

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fifth Session — Sixteenth Legislature
22nd Day

Wednesday, March 17, 1971.

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. SPEAKER: — Before we enter into the Orders of the Day I wish to introduce to all Members of the Legislature, the following groups of students in the galleries: from the constituency of Regina North East represented by Mr. Smishek, 70 students from St Thomas School under the direction of their teacher, Mr. Dumelie; from the constituency of Saskatoon City Park-University represented by Mr. Charlebois, 40 students from the Wilson School, under the direction of their teachers, Mr. Hart and Mr. Lamb; from the Regina Vocational School, 80 adults under the direction of their teacher, Mr. Metcalf; from the constituency of Regina North East represented by Mr. Smishek, 50 students from St. Mark School under the direction of their school teacher, Mr. Hilson; and in addition there are 10 guests of the Hon. Premier of the Province in the Speaker's gallery.

I'm sure all Hon. Members will wish to join with me in extending to all of these students and guests, the warmest of all possible welcomes to the Legislature of the Province of Saskatchewan and express the very sincere hope that they will find their stay here educational and informative and wish all of them a safe trip home.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

TRIBUTE TO ST. PATRICK'S DAY

MR. E. WHELAN: (Regina North West) — Mr. Speaker, the celebration of St. Patrick's Day is not limited to the Irish. On this day by adoption every citizen joins with enthusiasm the Sons of Erin to applaud those genial, lovable people whom the good Lord decided would be identified as Irish. A citizen of Irish descent on this day loves the French, the Swedes, the English, the Ukrainians, the Welsh, the Scotch. Only one conflict exists — he loves to fight and fight he does in Ireland. But today, to the real ones and to the temporary ones, to all the Irish, Mr. Speaker, best of luck and a happy St. Patrick's Day.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

BOUNDARY DAM PICKETED BY WINNIPEG BOILER MAKERS UNION

MR. I. H. MacDOUGALL: (Souris-Estevan) — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to ask the Minister of Labour (Mr. MacLennan) a question. I have information that a picket line has been thrown up at Boundary Dam in Estevan by the Boiler Makers' Union No. 555 which is a Winnipeg-based union and they have refused to let

non-union employees come in and do service work. Now this work has been done for the past 15 years by a local Estevan firm and I just want to ask the Minister what the situation is regarding a Manitoba-based outfit coming in and taking jobs away from the local citizens?

HON. D. G. MacLENNAN: (Minister of Labour) — Mr. Speaker, in reply to the Member's question, this was just brought to my attention this morning and we've sent down to Estevan one of our industrial relations officers and I have not received a report of the incident from him yet so I'll reserve any comments.

REMOVAL OF NAME "GARDINER" FROM DAM — HOW TRUTHFUL?

MR. E. KRAMER: (The Battlefords) — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to ask the Premier if there is any truth to the rumor that he has applied to our senior partners at Ottawa to have the name of "Gardiner" removed from the Dam.

HON. W. R. THATCHER: (Premier) — No.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order!

SECOND READING

HON. D. G. STEUART (Provincial Treasurer) moved second reading of Bill No. 36 — **An Act to assist Athabasca Forest Industries Ltd. in establishing a Pulp Mill in Saskatchewan.**

He said: — Mr. Speaker, in rising to move the second reading of this Bill, it is inevitable that my thoughts and those of many Members in this House should revert to a similar occasion almost five years ago when my former colleague, the late J. M. Cuelenaere, moved the second reading of Bill No. 90, an Act to assist the Prince Albert Pulp Company Limited in establishing a pulp mill in Saskatchewan.

At the outset, I should like to enunciate three principles which I believe will be useful to all Members as they consider this Bill. Firstly, the Bill which is now being presented is substantially the same as the one which was approved by this Legislature in 1966. While there are some differences which will be dealt with more fully as the debate on the Bill proceeds, the substance of the Bill is essentially the same as the one presented by Mr. Cuelenaere. The reason for this is obvious — the Prince Albert pulp mill is a success and has amply justified the measures which were taken in 1966 to provide that assistance.

The second principle which I should like to emphasize is this — whereas the Act to assist the Prince Albert Pulp Company Limited sought legislative ratification for agreements which had already been entered into by the Government and Parsons and Whittemore, Inc., this Bill is seeking legislative approval for the Government to enter into agreements to build a second pulp mill in Northern Saskatchewan. This is a most important point — the agreements which have been tabled along with this Bill have not been signed, nor will they be signed until legislative approval of this Bill has been obtained.

Thirdly, we have made a sincere and honest effort to meet some of the criticisms which were levelled at the Government in 1966 when the Act to provide assistance to Prince Albert Pulp Company Limited was introduced. At that time, the Member for Regina West, who is now the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Blakeney), stated:

In my view the Government has not done a sufficiently rigorous job of obtaining independent information before it took the very real and perhaps very proper gamble to back this venture.

Mr. Speaker, as I outline for the Members of the House the steps which have been followed to date in determining the viability and the feasibility of this mill, it will be abundantly clear that we have done a rigorous job of obtaining independent information on which to base a decision to proceed with this venture.

This Bill which is now being presented to the Legislature will authorize the Government to do those things which are necessary to bring a second pulp mill to Saskatchewan. In the first place, it authorizes the province, upon the recommendation of the Provincial Treasurer unconditionally to guarantee the payment of a \$107 million loan to Athabasca Forest Industries Ltd, and to enter into an indemnity agreement under which Athabasca Forest Industries Ltd. will indemnify the Province against all actions, or claims that may be made against the Province pursuant to that agreement.

Secondly, it authorizes any Member of the Executive Council to enter into agreements for the establishment of the pulp mill. This will apply in particular to those agreements which have been tabled.

