

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Third Session — Sixteenth Legislature
13th Day

Thursday, March 5, 1970.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT

DURUM WHEAT PAYMENT

Hon. W.R. Thatcher (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, just before I came into the House today I had a telephone call from the Hon. Otto Lang's office. I thought Hon. Members might be interested in what he indicated. Later this day it will be announced apparently that \$7 million will be made available for a final durum payment. I don't know whether it was made . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — . . . as a result of the Hon. Member for Elrose's (Mr. Leith) motion on our order paper. We were also informed that the over-all deficit in the final participation account this year, will be \$48 million. The figure includes both wheat and barley. The loss apparently will be absorbed by the Federal Government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — The Minister's office also pointed out that this Sunday, from Winnipeg, every farmer on the Prairies will be sent a letter of explanation, as to how the acreage payment legislation will be proceeded with. I hope this letter may clear up some of the many questions that are being raised all over the Province. I give the House that only as information.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. Speaker: — I apologize to the House for having got my procedures out of turn. I should have introduced the students from the galleries before we proceeded with the Orders of the Day. However, I'll do it now.

We have situated in the galleries the following groups of students: 44 students from the St. Gerard school in Saskatoon from the constituency of Saskatoon Mayfair represented by its Member, Mr. Brockelbank, under the direction of their teachers, Mr. Brezollo and Miss Budz; 32 students from the E.B. Feeham high school from the constituency of Saskatoon Mayfair again represented by its Member, Mr. Brockelbank, under the direction of their teacher, Mr. Baumgardner; 30 students from the Palliser Heights school in Moose Jaw from the constituency of Moose Jaw North, represented by its Member, Mr. Snyder, under the direction of their teacher, Mrs. Wood; 27 students from Montmartre high school from the constituency of Qu'Appelle-Wolseley represented

by the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, Mr. McFarlane, under the direction of their teacher, Miss Lachambre; 62 students from the Mass school in the constituency of Regina South, represented by the Hon. Minister of Health, Mr. Grant, under the direction of their teacher, Miss Brown; 24 students from the Leroy high school from the constituency of Humboldt, represented by its Member, Mr. Breker, under the direction of their teacher, Mr. Schugman; 38 students from the Victoria high school from the constituency of Saskatoon Nutana Centre, represented by the Hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, Mr. Estey, under the direction of their teachers, Mrs. Shamski and Mr. Stiller.

I am sure that all Members of the Legislative Assembly would wish me to extend to each and every one of these students and to their teachers an extremely warm and cordial welcome from the Legislature of the Province of Saskatchewan and to express the very sincere wish that their stay here will be informative and enjoyable and wish each and every one of them a safe trip home.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

COMPLIMENTARY PARKING PERMITS FOR MEMBERS

Mr. H.H.P. Baker (Regina South East): — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You will notice the red complimentary metered parking permit on your desks. I might say that this is a courtesy extended by our city council, to each Member here, to be used during the Session. I would suggest it be placed somewhere in the windshield or on your sun visor, so that it can be pulled and be visible to the commissionaires or police. I would suggest you keep them. We will also honor them just in case my friend the Premier calls another Session in the fall, so they could be used for the whole of 1970. We hope that you will make use of them. Thank you.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. W. McIvor (Arm River): — Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Liberal Members here in the House I would like to thank Mayor Baker and the council. I was the culprit that first approached him on this subject. He said he would see what he could do and that's less than two weeks ago, so his prompt action is well appreciated by us Members.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. F.A. Dewhurst (Wadena): — Mr. Speaker, I wish to inform the Member for Arm River that he is rather a Johnny come late. This request was raised with the city several years ago. He did not then have a sympathetic council.

Mr. Thatcher: — . . . any Government Member to . . .

Mr. Dewhurst: — As Members we come here to bring business to the city, not take it away, and I appreciate what the city has been able to do so far. Our best wishes go to them, but we hope it will be extended in the future.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

QUESTION

ANNUAL REPORTS OF HOSPITAL AND MEDICAL CARE PLANS

Mr. W.E. Smishek (Regina North East): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I wonder whether I can ask the Minister of Health when we might expect the annual reports for the Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan and the Saskatchewan Medical Care Insurance to be tabled in the House.

Hon. B.G. Grant (Minister of Health): — Well before the deadline . . .

ADJOURNED DEBATES

BUDGET DEBATE

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Steuart (Provincial Treasurer) that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the proposed amendment thereto by Mr. Blakeney.

Mr. F. Meakes (Touchwood): — Mr. Speaker, before I resumed my seat I had complimented our new Lieutenant Governor and given the good wishes to the retiring Lieutenant Governor, I had somewhat to say about the apparent irrelevancy of the Liberal party according to the Ontario Liberal convention and I had discussed a little bit about education.

I must get on with my notes and I want to say first that in reading the Budget one of the things that I noted — and I might say noted with pleasure — was the increase in the vote for the Indian and Métis Affairs. A year ago when the Department of Indian and Métis Affairs was formed, I said that I would vote for its establishment, but I would withhold real judgment on the wisdom of doing so until later. I am still in that position. Although in principle I think I am still against it, I want to see how it will work. I'll admit it is only the first year, and I didn't hear too much about it but I am prepared to reserve judgment yet.

As I said before, I know and I don't like to be repetitious, but the Department should, I believe, and must try to establish industries either on or near reserves. The Indian people I talk to again and again express the wish to be able to remain on the reserves and still have good meaningful jobs. To me this makes sense. Most of them now have much better houses on the reserves than a few years ago. It seems logical that these houses should be used. This Government claims to be interested in promoting industry. I suggest it should be ready to subsidize some industry. I suggest it should be ready to subsidize some industry to come to a place like Punnichy or Lestock where there are five reserves in the area. I believe there is a potential work force there of five or six hundred people. Another obvious place would be Fort Qu'Appelle or Balcarres which is near the File Hills and Fort Qu'Appelle agencies.

These Indian people do not want welfare. They want good

meaningful jobs, jobs that will bring them a decent standard of living, jobs that will make them first class citizens. This to me is much more logical than to move them into the cities, find houses for them, jobs for them, and then leave them alone to find out the pitfalls of a new urban environment.

I want to remind the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) that the band council of the Standing Buffalo Reserve has a letter dated September 15, 1967, promising that the Highway 364, which runs on the north side of Echo Lake to the Sioux Bridge, would be oiled in the immediate future. This letter was signed by the then Minister of Education, Mr. Trapp. I would like to ask the Government what it means by 'immediate future'. Surely it doesn't mean two years.

The Indians are very interested in getting this done. This is the road that they travel to their town of Fort Qu'Appelle. In the summer time during the tourist season dust conditions become terrible on this road. There have been several accidents and many, many near accidents. On behalf of these Indians I ask the Government to act this spring. I think it is a real emergency.

I have mentioned the fact that I believe industry should be brought to the reserve. The Standing Buffalo Reserve has several miles of good beach on Echo Lake. There is an overcrowding of beaches in the Qu'Appelle area. The Department would have a perfect project to help the Indian band finance the setting up of a resort area, not a resort to be rented to the white man but one that the band could own and run themselves. In talking to some of these Indians they expressed great interest in this kind of a project.

Over three years ago the Department of Highways consulted the band council of that same reserve, the Standing Buffalo, about bringing the highway from Lipton through the reserve to the Sioux Bridge and then from there joining Highway No. 364 into No. 10 Highway. As I understand it the reserve agreed to it and they hoped it would be done. This would save several miles for the general public travelling on No. 35 Highway to or from Regina. Also it would allow them to avoid several miles of speed zone following the north side of Echo Lake and through the town of Fort Qu'Appelle. I suggest the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) should look at this very carefully.

I think if this Department of Indian Affairs is going to be a success it will have to have Indian people running the Department in close consultation with the Indian people on the local level, and above all, let these people make their own decisions.

Mr. Speaker, of all the reasons why I will not vote for this Budget, the first is its callous disregard for the great urgent problems facing agriculture. The Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) boasted about the over \$1 million increase in the Estimates to the Department of Agriculture. When one looks at where that increase is to be spent, it is nearly all on either irrigation or projects for the Indian and Métis people. I have no quarrel with these expenditures, although I wonder about expenditures on more irrigation, when prices of farm products are as depressed as they are.

Certainly there is nothing in this Budget for the hard-pressed grain farmer, nothing to put money into his pocket.

To make it worse we also have a Liberal Government in Ottawa. The wheat acreage reduction program brought in last week is certainly not going to put cash into his pockets. Last weekend when I was home I talked to dozens of farmers. The universal remark was, "I can't summerfallow for \$6.00 an acre." As I see it the wheat acreage reduction will be of no assistance to the small or medium farmer.

I was dumbfounded at the Provincial Treasurer's (Mr. Steuart) words in his address, "Agriculture in our province has fallen upon difficult times." Imagine, he has just found it out. Those times started in 1964 when a Liberal Government was elected in this Province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Meakes: — At the same time to have a Liberal Government in Ottawa is just too much. Liberal times are hard times.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Meakes: — You know, the last sentence of the Provincial Treasurer's (Mr. Steuart) speech before he moved his motion of supply really was a confession of the failure of his Government over the last five years and I would like to quote him:

Nothing within our power will be left undone to get Saskatchewan back on the track of prosperity and economic well-being for all our people.

That statement is an admission that this Government somewhere along the way has derailed the economy of this province.

I want to spend some time discussing the diversification program instituted by this Government last fall. I am not surprised that some 3,000 farmers have borrowed \$10 million. Most of them are in such dire circumstances that they considered anything was worth gambling on. He had little hope of getting out of debt anyway. I do suggest though that this program only burdens the farmer with more debt and no guarantee of success. Until there is a guaranteed floor price for meat, buying into livestock is a hazardous venture.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Meakes: — Certainly and the prophecies are already out that pork will decline with the population explosion of pigs that there is in Saskatchewan. When pork goes down, for the life of me I don't see how beef can stay up.

The only group of farmers who really have benefited from this program are those who had females for sale. The artificial pressure on the market shot up the price of female stock, forcing those who bought to pay exorbitant prices, and with interest rates as they are, even with subsidization the cows will be dead before they are paid for.

As I said in a previous debate, this Government does not hesitate to put a floor price on potash, but it refuses to try to stabilize agriculture with floor prices for farm products.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Meakes: — In 1964 the Premier was always saying that the only exports that the CCF had in Saskatchewan were wheat and people. Let me tell him now that the export of people has risen and the export of wheat has declined. Let us read the headline of The Leader-Post of February 26th, 1970, "Population of Saskatchewan declines by 13,000 in 1969." And then wheat exports are down. Just another sign of the bad state of the economy that the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) hopes to get on the track again.

I am glad that at long last this Government has listened to the Opposition in regard to giving more assistance to education. I certainly hope that the prophecy that school units will either be able to hold the tax line or reduce mill rates is right. The trouble is this should have been done years ago. In the last five years property taxes have risen year after year.

Mr. Speaker, I have used these figures I will now quote before in this House but they are relevant still and I am going to quote them again. I use an example of the rural Municipality of Garry No. 245. From 1961 until 1964 the municipal rate was 35 mills. In the area where the municipality of Melville North School Unit is situated the mill rate was 32 mills in the rural and 37 mills in the urban. Yorkton School Unit was 31 mills in the rural and 35 in the urban. By 1968 the municipal rate had risen from 35 mills to 42 mills, an increase of 7 mills. Melville North School Unit had risen from 32 mills in the rural to 45 mills, an increase of 13 mills added to the 7 mills of the municipality, an increase of 20 mills. Melville North Unit had risen 32 mills in the rural to 45 mills, an increase of 13 mills and 37 mills in the urban to 47 mills, an increase of 10 mills. Yorkton Unit had risen from 31 mills in the rural to 45 mills, an increase of 14 mills and from 34 mills in the urban to 49 mills, an increase of 15 mills. This is what the taxpayers had to pay more, 22 mills on their property. With increases in property taxes like this it is no wonder that I say it is about time something was done.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Meakes: — In fact it is too late already. Some farmers have been pushed off the farm by the tax policies of this Government. It is like locking the barn after the horse is stolen.

Agriculture is sick in this province. Unless something is done immediately there will be a mass exodus from the farms in the next year or so. Many of our smaller farmers are on the ropes. I only hope I am wrong but I am sure in my mind that this Government and the one in Ottawa just don't care less. If these farmers are pushed off the land and into urban slums, it will cost our society more, both economically and socially. All over the American continent the same thing has happened and is happening. Farmers pushed off the land have moved to the great urban centres, becoming lost in the downtown slums, caught in the web of living off social aid, and living in rat-infested ghettos. Here in Canada nothing is being done about it.

The Federal Government says it will be injecting about \$100 million into the agricultural economy. We are not sure how

many acres will be taken out of the production of wheat. I doubt whether it will be that successful but even if it is, this is really not money being put into the farmers' pockets to pay his debts or to buy new machinery or to give a lift to the economy. All this money will be used for is to pay for summerfallowing. As I said before \$6 an acre will not cover the cost of a good summerfallow in our area.

What is needed to lift agriculture out of this morass is a huge injection of cash, not \$6 an acre but enough money to make farming a vibrant, viable industry.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Meakes: — Farmers ever since 1950 have been shortchanged. Their income for years has been less than their legitimate expenses. They have subsidized the rest of Canada with low-priced food. They have subsidized the rest of Canada with low-priced food. In fact the Governments in Canada over the years have deliberately followed the plan of not allowing food to rise in comparison to other commodities. I would not criticize this plan if the farmer had been subsidized to compensate for such decisions. As it is, the Canadian farmer has subsidized the rest of the Canadian people and at the same time has had to compete on the international market against the treasuries of the other exporting nations like United States, France, Argentina, etc. Those Governments have subsidized their farmers and sold the grain at world prices.

This Government and the Government at Ottawa are not hesitant to supply \$200,000 so that the Member for City Park-University (Mr. Charlebois) can play at building a mountain. With the hundreds of miles of Saskatchewan river banks across Saskatchewan, and also the long stretch to the Qu'Appelle River, no one can tell me that there weren't suitable ski-runs available. But, no, the Member for City Park-University had to have his toy mountain and it will stand as a monument of Liberal waste.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Meakes: — In the Budget there is \$1 million for doctors' salaries increase. That will be an average increase of about \$1,200 a doctor but no monies for the farmer. It is not only the farmer who is suffering this economic squeeze. Every businessman in the towns and villages across this province is suffering too.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Meakes: — Many have closed their doors, either bankrupt or closed out. For this terrible situation to go on means the death knell of the villages and towns of this province. I have talked to dozens of businessmen in the last three months and they tell me how their accounts are \$50,000, \$75,000 or even \$100,000 out. The great majority of outstanding accounts are to good people but the farmer has just not sold wheat. What is there in this Budget for them? Nothing. Some of these people have their whole life's work tied up in their businesses. This Government goes on building mountains, building four-lane highways, raising doctors' salaries, but these people go by the board. If I were to vote for this Budget it wouldn't be safe for me to go home.

I look at this Budget and see what there is in it for our young people especially our rural youth. Well, they will have to pay tax on their hot-dogs and hamburgers. This Budget will go down known as "The hot-dog budget." They will have to bury the taste of it though in lots of mustard. There is no promise of any long-term guarantee that the youth can stay in Saskatchewan, settle down and become citizens of the province. The people of this province have helped finance their education, now some other province will reap the benefit. If this Government had not got this province off the rails, we might get some young people back from other provinces, but who will come now?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Meakes: — I look at this Budget to see what there is in it for our older citizens. Here again, nothing, except tax on any bowl of soup they may be able to afford to buy. Here are our old people, the pioneers who opened this wonderful province of ours, left to eke out their last days on a pittance. And the member for City Park-University (Mr. Charlebois) gets money for his mountain.

Of course, I know, the Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald) will say that they can get assistance if they are in need. I will tell the Minister that these people have pride. They won't beg and go through all the answering of the questions that the Department demands. Many of them will go hungry first and some of them will die first. All will vote against the Government at the first opportunity.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Meakes: — Mr. Speaker, there are many other things that I would like to discuss in this Budget. I see my time is now finished. I want to assure this House that I will be supporting the amendment and opposing the Budget.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J.A. Pepper (Weyburn): — Mr. Speaker, I first extend my sincere congratulations to the latest addition to our Legislature, the Member from Kelvington, Neil Byers . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Pepper: — . . . a member that I am sure will contribute and has already displayed a great deal of knowledge and dignity to our Legislature and one who will be respected by all Members of the House.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Pepper: — As the Hon. Member from Prince Albert West, our Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) introduced his Budget on Monday last, I am sure that all Saskatchewan was waiting to see just what it contained that might help to alleviate the serious economic conditions that we find ourselves in today. This Budget pointed out that by using the money the Provincial Government now receives in Federal payments that it is able to provide

some benefits to a broad range of people of various age groups and professions. However, the message that I feel came through loud and clear to the people of Saskatchewan was "More taxes."

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Pepper: — And more additional taxes imposed on our people of Saskatchewan following a year in which our farm income had already dropped some \$130 million. And if sense of values and priorities are not given proper and greater consideration by the Government in distributing this Budget than it has in the past, the exodus from farm and rural life will be unparalleled since the Thirties.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Pepper: — Now, Mr. Speaker, as agriculture is recognized as our basic industry it should be of prime importance in any Saskatchewan Budget. This year there is some 3.83 per cent of the total Budget set aside for agriculture. Does that seem realistic to you, to be sufficient for an industry of such prime importance, for an industry on which the whole economy of Saskatchewan depends? Many of our farmers are fighting for survival like they have never fought before. They are in a situation which is different, a situation in which they have carried out their part of the agreement. They have worked hard, used their best judgment in both crop and livestock management. They have been favored with wonderful cooperation from the weatherman and have produced an abundant harvest . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Pepper: — . . . a harvest, Mr. Speaker, which they have long dreamed about only to see it now turned into a nightmare partly because of inefficient governments both here in Saskatchewan and in Ottawa.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Pepper: — We have poverty in the midst of plenty, a very chaotic and serious condition when they tell us that over half of the people in the world go to bed hungry each night. What we need, Mr. Speaker, is governments in office that are efficient and interested in the long-term welfare of all people and not just concerned about the short-term profits of a few.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Pepper: — We have heard a lot of talk about diversification in agriculture. This Budget speech mentions it. To those farmers who have some background training or experience in this area this could be a sensible move and might prove successful for them. But for those farmers who have had no experience and are grasping for a solution to utilize some of their grain now that a loan is being made available to them, I question the success that they will make of it, especially if there is no protection provided for them by the Liberal Government sitting opposite. Steps should be taken and taken now to assure these farmers a

continued realistic price for their livestock, a price that will not fall below the assurance of a reasonable profit for their venture. Feeder cattle today are being bought by farmers at livestock exchanges at a price range from 35 to 45 cents per pound. Packing house industry buyers are noticeably absent. But when these cattle are fed and resold by the farmer, who do you think will be there buying at that time?

I would like to see more effort being emphasized on the important place our Wheat Board plays on the marketing of our grain, more money set aside in our Budget for provisions for orderly marketing. It is very easy for our Governments to try and switch the responsibility that they should be taking and place it on our farmers, our farm organizations and our Wheat Board; stirring up dissension and mistrust among them, knowing that the Wheat Board could eventually be abolished and open markets and the Grain Exchange under such management as James Richardson will once again reign supreme.

Let me ask you, Mr. Speaker, just who is the Wheat Board. How are they appointed? Who sets out their Policy? And who has the power to dismiss them? In all cases the answer is the Federal Government at Ottawa. If the Federal Government would take the shackles off the Wheat Board, set up proper regulations, and let them implement the policies that should be provided for them, then and then only can Western agriculture receive equal opportunity and take its proper place in securing a fair share in this competitive world-wide marketing of grain. May I emphasize again, Mr. Speaker, this responsibility lies squarely on the shoulders of the Federal Government, and this Provincial Liberal Government should be one of the first to see that it is reminded of its responsibility.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Pepper: — On Tuesday morning, March 3, The Leader Post had headlines to this effect: "Saskatchewan budget brings increase in taxes." I read it over again and said to myself surely not, not from a Government that was elected to office two consecutive times with a firm promise of a tax reduction and the great assistance it would provide for people in Saskatchewan. Remember, Saskatchewan was going to have a new look one like they had never had before. Well, Mr. Speaker, as I have heard before quoted in this House: "This tax increase could be the straw that breaks the camel's back."

First let me say I am very pleased and will give it full points for the elimination of the 2-cent tax on farm fuel, a tax that should never have been imposed on our farmers in this province to begin with. But it ruined much of its effect by the imposition or shifting of it over on to the 2-cent increase in car gas and commercial and industrial purple gasoline, also 1 cent on diesel fuel, and the exemption of \$2 on meals for the purpose of educational and health tax, dropping this to 14 cents. Then there is the 1 per cent increase in personal income. Add them all together and you will have another tax increase, Mr. Speaker, of some \$9 million. Add this to the tax increases we have already had imposed on us since 1964, which I believe amount to some \$109 per person in Saskatchewan, and it becomes a very sizable sum. And this doesn't include deterrent fees for those requiring hospital and medicare, a fee which in many cases is a burden to many of our elderly citizens, or geriatric

patients, our old age pensioners, many of whom cannot afford this extra cost. Mr. Speaker, I ask you: could we have not done with a few less miles of double-laned highways and provided these people with a few million dollars of human comfort? Mr. Speaker, I ask you: where is this Government's sense of values and priorities?

I have touched on some of the tax increases that were introduced in this Budget, and previous Liberal Budget. Couple these with the increasing loss of employment and employment opportunities that face us in Saskatchewan today, and a decline of population of some 13,000 people in the year of 1969, a potash industry that has suffered severe cutback, an oil industry with very little expansion and production declining. Mr. Speaker, this is known as the "New Saskatchewan." I call it, Mr. Speaker, a different Saskatchewan. I am told that Newfoundland, headed by another Liberal Government is in serious trouble and many people are moving to other parts of Canada for employment. May I suggest, Mr. Speaker, the wrong people are moving and the only sensible move is to move the Liberal Governments out of office. We have nothing to lose and we have everything to gain.

There are some areas in the Budget that I feel will be endorsed by all Members, in the area of education, the issuing of free text books for grade 12 students, and the funds that are set aside for the renovation to the School for the Deaf in Saskatoon. But might I remind you, Mr. Speaker, we will be giving a very hard look and a close examination to the student-teacher ratio and how it will effect the quality of education in our province. I am receiving correspondence and I know the Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac) is also receiving some, which I say further necessitates a close examination of this student-teacher ratio. In the opinion of many of my ratepayers the quality of their children's education will be severely reduced if the student-teacher ratio is increased. This is a serious area to cut costs.

