Fourteenth Legislature
31st Day

Friday, April 6, 1962.

The Assembly met at 2:30 o'clock.

On the Orders of the Day:

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mrs. Mary J. Batten (Humboldt): — Before the orders of the day, Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to welcome on behalf of the legislature and introduce to you my constituents from the best constituency in the province of Saskatchewan, the beautiful young ladies sitting right over the clock and the handsome gentlemen sitting on the right. They are the winners of oratory contests held in my constituency and I want to read their names and I also want to give you the topics they chose because we have been accused, on this side of the house, of being monotonous and drib and I want to show that my constituents aren't even though I may be. We have with us Leona Jonas from Muenster, Norma Sproule from Leroy, Lois Schidlosky from Carmel, Marlene Shoep from Watson, Bruce Thompson from Naicam and Clifford Haggerty from Humboldt. Their topics were as varied as this; fallout shelters; photography; the problem of East and West Berlin; beatniks; literature and music. Now that shows you how really wonderful the constituency of Humboldt is where we have culture and intellectual ability. I hope that we in the legislature can set a good example here today, and show these students that the province isn't lagging too far behind.

Mr. L.P. Coderre (Gravelbourg): — Before the orders of the day are proceeded with, what I have to say might be debatable with the hon. member for Humboldt (Mrs. Batten) (the wonderful constituency of Humboldt) but I have from the constituency of Gravelbourg in the gallery, seventeen students from Grade XI and XII from Glen Bain School. They are accompanied here by Mr. and Mrs. Heimers. Mr. Heimers

April 6, 1962

is the principal. As well with the group is a young fellow who has attended the Tuxis Parliament here in this legislature. I am sure the proceedings of the day and their visit to the city will be most interesting for them. On behalf of the legislature I would like to thank them for being here with us today.

Mrs. J.E. Cooper (Regina City): — Mr. Speaker, from the wonderful constituency of Regina we have some Grade VII students from St. Patrick's School sitting up in the gallery and we are very pleased also to have them with us today. We hope they will enjoy the sitting of the House.

QUESTION: SALES TAX

Mr. F.E. Foley (Turtleford): — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are proceeded with I would like to direct a question to the Provincial Treasurer. In view of the great number of representations that have been made to him in recent weeks, I would like to ask what steps he has taken to alleviate the problems facing border merchants as a result of the increased provincial sales tax?

Hon. A.E. Blakeney (Provincial Treasurer): — Mr. Speaker, any action which the government is proposing to take with respect to this matter will be announced in due course.

MOTION: HOUSE SITTINGS

Premier Lloyd: — (moved:)

(1) That notwithstanding Standing Order 2, this Assembly shall, commencing Tuesday, April 10, 1962, meet at 10:00 o'clock a.m. and there shall be an intermission from 12:30 o'clock p.m. until 2:30 o'clock p.m.;

(2) That on Wednesday, April 11, 1962, and on each Wednesday until the end of the Session, Standing Order 5 (2) be suspended so that the sitting of the Assembly may be continued at 7:30 o'clock p.m.; and

(3) That notwithstanding Standing Order 2, on Saturday, April 14, 1962, and on each Saturday until the end of the Session, the Assembly shall meet at 10:00 o'clock a.m. until 10:00 o'clock p.m. with a two hour intermission at 12:30 o'clock p.m. and 5:30 o'clock p.m., the Order of Business on a Saturday to be the same as on a Friday.

He said:

The motion which I am to move has appeared on the order paper and I think all members are reasonably familiar with it and I would hope in agreement with it so it doesn't need any lengthy discussion. It simply provides for the setting aside of certain standing orders of the Assembly in order that we may be free to meet beginning on Tuesday of next week at 10 o'clock in the morning, as well as at our usual hour, and if we so wish it on Wednesday evening and on Saturday of next week. We can of course govern the hours of meeting as we move through the week if we wish to make any changes. Consequently, Mr. Speaker, I would move, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Blakeney the motion which appears on the order paper under my name.

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 32 — An Act to provide for the Celebration of the Sixtieth Anniversary of the Establishment of the Province of Saskatchewan and the Centennial of Confederation in Canada

Hon. Russell Brown (Minister of Industry and Information): — Mr. Speaker, Bill. No. 32 has been brought in to provide a vehicle for the setting up of a committee to plan and carry out a program with respect to the celebration of the sixtieth anniversary of the province of Saskatchewan and the Centennial of Confederation in Canada.

Much could be said on second reading of this bill with respect to the many things which may be done during a period of this kind but in order to save the time of the House I will simply point out that this bill is almost identical to the bill which was brought in back in 1952 to provide for the setting up of a committee to deal with the celebration of our fiftieth anniversary.

April 6, 1962

I am sure that there will be very little reason for exception to any provisions of the bill. Any questions I think could be better dealt with in committee of the whole. I would therefore move second reading of Bill No. 32.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

Bill No. 44 — An Act respecting an Area to be known as Wascana Centre

Hon. A.E. Blakeney (Provincial Treasurer): — Mr. Speaker, this bill is to provide for an area to be known as Wascana Centre in the city of Regina. Many members will know something of the proposed Wascana Centre project. It is a project which has been developed jointly between the government of Saskatchewan, the university and the city. Because it has been a joint project there has been a considerable amount of public discussion with respect to it — public discussion emanating from the deliberations of the city fathers of Regina, from the deliberations of the University of Saskatchewan board of governors and to some extent from the deliberations carried on by the cabinet of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, this project grew and evolved because of the requirements of each of the three participating parties, requirements which each party was pursuing independently. Each of the three parties, the government, the city and the university, was for different reasons pursuing a program of development in the same general area. In the case of the government it was a case of attempting to plan for the future development of these legislative building grounds. As the activities of government expand, not only here but everywhere, it is necessary from time to time to provide additional accommodation for government staff. This will mean, over the next number of decades, that additional buildings will probably be constructed on these legislative building grounds.