Thirdly, it authorizes the Province to purchase shares in, the capital stock of the Company; and fourthly, it authorizes the Provincial Treasurer to make grants to Athabasca Forest industries Ltd. for road construction purposes provided that the aggregate amount of such grants shall not exceed \$3 million.

Mr. Speaker, I should now like briefly to review the draft agreements which have been tabled.

The Shareholders' Agreement provides for the establishment of Athabasca Forest Industries Ltd. with authorized capital of \$24 million. This company will be owned 70 per cent by Parsons and Whittemore Incorporated and 30 per cent by the Government of Saskatchewan. The Company will have six directors and the Agreement contains a provision which will ensure that the Board of Directors will always have two members nominated by the Government. Effective control over the operation of the Company is ensured by provisions requiring an affirmative vote of five out of the six directors or 75 per cent of the shareholders before any major decision can be made. The Agreement also provides information concerning the capital requirements for the project and the anticipated source of funds.

Mr. Speaker, I should now like to turn to the Infrastructure Agreement which describes the kind of support which we expect to provide to the pulp mill. When it was first announced that we were negotiating for a second pulp mill, concern was voiced from many quarters concerning the feasibility of the

mill, the availability of wood and the effect upon our lakes and our rivers. We shared this concern; we recognized that there were risks associated with this venture and we have taken positive steps to minimize these risks. We have received from Parsons and Whittemore a feasibility study for the Athabasca project which has indicated that the project is feasible. I am not going to quote from this document, Mr. Speaker, nor am I going to table it since it is a confidential document which is the property of Parsons and Whittemore.

In 1966 when we referred to the feasibility study done by Parsons and Whittemore affiliates, the Leader of the Opposition dismissed it with the comment that he was unimpressed and suggested that the Government should have turned the feasibility study over to an independent consultant for a comprehensive study. This is precisely what we did in 1966 and we have done it again in 1971. We engaged Associated Consultants International Inc. a consulting firm of international repute, with broad experience in the pulp and paper industry and we asked them to do an exhaustive study of the feasibility of this mill. In his letter of transmittal accompanying this report the President of Associated Consultants International Inc. stated, quote:

1. I concur in the forecast of availability of markets, of wood supply and of water supply.
2. I approve the proposals of locating the mill near Doré Lake in the centre of the timber reserve and of generating electrical power at the mill site.
3. I find the layout of the mill to be excellent and the proposed process to be normal for the industry with the most modern features but without any unproven in operation elsewhere.
4. I find the estimated capital cost of \$117,700,000 for basic changes or \$145,280,000 when including expenses during construction and start-up in line with cost of other current mills of similar process.
5. I agree with the assumption on which the financial forecast is based and I believe that these tables present a fair picture of the mill as a viable project.

The report of Associated Consultants has been tabled and is available for the perusal of Members in this House.

But, Mr. Speaker, we did not stop there in our efforts to ensure that we had the best possible information before proceeding with this pulp mill complex. For example, we engaged the firm of Philips, Barratt, Hillier, Jones and Partners to investigate the quantity and quality of water available for the pulp mill and to make detailed recommendations on the alternative sources of supply, together with the capital and operating costs necessary. We retained Van Luven Consultants Ltd. to evaluate alternative methods of treating effluent and other waste products from the pulp mill and to recommend an effective system for the disposal of effluent and other waste materials in such a manner that will protect the environment. The system which is ultimately adopted must be satisfactory to all appropriate Government agencies, both Federal and Provincial. The reports of these consultants have also been tabled.

I should like to emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that each of these studies was commissioned by the Government of Saskatchewan and provides concrete evidence of our determination to have an independent opinion on these very important questions. In addition, we have engaged Associated Engineering Services Ltd. to investigate the requirements of a town-site in the vicinity of the pulp mill and to prepare a comprehensive pre-detail site design of the proposed town-site including a definition of development standards and cost estimates. Now because of the isolated location of the proposed mill site, it was desirable to determine the magnitude of problems which would be encountered in establishing a labor force in that area.

The Infrastructure Agreement outlines the responsibilities of Athabasca Forest Industries Ltd. and the Government of Saskatchewan in undertaking those things which are required to establish the pulp mill. For example, the responsibility for construction and maintenance of roads required for the pulp mill rests with the Athabasca Pulp Mill Limited. To assist in the financing of these roads, a capital grant of \$3 million will be made to Athabasca and SEDCO will provide a \$13 million non-revolving line of credit for a period of 10 years. SEDCO will receive interest on monies advanced under the line of credit and will also receive a commitment fee on the undrawn daily balance. In return for this assistance, the Province has the right at any time to convert these roads to public use.

It is a condition of the Agreement that during construction of the mill preference will be given to materials and equipment manufactured and sold in Saskatchewan. Furthermore, it is expressly provided that the price of machinery and equipment supplied by Black Clawson shall not exceed \$6 million.

The Supply Agreement and the Services Agreement outline in considerable detail the relationship between Athabasca Forest Industries Ltd., Parsons and Whittemore Equipment Corporation and Parsons and Whittemore Contractors Corporation concerning the construction and installation of the pulp mill. These two agreements must be considered together since fulfilment of both agreements will result in the delivery to Athabasca Forest Industries of a pulp mill capable of producing approximately 1,400 tons per day of bleached kraft pulp. These agreements contain adequate provisions to ensure that the mill is built to the required specifications, that it is capable of achieving the desired production and that the total cost does not exceed the guaranteed price.