The Budget has suggested a \$10 increase in the homeowner grant, bringing the total now to \$60, a move in the right direction for homeowners but it gives little assistance to renters of homes. Today there are many of these and less homeowners every day are becoming very evident. Well, from past experience when the \$50 homeowner grant was introduced in 1967, I believe it amounted to some \$8 million to be returned to the homeowner in the form of a grant, a cheque you remember with the signature of our Premier on it. This was just prior to an election. Then you remember the following year in 1968, the Government stuck its hand into the other pocket of the people of Saskatchewan and drew out some \$35 million in the form of new taxes. But the Premier forgot to put his signature to that one. If, Mr. Speaker, this is to be the custom and continuing policy of the Liberal Government this \$10 increase could become a very expensive grant for the homeowners of our province.

There is an additional \$4 million to be spent in the Department of Health and a considerable amount is set aside for our Base Hospital in Regina along with other hospital grants. But it did not inform us that during 1969 some 11 hospitals ceased to provide hospital services because of not receiving operating payments from the Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan. The services where these 11 hospitals have been located are discontinued, and today there are waiting lists for patients to be admitted as long as your arm.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer for a moment to the constituency which I have the honor to represent. Weyburn has been a progressive constituency, one where agriculture has been the predominant industry. Mixed farming is the chief source of income. We were fortunate to have located there one of our major oil fields of the province, and this was developed under the former CCF Government. But now since the sharp decline in farm income, and in order to keep our population from a further exodus particularly in farm and rural life, we need more industry. It might be of interest to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that within the 11 rural municipalities that are located in the Weyburn constituency, there has been a decline in population from 1963 to 1968 of some 893 people or almost 20 per cent. We need industry and budget assistance to help fill the vacuum that was created on the people of our area, due to the loss of employment and financial assistance, which our Saskatchewan Hospital provided for many of our people for so many years.

I asked the question the other day as to the future plans the Government has for the further use of the Saskatchewan Hospital at Weyburn. The reply, if you remember, was similar to the one I received a year ago. The Premier also announced while he was at a meeting in Weyburn last fall that we would have a rye distillery located there and that it was 98 per cent certain, Weyburn now being in the designated area qualified for assistance from the Federal Government. The latest figures I heard was that it was now only 38 per cent certain. He also stated that he would have another announcement to make concerning Weyburn in perhaps six months' time. Would this be another promise, Mr. Speaker? Well, the Budget has been brought down and if I can interpret it correctly, most of the funds for public works and industrial expansion are designated for the northern part of the province. Promises are not good enough. They may carry you for a short time, but when months become years of promises, the people begin to doubt, and this is certainly happening in the constituency of Weyburn. They want action now, Mr. Speaker, from this Government. Promises do not help to meet the needs or balance the budget of any unemployed parents and their families and they cannot borrow money and operate by deficit financing.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to leave a final thought with the Hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt). He informed me while I was to see him along with a delegation last fall that Highway No. 18 would not be considered for rebuilding for some time. I see that the Budget has increased its spending on highways. Would it be possible that he might have had a change of heart now and that we could qualify for a portion of this Budget being spent on this route from Oungre to Minton and then on to Coronach? I can assure him it would be money well spent and appreciated by many people across the southern part of both Weyburn and Bengough constituencies.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in summarizing this Budget I would say that it displays the lack of three qualities that I feel are necessary: leadership, research work and knowledge. Because of this the taxpayers of Saskatchewan are called on to pay the pound of cure when an ounce of prevention, in most cases, would have been sufficient. I find for these reasons I cannot support the motion but I will support the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. E.F. Gardner (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) for his presentation of a favorable Budget. I would also like to compliment the Opposition critic for his able and impassioned reply yesterday. You know last night I met an NDP acquaintance of mine and he mentioned the great speech made by the Member for Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney). I tried to find out from him what the financial critic had actually found to criticize in this fine Budget and this chap said that he really didn't know what in particular the Member for Regina Centre found wrong, but it sure was a great speech. Perhaps the financial critic (Mr. Blakeney) should be further congratulated, if you can find nothing to criticize and still convince your followers that you have made a great speech, then you have really accomplished something.

You know I was pleased, Mr. Speaker, to hear in the Budget Speech that the Provincial Government grants to schools will increase next year by a record \$11 million to \$73 million. This, Mr. Speaker, is the largest single increase ever provided and it is greater than the expected rise in school operating costs. It therefore should be possible for many school boards to decrease their mill rates in the coming year. This is especially important right now in rural areas because farmers and small businessmen are no longer financially able to pay the ever-increasing costs of education.

These people, Mr. Speaker, in the past have been paying far more than their fair share of the education costs. I believe that the time is long overdue for a major change in our method of financing education. Fifty years ago or so when schools were organized on a local basis, there were a greater number of farmers, very few professional or salaried people and school costs were low. A tax on land seemed a reasonable method of paying these small school costs. However, over the years, Mr. Speaker, the number of farmers has decreased, the number of professional and service people has increased and school costs have risen at an alarming rate. It seemed the easy way to raise more money was to simply increase the tax rate on land, rather than scrap the whole obsolete system.

We have reached the ridiculous situation today, Mr. Speaker, where the farmer and the small businessman, with a decreasing income, are bearing most of these staggering educational costs and the highly paid professional man, civil servant, teacher or laborer is getting off relatively scot-free. Farm land, Mr. Speaker, is a production asset acquired by man to earn his living. Yet it is almost the only production asset on which taxes are required for education. To illustrate this, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to take a minute of your time and give you an example. Supposing a man dies and leaves \$50,000 to each of his four sons. His son No. 1 goes to university and invests his money in an education to become a teacher or a lawyer. No. 2 invests his money in construction equipment and goes into the business of building roads. No. 3 invests his wisely in securities to provide him with an income. No. 4 invests his in farm land with which to make a living. Suppose they all earn the same amount of money, about \$6,000 and that as a result of investing their \$50,000 as above. They all pay the same income tax, \$1,500 or so and have about \$4,500 left to provide for their families. However, for some strange reason, Mr. Speaker, we say that we are going to tax only one of these individuals another \$1,000. We say that No. 4 because he chose to buy farm land to make his

living he is going to have to pay an extra \$1,000. No. 4 and only No. 4 will be charged this extra tax.

I think you will agree, Mr. Speaker, that this outmoded system of taxation should be changed. Education is a people service and should be paid for with a people tax such as a sales tax or income tax which is fair to all. Even without land tax, Mr. Speaker, a farmer carries more than his share of the tax burden. In his operations he is a massive consumer of goods — fuel, fertilizer, machinery, repairs, twine and so on, and the price of all these goods includes many taxes. What I am suggesting, Mr. Speaker, is that we work for the eventual removal of all school taxes from farm land. Education is not a service to the land and should not be paid for by a land tax.

I was pleased to see, Sir, that in the Budget the 2-cent tax on farm fuel was abolished. This was a tax on a production item used in farming and certainly couldn't be justified. Mr. Speaker, I have occasionally heard urban people complain because we are allowing farmers tax free gasoline in their trucks. Taken alone there may be some small justification for this criticism, but when you look at the farmers' overall tax situation as a package, I think you will agree that he is certainly entitled to this small concession.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all Saskatchewan people are interested in ensuring that our young people get the best possible education. The Government, however, is charged with the additional responsibility of ensuring that these fine facilities be provided at a reasonable cost to the taxpayer. People tend to get unduly concerned whenever any existing educational situation is in question. The recent discussion on pupil-teacher ratios is a good example. The Member from Weyburn (Mr. Pepper) just mentioned these ratios and I hope that he will listen carefully. I don't profess to know what an ideal ratio would be. I believe I have been in as many classrooms as anyone here and the class size that I have been in has varied from as low as five to as many as 275. Quality of instruction may depend to some extent on the size of the class but this is only one of many factors involved. Pupil-teacher ratios vary widely in the province. Past grant structure has contributed to a pupil-teacher ratio of about 18 to 1 in the Eston-Elrose unit, while the unit that I live in, Arcola, has a pupil-teacher ratio of about 24 to 1. Now we certainly know which ratio is financially better for the taxpayer but we do not know which is better for the student. Statistics do not indicate that scholastic achievement is better where pupil-teacher ratios are low. In fact I believe the achievement record is better in my home unit in Arcola and also in the Broadview unit with almost the highest pupil-teacher ratio in the province than it is with some of these others with a low pupil-teacher ratio. And strangely enough, Mr. Speaker, a study of unit statistics will also show that scholastic achievement is not necessarily higher in units where teachers are paid more because of higher classifications. Each time the pupil-teacher ratio is increased by one in Saskatchewan a saving of \$3 million is made. If two extra students were put in every classroom in the Province we would have about \$6 million extra to use, perhaps to a greater advantage, somewhere else in our education system. In view of these facts, Mr. Speaker, surely the Department is justified in taking a close look at pupil-teacher ratios.

Mr. Speaker, if there are any here who think the situation was better under the CCF they had better take a pretty good

look at the record also. I have here the grants paid to school units in my area and also the pupil-teacher ratios from 1964 to 1969 and I would like to give you a sample of this information. In the Moosomin unit for example in 1964, the last year of the NDP the grant from the Government to that unit was \$424,000. It gradually increased to 1969 and was \$593,000. The pupil-teacher ratio was 26.5 to 1 the last year under the NDP, it has gradually decreased until it is now 21.2 to 1. In the Arcola unit that I live in, in 1964 the grant from the Provincial Government to that unit was \$443,000, in 1969 it has increased to over \$700,000. And again looking at the pupil-teacher ratio, in 1964 the last year of the NDP it was 27.7 to 1 and it has decreased now to about 24 to 1. So we see, Mr. Speaker, that under the NDP the grants were small and the teacher-pupil ratios were very high.

I would like to suggest to the Members opposite that they ask their teachers and school boards if they would like to go back to the Government grant, to the average teacher's salary and to the pupil-teacher ratios that prevailed only six years ago under the CCF.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the Government for providing text books free to grade 12 students. This, Mr. Speaker, completes our plan of providing text books in all grades from 9 to 12. You know, Mr. Speaker, for 20 years the NDP talked of providing free high school text books but never took any action. Only since we have been the Government have these text books been provided to high school students.

I would also like to commend the Government for providing \$700,000 in the Budget to renovate the School for the Deaf in Saskatoon. I am sure this is badly needed. For the first time, Mr. Speaker, funds will be provided to assist in transporting retarded children to school in urban centres and other worthwhile projects.

Mr. Speaker, one of the blackest marks on the records of the former NDP Government was the way that they treated our University. In 1964, their last year of office, under \$12 million was provided to the University. This year the Government is providing over \$39 million. Mr. Speaker, I would hope that this vast sum is used by the University for the purposes that are intended. With this money facilities should be available for every student in the province who wishes to attend University. The percentage of the 18 to 24 age group in Saskatchewan going to the University is about 12 per cent, much, much higher than the Canadian average and something we should all be very proud of. However, when financing is mentioned to University officials they immediately think of curtailing enrolment or getting rid of some of the students. They never seem to consider other obvious ways of controlling costs, such as increasing the size of classes, increasing the time that a particular professor spends in front of a class, decreasing their staff, decreasing programs where graduates are not immediately needed by our society, or making greater use of facilities provided for a greater portion of the year. Instead of considering some of these factors, Mr. Speaker, they seem determined to keep some of the students out of university and after all the students are the reason why the University exists.

Mr. Speaker, no other Government in this province has ever been so concerned with education. No other government is presently doing more for education. Figures to bear this out are readily

available to all. I will support the Budget.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. A. Mitchell (Bengough): — Mr. Speaker, as I join this Debate today, may I extend my sincerest congratulations to our Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) for the wisdom and foresight he and the Government have shown in bringing in this Budget. Our Government has always stated that in normal times we believed governments should balance their budgets. As Members well know, this Government has consistently done this until this year. Members also know that we on this side of the House have stated as part of our policy that, if and when hardships existed, and it became necessary to prime the pump, our Government would take the necessary steps to see that this was done. I am sure that no Member in this House today, Mr. Speaker, would suggest that it is not necessary at this time for the Government to take some initiative in stimulating our provincial economy. This Budget, Mr. Speaker, is designed to counteract at least to some extent this depressing situation. It is also designed to cure some of the ills which plague the provincial economy at this moment.

This Budget is designed to assist our farmers in further diversifying so that they need not be so dependent on the vagaries of the international wheat market alone. What Member opposite would quarrel with this, Mr. Speaker? This Budget is designed to spur activity in the construction industry in order to provide jobs to the labor force of our province. Surely the NDP agree with this program. This Budget is designed, Mr. Speaker, to assist the local property owner through increased assistance to municipalities and more particularly, through largely increased grants for education — the largest in the history of the province. It is hoped that all school boards will use this 18 per cent over-all increase, to hold the local mill rate or even reduce it in some cases. Surely no Member of the Opposition would quarrel with this budgetary goal, Mr. Speaker.

The Budget presented to this House this year, Mr. Speaker, represents a positive and responsible approach to the economic problems facing our Saskatchewan citizens. It indicates that the Government is concerned with problems of cash shortage, unemployment, huge inventories of wheat, etc.

Now, Mr. Speaker, may I turn for a moment to the wheat crisis, as it has been called through the Prairies. Mr. Speaker, if I may take a moment, although many farmers are advocating that some changes should be made within the structure of the Canadian Wheat Board, may I emphasize that this does not suggest the abolition of the Wheat Board, but rather an improved Wheat Board.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Mitchell: — Recently the Federal Government announced a program of far-reaching changes in Federal agricultural policy. There is no doubt in my mind that some drastic change was long overdue. Whether a program to encourage the taking of land out of wheat production is the best answer is difficult at this point to know. I am convinced, however, that along with changes in Federal agricultural policy must go a serious change in attitude, at least with the Canadian Wheat Board. Changes in these two Federal areas must take place if the Western Canadian

farmer is to survive. We must see more emphasis placed on what is best for the Western farmer in view of the international market situation and less emphasis, much less, on bureaucratic detail and comfort. I believe we must see a much more aggressive attitude on the part of the Canadian Wheat Board in selling Prairie wheat.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Mitchell: — We also, Mr. Speaker, must see a great deal more cooperation between the Canadian Wheat Board and other Federal departments involved in international trade. If this were done, I believe we would see a great deal more wheat moving off Saskatchewan farms. I am convinced that a very serious look must be taken at the qualities and types of wheat which are presently licensed in Canada. To date yield has been neglected in Canada in favor of quality and disease resistance. Canada today has the lowest yielding varieties of wheat in the world. I believe there is room for the licensing of higher yielding wheats in Canada, perhaps under contract growing. Contract growing would provide maximum leeway in terms of varieties, price and delivery with the aim of capturing massive new markets for wheat and feeds at competitive prices. I am aware, Mr. Speaker, of a recent proposal made to the Federal Government along these lines which received a very cool reception. Here again the interests of the Western farmer are cast aside in favor of the comfortable status quo so fondly cherished by the seasoned Ottawa bureaucrats. I am convinced that a serious look must be taken at the restrictions that exist within the Prairie region with regard to feed grains crossing provincial boundaries.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Mitchell: — Surely, Mr. Speaker, it makes sense to regard the Prairie region as one unit with the free exchange of feed grains within this area. I know of a number of Saskatchewan farmers who have been unable to take advantage of large demands for feed grain in other provinces as a result of these restrictions.

Now, Mr. Speaker, for the past few years we've heard the Opposition in this House lamenting in the Press and in this House over the apparent large decrease in population which Saskatchewan is allegedly suffering. May I draw your attention to some facts which I have. I discovered this in going over the records of the Vital Statistics Branch of the Department of Public Health. These figures are taken from the SHSP records and in 1969 covered 963,878 persons which is about 99.9 per cent of our population. But listen to this, particularly the Opposition, the average annual net loss from the end of 1953 to the end of 1963 under the Socialists, the average net loss in that 10-year period was 10,040 people per year.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Mitchell: — And in fact, Mr. Speaker, SHSP records indicate that in 1957 the total net loss for that year was 19,200.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Mitchell: — These same records indicate

from the end of 1963 to the end of 1969 that the average annual net loss under this Government was only 6,933 per year . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Mitchell: — . . . for the 6-year average. On top of that, Mr. Speaker, there has been no year in the past six with a population loss that has ever been close to that astronomical figure of 19,200 under the Socialists in 1957.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Mitchell: — Even this year, Mr. Speaker, with the serious farm crisis and slow-down in construction the reported DBS figures are far from approaching this Socialist record in 1957 — dubious record I would say.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Mitchell; — Mr. Speaker, early in December of 1969 I had the privilege of being a member of the Saskatchewan delegation to the Constitutional Conference in Ottawa. I can tell all Members of this House that the performance of our Premier on behalf of the Saskatchewan and Western farmer at that Conference was absolutely fantastic.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Mitchell: — There is more to come! No other Premier at that Conference spoke with the determination, the authority and the sincerity of our Premier.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Mitchell: — I only wish the Leader of the Opposition had been there to see the dismal effort put forth by the NDP in Manitoba as compared to our Government's presentation.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Mitchell: — All the Western Premiers recognized the leadership ability of our Premier and they handed the case for Western Canada over to him. The presentation which he made certainly justified their confidence in him. I wish Hon. Members and the citizens of Saskatchewan could see how this man works untiringly for us when he is on these conferences.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Mitchell: — Talks on bilingualism and the constitution do not distract him from his basic motive of trying to solve the problems of the Saskatchewan people. I say again, Mr. Speaker, what an honor it was to be part of that delegation and particularly to see how well our Premier stands out when compared with the other heads of government across Canada.

Mr. Speaker, before concluding I would like to make a few remarks relative to the constituency which I have the privilege of representing in this Legislature. The economy of the constituency of Bengough consists mainly of three basic segments of agriculture: namely, extensive grain-growing operations, mixed farming and large-scale ranching. The Provincial Government in its policies of tax abatement on grain storage facilities and also the subsidized interest loans to encourage and to promote cow-calf operations has provided a measure of relief to agriculture in these adverse times. Our constituents of Bengough appreciate the Provincial Government's highway programs of the past five years. With the oiling this year of the two remaining sections of Highway 13 and Highway 36 we will have completed the oiling of all Provincial highways within our constituency. We have on occasion heard in this Legislature — some of the city Members on the Opposition benches — criticizing the Government. We had a case today — the Member from Weyburn (Mr. Pepper) — criticizing the Government for spending so much on highways. Let me assure you, Mr. Speaker, the rural people of Saskatchewan certainly disagree with such opinions.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Mitchell: — Our constituency has benefited from another program instituted by our Liberal Government — the installation of telephones in the unserved areas. We have had telephone service brought into three separate districts in the past three years and will have the fourth added early this year with a project in the Big Beaver area. We are also looking forward to having natural gas brought into several more of our towns and villages within the next two years.

Mr. Speaker, may I in conclusion, say the Budget Speech is designed to do what the Provincial Government can to ease the hardships and problems which I have mentioned. I will support the motion and not the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. D.T. McFarlane (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, this Budget indicates that this Government is not hesitant in coming to grips with the economic problems besetting our province. It indicates again that we are continuing to carry out programs for the benefit of our people and to introduce new policies and programs for the further development and diversification of our major resources which, in turn, benefit all our citizens. The Budget Speech reinforces the awareness of the people of Saskatchewan, yes, and of others outside our boundaries that we are the only party and the only Government that has the courage to take constructive and positive actions with, or even against, other governments or organizations, be they provincial, national or international, whose policies or actions we feel may not be in the best interests of the residents of our province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McFarlane: — The Budget Speech indicates that this Government will continue to forge ahead in developing our agricultural industry. It is the largest agricultural budget in the history of

Saskatchewan and almost double that of the NDP for the last year that they were in office. It emphasizes the importance that we have placed and that we will continue to place on helping our farmers diversify rather than on too many trying to rely on a straight grain economy. We are fully aware of the economic situation due to world surpluses in wheat. We are aware that wheat exports in the past crop year are down compared to what they were in the previous four or five years. We are aware that the cash income to our farmers is down on this account. But let me remind the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) and his colleagues, when he tries to blame this on the Provincial Liberals, if this is the criterion that he wants to use, then his record as a Member and Leader of an NDP Government for 20 years was terrible and no wonder the people kicked him out. The estimated cash receipts in 1969 for all crops was \$500 million. This is the lowest figure since we took office in 1964, but, in the last 10 years under the NDP, when they were in office it was only barely exceeded twice. This figure has been exceeded every year since we formed the Government. The average is better than \$655 million per year since we formed the Government in 1964. Farm cash receipts for all crops have risen substantially since we have been the Government, to an all-time high of better than \$728.5 million two years ago. If again, according to the NDP, this is bad, then again certainly their record was terrible. The same pattern applies to cash receipts from livestock and livestock products. From \$153 million the last year under the NDP, it has increased substantially every year to a peak of \$236 million in 1968. These facts surely prove that the farmers of Saskatchewan could never again afford to have an NDP Government.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, when the total farm cash receipts are published for 1969, they will be lower than the records established since we took office; but they will be far above those of the years our people suffered under the Socialists. Mr. Speaker, our worst is far better than their best.

Mr. Speaker, I want to turn now to the most perplexing problem that is facing our Saskatchewan farmers today, and this is the marketing of cereal grains and oilseeds; and, of course, the main concern is a more aggressive wheat selling program. We hear so much talk of reducing our wheat acreage or of cutting our production. There is some justification for this, but we Saskatchewan farmers, we are not concerned about our ability to produce; we are concerned that our share of the world marketings of our wheat and coarse grains has been declining. We have only one agency for the marketing of oats, wheat and barley, and that is the Canadian Wheat Board. It is not my intention to condemn the Wheat Board principle of marketing, not to condemn its personnel; but I do intend to bring to the attention of its members, and those whose responsibility it is to determine its policies, that there must be some changes made immediately if Saskatchewan farmers are not only to maintain, but most important of all, increase their share of the world's markets. Mr. Speaker, either we market or we perish. It is just that important. The following procedures must be carried out: 1. It is imperative that every possibility of further markets and sales, both in Canada and throughout the world be explored and established. 2. If some policies or regulations have to be adjusted to achieve more results, now is the time to make the adjustments and the changes. 3. Markets must be researched throughout the world in order that sales efforts can be geared to the type of product that fits the habits and the

needs of these countries. 4. We must maintain flexibility in our pricing systems so that sales are not lost because of fractional differences in prices with competitive countries. 5. Flexible credit terms to fit the needs of customers and of potential customers must be offered. 6. Employ individuals with salesmanship ability to continuously contact representatives of importing countries throughout the world. 7. The Saskatchewan Government must be allowed representation on the Canadian Wheat Board by virtue of the fact that complementary enabling legislation is provided for the marketing of oats and barley by the Wheat Board. 8. Provision must be made for more producer representation on the Canadian Wheat Board or on its advisory committee. 9. Provision must be made to guarantee customers a specific protein level of wheat. 10. There should be free movement of feed grains among the Prairie Provinces. These are just a few proposals that I submit should be taken into consideration immediately by the Canadian Wheat Board. Mr. Speaker, I would like to enlarge on some of these proposals briefly.