We were conscious, Mr. Speaker, that the character of the legislative building grounds here in Regina is somewhat unique. We have here legislative buildings in a park setting. I think these buildings and the park surrounding them have been a source of great pride throughout the whole province. The government felt that

they would like to plan so that over the next number of decades, this building and these grounds would not, by future buildings, lose this unique quality. The desire was that expansion in this area would be carried on in a manner which would be consistent with the character which has been built up for this legislative area. Therefore, it seemed to us that it would be advisable at this time, while there was still vacant land adjacent to the legislative building grounds, for the government to project its plans over the next many decades and to acquire ground which might be necessary for such expansion. So the government had in mind the possibility of getting some more ground for the legislative building area to provide for future expansion and to maintain and protect the unique character which these grounds have acquired since the founding of the province.

The city of Regina had its plans for development in this area. Regina, like most Saskatchewan cities is thriving; it is growing rapidly and it had in its future plans some projects for providing additional recreation facilities for its citizens. Members will know that immediately opposite, on the north side of the lake and opposite these buildings, there is Wascana Park, a city park largely for the citizens of Regina. The city had embarked on a further program of park development towards the eastern part of the area which is to be known as Wascana Centre — the city had embarked on building a park in what is known as Douglas Park area, immediately north of the existing experimental farm grounds. So the city of Regina had planned for development of some lands north of the creek in the Wascana Centre area.

The university has been, for some years, looking at the possibility of expanding its educational facilities in Regina. Since 1934 or thereabouts, when Regina College became affiliated with the University of Saskatchewan, the university has maintained an institution of higher education in this city. Because the University of Saskatchewan, like other universities, is facing very sharply increased enrolments over the next couple of decades, the university a couple of years ago turned its mind to what future development should take place in Regina. The board and the senate of the university decided that they should provide for a degree granting institution in Regina sometime in the mid-1960's. They then engaged some consultants to advise them as to whether their present campus, commonly known as Regina College campus, would be an adequate site for future development of the institution of the size they had in mind.

April 6, 1962

After a good deal of study they reached the conclusion that this site, the Regina College site, was not adequate and that they would have to seek a new site. A number of possible sites were considered, again in consultation with consultants engaged by the university and finally the decision was made by the university authorities that they ought to move their site to the present experimental farm property. So the university by this series of steps decided that they would take major development steps and that they would take them in this general area on each side of Wascana Lake and Wascana Creek.

So we have a confluence of three development plans, independently started by each of the participating parties. Once the university's decision was made that they were going to build their new campus on the site of the present experimental farm, the idea was conceived that this whole area, now to be known as Wascana Centre, bounding Wascana Lake and Wascana Creek on the south and on the north and bounded on the east by No. 1 highway bypass and on the west by Albert Street, — that this whole area ought to be developed as a unified centre for government, for education, for recreation and for development of the cultural arts. I may mention in reference to the development of the cultural arts that Regina College campus has always played a particularly important part in the fine arts program of the University of Saskatchewan. The art gallery here and the conservatory of music here have been a major part of the university's program in these areas. Accordingly the university had tentatively reached the conclusion that if they moved their university campus to the site of the experimental farm they would utilize the old campus, known as Regina College, as a centre for this area of their activities, — for cultural and fine art activities. So we have in the area then, governmental development, educational development, — the new university, — and recreation development being pursued by the city, and the development of cultural and fine arts programs previously pursued by the university and which they would continue to do on their old campus. As I said, the idea was conceived of developing this centre as a unified centre for these activities.

Now most of the development would have proceeded in any case. I think you can realize, Mr. Speaker, from the outline that I have given, that the government, the city, and the university were preparing to expand their facilities in any case and the idea to combine them, therefore, seems a natural one. Nonetheless, Mr. Speaker,

I think it is a rather exciting one. I think we can look forward in Saskatchewan to developing a centre here which will be a source of pride, not only for the citizens of Regina but all the citizens of Saskatchewan; just as this legislative building and these grounds have been a source of pride for all our citizens. I think we are very conscious of this when day after day we meet and greet here in the legislature, groups of students who have come to Regina, and among other things, have toured the legislative buildings. Almost without exception when they are questioned, they say they are most impressed by the legislative buildings and by the grounds. This is particularly true if they have good fortune to come here in the summer.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think it might be of some interest to the House if I gave members some review of the negotiations which have gone on during the past year between the three participating parties. I don't want to bore the House with an over-long description but I think it might be helpful if further questions are to be asked.

The project evolved, as I have indicated, by reason of the decision of the university to locate its new campus on the site of the experimental farm. This immediately involved the government because the experimental farm property is owned by the government of Saskatchewan, quite apart from the fact that the government of Saskatchewan has always acknowledged a responsibility for providing the land and building facilities required by the university. Early in 1961 the government and the university agreed that they would develop the south side of the creek in some unified manner, and they agreed that they would engage a planner to prepare a plan covering the area on the south side. They also thought they might well ask the planner to look at the north side of the lake, and to regard the area as a whole. The government and the university agreed that they would form a policy committee who would guide the work of this planner and a committee of officials who would assist in the recruiting of a planner and giving him day to day directions. It very early became apparent to both the government and the university that any development along these lines would involve the city of Regina, and involve them fairly quickly. Accordingly it was agreed that a representative of the city of Regina, a representative of the city council, would be asked to sit on the policy committee, and a representative of the city technical staff would be asked to sit on the committee of officials. The policy committee which came to be known as the "A"

April 6, 1962

committee consisted of Dr. Spinks, Dr. Auld, Mr. Justice Culliton, and Mr. McEwan (vice president) representing the university; and Messrs. Lloyd, Blakeney, Davies, and Williams, representing the government; and His Worship the Mayor, representing the city.