The performance of the companies under the two agreements is guaranteed by a performance bond in the amount of \$30 million and an advance payment bond in the amount of \$20 million. Moreover, in order to protect the subcontractors, the agreements provide for a labor and material payment bond in the amount of \$19 million. Now we put this in specifically to avoid the unhappy problems that we have experienced with the subcontractors in the building of the Prince Albert pulp mill. In addition, under the Supply and Services Contracts Guarantee Agreement, the parent company, Parsons and Whittemore Incorporated assumes responsibility for the performance of its subsidiaries and affiliates under the Supply and Service Agreements. In other words, Mr. Speaker, we are taking every possible measure to ensure that the interests of the province are adequately protected.

The Forest Management Licence Agreement between the Minister of Natural Resources and Athabasca Forest Industries Ltd. is basically the standard form of agreement whereby the Minister grants a licence to cut and remove timber from Crown land. The term of the licence is for a period of 30 years with right of renewal for an additional 20 years. The agreement contains a schedule of fees for operating licence and stumpage, but in addition provides for a change of 20 cents per cord of all softwood timber to be used for reforestation. The company is to pay a further 5 cents per cord of softwood timber harvested to defray costs of fire protection. The agreement provides for the submission of a management plan which must be approved by the Minister of Natural Resources. This will ensure that the timber is harvested in accordance with good forest management practices and that our resource lands will be safeguarded for posterity.

The Guarantee Agreement in effect ties together the obligations and undertakings of the parties to the other agreements and establishes the security upon which various provincial loans and guarantees shall be advanced. As security for the prime loan of \$107 million, Athabasca will execute and deliver a deed of trust and mortgage which will constitute a first fixed and specific mortgage, pledge and charge upon the fixed assets of the company and a floating charge on all other property and assets. The terms and conditions of the loan must be in a form satisfactory to and approved by the Provincial Treasurer.

In the case of the Prince Albert pulp mill, a limitation is placed upon distribution of net profits or dividends for a fixed period of time to ensure that the financial position of the mill is not impaired.

In consideration for the guarantee of the province under this agreement, the province will receive a guarantee fee of \$3.6 million.

Two other agreements, which have been tabled, namely the Management Consultant and Technical Services Agreement and the Sales Agreement are agreements between Athabasca Forest Industries Ltd. and Parsons and Whittemore Incorporated. These agreements provide for the provision of specified services by Parsons and Whittemore to the pulp mill — specifically in the areas of management consulting and technical services and the sales of pulp produced by Athabasca. Each of these agreements provides for services upon request of Athabasca Forest Industries Ltd. and may be terminated unilaterally by Athabasca.

Mr. Speaker, my review of these agreements in this speech has been very brief. The reasons for this are obvious. The agreements are very lengthy and complex and to deal with each one in full would unnecessarily prolong this debate. However, I have tabled all the agreements so that Members may study them carefully. I can assure you that we shall endeavor to answer any questions which may arise either out of this Bill or out of the agreements into which the Bill would authorize the Government to enter.

As this debate continues, I am sure we shall hear many references to the desirability of safeguarding our natural resources. Mr. Speaker, let us hope that there will be an equal number of references to the desirability of providing continued employment for the people of this province. Because, Mr. Speaker,

that is what this Bill is all about — the development of our natural resources is one way of providing additional employment and an improved standard of living for the people of Saskatchewan.

Now, reference has already been made in the press releases by the Premier and by Mr. Landegger to the fact that as many as 1,200 persons will be employed in the construction phase for the pulp mill. Now, Mr. Speaker, just what does this mean in terms of employment for specific trades and skills? Well, it has been estimated that there will be 410,000 man-hours of work for pipe fitters; 185,000 man-hours for boiler workers; 250,000 man-hours of work for electricians; 500,000 man-hours for mechanical workers; 766,000 man-hours for civil construction as well as less amounts for sheet metal workers and other trades. Mr. Speaker, this does not include the jobs which will be provided during construction of the railroad, nor the jobs which will result from the establishment of a new town-site. While it is impossible to predict with any degree of certainty the number or variety of jobs which will exist in this new town, it is not unreasonable to examine the experiences of other one-industry towns of a comparable size.

Based on a population projection of 4,000, the town will probably require some 500 to 600 persons engaged in non-basic industries. This figure could include as many as 40 to 45 teachers; 120 or 130 people in the retail trades; 50 to 60 in hotels, motels and restaurants; as well as many others in ancillary and related services. In other words, Mr. Speaker, this bold new venture will provide job opportunities not only for those who will find employment directly in the pulp mill and in the woods force but it will provide new opportunities for people in every walk of life; an opportunity to participate in the development of our northland and to achieve a measure of economic independence hitherto unknown in that part of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, you will also hear charges that the new pulp mill will destroy our tourist industry in the northwest. Well, let's just take a look at the tourist industry in that part of the province. What do we find? In Buffalo Narrows there are two tourist camps providing part-time employment at the present time for 26 people. In Ile-a-La-Crosse, three tourist camps provide employment for 12 people, again on a part-time basis. In Doré Lake there are four camps which employ 22 people on a part-time basis. This is the thriving tourist industry which we are accused of trying to destroy nine tourist camps employing 60 people on a part-time basis.

Mr. Speaker, the tourist industry in this part of the province has lagged because we don't have enough roads to provide access to this great potential tourist area. At the present time there are only 200 miles of roads but with the advent of the pulp mill we shall have many, many more miles of roads, built primarily for the pulp mill but which may be converted to multi-purpose use as the need arises.

Now, Mr. Speaker, another deterrent to the tourist industry in this area is the lack of adequate measures for fire suppression. The proposed agreements with Parsons and Whittemore call for the payment of an additional fee for fire protection — a factor which will be of immeasurable benefit to the tourist industry as well as for the protection of our forest resources.