A disturbing factor in today's wheat marketing situation is that Canada is still unable to offer wheat for a precise and guaranteed protein content. We are told that the Japanese market, and this market particularly, looks for guaranteed protein levels. They want it within a tenth of one per cent; they don't want it lower or they don't want it higher. The United States is prepared and is able to do this, while Canada is not. Secretary of Agriculture Hardin, speaking to the United States National Agricultural Congress very recently, noted the advantages that their country held over Canada just by this very fact. And surely, the time to rectify this situation is now and not a year or two years from now as has been suggested.

I have mentioned the importance of Provincial Government representation on the Wheat Board. And this view is shared by the Government of Alberta as well. This should have been requested when The Saskatchewan Grain Marketing Control Act was passed some years ago. And surely, the Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues, who were the Government at that time, should have realized the importance of a direct voice by the Province. It again, Mr. Speaker, points up that he is always ready to criticize but never prepared to be positive or to be practical.

It was not surprising to hear the Leader of the Opposition attempt to ridicule our recently completed barter sales. Again, he could only offer criticism. He could not offer one practical suggestion. He appears to be now joining those who would place every obstacle in the way of this Government which, in the interests of our cash short farmers, is trying by every possible means to see that grain is sold immediately. As the Premier pointed out on different occasions, two deals have been completed; and, with the cooperation of the Federal Government and the Wheat Board, we could complete additional sales. What is the story we hear from the Opposition? They say, "Oh, well, you aren't selling anymore wheat"; they say you can't prove that this wheat would not have moved anyway. They say that this will lead to retaliation by other competitive countries.

Well, Mr. Speaker, let me tell the Leader of the Opposition that he had better wake up and realize what is going on in some of these other countries. Let me remind the Canadian Wheat Board what is happening. Let me tell some of those representatives of farm organizations who criticize barter deals what is happening and what has happened. It is most important to note

the steps that the United States, also with large surpluses of agricultural products, are taking. Just a year ago, Secretary of Agriculture Hardin announced the formation of the export marketing service in the United States Department of Agriculture. This special agency has authority to formulate commodity credit programs. It has also been instructed to develop such additional policies and programs as it may find necessary. The United States like ourselves, has been concerned with a downward trend in agricultural exports. They have created this special agency to halt that trend. And here are some of the things that F.G. McKnight of the Export Marketing Service of the United States Department of Agriculture said to the National Agricultural Outlook Conference recently and I quote:

Barter is one of the tools we can use to supplement the more general programs, by providing an incentive to increase exports.

The current U.S. Department of Agriculture Barter Program is a way of using agricultural exports to generate funds with which procurement abroad can be made for other Federal agencies.

He went on to say, and this is the statement that we continuously hear and I quote:

How do we know barter exports are all additional to what the U.S. would sell otherwise? We don't, but we take a calculated risk that with restrictions it will give us at least some degree of additionality.

He quoted an example of reversing a downward trend of corn exports to Spain through barter and forecast barter exports reaching \$400 million for this year as compared to a previous high of \$405 million. So, Mr. Speaker, this seems to me at least an example of a country actively promoting its exports and actively selling its products. So much so, Mr. Speaker, that the United States' share of the world markets in coarse grains has risen sharply in recent years while Canada's share of 3 per cent almost bordered on extinction. Even a little country like Thailand exported more coarse grains than Canada. And again, Mr. Speaker, if those persons responsible for searching out markets and selling and moving grain would spend more time and effort in this regard and in changing some of the archaic regulations governing farmers' delivery permit books, they would be making a greater contribution to our farming industry as well as nullify many of the reasons for all the current talk of Western alienation.

Our Government is concerned with the movement of wheat to the terminals, especially the slow movement. This is reflected in low quotas of one-bushel or no quota at all at 176 of our shipping points. The seriousness of the situation can be pointed up when we realize we are now in the eighth month of the crop year and many points do not even have a one-bushel quota — 176 to be exact. We realize that a larger volume of wheat, coarse grains, flax and rapeseed must be moved if farmers are to be able to deliver the required amounts to meet present commitments in this crop year.

And again we remind the responsible authorities and the Wheat Board that available space at the terminals must be utilized immediately and there are four main reasons for this:

1. This will put much-needed cash in our farmers' hands at once. 2. It will prevent a glut in transportation at the end of the crop year as has happened in previous years due to shortage of boxcars, weather and labor strikes. 3. Potential customers will have more confidence of rapid delivery if grain is in shipping position and will attract more orders, especially from Japan. 4. Farmers have the time to deliver now and can take advantage of favorable road conditions before spring break-up or losing time during the spring seeding period. This, Mr. Speaker, will necessitate the complete cooperation of the grain companies, the railways, the shipping industry, the Wheat Board, and of labor.

I am not going to deal with the subject of strikes at this moment. These have been the biggest bugbear that our farmers have had to contend with over the years. They have continuously interfered with the marketing of his grain, such as, the serious marketing situation they caused at the beginning of the last crop year when approximately 2½ months of opportunity to deliver was lost to our farmers. They have continuously resulted in the increases of input costs to the farming industry. They have resulted in countries not placing orders for Canadian grain. There is a motion on the Order Paper, Mr. Speaker, and this topic will be dealt with at a later date during this Session.

Now the Leader of the Opposition has said that his party has made a striking contribution in agriculture. Certainly, their political affiliates, the union bosses, have managed to keep the grain industry in a state of turmoil. If the NDP can't get involved in a strike that will affect Canadian farmers, they send their Saskatchewan section to California to picket against farmers in that state. The striking contributions of the Leader of the Opposition and his party have had a disastrous effect on the cash income of our farmers, not only this year, Mr. Speaker, but in years past.

Mr. Speaker, those of us who are concerned with the welfare and the future of our agricultural industry must feel genuine concern regarding the White Paper on tax reform proposals. Apparently it has been endorsed by the NDP as were the Carter Commission proposals that would have cost our farmers millions of dollars more in taxes. So in the time available to me, I can only refer to two aspects of it. First is the regard to depreciation. At present, our farmers are using the straight line depreciation method on their farm machinery. This allows the farmer an advantage in that when the trade-in value exceeds the depreciated value he is not taxed on this gain. This is in the nature of a capital gain and under the new proposals would be taxable. We calculate that this proposal, even with the higher personal income deductions proposed, will cost the average-sized farm more in tax per year, and of course, a larger farm will pay considerably more. We know our farmers are in no position to accept these higher taxes.

Secondly, we are concerned with the implications of a capital gains tax on agriculture. Who is going to value the land? Who can say what it is worth? A farmer invests in land; he invests money in the form of machine hours, fertilizer, etc., and above all he invests his labor and management in improving his land. No one pays him for this. He expects to be rewarded partly through the sale of produce from it and partly through its improved value. That has been his security, his pension, and now it will be taxed.

We are particularly concerned that, when a farmer sells to his son and retires, a capital gains tax may be assessed just when the farm can least afford to pay it, at a time when it must support two families instead of one.

Often this type of sale is made at lower than market price balanced to give the father a reasonable retirement and the son a reasonable opportunity. But, now, it appears that some expert from the Federal Department of Finance will put a value on the land so that a capital gain may be assessed. These are but two of the aspects of the White Paper that concern us, Mr. Speaker, and on which we will in due course, be making recommendations to the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, it has become very evident that we are not hearing much from Opposition speakers about the agriculture program they adopted at their Provincial and National Conference last summer. At that time, according to press reports the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) was quoted as being very happy with it. Why are they not telling the people they intend to nationalize the farms? Why are they not telling the people that one of their labor delegates said, "It was not realistic to say that land is a resource for all the people and then oppose state ownership." Why are they not telling the people that another Moose Jaw unionist said that we have no qualms about nationalizing the CPR and that type of thing? How do you make a difference between that and land, timber and mining? Why aren't they telling the people that they went on record as opposing the homeowner grants? Why are they not telling the people their program calls for the nationalization of farm supply and service centres? Why are they not mentioning the Watkins Report and the Wafflers among them who signed it?

Well, Mr. Speaker, I imagine the reason is, as Premier Schreyer has said, "You don't mention these things if you want to get elected. You form the Government first and then do them." And that's the Socialist philosophy, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I suspect that the agricultural policy of the Saskatchewan NDP is so impractical that even Schreyer daren't try to adopt it in Manitoba. The same is true of the brief they presented to our Government prior to the recent Dominion -Provincial Conference. Surely the Leader of the Opposition must have made a copy of it available to the Schreyer Government before the conference. Surely the Manitoba Government must have studied it carefully and said, "Now, Woodrow, if you were in our position, how could you be so unrealistic on so many things." And they probably said, "Woodrow, with a brief like that you had better dream up some excuse to stay home." Well, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition chickened out.

Manitoba's NDP Government presented its submission designed to solve the agricultural situation in Western Canada. In my frank opinion it was a complete dud. There were only three recommendations.

Mr. Speaker, it is increasingly evident that the Manitoba NDP Government in power wants no part of the agricultural proposals of the Saskatchewan NDP in opposition. Mr. Speaker, the presentations by our Premier at the conference accomplished more for the people of Western Canada than those of any other delegation. I am sure his efforts on behalf of Western Canadians are appreciated by all people regardless of political affiliation.

I know they had a tremendous impact on all the representatives of the Federal and Provincial Governments present.

But most important of all, they received the support of provinces that had not previously realized the necessity of immediate action on many fronts to alleviate Western problems. The presentation by the Saskatchewan Government once again demonstrated the value of a positive and constructive approach versus carping criticism. The Leader of the Opposition stated that he decided not to accompany the Saskatchewan delegation so he could stay home and be in a position to criticize.

Mr. Speaker, the Budget Speech indicates further measures will be introduced to help in the diversification of agriculture in our province and to increase the economic base of our farm units. This has been a tremendous task, Mr. Speaker.

When we took office we had to halt the tremendous exodus of people off the farms and the decrease in farm units during 20 years of Socialism. And for the information of my hon. friend from Touchwood (Mr. Meakes) I would like to remind him that in fact under a Socialist regime, over 2,000 farm units a year had disappeared in Saskatchewan. In the years that they were in power over 50,000 farm units disappeared. Multiply this, Mr. Speaker, by an average family of four and you can realize the terrible exodus from our rural communities during that period of time. They talk about a few families leaving the province this year. Well, Mr. Speaker, it is only a trickle compared to the years of Socialist regimentation. Not only did we lose farmers, but the whole of the agricultural industry was neglected.

As I mentioned earlier, the NDP in their last year of office only allocated \$8.5 million for the Agriculture budget. We have almost doubled that figure for this year. We have seen substantial increases in the Agriculture budget each year under our Government to help the farmers of our province. Added to this, our farmers have benefited through a larger and better highway system; a larger and better grid road system; a farm access road program; larger grants to municipalities for maintenance and snow removal on municipal roads; urban assistance for street improvement in their shopping centres; and the bringing of natural gas to their local communities that the NDP Government and the financial critic when he was responsible said it was not economically feasible to do, and now, further to that, bringing natural gas to our farm homes.

Practically every service provided for in this Budget helps our farmers either directly or indirectly.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McFarlane: — Certainly this Budget marks a tremendous improvement in level of services to our people compared to the old NDP and CCF programs, but most important of all, the lack of programs they had in those long 20 years.

One of the first things our Government had to do upon taking office in 1964 was to bring about diversification of our agricultural industry. We had to devise programs and policies to enlarge the economic base of our farm units. We had to halt the decline in income from livestock and livestock products. Mr. Speaker, this has been accomplished. The income from this source

has been higher every year that we have been in office compared to the last year under the NDP. We had to increase, yes, prices. You go back over your records and your prices are terrible for the 20 years that you were in, as low as \$8 a hundred and finally got it up to \$10. You thought you had something when you got up to \$13 and \$14. We had to increase our cattle numbers and this has been done. Our cattle numbers have been higher every year we have been in office compared to any of the 20 years under the Socialists.

Mr. A.E. Blakeney (Regina Centre): — Rubbish!

Mr. McFarlane: — Rubbish, he says! He can't even read a report. If you would check your annual report even in 1969 you will see that as of December and September the amounts are higher every year that we have been in office than any of the years that you were in office.

Mr. Blakeney: — What happened to the June count of . . .

Mr. McFarlane: — The June count is not lower. And I also want to remind the financial critic that yesterday the only thing that he could criticize on the Agricultural budget was, I think he said turkeys were down. But he said that marketing of cattle was down. And if you were realistic at all, Mr. Financial Critic, you would realize that the reason that the marketing of cattle is down is because the females are all staying right on the farms where they should be to build up the number of cattle from year to year.

Again, our cattle numbers, and you can check the Agriculture reports, have been higher every year that we have been in office compared to any of the 20 years under the Socialists. We had to arrest the disappearing sheep industry. This we are doing and our programs and policies have been acclaimed and acknowledged across the nation. We had to rescue the hog industry that was on the verge of extinction. In fact, there were not enough hogs entering our packing plants to warrant maintaining that portion of the industry in our province. We found that hog numbers had declined from a high of 1½ million the year before the Socialists took office to a low of 441,000 in the last year of their term.

Again, Mr. Financial Critic, by virtue of our program, hog numbers have been higher every year since we formed the Government compared to the NDP's last year in office. Most important of all to our farmers is the fact that during the past year and again this year livestock prices are at an all-time high. Important, too, is the fact that we are raising, finishing and processing our meat products right here in Saskatchewan.

The value of livestock on our Saskatchewan farms has risen to all-time highs since we took office and predictions for the future indicate a substantial further rise.

Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons the Socialists failed in the development of the agriculture industry in our province was because of their negative thinking. We have heard them make such statements as the one a year ago from the Member for Turtleford that, if we fatten our cattle in Saskatchewan, the increase

in weight will cause a surplus of beef. Well, our farmers are doing just that. Numbers are increasing in our province and so is the price.

Then we hear the ridiculous statement that because we offer a farmer a grant of 25 per cent of the cost of his swine building, it will drive the man with four or five sows out of the business. How ridiculous can they get! They say that this will allow big corporations to take over in our province.

I want to remind my Socialist friends that the very thing that they are screaming against is taking place under an NDP Government in Manitoba. Apparently the NDP Government in the province doesn't agree with our Socialists, for a corporation of farmers and businessmen is setting up a million dollar hog production enterprise in that province with the help of the Department of Industry and Commerce, the big corporations with the help of Schreyer and his own Government. Again it points up the fact that all the Saskatchewan Socialists can do is criticize. I ask you now: do you sanction this move made by the Manitoba NDPers?

Mr. Blakeney: — No, I don't.

Mr. McFarlane: — You are against corporations. You talk one way in opposition. Schreyer says, "Don't talk about these things. First we have to get elected and then when we are elected then we do these things."

Mr. Speaker, may I review very briefly the positive steps we have taken since this Government came to office. We haven't just sat down and complained to Ottawa. We have been doing positive things. We have heeded the warnings that economists have been making since the mid-fifties. We have recognized the vulnerability of our farmers and of our whole economy to the vagaries of the international wheat market.

This Government took office in the spring of 1964. In less than three months we announced that we would live up to the terms of the 1948 Agreement and build the irrigation phase of the Gardiner Dam. The Socialists had been waffling about it for six years and had not done one thing during that time in regard to irrigation. It is with some pride that I can advise you, Mr. Speaker, that the irrigation system for 19,000 acres is fully complete now. This summer we will complete construction of the complete Outlook-Broderick block of 40,000 acres. Further, 8,650 acres are now readied for irrigation, either by gravity or sprinkler ready to go this spring. Of this, 1,480 acres are in a Crown Land Forage Project which will be used for a fodder reserve against a dry year.

We also have a 500-acre project in Miry Creek developed for the same purpose of protecting our cattle industry against an emergency. These are all under roof not like the old haystacks that you put up years ago, and the feed all rotted, and nobody got the use of it. These are practical programs to conserve the feed so that they will be there in a year of emergency.

Mr. Speaker, we now plan to proceed on the west side, the Conquest-Ardath area. The estimates provide funds necessary to finalize engineering plans and to commence construction of the west side pumping plant. In 1965 the emphasis of the Family

Farm Improvement Branch was broadened to include much more emphasis on modernizing livestock enterprises and to assist our small communities install modern water and sewage systems.

The first Mexabition, a new type of extension activity, where we draw together farmers interested in modernizing their production and farmstead with commercial people who can help them to do it, was held in 1965, and has been a tremendous success.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard much from the Opposition about the decline in our rural life, about the problems of our small communities. Well, we have undertaken to do something about it. And once again, let's compare the records. Up to and including the fiscal year 1963-64 four hamlets and one village had installed community water systems with assistance from the Branch. Now, since we have had direction of the program, this puny accomplishment has increased to 97 small communities assisted with water systems and 46 with the installation of sewage systems.

Also, in 1965 we commenced a policy of offering incentive grants to farmers for the construction of fodder storages and bunker silos as a measure to assist our farmers in carrying reserves. These are no longer a rare sight in Saskatchewan and we have paid out 535 grants to farmers in this program. In 1966 we undertook two further programs. In our individual irrigation policy we offer a cash grant of \$35 per acre, up to \$3,500. In the same year we commenced a policy of paying grants for seeding submarginal lands to grass and have paid grants to 4,591 farmers for seeding down about 200,000 acres. We have done things, Mr. Speaker.

In 1967, we undertook a direct program to assist farmers in the ARDA area to build modern hog-raising facilities. We offered a grant of 25 per cent of the costs up to \$4,000 per farm. To the end of last month we have paid grants totalling \$742,640 to some 328 farmers. I challenge the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) to name any program under his Government aimed at positive agricultural adjustment in our farming industry that even nearly approached this.

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition is fond of commenting that all this Government does is to make grants to industry and forgets the farmer. Just look at the record. Since 1964-65 — 535 fodder storages — \$67,000 in round figures; individual irrigation projects — \$34,000; re-seeding marginal land — \$514,000; land development grants in irrigation projects — \$174,000; hog building grants — \$742,000; farm water and sewage grants \$1,935,000; total of some \$3,468,000. To this I can also add the refund of sales tax on grain storage amounting to about \$600,000 this past fiscal year and about \$3,800,000 a year for tax-free purple gas, making a total of millions of dollars.

This, Mr. Speaker, is a listing of grants paid towards permanent improvements to individual farmers in the less than five years we have held office. Mr. Speaker, the Budget before you includes provision for further assistance to farmers towards diversification and towards assisting our livestock industry. You will note an item of \$120,000 to provide for grants under The Livestock Loans Guarantee Act. And as the figures have already indicated over \$10 million have been paid out to some 2,700 farmers. Assuming that interest rates stay at present level, an individual borrower can earn grants of about \$430 under

this plan.

The Estimates provide for an increase of \$193,000 to a Budget item of \$375,000 for the seeding of marginal lands. Further, Mr. Speaker, Members will note a substantial increase in funds provided to the Veterinary Division. Because of the problems experienced in holding veterinarians in rural areas we propose to double the grants available to Veterinary Service Districts.

The estimates of the Economics and Statistics Branch include over \$20,000 to meet the costs of additional farm management courses and costs of extending the CANFARM program to Saskatchewan farmers. The estimate for hog building grants is increased by \$60,000 to \$410,000. Now, Mr. Speaker, we have devoted much effort and substantial funds to encourage and support an expanding livestock industry. We are very much aware, however, that substantial opportunities may be available to us in the diversification of crops.

I am sure that with this in mind all Members of the Legislature heard with much pleasure the Provincial Treasurer's (Mr. Steuart) announcement regarding a Crop Breeding Institute at the University. Discoveries of such an institute would be available throughout the Prairie Provinces and, therefore, we feel it would be only equitable that the Federal Government share financing of the project.

\$400,000 would permit the establishment of a first-class institute and we are ready and willing to contribute \$200,000 towards it, if it is matched by the Federal Government.

I would like to refer briefly to our Community Pasture Program. Over 100,000 head of cattle and calves, of which 38,000 were breeding cows, were carried for 3,442 patrons last year. Increased estimates reflect an increasing expenditure for the maintenance of grass stands in those pastures. We will open two new pastures, one north of Tompkins, and the other on a section of the Lizard Lake pasture for sheep this coming year.

Mr. Speaker, we are proud of our agricultural program. We believe it to be one of the best in Canada. It is a far cry from the treatment meted out to our agricultural industry in one-shot emergency measures under the NDP. This Government has set a pace and record of achievement in its program towards assistance to our people of Indian ancestry that is widely regarded as the best in Canada. I need not remind you of the many years that these people languished under the former NDP Government without a single positive helpful step to really improve their position and status.

The Department of Agriculture is proud to play an important role through the management of our training farms and through our program of land improvement on Indian reserves. Indeed, these programs are recognized throughout Canada as a forward-looking imaginative step towards assisting these people to achieve their proper place in our society.

In 1969 we appointed a special extension agent to assist Indian farmers and bands in this province. The program is supported by the Federal Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. Last year under this program 37 Indian farmers were assisted in improving 3,800 acres of land. To date, 16

community pastures are under construction on Indian reserves under their own supervision and management.

Our estimates for the next fiscal year include a total of \$340,000 for development on Indian reserves, an increase of \$160,000 over the previous year. This Government has pioneered in the development of training farms for our people of Indian ancestry. The farms at Lebreton and Green Lake are being expanded. At Cumberland House we have five local families in the process of being established in their own ranching business. The large budgeting increase will provide for further development of farms at Silver Lake, La Loche, Ile-a-la-Crosse and Mortlach started last year and to commence a new farm at Beauval.