The committee of officials, the "B" committee as it came to be known, consisted of Messrs. McEwen, Professor Wedgwood and Mr. A.W. Johnston, for the university, Professor Lougheed, Mr. Langford and Mr. McCallum for the government, and Mr. Preston, the city planner, for the city.

The "B" committee was charged with the responsibility of finding a planner who could undertake this project on behalf of the participating parties. Meanwhile in May of 1961 the project was submitted to the board of governors of the university, for agreement in principle and this was agreed to. The government considered the matter and agreed to it in principle and agreed to go ahead with the engaging of a planner.

The "B" committee set out to find a planner and in July of 1961 they recommended to the "A" committee, the policy committee, that Mr. Minoru Yamasaki of the Detroit area be engaged. Mr. Yamasaki came to Regina, met with the "A" and "B" committees and it was decided to proceed with the planning stages of the project. At this point the government appointed a Mr. Allan Gillmore as special assistant to the Minister of Education to be in charge of the detailed arrangements with respect to this project. Mr. Yamasaki in turn engaged the services of Mr. Thomas D. Church a landscape architect, and they proceeded forthwith to prepare a plan. In September, Messrs. Yamasaki and Church returned to Regina and outlined for the "A" and "B" committees their idea of the Wascana Centre project. It began gradually to take shape. In October again Mr. Yamasaki came to Regina and presented to the university a number of alternative development plans for the campus area. I may say the pressure was on to develop a plan for the university because the university had certain development deadlines which they feel they must meet. Ultimately the university board of governors and university officials selected one of the several plans suggested. The university's choice was considered by the "A" and "B" committee and approved. At this time a number of conferences were held with officials of the waterfowl park to see whether this area could be preserved as a park. It now appeared, Mr. Speaker, that there was some firm basis for believing that

this project would proceed, and accordingly we turned our mind to building some more permanent structure than the ad hoc committees which had operated up to that point.

During November and December some drafts of legislation were worked upon to see whether we could evolve an authority which might be able to guide the development in this area in a manner which would provide for the flexibility which will certainly be necessary but at the same time preserve the elements of the plan which the participating parties would approve. So that in December the "B" and "A" committees were reorganized, more in line really with the draft legislation as we then envisioned it. The city of Regina was formally asked to name three representatives, and they did so; His Worship the Mayor, Alderman Peart and MacPherson; the university named three representatives, Dr. Spinks, Dr. Riddell, and vice president McEwen; and the government named five members, Messrs. Lloyd, Turnbull, Erb, Williams and Blakeney.

The "B" committee was reorganized and the city commissioner Mr. Smith, joined the city planner, Mr. Preston. The university named vice president McEwen and Professor Wedgwood, and the government Messrs. Langford, A.W. Johnston, and Brownstone.

Then a rapid series of negotiations ensued between the city council and the government, the board of governors of the university, and as I have said, each group was rather thoroughly conversant with what was in mind, so that there were relatively few difficulties.

On January 10th the government received from the city clerk a confirmation of their appointments to the "A" and "B" committees, and on a similar date a letter from Dr. Spinks on behalf of the university. We prepared a statement of the principles which were to be included in the legislation and these were sent out on January 11th, and discussed by the various authorities. Meanwhile, later in January Mr. Yamasaki again came to Regina presented to the university board of governors, the entire city council, a number of university and city officials, and members of cabinet and government officials, their more complete plans for the area. On February 9th we had what amounted to a formal meeting of the "A" committee representing the university, the city and the government, at which time the principles of the draft legislation and the draft budgets were considered in detail and were approved.

April 6, 1962

Following this, draft legislation, refined draft legislation along these lines, was prepared, and early in March, a draft copy of the act was sent to all members of city council, to all members of the “A” and “B” committees, to all members of the university board of governors, and to some other officials. The city council considered the draft, approved it in principle, and specifically approved the financial sections, and the university considered the draft and approved it in its entirety. Later in March Mr. Gillmore met with the city council to discuss small details with respect to the proposed legislation, and the city’s suggestions were considered and a House amendment with respect to one of them will be forthcoming.

From the foregoing, Mr. Speaker, I think it will be seen that there has been the closest co-operation and co-ordination between all the parties, over a period of many months. It is not possible, I think, to draw any act which is perfect, and I am confident that this act will disclose many difficulties and shortcomings in the years to come, but I think it is a sound act — sound in principle — it has been arrived at on a basis of consultation and negotiation between the three participating parties, and I believe it represents the widest possible unanimity of view on the appropriate structure and duties of the Wascana Centre Authority which it establishes. We have, in the course of drafting this legislation, not been able to find any real precedent for this. We were unable to find an instance where authorities of the nature of a provincial government, a city and a university have combined on a project. No doubt it has been done, but perhaps it hasn’t been covered by legislation of the type we are thinking of. A number of our provisions we have drawn from the national park legislation, or alternatively regard was had to the national capital legislation which operates in Ottawa between the federal government and the city of Ottawa. We have combed a number of these acts and have come up with what we think is an appropriate framework. I think, therefore, Mr. Speaker, I should take a little time to outline in some little detail what is in the act. It is not a simple act, I don’t think it is particularly involved, but it does have a good number of sections, and I think it might be helpful to the House if I took a few moments to say in general terms what the act provides for.

The act constitutes a corporate body which is called the Wascana Centre Authority, and it will consist of eleven representatives, five from the government, three

from the university, and three from the city. It envisages that a detailed plan of development for the Wascana Centre area, which is described in the act, and which I have just described to you, will be approved by the authority. The basis for the plan is the Yamasaki model which I think all of you will have seen. The model contains somebody's ideas of how this area might develop over the next, in some cases, one hundred years, and there are many parts of the model which are very much optional. However, the basic developmental plan described in the model, inherent in the model, is, I think known by the parties, and has been agreed to — the areas which will be government, the areas which will be university, the areas which will be park area, those which will be relatively active recreation and those which will be relatively passive recreation, those which will be carefully landscaped and those which will be landscaped only in a wilder or more general way.