I sincerely believe that the establishment of this pulp

mill will prove to be a boon, a shot-in-the-arm for our tourist industry and that new areas, previously inaccessible, will be opened up to provide recreational facilities for the people of this province and for tourists from other parts of Canada and the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I expect the debate on this Bill will be lengthy and involved. Let me say now that we welcome the opportunity to review with Members of the House the plans for this new pulp mill. That is precisely why we have come to the Legislature to obtain approval of these plans before the agreements have been signed. But let us not lose sight of the stakes for which we are playing. These stakes are jobs for the people of Saskatchewan, for the 3,300 people in the town of Meadow Lake where the largest single source of income is now, and has been for half a century, welfare payments for the 1,250 people in LaLoche, 1,200 people in Buffalo Narrows, 1,150 in Ile-a-la-Crosse who are forced to rely on welfare because there have not been any jobs in that area. Add to these the 550 people in Beauval and the 450 people in Green Lake and what are we talking about? Mr. Speaker, we are talking about giving 8,000 people a chance to walk with their heads high, with pride in the knowledge that they are playing a worthwhile part in the future development in the Province of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. STEUART: — Mr. Speaker, what kind of an answer is it to say to these people — 50 or 60 of you may find part-time employment in the tourist camps, a few more may find jobs at low wages in small sawmill operations. We are not prepared on this side of the House, not prepared to condemn these people to another generation or two of life eking out a bare subsistence existence on the cold comfort of social aid. The easiest thing in the world for us to do would be to back off from this issue. Right now everyone is excited about preserving our environment and we are concerned about exacting the kind of terms and conditions which will ensure the maximum protection for our environment with the construction of this mill. We don't like the idea that there might be some pollution of the environment. But let's not confuse our priorities. Of what comfort will it be to the people of Meadow Lake or LaLoche or Buffalo Narrows if our only answer to them is — we save you from pollution but we condemn you for another generation to social aid.

Mr. Speaker, progress inevitably involves some changes in the environment. When the first settlers came to Saskatchewan they found virgin prairies undisturbed and undeveloped. Had there been the same hue and cry at that time for the preservation of the environment, not one acre of Saskatchewan would have been surrendered to the plow. Is this the price we are prepared to pay for the so-called preservation of our environment? Would any Member in this House willingly exchange the rich farm lands of Saskatchewan for the unproductive prairies of 100 years ago? Were we wrong to develop our oil, were we wrong to develop our potash or our other resources? Yet each one of these industries have had an effect on our environment, each one of them has to a greater or lesser extent contributed to the problems of pollution. The fact that we have these industries is testimony to the recognition that the environment in which we live is important and we must be protected but it is not as important as the needs of the people who live in that

environment. This is why we are actively seeking the establishment of a second pulp mill in Saskatchewan, not because we are unconcerned about the preservation of our resources but because we are concerned about our greatest resource, the people of the Province of Saskatchewan.

And we are taking the necessary steps and I guarantee to this House and the people of this province that we are taking the necessary steps to preserve our environment — not by indulging in mass hysteria but by the provision of cold hard cash — over \$10 million is provided in the plans for the pulp mill to protect the environment from the effects of pollution. Additional sums are provided for the regeneration and reforestation of our wood resources. We are also providing real jobs at this time for the people of Saskatchewan.

We are not talking about providing part-time jobs for 50 to 60 people such as the tourist industry now provides. Nor are we talking about seasonal employment at minimum wages which are currently offered by small, uneconomic sawmill operations in the area. We are talking about full-time employment for up to 1,600 people at wages comparable to those paid by the Prince Albert pulp mill wages which have given to the city of Prince Albert the highest per capita income of any city in the Province of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. STEUART: — In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me summarize some of the major issues concerning this Bill. It is essentially the same as the Act to assist the Prince Albert Pulp Company Limited in establishing a pulp mill in Prince Albert. As I have said before, we are happy with the deal we made for the pulp mill at Prince Albert. And we are happy about the deal which we have been able to negotiate for a pulp mill at Doré Lake. Where this Bill differs from the Prince Albert Pulp Mill Act, it is because we have been able to negotiate more favorable terms for the Province of Saskatchewan. We know a great deal more about the operation of a pulp mill than we did five years ago and we have used that knowledge to obtain additional benefits and advantages for the people of this province.

In 1966 Opposition Members said we should have obtained advice from independent consultants before committing the province to the substantial risks involved in the Prince Albert pulp mill. Well, Mr. Speaker, we had that advice in 1966 and in 1971, as we propose the establishment of a second pulp mill, we again had that advice from independent consultants. Their advice is that this mill is feasible and viable. Now on the basis of that advice together with the research and analysis that has been undertaken by officials of various Government departments we are prepared to proceed. This Bill, which is before the Legislature, will empower the Government to do those things which must be undertaken to bring this great pulp mill complex into existence.