We are proud of this achievement and proud of the fact that last year we employed 89 adults on these farms and some eight teenagers. I listened to the financial critic trying to attack this Budget. Once again, I state that it indicates his complete lack of reality when he said that the Capital Budget was reduced. So I ask: would he spend more money to clear and break more land this year? Would he spend more money to drain more land and thus bring more land into production in a year like this? Apparently by what he said yesterday he would. I point out to you, Mr. Speaker, that these are the items that I would like to deal with but time does not permit. New legislation will be introduced that will substantially help our agricultural industry. Before I close I want to remind this House of the significant achievements and records established by our farmers under a Liberal Government since 1964, namely: the largest wheat crop in the history of Saskatchewan, 1966; the highest per acre yield of wheat in the history of our province, 1969; the highest per acre yield of barley in the history of Saskatchewan, 1966; the highest per acre yield of flax since 1905 in 1969; the highest per acre yield of rapeseed in 1968; the largest rapeseed crop in history, 1969; and now they are on the verge of a tremendous rapeseed industry for our province along with the many other records that I have mentioned earlier. So in appreciation, I want to thank the Premier (Mr. Thatcher) and the Hon. D.G. Steuart the Provincial Treasurers who provided the necessary budgets. I want to thank my colleagues for their support in initiating the policies and programs that made these records possible. I want to thank the staff of the Department of Agriculture in carrying out these programs and especially our farmers of Saskatchewan who have accomplished these fantastic achievements. I will support the motion, I will not support the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. G.R. Bowerman (Shellbrook): — Mr. Speaker, while listening to the Hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) I began to wonder if I was really in the right province. There were a number of things of course that he said that brought me back to the realization of the fact that we really are here in Saskatchewan. That was when he started his usual Liberal journey back into the past about nationalization of farm land and when he began to talk about socialism in Saskatchewan insofar as nationalization of farms is concerned. He began to claim sole responsibility for agricultural diversification in the province and he constantly wandered around in the years of 1944 to 1964 in order to justify his own Government's inactivity in 1970. I would like to say to the Hon. Minister of Agriculture that the hard cold facts remain, Mr. Speaker.

Saskatchewan agriculture in 1970 is in extreme difficulty, more serious by far than it has been for the last one or two or three decades and it behooves the Minister of Agriculture and his Government in 1970 to do something about the very serious position of agriculture.

As this, Mr. Speaker, is my first occasion to enter debate in this Session I want to add to the congratulatory remarks of other Members in honoring the appointment of Dr. Stephen Worobetz to the honorable office of Lieutenant Governor of Saskatchewan. We are aware in some limited measure of the respect and decorum which is required in this honorable office and are able to appreciate from our first observations the very able capacity and competence with which he has undertaken that duty. I could not extend these remarks without being reminded of the warm personality and the humanly responsive character of the retiring Lieutenant Governor, The Honourable Mr. R.L. Hanbidge. I simply re-echo the words already spoken by Hon. Members on behalf of His Honour's retirement and his years of service in this Legislature.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Bowerman: — I would suppose that while we are making our congratulations, Mr. Speaker, the other most worthy effort of commendation in this House is to congratulate the electors of Kelvington constituency for their decisive and to that rather controversial election of 1967. I congratulate our colleague, Mr. Byers, for a very excellent performance in delivering his first speech in this House. I suggest that his competence and contribution so early in the game is a compliment to all who supported him at the polls and he has, indeed, already become a welcome strength among his colleagues on this side of the House and a formidable opposition to the present Government who sit to your right, Sir.

I would suppose that the Hon. Premier and Members of his Government may very reluctantly admit now that Kelvington by-election was not just a usual Saskatchewan by-election. I rather suppose that it was an election that conclusively placed public opinion on the controversy of 1967 in that Kelvington seat. I believe as well that it expressed public opinion on the flatulent arrogance of the Premier and his Liberal party that surrounded this whole matter from beginning to end.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Bowerman: — Again, Mr. Speaker, I suggest the reaction of public opinion to the \$40 million tax increase was an expression of public opinion on the deterrent fees for health programs.

An Hon. Member: — \$35 million.

Mr. Bowerman: — \$35 million.

An Hon. Member: — \$40 million.

Mr. Bowerman: — By the time it is done it will be over \$40 million. Tax on farm fuels, the tax that was added on meals, the tax that was placed on long-distant telephone calls, taxes on household goods only to mention a few which came after that 1967 election.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, when the rest of Saskatchewan people have the same opportunity to express an opinion on that Liberal deal of 1967, that they will take the lead which Kelvington has already established . . .

Mr. D.G. McLennan (Last Mountain): — We'll see!

Mr. Bowerman: — Fine, we will see. Saskatchewan Liberals will then disappear, I suggest, as a Liberal force and they will only become a nucleus for the Western separatist party.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Bowerman: — On Monday last, Mr. Speaker, we listened to the Liberal program on how to go broke in one easy lesson. Perhaps the Treasurer's Budget would be better sung as a postlude to a passing Liberal Government and the broken and badly bent taxpayers of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Bowerman: — We have often heard the Liberal Premier proclaim his abundance of Liberal wisdom. Time after time he has charged Saskatchewan people with the obvious. There is no magic, he says, no magic about the source of Government funds. If people want more services they must be prepared to pay for them. Well, Mr. Speaker, I would advise the Premier and this House that has been a fact to Saskatchewan people for a long time. But, indeed, since 1964 it has become increasingly obvious, in fact so abundantly obvious, that when Saskatchewan people again have a tax buck to spend they will not get a Liberal Government to spend it for them. Saskatchewan people have been more than generous with this Government. And I suggest they don't mind paying taxes for services. But this Government will regret the day when Saskatchewan people know that they have been had, when they know that they have been had by a 60 per cent property tax increase in five years with a constantly decreasing public service. And this I suggest is too much to expect.

The tax facts that were so ably presented in rebuttal to the Budget Speech by my hon. colleague from Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) must, I suggest, become known by every citizen in this province. And when known and understood, Mr. Speaker, I say, it will spell the demise of this totally unacceptable approach by Government to its electorate.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Bowerman: — Mr. Speaker, I don't pretend to understand the very complicated and complex matters of management or distribution of high finance; but I can ask the simple question that is on the mind and on the lips of every bricklayer, of every pensioner, of every unemployed construction worker, of every farmer, teacher, hospital worker, home owner, lessee, small businessman or you name them, and that question is: where in fact is the money going?

Mr. Speaker, we will have increased our Provincial expenditures from slightly less than \$200 million in 1964 to slightly over \$400 million in 1970. That's \$208 million more taxes in six short years. The Premier tells us there is no magic about

where Government funds come from and that of course is obvious. Therefore, \$400 million of taxes are now coming from fewer taxpayers' pockets in 1970 than did \$200 million of taxes in 1964.

We have of late heard some remarks from the Premier about the bread-and-butter issues. It is interesting to observe that when the Prime Minister of Canada calls Canadian Premiers together to discuss matters of Canada's constitution, our Premier performs rather well on national television in regard to faking a prairie storm on what he calls the bread-and-butter issues. But when the Prime Minister calls a conference of Canadian Premiers to discuss the real bread-and-butter issues our confused and noble Premier thinks of the B & B conference and makes a take-off on Western separatism. To me, Mr. Speaker, and to the people I represent this Government totally misrepresents the serious plight of this province's agricultural industry. It dismisses it, as did the Hon. Minister of Agriculture this afternoon, with idle chatter about loans to diversify and it gives no serious thought to the effects or the results of its loan program even three years down the line. I say that this kind of benevolence the farmers of Saskatchewan can well do without. It is the kind of theory that has been directing farmers for the last decade. They have said to farmers, "Specialize." They have said to farmers, "Diversify." They have said to farmers, "Grow all the grain that you can grow." And they are now saying to farmers, "Don't grow any grain at all." The agricultural industry of Saskatchewan and Canada is facing the greatest social and physical upheaval in its entire history. It is an industry that contributes over 42 per cent to our gross national wealth in Canada and more than 85 per cent to our gross provincial wealth in Saskatchewan. In the face of these staggering facts, Mr. Speaker, we actually have a Prime Minister who has unquestionably identified himself by his actions as really not caring about the problems of agriculture.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Bowerman: — He has gone on record to say, Sir, that he is not interested in selling wheat nor is he concerned about the Western farm problems. I want to quote briefly from *The Western Producer*, February 19, 1970, and the headline is this: PM's remark on tractors brings question in House." And this, Sir, is the quotation:

Prime Minister Trudeau faced a barrage of questions in the Commons last week about remarks he made to a student Liberal conference in Ottawa.

Mr. Trudeau is reported to have said that when he was out West he saw some farmers riding \$20,000 tractors and they probably owned land costing \$100,000 to \$200,000. He was asked why when Montreal asked for millions of dollars for Expo the money was provided, but when Western farmers needed \$200 million it wasn't available. He replied that the money for Expo was because of an obligation by a previous Government.

I might say that that same previous Government and that same Prime Minister who made that commitment also made a commitment to the Western farmer.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Bowerman: — He made a commitment to guarantee to the Western farmers, \$2 a bushel for their wheat.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Bowerman: — Mr. Speaker, I go on with the quotation.

The student questioner said, 'But I don't understand why the farmers can't get the \$200 million.'

'I don't think these people are poor,' the Prime Minister is reported to have said.

I don't think they are poor the Prime Minister is telling the people. At the same time we have in this province, I suggest, a doddling, old-man's Government that is obsessed with its private monopolies and worn-out clichés. Its total imagination is still caught-up in the 80,000 jobs and reducing the tax on turkey saddles. Simply nothing more. While agricultural disaster is knocking at the door of every farmer and every rural community and every smaller urban centre in this province, we have a Liberal Premier and a Prime Minister of Canada locked in a mating dance that resembles the prairie chickens out on the farm which I operate — and I suppose they are out on the farm which some of you people are operating —

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Bowerman: — the whole objective of which is to deceive the innocent spectator. Mr. Speaker, surely for a province that has 85 per cent of her gross productive wealth invested in agriculture, the most commendable single project to which her financial and brain trust must apply itself would be the security and the stability of that industry. It is not good enough for a highly developed society to say that, when it has produced more wheat than an inefficient system can dispose of, it should label the producer inefficient and direct him into growing hogs or, when it is said that he has produced too many hogs, that it should tell him to grow hay or that, when he has produced too much hay it tells him to go borrow some more money and to try raising cattle.

Saskatchewan Governments must begin now to scan the horizons of its agricultural potential. Solutions to the problems of today's agriculture are not in the patchwork, hodgepodge of government band-aid programs. Liberal governments have sloughed off their responsibilities too long to assert agricultural management programs at the secondary levels of production control, distribution, marketing and of farm inputs. Too long, I say, have the governments and the experts hid behind the diversities of agriculture to excuse their fraudulent inactivity and their marriage vows with the industrial community.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Bowerman: — It has moved agriculture from crisis to crisis and it has continued to use the old line that farmers must become more efficient. There is absolute and unmistakable evidence about the management ability and efficiency of today's prairie farmer at the farm level. There is equally absolute and

unmistakable evidence about the management ability and efficiency of today's Prairie farmer at the farm level. There is equally absolute and unmistakable evidence in the area of public responsibility from the farmer to the consumers of the world. There are gross inefficiencies in transportation, in storage, in marketing and in uncontrolled prices and profits for the service industry. It is in this area of public responsibility that approximately 80 per cent or better of the farmer's dollar is being spent.

Mr. Speaker, the strength of Canadian agriculture, and particularly Western agriculture, has immeasurably depreciated since Trudeau-mania has become the governing force in our nation. Why? Because he has moved the public responsibility for agriculture further away from the farmer than any other Canadian government or any other Prime Minister in history.

Mr. G.G. Leith (Elrose): — That's not true.

Mr. Bowerman: — Well, I'd like to have the Hon. Member display the facts if he feels that it is not true.

Mr. Leith: — Be glad to.

Mr. Bowerman: — Very well, we will be glad to listen to the reports. Our Prime Minister undoubtedly has obtained a world record for the heights of his crass uncontrolled mania displayed in his statements respecting the public or his Government's responsibility to sell wheat and the unconcern he has for people who meet him on \$20,000 tractors. In the words of my respected colleagues I suggest his ignorance has almost become remarkable. Add to this, Mr. Speaker, the castigation of farmer organizations by the Minister of Highways and you have a combination that the farmers of this province must soon unload or suffer irreparable damage.

Our province and its farmers must not yield to the pressures placed upon agriculture today that are being exerted by the corporate industrial complex which is saying and they are saying it for their own gain that we must reduce our farmers 40 per cent or more by 1980.

I would suggest we think of the absurdity of such a statement when you analyse what it is in fact saying. They are saying that one farmer, Farmer A, will or should buy one or two or three or four or five of his neighbors, and that somehow this will magically reduce world production of farm products. Mr. Speaker, if Farmer A is to buy out his neighbors he must unavoidably become more efficient on that same land acreage by making that farm land produce to its greatest maximum potential. If he does not do this, he will in fact fail. We are at this stage now in our development. I, Mr. Speaker, own the family farm and I also farm land equal to four or five of my father's neighbors in his days of farming, and some agricultural or economic expert is telling me to buy out four or five more of the same farmers by 1980. There must unavoidably come long-term plans to guide agriculture safely into the future. And I suggest, Sir, that farmers will acknowledge the fact that Liberal governments just don't plan.

For some time in this House, Mr. Speaker, I have listened to various Members of the Government extol the virtues of their

great Northern and Indian development program. In the same breath they have claimed that virtually nothing but stagnation of North Saskatchewan occurred during the years of the former Government's administration. I have sat as a member of the Premier's Indian and Métis Task Force and I have listened anxiously and expectantly for the great program developments which the Premier so frequently speaks about. We have seen a new department established and we have heard the Premier and his colleagues refer to the massive sums of money he is prepared to spend. We hear Government Members talk about how many percentage points of employment have been opened to Indian people and, however small or large that may be, we indeed give credit and urge the Government to continue its efforts in this regard. One thing I have purposely not engaged in since coming to this Legislature, Sir, is to discuss the developments of the past. We, on this side of the House, live and represent the present and on-going generations, something that the Liberal party in this province has not, as yet, accomplished. We recognize the fact that the problems of today will more than equal all the combined energies, experience and mental capacities of the on-going generations, and to this fact we must address ourselves. However, because there is confusion about Northern and Indian development in this province, and because of the many old and tired Members of the Liberal party who have not yet realized that they are, in fact, the Government today, but in fact they continue to rate their own progress by misrepresenting the past, I suggest it therefore becomes necessary to set the records straight. I do so only to demonstrate the pitifully shameful record of this Government with its \$200 million more of capital with which to work and a sound base from which it was able to launch new and imaginative programs since 1964. In some respects, Mr. Speaker, I believe I can set that record straight from the position of my experience with Northern people, fishermen, trappers, prospectors, community development programs, that were established and with industries and development of Northern Saskatchewan from a forgotten wasteland in 1944 to an integral part of Saskatchewan in 1964.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Bowerman: — If they were in the House, I would challenge the Hon. Members for the constituencies of Athabasca and Meadow Lake — and the Member for Meadow Lake I see is in his seat — who represent principally all of the area of Northern Saskatchewan for them to present any factual evidence contrary to what I am about to say. I challenge, as well, Mr. Speaker, the Premier, and the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart), and either of the Ministers who deal in mines or resources and Indian and Métis Affairs, or any of the rest of that Government who sit to your right, Sir, with respect to the production of any single bit of evidence of their Government's programs, industry or community development, they might name it, including the pulp mill program in the city of Prince Albert, any of these programs I say that will match the programs of progress that occurred during the years that you and your Government so frequently refer to. And may I briefly refer to the programs of major impact on the progress of those years. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, let's not forget that as late as 1944 there were very few established settlements of people in Northern Saskatchewan, with the exception of those along the old fur trade routes of the Churchill and Fond-du-Lac Rivers.

People living in the barren land areas of the extreme

northeast of our province were still actively a nomadic people and a nomadic generation. Their life principally consisted of that of following the caribou herds as a source of existence. I would offer to the Members that if any of them wants to enlarge his understanding of that experience, I can refer him to Farley Mowat's book, "People of the Deer." But I want them to relate that situation in 1944, Mr. Speaker, to the Wollaston Lake settlement of 1964. Wollaston Lake settlement didn't exist in 1944. In 1964 it was a community with a church, a school, a modern, well-equipped people owned co-op store, a post office, coastal commercial fisheries processing plants, a tourist and air transportation service, a regular mail delivery, a pool room and a theatre owned and operated by the Indian Chief Loui Benounie, an airstrip for large wheeled aircraft, a producer-owned fish marketing co-op and a fur marketing service. These were all for the benefit of the people of that community . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Bowerman: — . . . that were principally a nomadic people before those years. I could go on to list the other social benefits that came as a result of regular visits of public health nurses, Department of Natural Resources officials, Welfare officers, Co-op Development officers, and an air ambulance service that was ready and willing at the people's point of greatest need to come when the call went out.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Bowerman: — But I can also tell the Members opposite that since 1964 that service has not been available to the people of Northern Saskatchewan. They must first put their money on the line before that aircraft will come to them. I can go on to list many other benefits as a result. This was a program I suggest for the development of Northern people and for the development of industry in Northern Saskatchewan. Similar developments followed at Reindeer Lake, Pine House, Pelican Narrows, Deschambault, Stanley and at Lac La Ronge itself. If the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) was in his seat, I would like to remind him and his punitively inert Government that the only means of overland transportation into the now thriving community of Lac La Ronge as late as 1944, Mr. Speaker, was a 200-mile canoe trip down the Montreal River to that community. By as early as 1946 and 1947 only two and one-half to three years after a change of government, cars and modern transportation were being seen by the indigent populations of that community in their village of Lac La Ronge.

It is true, Mr. Speaker, that the Government of that day was involved in a housing program where houses were costing \$1,000 or \$1200 or less per house, but what must be said of that operation is that people were involved. People were involved in logging, in sawing the logs and in the construction of their own houses.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Bowerman: — This not only reduced the cash cost of the house but

it did provide employment and it provided personal interest in the result of that construction. One of the greatest follies of this Government is exactly what the Members so proudly described as “their program”, and that is moving people from tents and from log cabins into \$17,000 Nelson homes. This, they do, without any involvement or very little involvement or any apparent appreciation and interest by many of those whom they claim to so generously assist.

Mr. Speaker, I must briefly mention in closing the other developments in Saskatchewan history that occurred during that period, which will yet be known as the greatest social development experience among Indian peoples of North America. I refer now to the fur management program. The present Government would so much like to say that it developed that fur management program, Northern cooperative trading stores program, cooperative fisheries marketing, fur marketing services, Northern schools development program, prospectors’ training schools, Northern radio communications network, road to resources, Saskatchewan airways, community development and cooperative training, natural resources conservation and management programs.

I could go on to list more of them, Mr. Speaker, but let me finally add the greatest single industrial development in this province’ history to date is the development of the Uranium City complex, an industrial development which virtually moved the old town of Goldfields off its foundation across the Athabasca ice to the new and ultra-modern community of Uranium City. No wonder the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) fails so consistently to mention his constituency and his people.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Bowerman: — Mr. Speaker, there are programs and attitudes towards people which even massive sums of money cannot produce. I suggest that the actions of this Government are heard much above the saying of the Premier and his colleagues about its Northern Indian and Métis program. Sincerity and concern for development of people do not come through publicity-oriented programs to fulfil the partisan political objectives of its sponsor . . .

We have heard the Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) say that the Government proposes to increase the welfare allowances under the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan. This, Mr. Speaker, is a welcome announcement to many in our province. The situation which exists now simply cannot continue and simply must not continue. But I want to suggest to the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) and the Hon. Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald) that these announced increases will mean very little unless the Government changes its attitude and its policy for the administration of relief to the needy.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Bowerman: — I charge the Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald) and the Government with current actions of suppression and harassment of welfare applicants that do have legitimate claims for welfare assistance. Mr. Speaker, I make my own claim that acute poverty and inevitable physical and social starvation do exist and exist with the knowledge of welfare authorities even in my own constituency.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Bowerman: — Indeed increased welfare allowances are a welcome announcement. But commensurate therewith must come a greater demonstration by the Government of a humanitarian concern to share the humiliations and desperations of the poor.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Bowerman: — Mr. Speaker, I want to turn for a moment to the conditions in my own constituency which occur as a direct result of Liberal . . .

Mr. J.J. Charlebois (City Park-University): — How come you didn't tell Cy MacDonald about that . .

Mr. Bowerman: — I can. I can. Would you like me to tell you?

Mr. Charlebois: — Yes, I would.

Mr. Bowerman: — You would?

An Hon. Member: — Where is he?

An Hon. Member: — He's down taking a swim.

An Hon. Member: — Where is he now? Why isn't he here?

Mr. Bowerman: — Mr. Speaker, I want to turn for a moment to the conditions in my own constituency which occur as a direct result, I suggest, of Liberal policy either national or provincial. For indeed it has been said that Liberal times are hard times.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Bowerman: — These, Mr. Premier, I believe are the nitty-gritty or the real bread and butter issues of Saskatchewan today. Your Government will be taking from the taxpayers \$200 million more in taxes in 1970 than it did six short years ago. Small businesses, small urban centres, farmers and residents in our constituency see absolutely no evidence of increased services in return for those increased taxes.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Bowerman: — We see in our weekly newspaper that 13 families left the small community of Big River simply because of no hope and no assurance of future employment after the destruction of the Big River sawmill.

The Premier still talks in terms of the local wind-bag when he says his Government expects to undertake a large industrial complex in that area in the near future. The population depletion and the social unrest of that community are the direct result of this Government's inactivity to respond in a positive

way with some of the annual \$200 million of taxes.

I can assure you, Mr. Premier, that the people of Big River know that the uncertainty which surrounds their timber industries now will be settled forthwith only after your Government's demise from office.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Bowerman: — Mr. Speaker, the timber won't be given away to the large corporations as it is now in jeopardy of such action.

While I am dealing with the Big River area I want to make reference to correspondence that is dated February 2, 1970. This is from a group of people in the Big River area who are attempting now to set up a Northern Development Association, because they have viewed others, such as newspapers, bottlenworks and grain companies, getting grants from the Federal Government, from \$10,000 to \$42,000. They are now making an application for some grants in that respect. Some of their comments are interesting, Mr. Speaker. They are asking that the Provincial Government take some action with respect to farm costs on machinery and machinery parts. It is interesting that I should quote here from some of the costs that they describe:

A 50/10 tractor tire has a price range from \$500 to \$728, a Massey-Ferguson 155 fanbelt \$4.50 to a high of \$11.20 depending on the needs.

They go on to mention that farmers rather than fast machinery dealer salesmen should be licensed to supply and service farm machine companies.

Mr. Speaker, they also go on in this letter to suggest that they are indeed in need of telephones and telephone services. They are having to wait and many of them have never had telephone services. And some of them now could have telephone services if they had the money to pay, would be paying in the range from \$390 to \$900 for installation alone. This, I suggest, is a disgrace in itself.

Each day, Mr. Speaker, there is new evidence of the erosion of rural life in Saskatchewan. Post offices in the rural areas beyond the railroad that have served so well in the farming communities are now under order of the Liberal Government in Ottawa to be closed. The small local community stores which have housed these post offices will inevitably be forced to close their doors. Rural people will be required to meet the added expense of driving the additional many miles for services.