The act envisages that land within this centre will for the foreseeable future be owned by four separate owners, by the government, by the university, by the city, and by the authority itself, and it recognizes that some of the land within the area is presently privately owned, and probably will continue to be so for some period of time.

Broadly the scheme of the act is that each of the participating parties will own its own land, and the buildings on this land, and each party will control the rate of building development, of capital development, on its own land. However, when one of the parties wants to build a building the design and style of the building will be approved by the authority. The interior design of the building will be completely within the control of the agency, (the government, or the university, or the city as the case may be), but the exterior design style will be approved by the authority according to the previously agreed upon plan. It is understood that either party, or any one of the three parties, may submit proposals for elaborating or changing the plan, and the act explains the procedure for doing this.

The act envisages that the authority will develop the basic landscaping in the area, and will maintain the landscaping in the area, so that the authority therefore will take on two forms. It will be a checking authority which will be designed to act as a guardian of the principles which are to be enshrined in the agreed upon development plan, and it will also be an operating authority, and as an operating authority it will carry on basic landscaping, that is horticulture and tree culture, silviculture, lawns, and the rest. It will not

April 6, 1962

be in the business of building or constructing buildings, except those that it may require for its own purposes. It will not be in the business of providing basic services such as roads or lighting but it will be in the business of proceeding with the initial landscaping and with maintaining the landscaping both on its own land and on lands owned by other parties.

Mr. Speaker, a problem clearly arose when attempting to define the power which the authority should have. It was agreed that the authority should have powers sufficient to provide some reasonable hope that the development plan might be followed in the future. The thought was that the authority ought to have sufficient power to keep the plan from being deviated from, except where the three participating parties felt that this was a good idea. Now members may know that in the early days of this province, when these buildings were built, an elaborate developmental plan was evolved, the so-called Mawson Plan, but because there was no procedure whereby this plan would be, in fact, a development plan, the plan throughout the years has been discarded. The need for some more positive approach has I think been widely felt. It was put this way in a Leader-Post editorial, May 16, 1961, "something of this nature," (in speaking of the creation of an authority) "is imperative to assure that the new plan does not suffer a fate similar to that which befell the Mawson Plan."

Mr. Speaker, there were problems with respect to what activities the authority should control in the Wascana Centre area. The authority has power to make by-laws with respect to traffic, boating, and commercial operations; powers which the city, the government and the university exercise within their own area.

There is certainly no idea that the authority would get into the business of regulating all the commercial activities within the centre area. There are cafeterias in these buildings, and it is not envisaged that the authority will get into the business of cafeterias or into the business of regulating cafeterias. There will be cafeterias and bookshops on the university grounds, and it is not envisaged that the authority would get into the business of regulating these. There may well be concessions on the grounds of the city, on the lands owned by the city, and it is unlikely that the authority would get into the business of regulating those. But on the lands owned by the authority and as may be agreed by participating parties, there will be some regulation of these activities by the three parties, acting through the authority.

Then there is power in the act to alter the area of Wascana Centre. I mention this because the act gives powers with respect to what happens within the centre area and clearly the power to expand the borders of the centre is a power which has inherent in it some particular problems. Accordingly it was decided that this should be done only with the express consent of each of the city, the university and the government.

Now the question of how to deal with private lands within the centre presented some difficulties. It was envisaged that these lands would have to be acquired for the purposes of carrying out the program which the three parties had agreed upon, so power to expropriate land within the centre is contained in the act, and a procedure akin to that contained in The Highways Act is provided for.

It was recognized that private lands might continue to be privately held for some time. It was recognized also that if extensive improvements were put on these lands, it would be to the detriment of everyone, since if the authority was going to acquire them within the next few years, the improvement would be largely wasted. However, it was recognized that the authority simply couldn't sit there and sterilize the private lands which were within the bounds of the authority. So it was provided that if a private individual wished to make improvements, he should seek permission from the authority, and if he got permission then these improvements would be taken into account when ultimately his land is acquired, and if he didn't get this consent, then the authority either had to buy him out or expropriate him out in one year. They couldn't just sit there and freeze him out by saying, "no development". The private owner has the right to either develop, — build a house if he wishes, and to do this he seeks the permission of the authority. If the authority gives him permission, then when the time comes to acquire his land the authority has to pay him for the house, and the incremental value of any, or less depreciation if any, as the case may be, and if they won't give him permission to build the house, then the authority either has to buy him out or expropriate him out within one year. This is the scheme for dealing with that problem.

The act contains some fairly elaborate financial provisions. It provides that the authority may borrow money up to \$3 million. It provides for a basic minimum budget, and the minimum budget is really on ten thirds of the amount of the yield from one mill of taxation in the city of Regina. Now that is a pretty

April 6, 1962

elaborate sort of formula, but basically it provides that the city of Regina will never be required to pay more than the yield from one mill of taxation, unless the city wishes so to do. The common costs of the authority are to be paid for as follows: 55 per cent by the government, 30 per cent by the city, and 15 per cent by the university. Accordingly if the city is to be committed to a limit of one mill, the total budget is limited to ten thirds of one mill, and this is the minimum budget. It was thought that more funds would probably be necessary to develop this area, but because, under the circumstances no government, certainly no city government, likes to commit itself for large sums of money in advance, the maximum commitment of the city of Regina was built into the act in this way. And by building it in for the city of Regina, it is built in for the other authorities as well. Thus the maximum commitment that the university will face in the future will be one one-half of the yield of one mill the city of Regina taxation, and the government will be just under twice the yield from one mill.

Now it is realized that there may well be special projects which the three participating parties will want to proceed with, and the act provides that these may be proceeded with by agreement between the parties and on such terms as they may agree.

The authority will have this revenue and it will also have some other revenues which it will obtain by reason of selling its services for landscaping. It is proposed that the authority would proceed with, actually carry on, the landscaping in the area, and it will do so on a fee for service basis from the three participating parties.