I appeal to all Members to support this Bill. I appeal to all Members to give the people in that part of Saskatchewan a chance, as we have in the rest of Saskatchewan, to live in a decent way working at good jobs with decent wages. Mr. Speaker, I beg leave of the Assembly to move second reading of this Bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. A. E. BLAKENEY: (Leader of the Opposition) — Mr. Speaker, the Provincial Treasurer in moving second reading of this Bill has indicated that the arrangements provided for in the legislation are similar to those with respect to the Prince Albert mill, that the basic infrastructure of this mill, the basic financial arrangements are to be similar to the Prince Albert mill. He might also have said that the basic reasons given in support of this Bill are the same reasons as given in Prince Albert, and he might also have said that the speech which he delivered was essentially the same speech as given in support of the Prince Albert mill. We should have been a good deal more receptive to the Provincial Treasurer's arguments if they hadn't been shop-worn the second time round. For example, we should have been tempted to believe his story that this mill will provide employment for the people at Beauval and Ile-a-la-Crosse, Buffalo Narrows and LaLoche, if we had not heard this same story from Members opposite, particularly from the late Mr. Cuelenaere and Mr. Boldt, who was then Minister of Welfare, when the Prince Albert mill was brought into being; if we had not heard Mr. Boldt at that time say that this was going to provide 4,000 jobs for Indian and Métis people, and if we didn't know that the facts now are that there are not 4,000 or 1,000 or 100 but approximately 75 Métis people provided with employment by the Prince Albert mill.

MR. STEUART: — . . . in the woods:

MR. BLAKENEY: — The facts are that the figure is well under 100, add them anyway you like, in the woods, in the mill, anyway you like, there are less than a dozen in the mill and the Provincial Treasurer well knows it. The facts are that the mill has not provided employment for native people in Northern Saskatchewan. We wish it had. We wish that the pious statements contained in the agreements that the Minister would like to see that 20 per cent of the people employed in the mill would be people of native extraction were something more than pious statements. We wish, for example, that Parsons and Whitemore or Athabasca would commit themselves even to hire one per cent native people but there is no such "commitment in these documents.

We wish, Mr. Speaker, that at Prince Albert the people who work in the woods would be, for the most part, people from Saskatchewan. But I think the Member for Prince Albert well knows that over half of the people working in the woods are people who came from outside this province, mostly from the Province of Quebec.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — We don't particularly resent people coming . . .

MR. J. J. CHARLEBOIS: (Saskatoon City Park University) — What's wrong with people from Quebec?

MR. BLAKENEY: — What's wrong with people from Quebec — the thing that's wrong with them is that they are not from Saskatchewan and we've got 10,000 people in Saskatchewan who are looking for those jobs. That's what's wrong with it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — Now, that's what's wrong with it:

AN HON. MEMBER: — What about you? Where do you come from?

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I want also to point out one or two other things with respect to this agreement. The Minister is very, very quick to say that the wages in Prince Albert are high. I wish also that he had said that of all the cities in Saskatchewan the welfare bill is highest in Prince Albert.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — I wish he had said that, then we should have some picture of just how much a mill does to obliterate welfare. In fact it has not been successful in obliterating welfare in Prince Albert. In fact, it has not been successful in providing employment or any substantial employment for Indian and Métis people. In fact, it has not been successful in providing many jobs for Saskatchewan people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — I want also now to turn to another aspect of the Provincial Treasurer's (Mr. Steuart) argument.

The Provincial Treasurer has pointed out that these agreements are in a different category than the agreements with respect to the Prince Albert mill. And indeed they are. The agreements do not indicate that a deal has been made in the same manner as it was with respect to Prince Albert. In fact there are a good number of prerequisites which have not yet come to pass. The deal will not come to fruition unless there is a grant from the Department of Regional Economic Expansion and that has not yet been agreed to. The deal, according to the documents, will not come to fruition until the cutting rights over the Cold Lake bombing range are assured, and I am not sure what their state is, but at least on the documents, that has not been assured.

The deal will not come to fruition unless an arrangement is reached with respect to the construction of a railway line and the deal will not come to fruition unless \$107 million can be borrowed at rates of interest which will make the mill economic. Nowhere in the documents is there any indication of what rate of interest will permit the mill to be economic. It may well be that it is in the feasibility study, which the Provincial Treasurer indicates will not be available to us. But it is not much help to us to have a feasibility study which is not made available to us. I wonder why this feasibility study is secret. I have the feasibility study for the Prince Albert mill. I don't know why the feasibility study for the Meadow Lake mill ought not to be equally available.

The Provincial Treasurer has elected not to make this document available. He's elected rather to make a little commentary on it available, something which says, for example, "I concur in

the forecast of availability of markets.” But that doesn't tell us anything about the forecast of availability of markets.

MR. STEUART: — It's in the study, you can read . . .

MR. BLAKENEY: — “I concur in the forecast with respect to wood supply” but doesn't tell us what's in the feasibility study with respect to wood supply, and on and on.

That is not very helpful in assessing the feasibility of the mill. I wonder frankly why this study is not available.

MR. STEUART: — . . .you've nitpicked somewhere and . . .

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, the bedrock of this agreement is a feasibility study which has not been made available to this House. And the Provincial Treasurer may feel that that is nitpicking but after all we are risking at least \$130 million of public funds on a feasibility study which is not to be disclosed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — The Provincial Treasurer may feel that \$130 million is just nitpicking but I feel that that sum of money is worthy of some consideration in this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, the Bill provides the framework in which it is proposed that a pulp mill in the Doré Lake area of Saskatchewan be established. The Bill was read a first time last Friday and at that time the documents were tabled — they run to some thousands of pages. According to the press reports they weighed 10 pounds, or was it 12 pounds. I don't know how much they weighed but I carried most of them around this weekend trying to find a little opportunity to look at them and I must say that they are comprehensive.

I say quite frankly that I haven't finished my analysis of the documents and I am sure that some other Members of the House have not yet had an opportunity to peruse them. I am sure that no Member in this House would want to vote on this Bill until he had himself looked at those documents to see whether he'd satisfied himself as to whether this was a good deal.

The basic outline of the proposed deal is set out in a draft agreement entitled "The Shareholders' Agreement" which the Provincial Treasurer referred to and which I assume is to be approved by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council pursuant to Section 4, the Bill which is before us.