Proposed withdrawal of certain railroad services to all the small urban communities in my constituency will hasten the development of ghost town results and the eventual complete withdrawal of the farming communities. And I simply ask, Mr. Speaker: what has our Provincial Government done by way of identifiable actions to prevent this process from taking place?

Mr. Speaker, I cannot nor will I support a government nor its Budget Speech that plays so much on words and so little on facts. I will support the amendment and be very glad to do so.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. J.C. McIsaac (Minister of Education): — Mr. Speaker, this is my first opportunity in this Session to participate in formal debate and before dealing with the Budget. Sir, I would like to congratulate you on the very capable and colorful manner in which you are again executing your duties this Session. And I wish also to congratulate our new Lieutenant Governor, Dr. Stephen Worobetz. It has been pointed out in the House that his appointment is an honor and a recognition to the medical profession and incidentally, Mr. Speaker, it is a secondary honor too to professional educators. I am sure most Members are aware that his brother Peter is a well-regarded member of the staff of the Department of Education.

I want to acknowledge too, Mr. Speaker, the services to the province so ably rendered by the retiring Lieutenant Governor, Mr. R.L. Hanbidge. As an elected Member, Mr. Speaker, he represented most of the area of my constituency. He has always had a very special regard for the Kerrobert-Luseland area, and I can tell him and tell the House that the people all through that country likewise had a very special regard for him. I know that I am speaking for all of my constituents when I say “Thanks, Dinny, for a job well done and we wish you the very best in retirement.”

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIsaac: — I am pleased, Mr. Speaker, to take part in this Debate. On Monday the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) brought down a Budget that warrants the support of all Members of this House.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIsaac: — And judging by the half-hearted, sort of half-baked criticism so far advanced by the NDP opposite, I am sure they will be voting for it. Can they vote against an increase in homeowner grants? Can they vote against increased aid to municipalities for police protection? Increased aid to libraries? Increased aid to the school boards of the province?

An Hon. Member: — They don't dare!

Mr. McIsaac: — This is a budget that gives the largest dollar increase to education ever given in the history of this province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIsaac: — And yet I am sure Members opposite will complain, Mr. Speaker. You know I am convinced, in the short time I have been in this House, that they enjoy whining and wailing more so than anything else. You know it is interesting to note that, as this country moves into the seventies and as other political parties look at the problems of the seventies and solutions of the seventies, our Socialist friends opposite still look backwards to the Thirties. They love that old depression complex, continually harking back to the Thirties. They do their utmost both inside the House and outside of it to perpetuate that old depression psychology that spawned them in the first place.

Mr. Speaker, we have had some references in this Debate to the changes in the seating plan of Members opposite. I want to welcome at this time too, before I forget, the new Member for Kelvington (Mr. Byers) and I note with interest too, Mr. Speaker, that he has been added to the force of education critics in the Opposition, and I welcome that very sincerely. Now I hope it isn't indicative of their priority in education the fact that all of these critics occupy the last row. Perhaps the numbers, Mr. Speaker, do indicate their philosophy in education in another way, although they have added another member to the force of critics thus lowering the teacher-pupil ratio, and without any perceptible improvement in quality, at least that we have seen yet, in the course of this Session.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIsaac: — In short, quantity before quality.

Mr. Speaker, in the field of education there has been a great deal of discussion in the past few months about budget reviews, teacher-pupil ratios, and other related questions. Some of these discussions have been very lively. Some of them very alarmist and some of them in many cases generating a good deal more heat than light. And again we have had examples of this kind of discussion both inside the Chamber and outside of it. The Member for Weyburn (Mr. Pepper) joined the club today with his remarks.

But before dealing with this to any great extent, Mr. Speaker, I want to refer to a couple of comments made yesterday by the financial critic (Mr. Blakeney). You know he did an excellent job I thought. I attended a Little Theatre performance last night in the city here and, while those performers were excellent, I don't think they came up to the job he did here yesterday in that speech that he made, and the fact that there was very, very little of actual criticism contained in it when one examined it.

An Hon. Member: — Good acting!

Mr. McIsaac: — Good acting is correct. One of the criticisms he made with respect to the homeowner grant — he was very careful not to oppose it, not to oppose the increase — so that he centred his opposition around the fact that our Indian and Métis people in the province would perhaps not be able to receive it, because obviously he couldn't find anything else to say in opposition. Under the policies of the former Government, or the lack of them, in providing housing for our Indian and Métis people, Mr. Speaker, they would have never got the homeowner grant, because native people in this province are receiving major assistance from this Government which was even agreed to by the Member for Shellbrook (Mr. Bowerman). He talked again yesterday about giving them the homeowner grant and in typical fashion didn't seem at first concerned with providing these people with homes. I can assure him that more and more of those people every year in this province will become eligible for the homeowner grant.

The budget in the Department of Education this year provides a sum of \$936,000 for special training and upgrading of our native people in this province, which I can point out, Mr. Speaker, is over double the Provincial support of this program in the current year.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIsaac: — I want to mention particularly a completely new, Provincially-sponsored program for people of Indian ancestry, which has been instituted this current year. The programs are put on by the Department of Education and the referrals are made by the Indian and Métis Department and the Saskatchewan Métis Society and the Federation of Saskatchewan Indians. This program was initiated at the request of both of these organizations in an effort to help bridge the educational gap that exists particularly in many of these rural areas where many of these people reside.

This year this program is being offered at approximately 35 different centres throughout the province. In addition to this the Department cooperates with the Department of Welfare, with Federal authorities, Manpower, ARDA and other agencies, to provide education opportunities for the native people of this province. We expect, Mr. Speaker, that the monies contained in this Budget should provide for an increase in the number of trainees for people of Indian ancestry alone from about 1100 this year to approximately 2,000 next year.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIsaac: — Mr. Speaker, we were able to cooperate this year with Federal authorities, in the Department of Manpower particularly, and the Provincial Department of Agriculture as well to provide 15 different courses throughout the province, accommodating about 360 farmers in farm management training. Nine of these courses are 11 weeks in length and three of them are six weeks in length. These are new courses in addition to other one-week courses in farm mechanics, farm machinery maintenance. That's something over 400 additional farmers are taking advantage of. The interest and the attendance at these courses have been excellent and certainly indicate the wisdom of this move.

The Member for Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) yesterday also mentioned the lack of vocational training opportunities particularly here in Regina. I want to point out to him again that this Budget provides for an increase in enrolments from approximately 6,600 this year to just over 8,000 for next year. The major part of that increase, Mr. Speaker, of course being in the two Provincial institutes at Saskatoon and at Moose Jaw.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIsaac: — He spoke about the need for additional vocational upgrading for adult workers particularly and adult trainees. For many years, as I am sure Hon. Members are well aware on both sides of the House, the emphasis in adult upgrading has been to bring trainees up to the vocational grade 10 level in order that they could then enter further courses primarily in trades training. I might say, Mr. Speaker, that the entire approach developed here to curriculum and the courses being offered in this province are second to none in the country.

There have been increasing interest and demand in offering grade 11 and grade 12 courses to adult students in order that

they might meet entrance requirements in the two-year technology programs or just in order that they might get a grade 12 certificate. We are offering courses at Prince Albert, at Regina and at Moose Jaw this year. We will be improving and extending this program and I hope before too many months we will be able to implement a grade 12 equivalency certificate for adults who are anxious to obtain a grade 12 standing, because it does not seem sensible for men and women, presently in the work force — 35 and 40 years of age, to take a grade 11 and a grade 12 program that is based almost completely on today's high school program with the departmental grade 12 examinations, which after all are designed primarily for university entrance. I am convinced that the development of a special course tailored to their needs is not only a sensible step but a necessary one and one that certainly will be welcomed by the adult trainees who are interested in furthering their standing.

Discussions on this are now taking place between our Department and the Federal Department of Manpower and Saskatchewan Newstart. I might mention too that Saskatchewan Newstart has done a good deal of research and work in this particular area and it has been of great assistance to us.

I would like to turn now for a few moments, Mr. Speaker, to this question again of student-teacher ratios and school grants. Let us take an example of a rural unit and look at those student-teacher ratios and the grant figures for the past few years. We heard today the examples cited by the Member from Moosomin (Mr. Gardner) in this connection. And I suppose we could choose almost any unit in the province to illustrate the trend and illustrate the patterns. I have the figures for the Lloydminster unit which I intended to use in the previous Debate and didn't have the chance to do so. I am going to use them here.

In the year 1963 the teacher-pupil ratio in that unit was about 22.2 to 1 and it dropped gradually 21.6 the next year, 20.8, 20.6, 20 even and 19.2 in '68 and last year to below 19 to 18.8 approximately. In the meantime the operating grants provided by the Province to that unit rose from \$370,000 in 1963 to \$598,000 last year. Now in the current school year this particular unit employs 87½ teachers. In their preliminary budget submitted to the Department they indicated they were planning to employ 85 teachers in the forthcoming year, September, 1970.

The professional educators in the Department reviewed their enrolments not only in the whole system but in each and every school and the programs being offered in those various schools. They came up with a figure of 73 teachers and an average ratio of about 22.6 to 1 which is roughly what it was five or six years ago. When you look at the classroom loads in this unit the study shows that 42 of those teachers (87½ total staff) had 20 students or less on the register of their classrooms and of these 26 were in the elementary and 16 in the high school. There is one school within a very few miles of Lloydminster with an enrolment of 75 students grades one to nine with five teachers employed. One teacher has grades one and two, total 16 students. The next one has grades three and four, a total of 15 students. The next one has grades five and six, a total of 23 students. The grade seven and eight teacher has a total of 13 students. The grade nine teacher, who is also the principal and something close to a \$9,000 a year salary, has eight students in his class.

Now perhaps this is an extreme example. I didn't particularly look for an example of this kind in bringing in the example of the Lloydminster unit. But we will be recognizing, Mr. Speaker, three teachers for that school in the coming year. Enrolment will be down somewhat as well, I understand, and yet Hon. Members would accuse us of undermining the quality of education by taking action to improve situations of this kind.

I will have a good deal more to say on this question tomorrow, Mr. Speaker, and other points with respect to ratios, school grants, and so on, but it has been estimated, Sir, that, if present trends continue in teacher-pupil ratios here and elsewhere within 25 to 30 years, we would see half of the population of North America seated in the classroom and the other half standing in front as instructors. And I suppose at noon everyone would get up and change places, I don't know what you would do then. That prediction was probably made facetiously and it sounds ridiculous, but it isn't too far-fetched and the reports come, not from us, but from the States. And in a number of other places you can find a similar situation developing.

As I say, Mr. Speaker, I will have a good deal more to say on this and other topics tomorrow and I beg leave at this time to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

INTRODUCTION OF CADETS

Mr. Speaker: — Before we proceed with the business of the House I wish to introduce to all the Members of the Legislature 36 cadets situated in the Speaker's gallery from the 10th Field Artillery Cadet Corps and their seven officers. They are under the direction and command of Major Bright. After they leave the gallery they will be inspected by the Minister of Welfare, the Hon. C.P. MacDonald.

I am sure that all Members of the Legislative Assembly would wish to join me in extending a very warm and hardy welcome to all these cadets and to their officers.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

MOTIONS FOR RETURNS

Return No. 33

Mr. R. Romanow (Saskatoon-Riversdale) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 33 showing:

- (1) The number of applications that were made in the calendar year 1969 to the Crimes Compensation Board.
- (2) The number that were successful.
- (3) The amount paid out in successful claims by the said Board in the said year.
- (4) The breakdown, by sections of the Criminal Code, of the said applications in the year 1969.

Hon. D.V. Heald (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I have discussed this motion with the Hon. Member and I am proposing an amendment which I think will give him the information which he is really asking for, so I would accordingly move, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Grant that Motion No. 33 be amended by deleting Nos. 1 to 4 inclusive and substituting therefor the following:

- (1) How many applications were made in the calendar year 1969 to the Crimes Compensation Board.
- (2) How many awards were made in the calendar year 1969 by the said Board.
- (3) What is the total amount of the awards made in the said year 1969.
- (4) What is the breakdown, by sections of the Criminal Code, of the said awards in the year 1969.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 2 — An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Bill of Rights Act

Hon. D.V. Heald (Attorney General) moved second reading of Bill No. 2 — An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Bill of Rights Act.

Hon. Mr. Heald: — Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I move for leave to introduce this Bill to amend The Saskatchewan Bill of Rights Act. This Act has been in the forefront of human rights legislation in Canada and this provision, we think, will make the Act easier to administer.

Without the Bill to amend this Act, the provisions in the Act requiring prosecution to enforce rights are in our view inadequate. The amendments give the power of appointment of an officer to mediate and conciliate disputes which arise under the Act. In some cases prosecution is extremely difficult in this kind of a case, and we have found in the case of the two companion Acts, the Employment Act and the Accommodation Act, mediation and conciliation can quite often prove more fruitful than just a straight prosecution. So the amendment that I am submitting here now is similar to the provisions in The Fair Employment Practices Act and The Fair Accommodation Act, which makes provision for the appointment of an officer to resolve the difficulties between the parties.

Section 4 of the Bill is a consequential amendment allowing payment of compensation to the members of the commission if it is necessary to establish a commission.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that all the Members of this Legislature will support this Bill, which will allow, I think, for better enforcement of the Act which is really basic to our democratic form of government. I commend these amendments to all Hon. Members.

Mr. R. Romanow (Saskatoon-Riversdale): — I have some few words to say on this Bill. May I preface

my remarks by saying that unfortunately I don't think the Members on this side of the House can be as enthusiastic about this proposed amendment as the Hon. Attorney General is. I think all Members will agree that human rights and the preservation of them are, as the Hon. Attorney General has said, one of the foundations of a strong democracy. It has often been said, Mr. Speaker, that we can judge the sophistication and maturation of our state by the type of human rights legislation that it has and enacts from time to time.

However, it is with some regret and some mixed emotions that we now see the introduction of Bill No. 2. We cannot, Mr. Speaker, say that we will be voting against it, for any improvement in human rights legislation must be supported. But we also can say that we cannot lend our wholehearted support, as perhaps we ought to be lending it, to legislation that could be as important as this amendment has the potential of being. The best way that I can summarize the feeling of myself and the Members on this side is to ask the Hon. Attorney General to withdraw the Bill and take it back to the drawing board, so that a new Bill that truly embodies human right legislation, the best that can be presented before the Members of this House.

We say that the proposed Bill is weak in its professed attempt to protect human rights. We say that it is contradictory. Perhaps, most important, it relies on the Attorney General and the Government to such an extent as to make it next to meaningless, Mr. Speaker, as an effective form of protection for individual human rights in our province. It is, I think, with respect, perhaps a sloppily drafted Bill. May I give you some concrete examples of what I mean. Firstly, the entire theory or the thesis of this Bill, is in my submission, contrary to human rights legislation as it exists in few other provinces in Canada. I think the basis of good human rights legislation is to firstly clearly define the principles of equality, fairness and non-discrimination, in sort of a broad charter in the legislation, and then, secondly, attempt to protect those ideals through the establishment of an independent human rights commission. Now to summarize. The two important things I think are the definition of those goals to preserve and secondly the establishment of an independent human rights commission to enforce those freedoms. Regretfully this Bill does not place the power for protection of human rights legislation in the hands of an independent commission as it should. Rather it places the power almost exclusively in the hands of the political personage, no matter who is the government of the day, the Attorney General of the Province of Saskatchewan.

For example, one of the key proposals of this Bill is that an officer should be designated by the Attorney General to receive and deal with complaints under the Bill of Rights. That person is to be designated from the Public Service of the Province of Saskatchewan by the Attorney General. Again, it is permissive legislation and it says that the Attorney General may appoint this officer. When a complaint arises, it goes firstly to the Attorney General, who may or may not refer that complaint to the person that the Attorney General exclusively designates as the officer deemed to investigate and recommend the proposed grievance.

Further, proposed Section 12 (b) gives the Attorney General the power to set up a commission from time to time on individual cases to further hear evidence. But whether or not that

commission is set up is again entirely and absolutely in the hands of the Attorney General. Thus the basic provision of the Act is such that the Attorney General may or may not appoint a proper person as the officer designated to receive the complaints. He may or may not ask that officer to investigate the complaint. He may or may not in his absolute discretion set up a commission to investigate further that complaint.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Hon. Attorney General, we say that this places far too much power in the hands of the Attorney General. This is far too much power to make this type of mechanism independent and meaningful human rights legislation for the Province of Saskatchewan. The options are open to the Attorney General to make first of all a judgment call on whether or not any complaint is of sufficient gravity or of sufficient seriousness to merit further investigation by the officer or ultimately by the commission. I say that this is contrary to good human rights legislation. It is not for the Attorney General or for the Government of the day to grandly decide, no matter how well intentioned the Government might be, whether or not an individual complaint should receive further investigation.

I say that the proper method would have been for the setting up of an independent human rights commission that would not be dependent upon the whim of any one politician or political party, no matter how noble or honest that party or politician may be. It is for the commission, and the commission alone, to search out discrimination and injustice and to prosecute it, no matter who offends it, whether it is an individual in our society or a government as, from time to time, allegations may arise.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, in the proposed amendment, when the commission is set up, it is set up within the confines of the terms of reference that are given to it by the Attorney General. As I read the Act, the Attorney General will not have a standing human rights commission, but rather he will, from time to time, designate one, as the circumstances in his wisdom apply. It is possible that the terms of reference, as they are given by the Attorney General when he sets up this commission under the proposed legislation, would be so confining and so restrictive as to effectively tie the hands of the commission that investigates a complaint further. Again, the important thing to emphasize to the Members of the House is that the commission should have absolute freedom to search out and to find its own terms of reference and come to the truth of the matter in a particular complaint and not be bound by terms of reference as given to it from time to time by an Attorney General. As a consequence of this proposal in the legislation, it is natural for us to assume that a commission will not be a permanent one. It will be transitory. It will not have the benefit of experience and it should be an independent commission that will be permanent, that will acquire experience that will be meaningful. It must be the object that all persons or sectors of our society can look to for justice in times of complaint.

Thirdly, as an object to criticism of this Bill, it is my view that much good is gotten by the public being fully informed of complaints and violations under the Bill of Rights. This means that all matters should, as a general rule, be open to the public for perusal in these types of complaints from the very moment that the initial complaint is laid to the time that it is finally resolved. That aspect of openness is missing from this

proposed amendment. You will note the legislation states that the officer designated by the Attorney General will report back to the Attorney General.

In Section 12B, subsection (6), the findings and recommendations of the commission will be reported again back to the Attorney General and, again, may or may not be reported to the public as a whole. In my view, a great deal of the sanction of the human rights legislation and the strength of the Bill of Rights of this nature lies in the fact that discrimination and injustice are, as I have said, exposed to the light of day from the time the complaint is made with the proper commission or officer and until it is determined. That Act does not incorporate that aspect. It doesn't say anything about it. I say that is one more reason why the Bill ought to go back to the drawing board.

The fourth reason is that there is a strong need to coordinate an educational program respecting human rights and the protection in Saskatchewan. In other provinces, Mr. Attorney General, notably the Province of Ontario, human rights legislation gives the power to the human rights commission which I must emphasize in that Province is independent, to post notices in employer's shops, to print in newspapers, to carry publications on radio and television, to carry out an educational program that it deems necessary and appropriate for the times in order to publicize the remedies that are available to eliminate these types of injustices and discriminations.

This Bill makes no mention of this very important function. This Bill, in fact, doesn't even suggest that there should be a power in the temporary commission for this type of on-going education program. There is no such power in the hands of the Attorney General. May I say this, Mr. Speaker, even if there was this power in the hands of the Attorney General I would still oppose it. The manner in which publicity and education about human rights are disseminated and spread among the people is as important as the actual hearing and determination of the human rights case. I would think that the Attorney General (Mr. Heald) and the Government itself would not want to be put in the position where it can be said of them that educational programs are really political propaganda, that education is political breast-beating, because, if that was the case, then all of us would be the losers as far as education and a meaningful publicity program for human rights legislation are concerned.

This program of education can only rest within the hands of this independent commission that I would have hoped the proposed amendment would have provided. In any event, this aspect of education and publicity is totally left out of the Bill. I want to emphasize that, in the Province of Ontario and elsewhere, specific statutory sanction is mentioned and made, as I think it ought to be in this type of case, for the commissions involved.

Mr. Speaker, there are many other problems with this Bill that one could recite. I could, for example, dwell on the question of the definition of creed. The definition of creed is limited to mean religious creed. It is open for some commission, temporary or otherwise, for some court some day to rule that discrimination does not extend to political creed, that discrimination, because of a political creed, would not be or could not be a violation of human rights. I think that danger of interpretation exists by virtue of the fact that creed is limited to

religious creed only. It would be inconsistent, unreasonable and incomprehensible in my view with the tenor of the Saskatchewan Bill of Rights to suggest that discrimination would be allowed for political reasons especially in day-to-day jobs that have nothing to do with this Legislature or Government. Yet, the definition of creed in this Bill — and I say that definition is just another part of the failure of the Government to introduce proper human rights legislation — leaves that door and that possibility open.

What happens when the temporary commission that the Attorney General talks of makes a recommendation? There is no mention, Mr. Speaker, in the Act that says that the ruling of the commission can be or will be enforced with the strength of law. The recommendation simply goes back to the Attorney General, and again in his absolute discretion they may or may not be processed to alleviate the injustice. We say an independent human rights commission that will have the power and the strength to act, freely and independently, to stamp out the types of things that are intended here, is necessary. There should be a provision so that the findings of this commission are enforceable and binding, so that the situation involved can be remedied.

Mr. Speaker, this type of legislation is full of traps for the real preservation of human rights. I should think the Government wouldn't want to be in a situation where it could be said that it used human rights legislation to cover up some misdeed or some error on its part. As governments adopt more positive roles in our society, it is inevitable that it is going to come into more and more contact with people. It is inevitable that bureaucracy will increase, and some decisions are going to alienate persons and from time to time there will be allegations of discriminations under the Bill of Rights. Herein, Mr. Attorney General, lies a potential conflict between the political interests of the Government of the day and the legitimate interests of the individual who says his rights on the Bill of Rights have been breached. For example, one year and a half ago, there was an allegation displayed in the newspapers in the Province of Saskatchewan against the Hon. Premier of the Province of Saskatchewan by a woman who said that she had been dismissed — a Métis woman — on an order from the Premier, although according to the newspaper reports the immediate superior had found her work to be satisfactory. The husband of the woman, the newspaper reported, was a campaign manager for a political party in Meadow Lake in the June 25, 1968 Federal election. That was a very serious allegation against the Premier and the Government. To be fair, the newspaper reported that the Hon. Premier denied the dismissal was due to political reasons. We accept those words. But I say to the Members this is the best example of the type of conflict that the Government can place itself in when it comes to human rights legislation. What could be said under this proposed legislation of this example? Can the Members see the conflict of the situation being placed squarely on the shoulders of the Attorney General? He would inevitably on the one hand, Mr. Speaker, have the pressures of politics, the Premier and other considerations to meet on one hand at the initial stage when he has to consider whether or not that complaint goes on to an officer or ultimately beyond to a commission and, on the other hand, he would have the duty and the necessity to have the complaint legitimately aired and heard and determined. Under this proposed Bill, it is possible for the Attorney General to receive the complaint and not process it any further. That type of power does not belong in the hands of the Attorney

General nor in the hands of any government. It is not true human rights legislation.