The initial budget which I have referred to, being ten thirds of the yield from one mill of the city of Regina taxation, will be used for basic landscaping, for servicing capital borrowing, — repayments, sinking funds, or debenture repayments, and interest, — and for paying the administrative overhead of the set up.

Mr. Speaker, the act contains a number of other very detailed provisions that I think the House will want to look at when the bill moves to the committee of the whole. I think I do not need to say anything more of what is contained in the bill. I just want to say a word or two about the project itself. I won't labour this point because my colleague, the Minister of Public Works, who will be intimately associated with this project, will have something to say to the House on this.

I just wanted to say in closing, Mr. Speaker, that it seems to me that we in Saskatchewan owe a good deal to the people who planned this building and these grounds. In going across Canada as I am sure many of us have, I am sure we have all felt (when looking at legislative buildings in other areas), a sense of pride when we thought of what our buildings were like, the grounds surrounding them, the very fine way they have been developed. I think we have the finest legislative building area in Canada. I don't think this is because we have the best site, I don't think anyone can claim that, there are many with finer sites. I don't think it is necessarily because we have architecturally the finest building, although we have a very fine building, but there are other fine buildings, Manitoba has one, Alberta has one, and there are others, depending on your taste in architecture. But we here have combined a very fine building architecturally with a very pleasing setting, which has made everything of the natural site. This is due to the foresight of the people who have gone before us. The Scott government showed amazing foresight in its work on these grounds, in building this building. Anyone who has seen some of the plans of the building that might have been built here, must commend the people for choosing this particular plan, and think of what a near miss we may have had if some of those other plans had been adopted. The Scott government showed amazing foresight in planning this building and having it erected, and then planning the grounds. Others have contributed, the Anderson government, — Mr. Bryant, the Minister of Public Works under that government, — made a very substantial contribution to the beauty which is this area. I think, Mr. Speaker, we owe a good deal to these people who have gone before us, and we, I think, can repay part of the debt we owe to these people by carrying on their good work in Wascana Centre. We can repay these men and hand down to our children a legislative-university-park area which will continue to be the envy of all Canada.

It is accordingly, Mr. Speaker, with a great deal of pleasure that I move second reading of this bill.

Mr. W. Ross Thatcher (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I am only going to take a few moments to state very briefly the position of the opposition on this bill. I think after the speech which the Provincial Treasurer delivered, such a procedure is about all that is necessary. I say at once that I rise with pleasure to support the principle of this legislation.

April 6, 1962

I recall about twelve or fourteen years ago being in Ottawa in the House of Commons, when a very similar bill was brought before Parliament. At that time a national planning commission was set up to plan the future development of Ottawa. I can recall at the time I was most unenthusiastic about the bill, because I thought there were lots of places in Canada where money could be spent more effectively, than in the national capital where only a small number of people proportionately might see the results. But, Mr. Speaker, I saw that legislation over the years take a capital which was dingy, dirty, filled with narrow streets, unplanned, and build it into what I think is one of the nicer capitals that I have seen throughout the world. There have been new parks, there have been new roadways, there have been new recreational facilities built and so on. At Ottawa we have seen planning on a city basis, and I would agree that such planning is desirable.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I presume this bill which today sets up the Wascana Centre Authority, will try to do the same thing in Regina. As has been pointed out by the minister there is vacant land which is still available at a reasonable price. I think it makes sense for this legislature to plan ahead, ten or twenty or thirty years. We can purchase the land now and then we will develop the improvements as the resources of the province will permit. Therefore I say again that I do favour this legislation. I think it makes sense for the government, the university, and the city, to get together to plan this future development. I think as the years go by, we will find that this centre will be one of the main tourist attractions that we have in Saskatchewan, and goodness knows we haven't too many of them.

Now in talking about tourist attractions, Mr. Speaker, I want to make a suggestion. You will pardon me if I say I was over in London about a year ago. I watched, as every other tourist does, the changing of the guard. I was in Ottawa not too long ago and there they have emulated the London ceremony. They have their changing of the guard. The thing that strikes you on both those occasions is the number of Americans that are watching the changing of the guard. Here we are sitting in Regina with the RCMP barracks. The Americans are more curious about Mounties than they are about most Canadian affairs. So I say when we get this centre, and when we have a big flat expanse around our buildings, let the Mounties parade or change the guard during July and August, for the benefit of the tourist.

Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — Try and get the Minister of Justice to go along with such a ceremony. I don't know of any other attraction that would get tourists up from Minot, Bismarck, and other places, in those hot summer months, the tourist months, in this beautiful new centre, as a parade of Mounties, I don't think it is necessary for me to say anything more at this time, Mr. Speaker. Members of this group will, of course, reserve the right to perhaps criticize details of the expenditures in committee. Our members may object to certain features of the bill, but I think I speak for my association and colleagues when I say we support in principle the legislation.

Hon. J. Walter Erb (Minister of Public Works): — First of all I should say, and I am sure I speak on behalf of my colleagues, how very much we appreciate the enthusiastic support of the Leader of the Opposition has lent to this bill, and to the extra activities, if I might call them that, he has suggested that we might incorporate in this development.

I too should like to make a few comments, Mr. Speaker, on this bill. The Hon. Provincial Treasurer has, I think, very adequately explained, on second reading, the purposes of the bill, the authority that will be given to the authority and all the other necessary arrangements that will have to be made in order to begin to bring Wascana Centre to fruition. It therefore requires no further elaboration on my part. But I should like to make a few comments, and the comments I will make I would like to think as being a "selling job". However, after the Leader of the Opposition has spoken I don't think I have to do much selling, because I am quite sure we are all very much sold on what I believe is a most significant and unparalleled opportunity for us to begin to bring to fruition a great vision that encompasses government, higher education, the arts, and recreation, in one great complex covering some one thousand acres of land.