This agreement sets out the proposed capital requirements. The amount of money that we need \$177 million. Equity provided by the shareholders \$24 million. Grants \$15 million — \$12 million of that from the Federal Government, if we get it. \$3 million from the Provincial Government. So those are grants of \$15 million. Loans guaranteed by the province alone — and

not by Parsons and Whittemore — \$107 million. A contingency loan guaranteed by the province and Parsons and Whittemore \$6 million. Loans to be provided by the province, by SEDCO, \$13 million and project and equipment financing \$12 million . . .

MR. STEUART: — By Parsons and Whittemore.

MR. BLAKENEY: — . . .total \$177 million. A comment by the Provincial Treasurer is that the project and equipment financing is to be provided by Parsons and Whittemore — that may be — it's not in the documents.

Mr. Speaker, of the equity of \$24 million, this will be provided by Parsons and Whittemore — which for the sake of convenience I shall call P&W from time to time — \$16.8 million, and the province \$7.2 million. The province is to receive a guarantee fee of \$3.6 million. For ease of calculation I shall regard this \$3.6 million as a deduction from the price of the shares. On this basis the province's shares will cost \$3.6 million.

Now let's recap a bit — Total \$177 million. Parsons and Whittemore put up \$16.8 million. Their only other exposure is a possible liability on the contingency loan, which I shall put on of \$3 million. Total liability, total exposure, less than \$20 million and they will own 70 per cent of the equity. The province in cash and guarantees is putting up a grant of \$3 million, a little over \$3 million for shares, that's \$6 million; SEDCO loans another \$13 million, that's \$19 million; a contingency guarantee — another \$3 million, that's \$22 million; guarantee of bonds \$107 million, that's \$129 million and more, approximately \$130 million is the total Provincial Government cash and exposure.

Get that again. Parsons and Whittemore total cash and exposure less than \$20 million and they own 70 per cent of the equity. Our cash and exposure is \$130 million and we own 30 per cent of the equity.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — A good deal! That's a good deal!

MR. BLAKENEY: — The Federal Government grant is in effect a grant to the shareholders. \$12 million of Federal Government money and in effect \$8.4 million of that is going to P&W and \$3.6 million to the people of Saskatchewan.

Wouldn't it have been better, just as an aside, if that \$12 million had gone in for the benefit of the people of Saskatchewan but well over \$8 million of it goes in for the benefit of P&W.

In short, Mr. Speaker, P&W will own 70 per cent of the equity of this \$177 million project. ^Their cash investment will not exceed \$16.8 million — and I'll have more to say about that in a moment — their total exposure will not exceed \$20 million.

The province, on the other hand, will have a 30 per cent interest. Our cash investment will exceed \$20 million substantially. Our total exposure will be \$130 million.

Mr. Speaker, I said that Parsons and Whittemore would put

in \$16.8 million. This is the amount that they will pay for their shares nominally. But let's look a little deeper. P&W is not asked to pay this \$16.8 million at the beginning of the project.

This isn't an ordinary financing deal where the borrower puts in his money first and then the lender follows with his money. This isn't going to be set up as you would with a NHA house if you were borrowing money — you put your money in first and then the mortgagee puts in his money. Oh, no. P&W are not obligated to put their money in first. The equity money doesn't go in first. The equity money only goes in when the bond money goes in and I wonder where you can find a deal like that in ordinary financing circles. P&W doesn't in fact have to put up its \$16.8 million until the province has put in the last of the \$107 million.

Now let's note another curious thing or two. This joint venture — and that's what it is — because the province and P&W have come together and they formed Athabasca Forest Industries Limited. This partnership is going to build a pulp mill but they are not going to call for tenders. They are not going to call for tenders to get this pulp mill built. They are not even going to solicit any competitive bids of any kind. I wonder what anyone would say if two partners got together and both decided they were going to build a building and then the senior partner decided, "Yes, we'll build a building and we'll give the contract to build it to me." What would the junior partner say to that or what ought he to say? He ought to say, "Let's have an independent contractor" . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — He'd say, "Let's call for tenders, then we shall know we are paying the right price."

We don't know that the price we are paying is a fair price. We have no assurance that it's the cheapest price possible. In fact we virtually have the assurance that it's higher than the cheapest price possible because in fact if Parsons and Whittemore knew that they could get the contract on the basis of competitive bids, you can bet that they would be willing to go through that exercise and the province would insist that they do. But it's only because we are reasonably sure that this price is higher than it would be if they had called for competitive bids that bids are not being called for.

Now, I am aware that they've got a consulting firm which says, "I've looked at the price, we've looked at the price and it's within the general range." I invite any Member in this House to read this report of Associated Consultants International Incorporated with their comments, on the price of the mill and ask yourself whether you would be satisfied from those comments as to whether or not that's a fair price.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — Every single comparison which Associated Consultants International Incorporated uses as a comparison for a price of a pulp mill is that of another pulp mill for the estimated cost. Nowhere do they compare the price of this pulp mill with the actual price of any other pulp mill built.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — And I invite you to look at the report.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Some Consultants;

MR. BLAKENEY: — It may be that the price is reasonable. However, there is certainly no firm evidence that the price is reasonable. No firm evidence on which that conclusion could be based and certainly no evidence that's safe to forego the protection for this massive amount of public money which a competitive tender would offer. Without competitive tender the people of Saskatchewan can't know whether they are paying too much for this mill. And let there be no mistake about it, the people of Saskatchewan are paying for this mill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — And without competitive tender the people of Saskatchewan can't know whether Parsons and Whittemore are in fact putting up a penny of their money.