Rather the whole issue should have been placed in the hands of an independent human rights commission. The Government should, in this type of case or in any other similar situation, be as interested as anyone, including the person affected, to have the matter heard, aired and determined according to due process so that the issue is clear. As it was in this particular case, the person was to have her complaint heard by a voluntary human rights association in Saskatchewan. I have the newspaper clippings on that particular issue and to date — and I stand to be corrected — I have seen no report as to what the finding was with respect to that serious allegation.

Now I anticipate the Attorney General to repeat his argument, in rebuttal of last year, that there is presently this voluntary human rights association in Saskatchewan. Last year, when I introduced the Resolution on the Independent Human Rights Commission, you will recall that the Hon. Attorney General (Mr. Heald) said that to set up a human rights commission would be a duplication of effort of the one that presently exists. Respectfully, Sir, to that I say, “Nonsense.” As a voluntary human rights association, it exists and it serves a valuable function — an education function — we must support it in that role, but it has not legislative power. In the case that I have just cited supposing it was found that there was political discrimination, would that finding be binding on the Provincial Government and binding on the Attorney General, especially in the circumstances and the Premier has already made it clear that there is no political discrimination?

The fact of the matter is that it can't be binding. It has no legislative authority or sanction. The answer is that nothing would come of it as in fact nothing has come of the allegation one and one-half years ago.

Again, this highlights the need to have an independent commission that would have this binding affect on the Government and all sectors of our society when there is a hint of discrimination. This cannot be done by this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the demand for better and more human rights legislation is ever present and I say that today's generation young or old, today's society has a keen eye to social injustice. I think our youth and our press and our public at large in the Province of Saskatchewan are more aware and concerned about discrimination than it ever has before. It's their mood to stamp it out. This is also the question of the revolution of rising expectations in terms of economic and social demands. As people in our society burst out and seek more and more activity, there will be more and more conflict resulting in fair and equitable and independent means to resolve injustices against the people in our society.

As Members can see, this legislation has not been thought out. It has those four specific areas that I mentioned. It places far too much power in the hands of the Attorney General. What we are plugging for is an independent human rights commission, as I have said, to administer that Bill of Rights of Saskatchewan. We agree with the Attorney General that Saskatchewan has been a pioneer in the Bill of Rights when it was introduced under the old CCF Government in 1944 or thereabouts.

We want this Bill of Rights to be more meaningful in the 1970s. We want the Bill of Rights, however, Mr. Attorney General, to be amended so that the new demands of today are set out in a new charter of human rights, in the new Bill of the human rights of Saskatchewan and that there are legitimate and truthful and lawful means, independent means to resolve those disputes. We want those human rights to be preserved and protected in every walk of life right up to, perhaps even including, the Cabinet.

So therefore, Mr. Speaker, as I have said, we will have to support the Bill in second reading when it comes up, but I am asking the Hon. Attorney General (Mr. Heald) to seriously consider the reservations that I have listed to him about the independent human rights commission. I ask the Attorney General to examine the Province of Ontario and to look carefully at the human rights legislation and the human rights commission there. I ask him to take the leadership from the Province of Ontario, building on from there within the principle, to take back that Bill of Rights to the drawing board and come back with truly a Bill of Rights for the Province of Saskatchewan and the people of Saskatchewan. If he doesn't, although we will be supporting it in second reading, we would ask and give notice to the Members that wide-spread amendments would be sought by those of us on this side to make this Bill truly the human rights legislation that it could and should be.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. R.H. Wooff (Turtleford): — Mr. Speaker, I am going to be very brief. The few remarks that I have to make are going to be strictly from a layman's approach.

I feel very strongly when it comes to matters dealing with human rights. It always seems to me rather doubtful to have legislation which in the case of the Government, may be the very body assessing a wrong perpetrated by that body, in other words responsible for an unfair practice. Such legislation, Mr. Speaker, leaves a rather off flavor in the mouth of those who receive an adverse judgment. I would feel much happier if there was to be an independent commission. This, Mr. Speaker, would be a safeguard not only for the public but it would be one of the best safeguards for any government.

Mr. A.E. Blakeney (Regina Centre): — Mr. Speaker, I wish only to add a very few comments and I am going to restrict my comments to the new definition of the word 'creed.'

I think that the Attorney General (Mr. Heald) expressed his view that the balance of the Bill expands the operation of the Act and widens the protection for human rights. I think that he will agree that the new definition of 'creed' restricts the Bill. Prior to this time the word 'creed' was undefined. It undoubtedly included religious creeds and probably included other creeds. I see no reason why protection should be restricted only to those who may have had their rights violated in respect of a religious creed. May I call to the attention of Hon. Members the fact that some of the greatest violations of human rights which we recall in the last couple of decades have been in respect of creeds which were not religious creeds.

In the United States we had the era of McCarthy and,

whatever one might say about that era, there were undoubtedly at that time violations of human rights based upon creeds other than religious creeds. I would, without reviewing that era, direct people's attention to, let us say, a book by say Owen Lattimore on "Ordeal by Slander," or the attention of the Attorney General to some of the reminiscences of Louis Nizer or other lawyers who have been involved in those sorts of civil rights cases. But, Mr. Speaker, we do not have to go to the United States; we can stay in Canada and refer our attention to the Padlock Law of Quebec. There was a law which undoubtedly violated human rights and did it on the basis, not of a religious creed but of another sort of creed. Eventually that law was struck down by the Supreme Court of Canada, but a substantial number of people who could not afford to appeal the matter to the Supreme Court of Canada had their rights abridged by the operation of the Padlock Law, which, as I repeat, was not based upon any religious creed. I suggest that there could be many other examples. I picked those two because I think they would be familiar to the Members of the Legislature. My point, therefore, is that this provision of the Bill in fact restricts the law rather than broadens it and accordingly ought not to be included in this Bill. I think that I would, therefore, ask the Attorney General to consider that aspect of it and see whether or not he would in Committee be prepared to delete the new Section 2(a).

Mr. Heald: — Mr. Speaker, dealing with the comments of the Hon. Members opposite starting with the last speaker, sure I will have a look at that. That is something which we would consider in Committee anyway. We wouldn't be dealing with it on second reading. The matter of definition of creed is something that we can look at. I don't disagree too much with the comments and the remarks of the Member for Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney).

I was interested in the remarks of the Member for Turtleford (Mr. Wooff) because I think probably he was in this House, I think he was in this House, as he certainly was a Member of the Government during the days when The Fair Accommodation Practices Act and the Fair Employment Acts were passed. Now to go back into history for a moment or two, Mr. Speaker, there are three Acts involved in this human rights legislation. One is called The Fair Accommodation Practices Act, another is called, The Fair Employment Practices Act and the third is The Bill of Rights. Now in the other two Acts the Government of the day, the gentlemen who now sit to your left, had a conciliation procedure and has a conciliation procedure, which is practically identical to the amendments which I am seeking to put into The Bill of Rights Act by this Bill. So all of the comments that the Member for Turtleford has made saying that he would feel much better if there was an independent commission, instead of putting power in the hands of the Attorney General and the Government, I wonder if he made those comments in the House at the time The Fair Accommodation Practices Act and The Fair Employment Practices Act were passed, because those same comments that he made tonight would have application at that time.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, we have this curious double standard, this different standard when the Members who sit now to your left had when they sat over here to your right. They thought that it was fine to give the Attorney General power at that time, but now that they are sitting over to your left, Mr. Speaker, they seem to have developed a curious lack of faith, not only in the integrity of the Government but in the

integrity of the Attorney General.

What I am doing by this Bill, Mr. Speaker, is putting the same mediation and conciliation procedure in the Bill of Rights that was in The Fair Accommodations Practices Act and The Fair Employment Practices Act. Nothing else. That is what I am doing. I am improving your legislation.

The Member for Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) of course, is back to the old business of cheese and chalk and apples and oranges if I may say so. In this debate you have injected the whole question of a human rights commission. Now that's fine! You had a Resolution last year and the Resolution was voted down. A human rights bill is a different thing. And about 75 per cent of your remarks this evening were in favor of a human rights commission.

What we are talking about here is the way by which we can improve and strengthen the provisions of The Saskatchewan Bill of Rights Act. Let's look at the Bill if you will for a minute or two. 'Officer' means the officer in the Public Service designated by the Attorney General to receive and to deal with complaints under this Act. Now this is not a temporary appointment. Under the other two Acts an Order in Council has been passed appointing a law officer in my Department to be the conciliation officer. He is not a temporary officer. He is a permanent officer. It was Mr. Holtzman when he was working for me as Executive Assistant and he is now the Legislative Counsel. The appointment, the Order in Council under the other two Acts appoints Mr. Gary Lane as the conciliation officer within the meaning of Section 2. The same procedure will be followed if this Bill becomes law. Mr. Lane will be appointed the conciliation officer with full authority to make full investigations and report to me. Hon. Members will know, pursuant to the provisions of one of the three Acts, The Fair Accommodation Practices Act, Mr. Lane has already been to North Battleford and has made a very expeditious investigation of the allegations of discrimination and is now in the process of having the evidence that he took up there transcribed, and he is going to be making a report to me. I will give this House this undertaking that, when the report is available to me, I will make the report public and I will lay it on the table of this House. I will do the same thing in respect to any investigations under this Act. So I don't know what the Hon. Member from Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) is complaining about, this business about saying that it is a weak piece of legislation.

Here again, Mr. Speaker, we get to the double standards. If this is weak legislation amending the Bill of Rights Act, then the legislation which they passed when they were the Government of the day, by their own admission was weak and ineffective legislation. I don't think that's right. I think that it was good legislation. I think it was legislation which works. But somehow or another, this particular amendment, Mr. Speaker, which you had in the other two Acts, fell between the chairs when you passed the Bill of Rights Act. You had no teeth in the Bill of Rights Act, none at all. All you had was the ability to lay a charge and you all know that in this kind of legislation the laying of a charge is not always the best way with which to deal with the matter.

So this is why we are asking for this same kind of legislation that you had in your other two Bills. We are asking that

you pass the same kind of amendments for this Bill that puts us in the same position. We will be able to enforce this Act. We will be able to do a good job of enforcing this Act as we are enforcing the other two Acts. I commend it to all Hon. Members and I know that all Hon. Members over there are going to vote for this Bill.

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division and Bill read a second time.

YEAS — 54

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

NAYS — 0

Bill No. 4 — An Act to amend The Public Health Act

Hon. G.B. Grant (Minister of Public Health) moved second reading of Bill No. 4 — An Act to amend The Public Health Act.

Hon. Mr. Grant: — Mr. Speaker, the most important provision of this Bill relates to the Northern Saskatchewan Administration Districts. As the Health Services Act and The Public Health Act now read it is not possible for a part of the Northern Saskatchewan Administration District to be part of a health region.

There are various advantages to this being made possible. In the first place public health services can sometimes be provided more effectively from a nearby health region to a community in the southern part of the district, if it were considered to be part of the district for this purpose.

Secondly, the Northern Administration District is part of the province and its residents should not be isolated from existing Provincial programs merely because it has a somewhat different form of organization. I would like to make it clear that, if one of these communities is added to an existing health region, my Department will make the necessary financial arrangements to ensure that insofar as public health costs are concerned there will be no cost to the community affected or to the balance of the region by reason of the addition being made.

Another amendment provides that where the Board of Health has abated a nuisance it may recover the cost of abating the nuisance from the owner of the land by adding the cost to the taxes on the land on which the nuisance was situated. This principle is already contained in similar provisions in the various municipal acts.

You will also note, Mr. Speaker, that the definition of communicable disease and public eating establishments are being revised. The revision of the definition of communicable disease is being proposed to bring the definition in line with current thinking respecting diseases, while the definition of public eating establishments is being revised for the purpose of clarifying the meaning.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

Bill No. 5 — An Act to amend The Health Services Act.

Mr. Grant (Minister of Public Health) moved second reading of Bill No. 5 — An Act to amend The Health Services Act.

Hon. Mr. Grant: — Mr. Speaker, the provisions contained in this Bill are being proposed either for the purpose of enacting certain desirable authorization or for clarifying certain provisions. The same comments apply to this Act in connection with the Northern Saskatchewan Administration District and portions of that district to health regions, also the same confirmation that there will be no penalty or discontinuance of funds to those areas as a result of the change.

In addition to this, between 1948 and April 1, 1969 public health research and study programs in this province were paid for by the Federal Government, with payments being initially made from a provincial government's advance account. No provision was made in the Government's Budget for these expenditures. As of April 1, 1969 provision for the initial payments and studies is contained in the Departmental sub-vote. It now appears that our legislative authority for making these payments is rather doubtful and an amendment is therefore being proposed to provide this authority.

The Federal Government will continue to fully reimburse the Province in making these payments. It should also be noted that the Federal Government grant program for public health research will continue indefinitely; that is, it is not being phased out as is the case in certain other fields.

Another amendment concerns broad authority on the Minister of Public Health to enter into agreement for a wide variety of purposes. This authorization is desirable from an administrative viewpoint.

Another amendment relates to the Regional Board of a Health Region. It is a technical amendment and has no significance insofar as government policy is concerned. This amendment repeals subsection (3) of Section 6 and is intended merely to clarify the point beyond all doubt that in the field of public health the Regional Board of a Health Region has an advisory function only and is not empowered to take any action in its own right.

Mr. Blakeney: — A very brief comment, Mr. Speaker, directed to the

Minister. I wonder whether the Minister would look into the matter, so that it might be referred to in Committee, of whether in his opinion the new Section 59 (a) allows him to enter into agreements with various organizations to exercise the powers which he now has, or whether, in fact, the Minister takes the view that this provision would enable him to enter into agreements to do things which are not now within the power of the Minister. Does this broaden the power of the Minister or merely provide a way of him exercising the powers which he now has in conjunction with, and by agreement with, a series of organizations? That is a point which I think might be better pursued in Committee. I will be supporting the Bill.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

Bill No. 6 — An Act to amend The Vital Statistics Act

Mr. Grant (Minister of Public Health) moved second reading of Bill No. 6 — An Act to amend The Vital Statistics Act.

Hon. Mr. Grant: — Mr. Speaker, this Bill contains only one amendment. The Vital Statistics Act requires a still birth as well as a live birth to be registered with our Division of Vital Statistics. A still birth is presently defined in the Act as the expulsion from the mother of a product of conception after at least 20 weeks of pregnancy where there is no sign of life. The practical difficulties that sometimes arise is that the period of pregnancy may not be known. In these cases the attending physician has often adopted a rule of deciding that there has been a still birth where the fetus weighs at least 500 grams. The proposed amendment therefore coincides with what can't be the existing practice.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

Bill No. 7 — An Act to repeal The Pure Bred Sire Areas Act

Hon. D. T. McFarlane (Minister of Agriculture) moved second reading of Bill No. 7 — An Act to repeal The Pure Bred Sire Areas Act.

Hon. Mr. McFarlane: — Mr. Speaker, the Minister's order prior to January 1964, establishing the Herd Law in certain Local Improvement districts based on petitions submitted by the Local Improvement Districts, was not registered in accordance with The Regulations Act.

The amendment will establish the legality of Minister's orders dated prior to January 1, 1964 and thereby avoid the expense and inconvenience of re-petitioning these areas. The problem does concern 64 townships in seven LIDs plus two areas in the Northern Administration district.

Areas established since January 1, 1964 have been properly registered under The Regulations Act.
Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

Bill No. 8 — An Act to amend The Stray Animals Act

Mr. McFarlane (Minister of Agriculture) moved second reading of Bill No. 8 — An Act to amend The Stray Animals Act.

Hon. Mr. McFarlane: — Mr. Speaker, the repeal of this Act is recommended since it is believed that it is no longer consistent with present livestock management practices. Repeal of the Act is recommended because . . .

An Hon. Member: — The Minister is on the . . .

Mr. McFarlane: — This is the one that was called Bill No. 8. Oh, they called the other one first.

I think I was confused, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — We have just passed Bill No. 7 — An Act to repeal The Pure Bred Sire Areas Act and we are now debating Bill No. 8 and that is An Act to amend The Stray Animals Act. Bill No. 7 has passed the House.

Hon. Mr. McFarlane: — I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, it may be my mistake. I thought you had called that one first and that was the second reading I gave just previous.

Mr. Speaker: — If someone would move second reading on The Stray Animals Act we might get through the House.

Hon. Mr. McFarlane: — I will move second reading of Bill No. 8 — An Act to amend The Stray Animals Act.

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I really don't want to prolong this argument but it appears that this has to do almost wholly with The Regulations Act rather than The Stray Animals Act. And the provision is that the orders under The Stray Animals Act will not be published. That is the net effect of it. I am sure that there are good reasons for this, but I would like the Minister when he closes the debate to indicate what there is about the orders under The Stray Animals Act which makes it inconvenient for them to be put into the Gazette. If they are going to govern people ordinarily they should be in the Gazette, but there may well be good reasons for not doing so and I would be interested in the reasons.

Mr. McFarlane: — Well, the main reasons, Mr. Speaker, was that this was an oversight at the time The Regulations Act was drawn. And if they were to enforce the regulations now they would have to go back to the 64 townships, as I indicated earlier, and proclaim them all as herd law areas. By bringing in this amendment this would cover the foresight at that time and bring them under the regulations as spelled out in The Regulations Act.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

Bill No. 9 — An Act to amend The Municipal Employees' Superannuation Act.

Hon. C.L.B. Estey (Minister of Municipal Affairs) moved second reading of Bill No. 9 — An Act to amend The Municipal Employees' Superannuation Act.

Hon. Mr. Estey: — Mr. Speaker, The Municipal Employees' Superannuation Act is really administered independent of government. It is administered by a board composed of the secretaries or representatives from the SARM, SUMA, the School Trustees Association and the rural telephone people. There is one Government representative on this board and the Government also supplies a small

administrative staff in order to administer the Act.

These amendments come as recommendations from the Board of The Municipal Employees' Superannuation Act. In the main they are dealing with clarification of the provisions of the Act. For example, one amendment clarifies the fact that additional contributions may be made to this fund by both the employer and the employee. The basic contribution is now a five per cent requirement.

Another amendment, for example, clarifies the fact that an employee who has left the fund and received a refund, may pay that money at a subsequent date back to the fund and pick up his years of service. You will also note, Mr. Speaker, that in this Act there is a revision of the time of vesting. This provision has been put in by the Board in the hope that younger people can be attracted to this work by the attractiveness of the pension provision.

There is another amendment which arose in a case last year where North Battleford disorganized its police force and the members of that force were members of this superannuation plan. At that time the Act, and as the Act stands to date, contemplates the disorganization of a municipal corporation. We are amending this Act to provide that, if this situation should happen again, that is where the police force is dissolved but not the municipal corporation, those members of the police force will have an opportunity either to transfer their interest including their vested interest to another pension plan or to have the privilege of having an annuity purchased for them on reaching 65 years of age.

There is also another important amendment to this Act. As the Act now stands a person earning up to \$750 may join the plan but once over \$750 has to join the plan. In view of the self-employed pension plan permitted under the income tax laws of Canada, we have had occasion where very good secretaries of a village are fundamentally self-employed, but yet the village pays them over \$750. Last year the income tax people, as they do every so often, had a project and their project was to go through returns to find out if anyone was under two employee pension plans. We found some people in the province who suffered because they had contributed to one of these self-employed pension funds and had to go into this plan. So we are now raising the \$750 to \$1,500 and saying that, if you are earning under \$1,500, you may join the plan and if you are over you have to join the plan. We think that this will take out this rather incongruous situation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that is probably the main point in these amendments.

Mr. W.G. Davies (Moose Jaw South): — Mr. Speaker, I think that I would agree with the principle of this Bill. As I understand it, there is a body, a trustee body, for this Act. I understand that there are some nine members and that these represent the employees in two or three areas, plus the school trustees, the urban areas and one or two other bodies as well. My question, I think, now would be: have all of these amendments been placed before that body and discussed with them?

Mr. Estey: — Mr. Speaker, in reply to the

question which has just been presented to the House and which I dealt with in my initial remarks, everyone of these amendments has come to the Department from the board in charge of this plan.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

Bill No. 10 — An Act to amend The Community Planning Act

Mr. Estey (Minister of Municipal Affairs) moved second reading of Bill No. 10 – An Act to amend The Community Planning Act.

Hon. Mr. Estey: — Mr. Speaker, this Act deals with amending The Community Planning Act. It is an attempt in some regard to clarify the provisions of the Act. These trailer parks and mobile homes have been giving some difficulty. Certain councils have doubted whether they have the power to regulate such parks and in our first amendment we are putting this power in the hands of the council. A second amendment to this Act deals with the question of notice prior to the passing of the zoning by-law. We have had some difficulty with the municipal corporation publishing a long list of addresses, and the person to know whether they are involved or not has to go all the way through these addresses. Often they have not the patience to do so. In an amendment we are giving the council power where it is not practical to publish a list of street addresses to designate the area concerned by a map and between certain streets or avenues and in such a manner, we hope, that notice will come to the attention of those involved in a more practical manner.

Now there has since time in memorial been some difficulty in regard to a building which does not conform to a zoning by-law but which was in existence at the time of the passing of the by-law. For example, a building may not conform to a by-law insofar as use is concerned but was in its location prior to the passing of the by-law. We have provided that, if a building is in such a position, that is, its use does not conform to the by-law that “use” means the whole building, you can extend that use to the whole building. We are also providing in this amendment that, where land has been subdivided for residential purposes or a low density area and then is rezoned to a higher density, once it is rezoned to a higher density, there is a formula set out in the amendment which is applied to the area which must be given for public use, and, by public use I mean other than streets and lanes. If this is done in a built-up area we provide in this amendment that the developer requesting the change in the rezoning shall pay an amount equal in cash to the municipal body in order that the municipal body may purchase sufficient land in order to comply with the amendment.