Now this vision or concept, Mr. Speaker, I submit, is eminently in keeping with the tradition of the founders of our university and the government of Walter Scott which erected these fine buildings some fifty odd years ago. Today we acclaim the vision and foresight of these great pioneers. I think they were planners in the classical sense of the word. In 1909 on April 7th almost exactly 53 years ago the city of Saskatoon was chosen as the site for the new university,

April 6, 1962

and in that same year a master development plan for the campus was prepared by Andrew Russell Campbell who adopted the collegiate gothic style of Bryn Mawr and Princeton.

In 1910 Chancellor Wetmore turned the first sod on the new university campus, and on July 29, 1910, Sir Wilfred Laurier laid the cornerstone for the College of Agriculture. An Order-in-Council was passed in 1910 for \$792,291.83 for the College of Agriculture, Saskatchewan Hall, the Livestock Pavilion, the Agriculture Engineering Building, and the Powerhouse. On September 29th the first classes began in Saskatoon with 70 students. The official opening and the first convocation on the university grounds took place in 1913. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have made this short excursion into retrospect in order to show how, from a small beginning 53 years ago, but with the great vision of the pioneers of our university, it has developed into what I think, it is safe to say, one of the finest academic institutions and the loveliest campuses in North America. I believe at the moment there are some 7,000 students enrolled at the University of Saskatchewan. I am sure none of us in this House sets foot on the university campus but what it evokes in us a sense of pride and gratitude.

In a similar context therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note the development that has taken place in respect to the legislative buildings and the legislative grounds. The contract for the construction of these buildings was let in 1908, and on October 4, 1909, the cornerstone was laid by Early Grey, Governor General of Canada. The Legislative Assembly met for the first time on January 12, 1912, in this legislative building.

I might say how incongruous it must have appeared to citizens of that day to see this magnificent and majestic building rising about the bleak prairie background.

The session of 1906 settled the question of a capital location, and the new provincial government, headed by Premier Walter Scott, immediately began planning for a new structure to replace the territorial government building located on Dewdney Avenue between Athol and Montague Streets. The territorial government property, the only site owned by the provincial government was not considered because of its small size. Several other sites were investigated by the city of Regina. J.A. Calder, the Provincial Treasurer, conducted the negotiations which led to the choice of the site opposite Wascana Park on the south side of the reservoir,

amounting to some 168 acres. With this fine site in its possession the government plans for the development were entrusted to a landscape architect from Montreal, named Frederick G. Todd. Todd's plan for the layout of the ground and the site of the proposed new legislative buildings were submitted in January, 1907. The Legislative Assembly buildings should face north, well back from the water, with its centre axis on the exit of Smith Street. This seems to have been the only major part of Todd's recommendation to have been followed.

The appointment of an architect for the legislative buildings was the next task. Premier Scott felt that well known architects should be interviewed and an appointment made. His colleagues urged a competition, so a compromise between the two methods of selection was arranged. Percy E. Nobbs, Professor of Architecture at McGill University, prepared the terms of a limited competition, advised on the selection of competitors and acted as the assessor or judge, aided in the judging by two well known American architects — Bertrand Goodhue of New York, and Frank Miles Day of Philadelphia. The competition was limited to seven architectural firms, five Canadian, one American and one English. Darling and Pearson of Winnipeg and Toronto, Marchand and Haskell of Montreal, E. and W.S. Maxwell of Montreal, F.N. Rattenbury of Victoria, Storey and Van Egmond of Regina, Cass Gilbert of New York, and Mitchell and Raine of London. This competition was closed on November 30, 1907. The assessors announced Edward and W.S. Maxwell as the successful competitors. In May, 1908, six bids, ranging from \$1,311,000.00 to \$1,583,625.00 were received, and the government faced up to the unpopular decision of passing over the local low bid to give the work to Peter Lyall and Sons of Montreal, on the bid of \$1,424,150.00 because their experience and equipment left no doubt as to their ability to give a building up to specifications.

Now modifications to the site layout introduced by the Maxwells, as well as the limitations discovered in Todd's landscaping plans, made it necessary to re-examine the development plans for the property. Thomas Mawson and sons of Lancaster, England, and Vancouver, were commissioned to restudy the area in 1913. Also, during the same year, Malcolm Ross was appointed to the staff of the Department of Public Works as a landscape architect. Ross, along with George Watt, long-time Government House gardener, prepared the detailed plans to implement the general features of the landscaping recommended by Mawson.

And so, Mr. Speaker, after these 50 years or more, these buildings and grounds surrounding them and beyond, have become known far and wide for their beauty and elegance.

April 6, 1962

Countless thousands of our citizens have found, and find pleasure, delight and relaxation on these grounds. Thousands of visitors from other parts of Canada and other lands have expressed amazement and delight that such man-made beauty could be created in a prairie setting.

Like the university buildings, the legislative buildings and grounds have become part of our people. I might add, as an aside, the Museum of Natural History has likewise captured their interest and imagination. I think, Mr. Speaker, nowhere else do we find citizens relating to their university and their seat of government as do the people of this province.

Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Erb: — Now speaking more directly and very briefly on the Wascana project because I don't think one needs to talk to any great length. The original concept of Wascana Centre originated, it appears, in 1960, when the University of Saskatchewan decided that it would be necessary, in the not too distant future to expand the Regina campus.

A number of alternatives were explored, and the firm of Shore and Moffat were engaged to undertake a study in this regard. The Shore and Moffat study indicated that there would not be adequate land adjacent to the Regina campus, and it was then decided that alternate sites should be explored. When the location of the federal Experimental Farm was considered as a serious possibility, a Mr. Geer, one of the junior associates of Shore and Moffat, suggested to Mr. A. Johnson, Deputy Provincial Treasurer, and several other members of the University Board of Governors, that Regina might offer unique possibilities to develop an area embodying the concepts of government, education, recreation, and cultural affairs. This idea soon caught fire, and a search was made jointly by the University Board of Governors, and the government of Saskatchewan for a competent architect-planner. In due course, Minoru Yamasaki was selected as the architect-planner and he, in turn, engaged the services of Mr. Thomas Church, landscape architect.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that we have been most fortunate in obtaining the services of Mr. Yamasaki, who is regarded as possibly one of the foremost architect-planners in the world; and Mr. Thomas Church, who is equally famous as a landscape gardener.