Parsons and Whittemore are to buy shares at \$16.8 million, as I said, but Parsons and Whittemore are to get construction contracts totalling \$17 million, without competitive tender, without even asking any other contractor what their price is. So that they may well be able to make on this \$117 million a profit which would cover a major part of their \$16.8 million. In fact, they may be able to make the whole \$16.8 million.

The Financial Post of February 20, 1971 in an article entitled — and I think very accurately entitled — "Saskatchewan Digs Deep for \$177 million Mill." It says that Parsons and Whittemore will probably make on the contract a large part of the \$16.8 million share of their cost. The Financial Post says Parsons and Whittemore will receive: (1) about \$12 million as their normal fee to be paid on a turnkey contract; (2) profits on the machinery supplied. I'll quote from the Financial Post:

These profits and fees would bring Parsons and Whittemore's profits during construction close to its \$16.8 million equity payment. In that case the company would basically be purchasing its 70 per cent equity to a large extent with its services and work as a turnkey contractor.

In short, Mr. Speaker, without competitive tender, with Parsons and Whittemore having a captive construction contract, Parsons and Whittemore may well have to put up little or nothing in cash and get 70 per cent of the equity in the mill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — And all the while the province is putting up by cash or guarantee \$130 million. In fact nothing in the deal in any way prevents Parsons and Whittemore from making a profit on the deal before a wheel turns.

Mr. Speaker, I don't want to be misunderstood. I don't object to a contractor making a profit. It's a hazardous business and losses are common enough. We do say, however, that where the

funds are being provided by public funds or public guarantee, profits for contractors should be made on the basis of open competitive tender and not on the basis of backroom contracts. . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — . . .not made between Parsons and Whittemore and Athabasca Forest Industries which is controlled by Parsons and Whittemore.

Mr. Speaker, who is chairman of the board of Parsons and Whittemore Incorporated? The answer is Karl F. Landegger. Parsons and Whittemore Incorporated or one of the many emanations of Parsons and Whittemore Incorporated is entering into a contract to build a pulp mill with Athabasca Forest Industries Limited. And who is chairman of the board of Athabasca Forest Industries Limited? The answer is Mr. Karl F. Landegger. They're settling down and hammering out a deal. Mr. Speaker, that doesn't sound like a very tough bargaining session.

Mr. Speaker, I want really to remind this House that there are, in effect, two construction contracts, one with Parsons and Whittemore Contractors Incorporated and the other one with Parsons and Whittemore Equipment Incorporated. These are both new Delaware companies which we haven't seen before and are not to be confused with Parsons and Whittemore Incorporated or Parsons and Whittemore Industries Incorporated or Parsons and Whittemore Pulp Mills Limited, which we saw in the Prince Albert deal. These two companies before they start any work are to receive advances totalling \$17 million. Before they do any work they are to get advances totalling \$17 million. And thereafter they are to be paid on the basis of actual invoices for expenditures made by these companies plus the 10 per cent override. So that the interim financing also will be provided out of public funds. In this case the contractors will not have to provide money during the period of construction. There is every likelihood that Parsons and Whittemore will have remarkably little, if any, of their money actually paid out at any time during the construction of this mill. Once again competitive tenders with ordinary provisions, provisions* for example, like the Minister of Public Works would insist on with respect to the South Saskatchewan Base Hospital, or which were insisted on when the Government provided money to build the cement plant, let's take either of those, would offer far, far more protection to the taxpayer.

Under an ordinary building contract and I suspect — I haven't examined it — but I suspect, this is true let us say of the South Saskatchewan Base Hospital, payments are made out not on the basis of invoices but on the basis of on-site construction. Now, on this contract I point out that payments are going to be made out, first by an advance of \$17 million and then on the basis of invoices submitted by Parsons and Whittemore. And it is entirely possible that \$30 million or \$40 million of public funds could be paid out with very, very little construction on site.

It should be kept in mind that, as I understand it, it was just such a type of contract which provided for payment out on the basis of invoices and not on the basis of on-site construction that led to the Churchill Forest Industries fiasco at the Pas.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — Now I'm very sure that the Roblin Government felt perfect confidence in its partners. But that did not prevent the disaster from taking place.

We don't question the competence or reliability of Parsons and Whittemore in any direct sense. We don't question the competence or the reliability of Poole Construction Company, the people who are building the South Saskatchewan Base Hospital. And I hope you don't. But when it comes to the South Saskatchewan Base Hospital, you don't pay Poole in advance like this and you don't pay them on the basis of invoice, you pay on the basis of on-site construction.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — We say that Parsons and Whittemore are no less nor more competent in their line of work than Poole Construction is in their line of work. We do say that the Government should follow the same procedures about calling for competitive tenders on paying on the basis of on-site construction in the case of Parsons and Whittemore as you do with Poole. To do this is to take major risks with taxpayers' money.

Mr. Speaker, this deal not only offers Parsons and Whittemore the opportunity to get 70 per cent of the equity in the largest kraft mill in Canada with little or no cash outlay, it not only offers them a chance to get out with little or no financial loss if the mill goes belly-up, it offers Parsons and Whittemore the chance to make substantial profits if the mill operates, even if it operates at a loss.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I want to reiterate this again. In our view, assistance to private persons to develop industries in Saskatchewan should be on the basis that the private developer cannot make a profit unless the industry makes a profit. In this deal, Parsons and Whittemore can, I submit, very possibly make a profit if the mill never turns a wheel and they unquestionably can make a profit even if the mill never makes a dollar of profit.