We have also provided an amendment in this situation which has arisen throughout the province. We have several areas in the province, Mr. Speaker, where cottages have been built, for instance, on what was formally farm land. The cottage owner cannot get title to the cottage site, therefore, he or she cannot deal with the cottage. The owner is not anxious to go to the expensive subdividing; the rural municipality does not want to get involved in an urban situation. This amendment provides in such circumstances the Minister may subdivide that area, charge the expense of subdivision to the municipality and the municipality can in turn collect the costs of that subdivision from the owner through the tax roll. I might say at this time that there will be one House amendment come in here, and I believe it is the last amendment in this Act, which gives to the Planning Commission authority to assess costs. There have

been one or two cases in the past year, or three cases I believe in the past year, where an appeal was taken to the Planning Commission and once the Planning Commission got around to sitting, the parties did not appear. What we are attempting to do in the last amendment to this Act is, in such a situation, to give the Commission power to assess costs, and we will be limiting the amount of costs which can be assessed.

Mr. E.I. Wood (Swift Current): — Mr. Speaker, I have been following with a great deal of interest in what the Minister (Mr. Estey) had to say in regard to this Bill. I think in the most part we are prepared to go along with what he has to say concerning most of the amendments. I was especially interested in what he said regarding the last amendment. On the face of this it says that the appeal board now — if this amendment is passed — would have the right to charge for the costs of the hearing before the Provincial Planning Appeals Board. Hitherto, this has been paid for entirely by the Province. It says the costs would be picked up by the Provincial Government. I think that, as this stands here, this would act as a deterrent to the people bringing appeals before the Board. They might say, “Well, we don’t want to get involved in a lot of expensive litigation, we will let the thing go.” Now from what the Minister has just said — I don’t think he was quite clear insofar as I’m concerned — if he means that there will be a House amendment to this section to the effect that this will only apply if the parties do not appear, this would place a different complexion upon it. But coupled with another section in this Act which says that the fee accompanying the original appeal is going to be raised from \$25 to \$50, I think that this in itself would have a tendency to possibly deter appeals which would otherwise be made. Unless the Minister is prepared to make it clear that this Section 10 applies only to the cases where the applicants do not appear, I am afraid that I would have to oppose this Bill.

Mr. H.H.P. Baker (Regina South East): — Mr. Speaker, I think what the Member for Swift Current (Mr. Wood) has brought out makes good sense. What are we trying to do by raising the \$25 for the first appeal to \$50? I thought the Appeal Board was set up so that individuals should be able to appeal because there are times when councils are divided on issues with regard to the zoning or on matters of conformity. You are making it more prohibitive by raising it to \$50. Most of these appeals come out of council for the first time, Mr. Minister?

Mr. Estey: — Yes.

Mr. Baker: — Well, I don’t think we should raise this at all. We should make it much easier for the people to appeal because a lot of them that do go to the Appeal Board are cases dealing with individuals who haven’t the means to expend this sort of money. It is really a protection as I see it for the public and I don’t think we should make the appeal procedure prohibitive by increasing the fee. There are added assessed costs in case they have to go to the Provincial Appeals Board. This could be a very costly thing and it might be a very small item that could be assumed locally. I agree with the Member for Swift Current (Mr. Wood) and I would suggest that this be looked at again. Let’s not try to out-charge people who really have a grievance.

In many instances council is unable to do anything about it because of the way The Community Planning Act is set up. I will oppose raising this to \$50.

Mr. Estey: — Mr. Speaker, this Section which I apologize for not referring to in my opening remarks, which refers to increasing a fee from \$25 to \$50, refers to an appeal to the Zoning Appeal Board which is appointed by the council. We in the Department have received representations from urban centres in Saskatchewan, saying that the present \$25 fee doesn't even cover the advertising, and I, as Minister of Municipal Affairs, am not prepared to say that the urban centres do not have to advertise. I don't think for one moment that, if what the city says is correct, they spend more than \$25 on advertising. I think this is very vital work insofar as an individual is concerned and I do not think the \$50 is out of line. I want to say that this amendment was put through due to representations received from urban centres in Saskatchewan, and I believe off hand Regina was one of them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, insofar as the last amendment is concerned, I am prepared . . .

Mr. Baker: — On a point of privilege . . .

Mr. Estey: — Mr. Speaker, he . . . There is no privilege involved . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! Now he is rising on a point of privilege and when a Member rises on a point of privilege he has to be heard. Now what is the point of privilege?

Mr. Baker: — Make him sit down.

Mr. Speaker: — Now, order! Let me tell the Mayor for Regina, he doesn't tell anyone who to stand up and who to sit down. Now state your point of privilege.

Mr. Baker: — Well all right, my point of privilege is this that Regina as far as I am concerned did not make representation to the Minister personally on any occasion, so he is giving this information here.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! Now that is not a point of privilege. That is just a point of interruption.

Mr. Baker: — Well he said Regina.

Mr. Speaker: — That is just a debating point and it is a point of interruption and the Member shouldn't abuse the question of privilege by rising to interrupt people on a supposedly question of privilege.

Mr. Estey: — Mr. Speaker, I have been called the equivalent of a liar and I ask that the Member withdraw.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker: — Now let's not be simple about this. How simple can this man get, Mr. Minister? How simple can this man get? I don't remember using the word 'liar', I didn't even infer that. All I am trying to do is bring out a point that he is making the city of Regina a liar, because we did not put this in as a motion from council and from me particularly. You have received nothing, in fact I'd like to see you take the \$25 off.

Mr. Speaker: — Well to be honest, for the Member of the House, I didn't hear the word 'liar' used. If it was, the record would show it if the Member wishes to pursue it further.

Mr. Estey: — Mr. Speaker, insofar as this restriction on costs is concerned, I think that is a matter that can be dealt with in Committee and I have given the House assurance that there will be a restriction put in there.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

Bill No. 11 — An Act to amend The Absentee Act

Hon. D.V. Heald (Attorney General) moved second reading of Bill No. 11 — An Act to amend The Absentee Act.

Hon. Mr. Heald: — Mr. Speaker, this is a Bill to amend The Absentee Act. As Hon. Members will recall The Absentee Act was passed by this House in 1969. The purpose of the Act was to ease the administering of estates of absent persons and to ease the tragic burdens on people who are left — relatives of these absent persons. I think I can say that the Act has been well received and the Act sets out the powers to act which were given to the judges of the Court of Queen's Bench. Now the judges of course are vitally concerned with the administration of the Act and, although there was no requirement of notice to be given to the official guardian if an infant was interested in an estate, the judges required such notice. The same rule applied if a lunatic or person of unsound mind was interested. These amendments merely ensure the Court's ability to require notice. Sub-clause (b) will extend the judge's discretion. The Bill also makes it clear that an interim order can be made. This will further serve, I think, to reduce hardship on the interested parties. Often an estate can tie up in administration for some time and this provision will ensure that the dependants will not suffer economic hardship unnecessarily. I urge all Hon. Members to support these amendments.

I should make one comment. Hon. Members may wonder about the wording "the age of 21 years" in the Bill in light of the expressed intention in the Speech from the Throne to reduce the age to 19 years. We propose to do this by The Coming of Age Act which will be introduced. It will amend this Act along with a large number of other Acts from 21 to 19 so that is why we are leaving it at 21 in here.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

Bill No. 12 — An Act to amend The Criminal Injuries Compensation Act, 1967

Mr. Heald moved second reading of Bill No. 12 — An Act to amend The Criminal Injuries Compensation Act, 1967.

Hon. Mr. Heald: — Mr. Speaker, in 1967, this Assembly supported the belief that society should assume some of the loss suffered by persons who are the victims of crimes of violence whether or not fault can be established against the offender. The Government feels that The Criminal Injuries Compensation Act has served its very serious purposes extremely well. In 1967, I advised this House that Saskatchewan was the first jurisdiction in North America and only the third in the world to implement this far-reaching legislation. This House was also advised that there would probably be many problems arising out of the getting into operation of this kind of program. I think this is always inevitable when a new and a progressive program such as this is implemented and there really isn't much practical experience to draw upon.

Mr. Speaker, the Government's goal is to provide relief from economic hardship of the victims of crimes of violence, and the amendments that I am asking the House to consider this evening are designed to foster and expedite the reaching of this goal. Now the amendment to Section 11, for example, allows a less restrictive approach to expenses. Section 3 of the Bill amending Section 12 allows the Board to act without serving the accused. We have run into the problem several times where a criminal has disappeared after injuring a person in a crime. That person has had no recourse if the accused can't be found. Under the provisions of the Act, the accused really is not concerned until the Attorney General decides to attempt to recover some of the monies from him and of course the accused will be served at that time.

Section 4, amending Section 15 (a) sets out alternative service provisions for persons under a legal disability and allows service on the administrator of estates, or parent, or guardian, or the official guardian, or the official administrator as the case may be. These amendments have been asked for by the members of the Board, particularly, Mr. Eremko, the chairman, as a result of things that have occurred in the administration thus far.

Section 5 amending subsection (2) of Section 18 sets a time limit allowing the Board to act, if an appeal is not taken to the Supreme Court of Canada within 60 days of the last appeal. This is so that the applicant is not held up indefinitely.

The amendment to Section 22, set out in Section 6 of the Bill, allows the Board to make payments to any person who made payments on behalf of the victim or applicant. This is so even if the payor would not be able to legally recover from the applicant or victim. For example, a gratuitous payment would be an example of that.

Section 7 allows payment where the payor would have a legal right to recover from the victim or applicant. In the past the Board had no directions as to what it should consider in varying an order and Section 8 of this Bill corrects that omission. Section 9 clarifies the power to regulate the application forms. I think it is obvious, Mr. Speaker, that these amendments are designed to ease the burdens on the applicant and to ensure that he obtains compensation as soon as possible and to save people

who assist the applicant from needless litigation.

Mr. Speaker, for these reasons I urge all Hon. Members to support this Bill to amend The Criminal Injuries Compensation Act, 1967. The amendments in a general way, I think, expand and improve the benefits payable under the Act.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

Bill No. 13 — An Act to amend The Credit Union Act

Hon. L.P. Coderre (Minister of Labour) moved second reading of Bill No. 13 — An Act to amend The Credit Union Act.

Hon. Mr. Coderre: — Mr. Speaker, after consultation with what was then the Credit Union League, the Credit Society or now jointly the Credit Society, these amendments are brought in with concurrence of both organizations. As you know each credit union is autonomous and determines its own rates of interest and rather than open The Credit Union Act every time that there is a need to change the interest rates and to set the ceiling, it was decided that it might be best that the ceilings to be established should be done so by Order in Council. This would then prevent that, if there was a sudden change in the maximums to be brought in, these changes wouldn't have to wait for the following year before the Act was open. The same section or subsection of that Section also is to clarify the problem which could arise respecting loans written on demand. Another section is merely to provide for allocations of reserves more directly related to the conditions of the outstanding loans that are possibly lost due to delinquency. Another section would provide the amalgamation of the League and Society which in fact has already taken place.

Another Section 117 merely changes the basis of assessment for the mutual aid fund from 5 per cent of net surplus to 1/5 of 1 per cent of shares and deposits. The new basis will provide the same annual amount for the mutual aid fund. The last Section removes the ceiling on the funds so that it may reach an amount commensurate with the increased assets of credit unions.

Mr. A.E. Blakeney (Regina Centre): — Mr. Speaker, I advise you that I do not propose to vote on this vote or on further votes with respect to this Bill.

Mr. Speaker: — Will I take the House . . . The Member is advising they are reverting this Bill.

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I have done some work that resulted in these Bills. I had charged some legal fees in respect thereof. I want no question to rise in anybody's mind with respect to it.

Mr. Speaker: — Well, I am sure the House will accept the Member's statement.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

Bill No. 14 — An Act to amend The Radiological Health Act

Hon. G.B. Grant (Minister of Public Health) moved second reading of Bill No. 14 — An Act to amend The Radiological Health Act.

Hon. Mr. Grant: — Mr. Speaker, the most

important amendments are related to the use of radioactive substances, that is radioactive isotopes. The Radiological Health Act provides for the registration of radiation equipment, that is equipment producing X-rays, and for various other matters related to the installation and use of such equipment. The Radiological Health Committee consists of highly qualified persons and advises the Department with respect to the educational measures to be taken in connection with the use of radiation equipment and other matters relating to administration of the Act. The Federal Atomic Energy Control provides for the licensing of the use of radioactive substances. Radioactive isotopes are used for medical purposes in this province primarily in the two cancer clinics. In addition there have been approximately 75 licences issued for the industrial use of radioactive isotopes in the province. The Atomic Energy Control Act does not contain any provisions for employees of the Federal Government to advise persons about the dangerous propensities of radioactive isotopes and their proper handling. Radioactive isotopes are potentially as dangerous as radiation equipment, and it is believed by the Radiological Health Committee that there is a real need for an educational program to be commenced in this province to assist technicians working with the radioactive isotopes. The Act is therefore being amended to authorize the Department's staff to provide consultative services in connection with the use of radioactive substances and to authorize an educational program to be conducted in connection with these substances. This program would function on the advice of the Radiological Health Committee. These amendments are being proposed with the unofficial concurrence of the senior officials of the Federal Department concerned with radiological health.

Another amendment removes the requirements that persons under 18 years of age or known to be pregnant be prohibited being employed as occupational workers and in turn authorizes such a requirement to be contained in the regulations. It is believed that regulations providing in some detail for the protection of the health of these persons as X-ray technicians would be more effective than existing provisions of the Act. It should be noted that the regulations would be made governing the employment of females in the child-bearing age, while a provision being repealed prohibited the employment as occupational workers of persons known to be pregnant. This change of approach is consistent with current thinking in this regard. The actual wording was recommended by experts in the field.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

Bill No. 15 – An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Medical Care Insurance Act

Mr. Grant moved second reading of Bill No. 15 — An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Medical Care Insurance Act.

Hon. Mr. Grant: — Mr. Speaker, this Bill contains primarily three amendments. One of the amendments authorizes regulations to be made providing that the Saskatchewan Medical Care Insurance Commission need not make payment for an insured service where the account for payment had not been submitted until after the expiry of a certain period following the provision of the services. This period would be specified in the regulations. For example, the regulation might state that the Commission need not make payment for an insured service where the account for payment for that service had not been submitted to the Commission for payment within the period of 12 months following the provision of the service. At the present time the Commission is

legally required to favor all insured services received by beneficiaries without regard to the lateness of the date upon which the account for payment is submitted. Serious administrative difficulties arise because of changes in the medical fee schedules made from time to time. For example, an account for payment for services provided before August 1, 1968, is paid according to the 1959 schedule of fees. Accounts for all services provided before November 1, 1967, are paid at 85 per cent of the fee schedule, while the accounts for office, home and hospital visits provided between November 1, 1967 and August 1, 1968, are paid at 95 per cent of the fee schedule. Accounts for payment for services provided after August 1, 1968, are paid according to the new centennial fee schedule of College. The Commission with some difficulty is able to pay these old accounts according to the fee schedule applicable when the service was provided. Most beneficiaries and most physicians being paid directly by the Commission submit their accounts promptly. However, in a few years after the service was provided. The processing of these accounts involves a high volume of administrative time and expense. It is believed that, if this amendment is enacted and the regulation made, it will expedite the submission of accounts by those persons who are ordinarily slow in doing so. Another amendment relates to the composition of the Commission. It is now stated in the Act that three of the members of the Commission shall be physicians, whose appointment had been agreed upon between the Lieutenant Governor in Council and the Council of the College of Physicians and Surgeons. An amendment provides that, where a period of three months has expired following the end of the term of office of the physician being replaced and the Lieutenant Governor in Council and the Council of the College had been unable to come to an agreement, the Lieutenant Governor in Council may appoint a physician without the agreement with the College being required to be made. This amendment is made in order to ensure that the membership of the Commission will remain at the intended level. It is not expected that this amendment will be applied since in the past there have not been any difficulties encountered in connection with the College and the Lieutenant Governor in Council coming to an agreement with respect to the appointment of these physicians as purely a safeguard.

In addition to these amendments, a series of minor amendments are being made to Section 45. Subsection (2) of this Section in effect authorizes the Commission to reassess certain accounts for medical services for which payment had already been made and collect any sums that may be owing as a result of the reassessment. This reassessment is to be done with the concurrence of the Council of College. It is also provided that this reassessment procedure may be carried out within 12 months to 18 months. Another amendment increases the percentage of interest payable against the unpaid balance for 30 days that expires following notification to the person in debt of the fact that the reassessment had been made. The interest percentage is increased from seven per cent to nine per cent. Another amendment provides in effect that the other provisions of Section 45 do not apply in any case where a reassessment of an account is made merely for the sake of correcting an error.

To summarize, Mr. Speaker, this Bill basically contains these three amendments. These amendments are intended to improve

and facilitate the administrative procedure established under this Act and they have, therefore, been introduced for your favorable consideration.

Mr. A.E. Blakeney (Regina Centre): — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to make some comments on this Bill. I want particularly to confine my comments to the new Section 14 (1) and to state that I disagree with this Section in the most emphatic term. This Section allows the whole Medical Care Insurance Plan to be very seriously undermined. Whether or not the Minister agrees or knows what it is doing, the facts are that this Section will enable the Medical Care Insurance Plan to be torpedoed.

Now let me explain what this Section says. It says that where a doctor fails to submit his Bill in the period set out in the regulations the service covered by the Bill shall no longer be an insured service. I want you to listen to that. The Minister has said that the period set out in the regulations will be one year, but of course he could make it six months or indeed three months. I suggest to you that the Bill should not provide that the period should be any period specified in the regulations but, for the protection of physicians, ought to be, let us say, one year or such longer period as may be set out in the regulations. It seems to me that the physicians should have some basic period of protection against regulations made by the Crown. But that, Mr. Speaker, is a peripheral point to the basic point that I make. Suppose the Minister (Mr. Grant) says that the period is going to be six months and suppose a physician does not submit the bill in six months, what is the effect? The effect is that the physician is not paid by the Medical Care Insurance Commission or by the approved Health Agency, but the effect is that it is no longer an insured service and the physician can collect from the patient. See just how that will work. All the Minister needs to do is say that that period is one month, or two months, and then everybody who goes to a doctor in this province will no longer have any protection under the Medical Care Insurance Plan unless the physician submits the bill in one month or two months. It is quite intolerable, I suggest, Mr. Minister, for you to say that I can go to a doctor today and because my doctor does not send in the bill for 13 months then I must pay the doctor directly. That's what your bill says and I say that's intolerable. I should know when I go to the doctor whether or not I am insured, and my status as an insured person ought not to depend on whether or not a doctor submits an account six months, eight months or 12 months from now.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — If the idea was that the doctor should have no right to recover, fine. I think it's pretty rough legislation but that at least would say something. But to remove it from the status of an insured service is to say that the patient must pay himself. It is wholly inconsistent with the set-up of The Medical Care Insurance Act to suggest that a patient could go to a doctor and believe that he is insured and, because the doctor is tardy in submitting the bill, the patient could be laying himself open to having to pay the full doctor's fee 15 months from now. I don't know whether the Minister (Mr. Grant) intended that, but if he did I suggest that it is a subterranean attack on the very basis of the Medical Care Insurance Plan. If

he did not intend it, I suggest that he look at that clause again and remove any suggestion of fact that this service would not be an insured service and provide rather, if you wish, that the physician has no right to recover either from the patient or from the Plan. I think nothing less than that will give to the citizen the minimum protection which he now has and which he is entitled to continue to have under The Medical Care Insurance Act.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. W.E. Smishek (Regina North East): — Mr. Speaker, because of other ramifications in this Bill and since we have not received the explanatory notes to date on this Bill, I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

Bill No. 16 — An Act to amend The Sewage Drainage Inquiry Act

Hon. C.L.B. Estey (Minister of Municipal Affairs) moved second reading of Bill No. 16 — An Act to amend The Sewage Drainage Inquiry Act.

Hon. Mr. Estey: — Mr. Speaker, the House will recall that at the last session of the Legislature we passed a Sewage Drainage Inquiry Act which Act was to apply primarily to lagoons; and the initial adjudicating body was the Saskatchewan Assessment Commission. There are now three cases before the Assessment Commission and in each case the party who has suffered the damage is represented by a solicitor and that person has received advice that their case should be heard before the Commission. It has been construed by some that a sewer that's backed up or a sewer that broke in an urban centre comes under this Sewage Drainage Act rather than under the normal section of the applicable Municipal Act. Of course this was never the intention. Now under this amendment we are attempting to clarify the fact that this Act has no connection whatever to a rupture in a sewer line or to anything relating to a sewage works. Members may recall that under The Sewage Drainage Inquiry Act, after you go to the Assessment Commission, you then have the right to go to a court of law if you are not satisfied with the adjudication or don't agree with it. There is a statutory limitation there. The statutory limitation for bringing an action for damages under the respective municipal act is one year. A year is nearly up in one or two of these cases. Now what we are proposing in the second amendment to this Act is to extend the time for the bringing of action to 90 days from assent being given to these amendments so that the parties will not be bound by the year's limitation which now appears in The Municipal Act.

Mr. E.I. Wood (Swift Current): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that when this Bill was first laid on my desk I was somewhat mystified but I think the Minister has given us a very satisfactory explanation and I'm prepared to support it.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

Bill No. 17 — An Act to amend The Rural Municipality Act

Mr. Estey (Minister of Municipal Affairs) moved second reading of Bill No. 17 — An Act to amend The Rural Municipality Act.

Hon. Mr. Estey: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Act

deals with a few amendments to The Rural Municipality Act some of which might be considered housekeeping. One of such amendments deals with the responsibility of setting a nomination day when a vacancy occurs on the council between elections. This point was not clearly covered in the Act. We are now amending the Act to provide that it is the responsibility of the council to set the nomination day. We are also providing in the amendments to give the council the authority to vary the hour of the annual meeting, which for some reason has always been set out in the forms prescribed in the Act. In the past, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and the present I might add, we have certain secretary treasurers who also act as managers or secretaries of credit unions and we have an excellent cooperation from the Credit Union of the Association of Saskatchewan in obtaining a list annually of people who act as credit union managers and secretary treasurers. What we are providing by this amendment is really a prohibition you might say to a secretary treasurer who is manager of a credit union depositing the monies of the RM of which he is secretary treasurer in that credit union. This was suggested to us I might say by the SARM. I am not saying that we had difficulty with this Section. We are merely putting into legislation a practice which does exist in cooperation with the Association of Credit Unions. It sometimes may present difficulties if you have an audit of the accounts of the rural municipality and the secretary treasurer of the RM is at the same time manager of the credit union in which RM funds are deposited.

We are also providing in here that, if a piece of land has a great deal of tax arrears against it and the owner gives up and transfers it to the municipal body which is unable to sell that land for the tax arrears, that these arrears may be prorated under the provisions of The Tax Enforcement Act.