I like to think, that like Gilbert and Sullivan, and Rogers and Hammerstein, teams which have enriched the lives of countless millions of people by their combined geniuses of music and poetry — that these two gentlemen have combined their genius and have developed a plan which, if carried to fruition, during the decades that are left in this century, will, in Mr. Yamasaki's words make Regina one of the very great cities of North America, and indeed of the world.

Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Erb: — The scale model of Wascana Centre developed by Yamasaki and Church, on display in this building, as hon. members know, speaks infinitely more eloquently than words can describe.

I am sure that the vision embodied in the scale model of Wascana Centre has captured the imagination of all of us in this House. For it is a vision — a project which contains no barriers of political or religious creeds or color. It will become a monument I submit, to the members of this legislature who, by statute, make this undertaking possible, and to the men of the university and city council, who have co-operated with the government in a most exemplary manner in defining the responsibilities of each party in this great project, and to this generation, which makes the financial means possible.

The concept of Wascana Centre has no equivalent on the North American continent, enclosing within its boundaries, as it does, existing government buildings and functions; a complete university campus for approximately 8,000 students; a cultural nucleus of the arts, and parkland and recreation.

Mr. Speaker, in an age of materialism, and where the world seems too much with us, it is essential, in my opinion, if we are not to lose our perspective, that we create for ourselves and for those who follow us such opportunities that make for the nurturing of the higher instincts of man. Wascana Centre will be our gift and heritage to generations yet unborn, and they shall acclaim our generation for its vision, courage, foresight and concern.

There is a little poem I read many years ago and which came to my mind as I was preparing these few comments, Mr. Speaker, because when I speak of leaving something as a gift and a heritage to generations yet unborn, we are in a way doing as this old gentleman did in this poem:

April 6, 1962

“An old man going along a lone highway
Came at the evening cold and grey
To a chasm deep and wide
Through which was flowing the sullen tide,
The old man crossed in the twilight dim;
The sullen stream had no fear for him,
But he paused when safe on the other side
And built a bridge to span the tide.
“Old man,” said a fellow pilgrim near,
“You are wasting your time by toiling here,
You are safely across at the close of day
You never again will pass this way.
You have crossed the chasm deep and wide
Why build the bridge at eventide?”
The pilgrim lifted his hoary grey head
“Good friend, in the way I have come,” he said,
“There follows after me today a lad
Whose feet must pass this way.
He too must cross in the twilight dim,
Good friend I am building this bridge for him.”

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that inasmuch as we are not only providing for our own needs, but in projecting our thoughts to the needs of future generations, we are indeed building education, cultural, and all those necessary bridges that will make life indeed richer and more meaningful for those who follow us.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in supporting the second reading.

Mr. Ross A. McCarthy (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, I would just like to contribute a few words and I assure you it is not going to be long. I had the privilege of being in this province, and in this city, at the time these buildings were built, and looking back I appreciate very much, as the minister said, I was glad to pay tribute to these men who had the foresight at that time to build the kind of buildings we have here today. I have been, I think, in all the provincial buildings from Ottawa to the coast, and I am quite sure that ours are very much better than any of them in a great many different respects. People can hardly realize it now, but when these buildings were built the common gag around Regina was “Why didn’t they build them at Wilcox?” That seems ridiculous today, but when you think at that time that the better buildings in Regina were Victoria Avenue, and the only way you could get out here was either walk or a livery team, they did look to be a long, long ways away, and it was a

common gag, that they might as well have built them at Wilcox as here. When you look around now and see the city starting to encircle the buildings, it does give you reason to pay tribute to the man who had the foresight to set up buildings on this particular site, and with the surrounding grounds.

There is just one thing that has always annoyed me and I spoke about it before in this House, that is, that some of the buildings that this government put on these grounds, I don't think should ever have been here. I think it was a mistake — however, that is past and gone.

I am very much in favour of this type of thing just for that reason, that I hope the authority and I think it will, will preserve these grounds, and grounds that are being added to them, so that they won't be cluttered up with a lot of unnecessary buildings that don't belong in this particular set-up.

Mr. F.E. Foley (Turtleford): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to associate myself with my leader and other speakers who have spoken in connection with the Wascana Centre project. Interested in education as I am, and also very proud of our Saskatoon university campus, I am naturally very pleased to note the expanded university facilities that are visualized under this act. I certainly feel that one of the great strengths of our province and one of our greatest movements for the future of our young people, are widely expanded and highly developed educational facilities. I am also, of course, pleased to note other cultural and recreational plans.

However, Mr. Speaker, while I recognize that all the citizens of Saskatchewan will benefit from many of the actions predicted in this bill, coming from a rural constituency, and representing a rural constituency as I do, I think it may appear that the benefits will be more remote for many of our rural people, and while we are giving consideration this afternoon to this legislation I feel we should not lose sight of the need for wider development in our rural areas; development of our utilities, transportation facilities, the preservation of the family farm . . .

Mr. Speaker: — We are getting away from the principle of this bill, when we get too far out into the country.

April 6, 1962

Mr. Foley: — And the support of our smaller urban centres. Mr. Speaker, I think we all recognize it is only with the strong and vital rural economy that we can maintain our cities and that we can support their growth.

With those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I will support the principle of this bill.

Mrs. Gladys Strum (Saskatoon City): — I would like to just say a few words in support of this bill. Coming as I do from the beautiful university city of Saskatoon, I want it to be understood that there is no sense of competition or rancour or envy in the minds of the people from Saskatoon. We are only too pleased to support this development.

On the campus at Saskatoon we have a complex of buildings that owes its beauty to the unity expressed in material and design. The people who started off with limestone have continued with limestone, but have modified somewhat from the gothic to the modern style of architecture, but our buildings add up to what I was told by the assessor who was there last fall, and who goes all over North American, I was told by him that we not only have the finest campus in Canada, but the finest campus on the continent. This coming from a man of very wide experience meant a great deal to me.

I think we have here a marvelous opportunity to make this add up to something. The fact that we own so much of this land, the fact that we can take the mud out of the lake bottom and make a mountain, the fact that we can have winter sports, and summer athletic events, the fact that we can have outdoor theatre and library facilities and campus and residence facilities, the fact that we can start off by planting our own trees, and as we replace the trees with buildings, we will not only develop a beautiful structure but we will save a great deal of money. By having a long term plan from the very beginning, Mr. Speaker, we will make the very best of all the material available, and it is with great pleasure that I add my support to this bill.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

**Bill No. 53 — An Act to amend The South Saskatchewan River Development Commission Act,
1959**

Premier Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, coming after the bill to provide for the celebration of the centennial of Canada, and for the development of Wascana Centre, my poor little bill sounds extremely prosaic and dull, so much so that I am tempted to say it contains no change in principle, that it could all be discussed adequately in committee. Indeed I think that is what I will say and move the second reading of the bill.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

Bill No. 56 — An Act to amend The Power Corporation Act

Hon. Russell Brown (Minister of Industry and Information): — Mr. Speaker, I intend to be just as brief as the Hon. Premier in moving the second reading of this bill. The explanatory notes indicate that mainly this is a revision of section 48 of The Power Corporation Act, and the only real change is the addition of sub-clause 4 of clause A. This new sub-clause being added has been proposed to us by the Treasury Department, who take care of investment of surplus funds of the corporation, and is designed to facilitate short term investments, and they have asked us to give consideration to this, and I would therefore move second reading.

Mr. Speaker: — It has been moved by the Hon. Mr. Brown that this bill be now read a second time.

Mr. W. Ross Thatcher (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, might I ask the minister to tell the House what exactly are the changes that you are proposing. I am not quite clear on these.

Hon. Mr. Brown: — My understanding is, Mr. Speaker, that . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I must warn the House that the minister is about to close the debate, and if there are any further questions, anyone wishing to speak to it must do so now.

Mr. Thatcher: — I was just asking a question.

April 6, 1962

Mr. Speaker: — That is just considered as a question.

Mr. Thatcher: — Yes.

Hon. Mr. Brown: — Well under the terms of The Power Corporation Act you have rather wide powers with respect to long term investments, which is restricted in respect to short term investments, and we do at times have surplus funds on hand, which may be needed almost momentarily and we don't like them to lie idle, and the treasury department takes care of the investment of the funds for us, and it is they who have suggested this type of amendment, to facilitate their handling of our short term investment.

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker, the minister still has not made it clear in my mind, what is the change from the former bill?

The fact that you have in italics *The Co-operative Associations Act, 1960, The Co-operatives Marketing Associations Act, 1954*, now is this a new part of it.

Hon. Mr. Brown: — No — Mr. Speaker, the new part is . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I think you had better take note of that because these questions are getting lengthy and you can close the debate.

Hon. A.E. Blakeney (Provincial Treasurer): — Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that the only part of this that is new is sub-clause 4, on top of page 2 of the bill. Members may recall that when I was dealing with changes in The Treasury Department Act, and when the Minister of Telephones was dealing with changes in The Telephone Department Superannuation Act, a similar clause to this one was dealt with. It permits funds to be invested in deposits with a society or company in respect of which an Order of the Lieutenant-Governor approving of deposits with the society obtained under this section is in force. That is a good deal of jargon, but stated briefly it says funds may be invested in deposits with a trust company which is authorized by the Lieutenant-Governor to accept deposits, and these are simply trust company deposits. These are added to the list of permissible investments.

Mr. Thatcher: — I see.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

Bill No. 57 — An Act to amend The Local Improvement Districts Act

Hon. E.I. Wood (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 57 is An Act to amend The Local Improvement Districts Act. The amendments considered in this act would provide for the collection of telephone taxes in LID's. At the present time the rural municipalities collect telephone taxes for telephone companies, but there is no provision for this in the LID act, and this would make that provision. It also would make provision for the considering of certain employees who are working in regard to road construction in a LID, who are paid out of the funds of LID as civil servants, in regard to certain things under The Public Service Act. They are not entirely civil servants in the true sense of the word, but they could be considered as civil servants, and with this explanation I think this could be considered in committee, and I so move the second reading of this bill.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

Bill No. 58 — An Act to amend The Family Farm Credit Act, 1959

Hon. O.A. Turnbull (Minister of Education): — Mr. Speaker, this Bill No. 58 refers to amendments that are to be made to The Family Farm Credit Act, and I would like members to know there are no new principles in the amendments, but the effect of the amendments are to do two things; the first has to do with the maximum amount of appraised value that any borrower can have to qualify for loans, and this has been increased from \$25 thousand which it was to \$35 thousand. The reason for this is that part of the appraised value, parts of the appraisal would include grain in store, total assets are reckoned in the appraisal, and while over the years a farmer may have accumulated grain it won't necessarily reflect the position of the farmer, so the effect of this is that a person can now qualify for a loan if his total assets appraised are up to \$35 thousand and of course he could get a loan on less than that, and the ceiling of the loans are still appraised, that is a combination of the loans and the appraised value cannot exceed \$50 thousand so there is no change in that.

April 6, 1962

The other part refers to a section which indicates the amount of monies the provincial government pays, which is calculated on one per cent of the loans made as a means of assisting the co-op trust in meeting its administration charges, or administration overhead, and this was going to expire July, 1962, and this has been extended for one year, so it will now expire in July of 1963, and with that explanation, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:35 p.m.