We are also providing that sewer and water systems may be established in hamlets and dealt with as a normal local improvement. This provision in the past has applied to organized hamlets but not to hamlets.

In The Rural Municipality Act there is a formula set out for the taxation of railway right-of-ways and gas and oil pipelines. We are now providing that the Section or subsections dealing with the taxation of railway right-of-ways and oil and gas pipelines be taken out of the Act and put into the taxation manual where you might say all of the other formulae dealing with taxation are located. I might say the gas and oil line provision in The Rural Municipality Act is now really out of date for all intents and purposes because it refers to taxation of pipelines in a right-of-way. We have now reached the position where there is no definition of right-of-way. Some companies have 150-foot right-of-ways, others have 50-foot right-of-ways, and under our Section, the way it is worded today, a company with a 150-foot right-of-way would have a real tax benefit when it comes to further lines than a company having only for instance a 50-foot right-of-way.

Mr. Speaker, I think the other amendments to this Act may be regarded as housekeeping and could probably be dealt with better in Committee.

Mr. Wood: — Mr. Speaker, I have gone through this Act as carefully as I can. I will say that the labors in this regard

would have been quite a bit easier if we had of had a few notes accompanying the . . .

Mr. Estey: — I apologize for that, Mr. Speaker, I understood there was . . .

Mr. Wood: — We did go through it and I would like to say that I am quite in accord with the Sections of the Act the Minister has mentioned. However, I feel that a little attention should be drawn to a section that he didn't mention here and I think there is a principle involved here that is worthy of mention on this reading of the Bill. This is in regard to where a person is paying a portion of the taxes. Hitherto he had the privilege of saying that this could be applied to a certain parcel of land. This Section now says that it has to be applied to arrears. I think the problem could arise in this in regard to a person who endeavors to keep his home quarter at least paid up in order to qualify for the homeowner grant. But under this new legislation, even though his arrears were paid up on the home quarter, I believe the homeowner legislation says that he must pay an amount on this land equal to the amount of the current taxes, but, if he has his home quarter paid up and there is \$195 in current taxes against it, and he comes in and wants to pay \$200 which is equal to the current levy on this land, this money is not applied against that quarter but applied against some other quarter that the man owns, and he has not paid on that quarter section on which he is eligible for the homeowner grant. He has not complied with the homeowner legislation and I think this could have quite a bearing in that regard. I would just like to point this out to the House in passing.

Mr. Estey: — Mr. Speaker, I will certainly go into this section to which the Hon. Members has referred to determine if the effect of it is as has been stated.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

Bill No. 18 – An Act to amend The Alcoholism Commission of Saskatchewan Act, 1968

Hon. G.B. Grant (Minister of Public Health) moved second reading of Bill No. 18 — An Act to amend The Alcoholism Commission of Saskatchewan Act, 1968.

Hon. Mr. Grant: — Mr. Speaker, this Bill is concerned exclusively with the non-medical use of drugs. One of the most serious trends that has taken place in our society in the last decade has been a sharp increase in the consumption of drugs for non-medical purposes. In the main the drugs being used have been the so-called soft drugs rather than the strongly addictive or the narcotic type. The soft drugs may be divided into three categories; those producing hallucinations such as LSD; those used as stimulants such as Methedrine or Benzedrine, sometimes called speed or benny pills; and those referred to as depressants, the barbiturates and tranquilizers. While these drugs are said not to be addictive a number of persons have used them at regular intervals with consequent damage to themselves both physically and mentally. While this problem is believed not to be particularly serious in this province compared to some other provinces, it is thought that some agency of Government should assume responsibility for conducting educational programs about the non-medical use of drugs and for organizing treatment that may

be required by drug users. The Alcoholism Commission of Saskatchewan seems to be the most appropriate body to be assigned this function and for that reason this Bill has been prepared, conferring these powers on the Commission. It is expected that the treatment program will be of a rather modest proportion at the outset. However, the important point seems to be that a treatment program could be started for those who need it and the program could be enlarged should the drug problem become more serious in the future.

Mr. G.T. Snyder (Moose Jaw North): — Mr. Speaker, it doesn't happen too often, but occasionally the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) produces a good thought, and when this happens I almost feel obliged to offer some commendation in this connection. I think the provision which amend The Alcoholism Commission of Saskatchewan Act give some recognition to a problem that I think most Saskatchewan people recognize as a problem that is becoming one of some significant proportions in relation to drug addiction and other related matters. A reference to the treating and rehabilitating and the provision of other services I think has to represent a forward step for the problems of those who are addicted and dependent upon substances other than alcohol. The dissemination of information has to represent an important factor in educating especially our young people, in the very questionable practice of becoming involved in experimenting with these substances which have created a great many social problems in other parts of the world. We lend our support to these amendments, Mr. Speaker, and we trust also, Mr. Minister, that when Health Estimates are before us that there will be sufficient financial provisions in the estimates of the Minister to give some real meaning to the provisions that we have been discussing. I certainly will be happy to offer my support.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

Bill No. 19 — An Act to amend The Liquor Board Superannuation Act

Hon. C.L.B. Estey (Minister of Municipal Affairs) moved second reading of Bill No. 19 — An Act to amend The Liquor Board Superannuation Act.

Hon. Mr. Estey: — Mr. Speaker, this is a Bill to amend The Liquor Board Superannuation Act and the essence of the first amendment to this Act is to increase to \$16,000 the salary on which an employee of the Board may contribute insofar as his pension is concerned. At the present time his ceiling on which a contribution may be made for pension rights is \$11,500 a year. We have many senior people in the Civil Service and in boards such as the Liquor Board where their salaries have reached quite a high level, and they naturally are very interested in pension rights. Insofar as the second amendment to this Act is concerned, Mr. Speaker, it is merely housekeeping. It has been deemed that this Act was not clear as to the rights of a widow whose husband had taken a deferred pension and passed away prior to reaching the age of 65 years. There was some doubt as to whether a pension could be paid to the widow from the date of her husband's death. This procedure has been followed and the reason for the second amendment to The Liquor Board Superannuation Act is simply to clear this matter up.

Mr. H.H.P. Baker (Regina South East): — Mr. Minister, just a question. What is the maximum

pension under the various superannuation Acts that are paid?

Mr. Estey; — The maximum pension once a salary reaches \$16,000, 70 per cent of that amount providing there is 35 years of service, which amounts to \$11,200. As of today on \$11,500, I think it is \$8,050, if someone just figures out 70 per cent of \$11,500.

Mr. W.G. Davies (Moose Jaw South): — Just in clarification to the Minister's answer, Mr. Speaker, I think the situation is this, Mr. Minister, and you can correct me if I am wrong in this assumption, it will take a period of some six years after May, 1970, before the maximum that could be received on the \$16,000 contribution could be received. Is this not right?

Mr. Estey: — Right, because the pension is based on the highest average six years' salary.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

Bill No. 21 — An Act to amend The Power Corporation Superannuation Act

Mr. Estey (Minister of Municipal Affairs) moved second reading of Bill No. 21 — An Act to amend The Power Corporation Superannuation Act.

Hon. Mr. Estey: — Mr. Speaker, my former remarks also pertain to this Bill, and I would move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

Bill No. 22 — An Act to amend The Workmen's Compensation Board Superannuation Act

Mr. Estey (Minister of Municipal Affairs) moved second reading of Bill No. 22 — An Act to amend The Workmen's Compensation Board Superannuation Act.

Hon. Mr. Estey: — Mr. Speaker, this Bill is an amendment to The Workmen's Compensation Board Superannuation Act and my previous remarks also apply to this Bill.

Mr. Davies — Just a question to the Minister, Mr. Speaker. Do reports on The Workmen's Compensation Board Superannuation Act, the annual reports come to you on the annual experience and other questions that relate to it?

Mr. Estey: — Mr. Speaker, I think I will have to call on the Minister in Charge of the Workmen's Compensation Board for the answer to that question.

Hon. Mr. Coderre (Minister of Labour): — The report on The Workmen's Compensation Board Superannuation Act has been tabled in the Legislature. They are presented to the Minister from the Board. It was tabled I think about three or four days ago.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

Bill No. 23 — An Act to amend The Securities Act, 1967

Hon. D.V. Heald (Attorney General) moved second reading of Bill No. 23 — An Act to amend The Securities Act, 1967.

Hon. Mr. Heald: — Mr. Speaker, in 1967 this House passed a new Securities Act. It was designed to assist in obtaining uniformity in securities legislation throughout Canada. It was also designed to update the existing securities legislation. Mr. Speaker, the field of securities legislation is, I think, one of the most rapidly changing fields in Canadian government. It is the very heart of much of our business activity of course and the Government is constantly reviewing this securities legislation to ensure uniformity and also to ensure security and protection to the general public and to grant a stable climate for legitimate business.

This Bill I suggest, Mr. Speaker, is a continuation of this program. The Bill will ensure that a person or a company who wishes to appeal from the decision of the chairman will not be penalized by delay in mailing of the decision to him. There was some suggestion that there was a bit of a problem here so we are trying to clear that.

The Bill is designed to protect a person's or a company's right of appeal. The Bill will grant more discretion to the Commission in its deciding of what constitutes a primary distribution of securities, a little more flexibility here. If controls in the judgment of the Commission serve no useful purpose, then the Commission may exempt the trade from the definition of what constitutes a primary distribution.

The Bill will allow companies or persons to use data processing techniques in confirmation receipts. This is simply an updating. These provisions will serve to ensure that the business community affected by The Securities Act can carry on business in an efficient and up-to-date manner.

The proposed Bill will protect the average investor. The Bill provides for the control of finance companies. It will require full disclosure by finance companies making a primary distribution to the public of securities. If this full disclosure is not forthcoming the Commission will have the power to stop trading in these securities. Financial disclosure provisions are being made to apply to persons as well as companies, not just companies. Now there are some very important provisions in this Bill, Mr. Speaker, dealing with enforcement of The Securities Act. In this Act there are very strong and I think very effective penalty provisions, but we are adding procedures to ensure that the provisions of The Securities Act will be complied with.

As the Act is now at the present time, if there is a violation of the Act — supposing somebody goes out and sells securities without having a prospectus qualified — there is a provision for penalties to be assessed at the present time. Under the Act as it now exists, if a provision of the Act is breached there is no power to enforce compliance with the Act.

Mr. Speaker, I can assure Hon. Members that this will be rectified in this Bill now before the House. In other words there are going to be injunction or restraining procedure provisions by application to a Queen's Bench Judge. The Bill provides for temporary orders to compel compliance and I think

this will enable the Commission to better protect the public interest.

I think these provisions in the Bill are a further step in our program to ensure an orderly market and to provide the dissemination of complete information to the investor. I think the provisions will also ease internal administration in companies or with respect to persons registered for training in securities.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge that all Members support the Bill because I think it does ensure an orderly market place for securities.

Mr. A.E. Blakeney (Regina Centre): — Mr. Speaker, I simply want to indicate that we will be supporting this Bill. I certainly welcome Sections 2 and 3 indicating that the time limits run from the time of the mailing of the decision and not the date of the decision.

Our firm had the misfortune of going to the Court of Appeal unsuccessfully on that particular provision.

The provisions with respect to finance companies are, in my view, worthy of support. One looks at provisions like 148 (a) and 148 (b). They are undoubtedly very onerous provisions which allow the Commission to suspend trading for 15 days on its own say so. But knowing the nature of the securities business and knowing that, if we do want an orderly market in securities, it is regrettably necessary to repose a very substantial amount of authority in public officers. I cannot object to these but only express the plea — that I know is not necessary — that the provisions not be used unless the proper authorities feel that it is absolutely necessary to use them.

In short I agree with the summation of the Attorney General (Mr. Heald) and will join with him in asking Members to support the Bill.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

Bill No. 24 — An Act to amend The Statutes Act

Mr. Heald (Attorney General) moved second reading of Bill No. 24 — An Act to amend The Statutes Act.

Hon. Mr. Heald: — Mr. Speaker, basically this Act now states that the date of assent or of signification by either the Governor General or Lieutenant Governor, as the case may be shall be the date of commencement of the Act, unless a later commencement is provided in the endorsement.

There seems to be some doubt as to the effect of the word “later” on retroactive legislation. To ensure clarification the words “no other” are substituted for the word “later.” Subsection (2) of Section 4 of The Statutes Act is therefore repealed and the substitution made as set out in the Bill before the House.

Again, Mr. Speaker, this is merely to clarify the situation with regard to retroactive legislation. I don't here hold any brief for retroactive legislation, but the Legislature has from time to time passed retroactive legislation in its wisdom or otherwise, and this amendment is simply a housekeeping amendment to ensure the efficacy or the legality of retroactive legislation. We don't say that it wasn't legal before, but the advice of my

law officers is that this is a desirable amendment to remove any question with regard to statutes which do have retroactive effects.

With that short explanation, it is a housekeeping amendment, Mr. Speaker, and I would ask Hon. Members to support it.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

Bill No. 25 — An Act to amend The Exemptions Act

Mr. Heald (Attorney General) moved second reading of Bill No. 25 — An Act to amend The Exemptions Act.

Hon. Mr. Heald: — Mr. Speaker, The Exemptions Act has served an extremely valuable and necessary purpose in the history of our province. It protects debtors from harsh treatment by creditors and it ensures that at least a minimal amount of property will be free from seizure. The Bill before the House will serve to extend this protection.

As a result of a legal decision in one of our courts in the province there is some considerable doubt whether the provisions of the Act apply to small businessmen, for example, truckers or small contractors and many other self-employed people. I think perhaps it was an oversight in the original drafting many, many years ago.

On studying the provisions in other jurisdictions we noted that many other jurisdictions used the word “business” or “trade” or “calling” or “trade, profession or occupation.” These words were designed to ensure that the self-employed along with the other people have the protection of the Act.

Section 2 of the Bill ensures that the protection of The Exemptions Act applies to many of the self-employed.

Mr. Speaker, there was a case in Moose Jaw within the last six or eight months where this whole question arose.

The amendment as proposed in Section 3 of the Bill removes the protection for exempt goods purchased with a chattel mortgage as security, if the loan is granted under The Livestock Loans Guarantee Act, 1970, which will be dealt with at this Session. There was a problem in that the lenders would not loan money for the purchase of livestock which would then be automatically exempt by reason of Section 2 of The Exemptions Act.

I feel certain, Mr. Speaker, that Hon. Members will support this amendment to ensure the protection and effectiveness of The Exemptions Act and that is what this Bill endeavors to do. I support you could say it does away with a weakness which became apparent through the decision of one of the courts of our province.

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few very brief comments on this, but I would like not to make them at this time and therefore ask leave to adjourn.

Debate adjourned.

Bill No. 26 — An Act to amend The Land Surveys Act

Hon. J.R. Barrie (Minister of Natural Resources) moved second reading of Bill No. 26 – An Act to amend The Land Surveys Act.

Hon. Mr. Barrie: — Mr. Speaker, The Saskatchewan Land Surveys Act was originally taken from the Dominion Land Surveys Act when the lands were transferred to the Provincial jurisdiction in 1931. Some of its provisions are no longer applicable and some of its procedures should be updated in view of advances in technology. Thus the proposed amendments are mainly in the nature of housekeeping changes.

However, there is one major proposed change which would ease the problem of numerous duplicate monuments and would set one policy for the re-establishment of lost corner monumentation. The amendment will allow a surveyor to re-establish a lost corner in the most probable location from the best evidence obtainable by him and to perpetuate the lost corner by planting a monument of such a character and in such a manner as it prescribed for an original monumentation of a similar corner.

A proposed amendment to Section 58 would permit water boundaries to be plotted from aerial photographs rather than the traveller's measurements. In certain cases such boundaries can be plotted more accurately and much more economically from aerial photographs.

A new Section is proposed which would deal with control surveys. This Section will provide legislation to commence on the coordination of legal surveys which will result in greater efficiency and economy. The amendment provides that the Minister may enter into an agreement with a municipality for the purpose of providing survey control. This is the establishment of precise latitude and longitude for monumented points on the ground. Control points would be established at approximately a quarter-of-a-mile spacing, so the land surveys can be coordinated to give a relocatable point with an accuracy of a couple of inches.

Utilities and public improvements would be tied to this control network to allow easy location of underground utility lines and to prevent encroachments on private property. The coordination of Provincial and municipal efforts in this line would ensure maximum efficiency as well as a minimum duplication and minimum variation in standards resulting in very substantial economies for all parties involved.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

Bill No. 27 – An Act to amend The Forest Act

Mr. Barrie (Minister of Natural Resources) moved second reading of Bill No. 27 – An Act to amend The Forest Act.

Hon. Mr. Barrie: — The proposed amendments to The Forest Act are for the purpose of consolidating two current defined forest areas in the northern part of the province. It is proposed that the schedule to The Forest Act be amended by deletion of the Carrot River Provincial Forest area and including it in the Northern Provincial Forest, also including the addition of some 6½ townships of land in the Carrot River triangle area to the Northern Provincial Forest. This block of land is of limited use for agriculture but shows a good potential for forest production.

In another proposed amendment a quarter section of land

suitable for grazing would be deleted by the Department of Natural Resources from the Northern Provincial Forest in return for the administration of another quarter from the Department of Agriculture which is more suited to production of forest crops. This exchange, I might say, was agreed upon at the meeting of the Land Use Coordinating Committee.

The amended schedule includes a full description of those lands inside the Northern Provincial Forest within the Carrot River triangle area which are still administered by the Provincial Department of Agriculture.

Mr. G.R. Bowerman (Shellbrook): — Mr. Speaker, the explanation of the Minister (Mr. Barrie) has laid some question in our minds with respect to that which is really being undertaken in this amendment. It would have been desirable, however, if we had the opportunity to have had some explanatory notes and to have as well had some outline of the Forest boundaries which will be changed as a result of this, but I would see no reason as a result of the explanation given by the Hon. Minister for not proceeding to move.

Mr. Barrie: — I apologize, Mr. Speaker, for not having explanatory notes and maps which I hope we will have when the Bill goes into Committee, if not before.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

Bill No. 28 — An Act to amend The Secondary Education Act

Hon. J.C. McIsaac (Minister of Education) moved second reading of Bill No. 28 — An Act to amend The Secondary Education Act.

Hon. Mr. McIsaac: — Mr. Speaker, this Act contains several amendments to The Secondary Education Act. I believe they are quite straight forward and fairly easily understood. I will comment briefly on each of the amendments proposed here.

Section 30: The new clause extends to some extent perhaps and prescribes in more detail the requirements on the school boards to furnish the Department with reports, returns, budget information, and so on.

The next Section is a new clause that makes it legal for boards to take out insurance to cover costs incurred on account of teachers' illnesses. This will cover a provision that was incorporated into a teacher's salary agreement last year, I believe, in the Saskatoon area. It is an extension really of the sick leave provisions that have been here for many, many years.

The next Section deals primarily with the fact that the present Act requires teachers to maintain registers as defined in the Act and in the Regulations. No other form of recording attendance is actually legal. With the development of the semester system and very large schools such a system is a little too rigid, and not necessarily always practical. It will allow and permit other forms of recording attendance on a class or on a classroom basis.

The final Section is purely a housekeeping section, a change in reference number.

Mr. J. Kowalchuk (Melville): — Mr. Speaker, the Minister (Mr. McIsaac) has spent a little time on such an important Bill. His explanations make it appear as if there is not much to it.

There are certain Sections of this Bill that I agree to but subsection (2) Mr. Speaker, is another one of these usual education Bills that this Government is famous for further eroding the autonomy of the school unit boards and other school boards to the point that all the major decisions and many minor ones are going to be made by Government officials.

This Bill once again asks the local trustees to go hat-in-hand to the Government to explain all and sundry expenses. Mr. Speaker, many trustees take strong objections to that part of this Bill. As one trustee from my area said, "I know how my fellow compatriot in the Ukraine must feel when cap-in-hand he is summoned by the Russian commissar to Moscow to explain his extravagance in the use of his farm machinery."

Hon. D.G. Steuart (Provincial Treasurer): — Whoopee!

Mr. Kowalchuk: — I intend to have a lot more to say on this Bill, Mr. Speaker. It was a few days ago that this Bill was laid on the table and I and others on this side of the House will have more to say on this Bill, Mr. Speaker. I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

Bill No. 29 — An Act to amend The University Act

Mr. McIsaac (Minister of Education) moved second reading of Bill No. 29 — An Act to amend The University Act.

Hon. Mr. McIsaac: — Mr. Speaker, this Bill provides amendments to The University Act and is legislation that was requested, approved by the Board of Governors and approved by the Senate of the University.

The principal features again I think are straight forward and relatively simple.

Mr. Thatcher: — Progressive!

Mr. McIsaac: — First of all to simply provide for membership on the University Senate by two students from each campus of the University, Regina Campus and the Saskatoon Campus.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIsaac: — I should like to hear Members opposite comment on this one. I am sure they will.

Mr. Blakeney: — We did last year!

Mr. McIsaac: — To provide also that the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) may now become, among his other duties, a member of the Senate along with the Minister of Education.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIsaac: — Several provisions, Mr. Speaker, dealing with the internal realignment of functions of the general campus council and the campus councils of the University.

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker, I just want to mention I think they've got the wrong Senate.

Mr. H.H.P. Baker (Regina South East): — The best Member from Regina, Sir.

Mr. Blakeney: — On a point of order!

Mr. Baker: — Well I want to refer to Section 78 in what you said everything was relatively simple. Section 78 in what you said was substituted by the following Section "A campus council shall consist of the president" and so forth. Does that mean that you are going to give the Regina Campus a president through this amendment, Mr. Minister (Mr. McIsaac)? Will we get full autonomy here, with a vice-president and principal and all other offices that go with it? This is a bit confusing to me and I would like an explanation as to what it means.

Mr. W.S. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition): — As the Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac) has said this is an Act which, if passed means that we will put the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) in the Senate of the University. I suspect that in a few years time another Act by somebody else will put the Provincial Treasurer in the Senate in another place.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — And we will all look forward to that point and I am sure that he will enjoy that particular action when it takes place.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Education in introducing the Bill noted that this had been requested and approved by certain university authorities. I recall that a couple of years ago those same university authorities requested and approved certain other changes which I regret are not here. For example, they requested and approved a few years ago that members of the faculty be provided with positions on the Board of Governors. I think it is unfortunate that that year went past and another year went past and this year has gone past evidently without action being taken on this. I think it is unfortunate that there is not provision in this Act to allow for students on the Board of Governors, something we have proposed for a number of years.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, there are a number of other remarks which I would like to make about the Bill and I would ask leave

March 5, 1970

to adjourn the debate at this time.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 9:55 o'clock p.m.