I want to come to two other contracts referred to by the Provincial Treasurer — the management contract and the sales contract. I leave aside the management contract. It is not easy to calculate the value of the benefits accruing to Parsons and Whittemore through that one. But the sales contract is simpler. It is not incidentally terminable at will by Athabasca because it has a solid five-year term before it can be terminated. It is a five-year contract and thereafter it is renewable indefinitely. And I point out that Athabasca Chairman of the Board, Karl F. Landegger and Parsons and Whittemore Incorporated, Chairman of the Board, Karl F. Landegger, may find the basis on which to renew it indefinitely. This contract gives Parsons and Whittemore a 3 per cent commission on all sales of pulp handled by Parsons and Whittemore. It will be seen that this can mean that Parsons and Whittemore will receive large sums even if the mill operates at a loss. For example, at Prince Albert where there is a similar contract the mill had an operating loss in 1969 at \$717,000. But Parsons and Whittemore go sales

commissions in that year of approximately \$750,000. It didn't matter whether the mill made a profit or made a loss. Parsons and Whittemore got \$750,000.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — And I say that if you want to get the broker to sell your pulp, why don't you get a broker who is independent of Parsons and Whittemore, why don't you get someone who isn't an insider.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, it is perfectly clear that this will mean that Parsons and Whittemore will receive large sums of money for selling pulp even if this mill operates at a loss.

HON. C. P. MacDONALD: (Minister of Welfare) — What per cent would you give anybody else?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — On the Athabasca mill, when it operates at capacity the sales contract will be upwards of \$2 million a year, upwards of \$2 million a year.

MR. STEUART: — What's wrong with that if they sell all the pulp?

MR. BLAKENEY: — What's wrong with it is that Parsons and Whittemore are insiders. What's wrong with it is that you have no idea whether or not this pulp could not be sold at very much lower commission rates.

MR. STEUART: — You . . . the pulp industry. What's the average?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, Members opposite have made their speeches and some others are doubtless going to make their speeches if they ever get the courage to stand on their feet. Some of them make their best speeches when they are sitting down and we certainly appreciate their forbearance because we don't like to hear it when they stand up for the most part.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — But I want to say this: on the Athabasca mill, when this mill operates. Parsons and Whittemore will be getting sales commissions of \$2 million and if there are profits then Parsons and Whittemore get 70 per cent of the profits and we get 30 per cent. Now these are the bare bones of the financial arrangements covering the Athabasca mill. They can be shortly summarized. I think the people of Saskatchewan will be asking themselves whether or not this mill is the best place to put the \$130

million of public credit. I think they will be asking whether or not the pulp mill is the first priority with \$130 million of public money.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — I think they will be wondering whether or not more employment and more benefit to, this province couldn't be provided in the agricultural industry rather than this secondary industry . . . the Member is answering in his seat . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — . . . with \$130 million of public credit. Those are the questions I think will be asked. I think they will be asking just whether or not they like this financial deal. Here is a deal which involves granting of contracts of \$117 million payable out of publicly provided funds without calling for tenders, without even giving any other contractor but Parsons and Whittemore a chance to make a submission. Here is a deal whereby Parsons and Whittemore will put up little or no long-term money, will take little or no risk, will get a sales contract netting millions each year and get 70 per cent of the equity besides. Here is a deal where the Government will put up all or substantially all of the money, take all or substantially all of the risks and give additional valuable concessions and get 30 per cent of the equity. This deal fails to provide safeguards for the people of Saskatchewan. It is a bad financial deal. It is a bad financial deal for the people of Saskatchewan and in prudence and in conscience it cannot be supported and I will not support it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — I want to say to the exuberant Members opposite that if they think that is an election issue, let . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, there are other aspects of this which deserve the consideration of the House. Time does not permit an analysis of these and therefore I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

Debate adjourned.

ADJOURNED DEBATE

SECOND READINGS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. D. V. Heald (Attorney General) that Bill No. 12 — **An Act respecting The Elections Act, 1971** be now read a second time.

MR. A. E. BLAKENEY: (Leader of the Opposition) — Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to detain the House at length

on this. I was hoping that my colleague from Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) would be able to make some remarks on this. He is still down with the flu and we do not intend to make any effort to see that he has his opportunity to speak on second reading, if I may so phrase it.

I did, however, want to mention a few matters with respect to this Bill. I think that in considering The Election Act we should keep in mind three or four principles which should pervade any election legislation: (1) there should be ready access to the ballot by all citizens; (2) there should be approximate electoral equality of the ballot; (3) there should be full opportunity for all electors to communicate with those who offer to represent them, and (4) there should be full opportunity for all of those who stand for election to contact as many electors as they might desire to contact.

Mr. Speaker, before dealing at any length with those principles, I want to refer to one or two matters which have been alluded to earlier in the debate. I don't think it is worthwhile dredging up many of the comments made by the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy), who seems unable to grasp the difference between political parties at the provincial level and political parties at the federal level. He seems to be mystified by the fact that the Provincial New Democratic Party would have a different financial statement than the Federal New Democratic Party. He could if he wished obtain both financial statements. They are readily available. They are presented at each convention. Then he would know with some precision how much money is obtained by the Provincial Party and how much by the Federal Party by individual contributions and memberships and how much by trade union contributions. I may advise him if he doesn't know that the Provincial Party gets no money from the Federal Party. The Federal Party is in fact financed very largely by sums from the Provincial Party together with some trade union contributions as is indicated in the filed financial statements. This will presumably clear up the mystery in his mind and will perhaps now enable him to grasp the proposition that so far as the Provincial Party is concerned, little or nothing is received from trade unions in the form of trade union contributions. We have not had any members of trade unions who support our Party appointed to the Senate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — It was Jimmy Hoffa's union which has been so blessed by Mr. Trudeau. I don't suggest that the Teamsters are in anyway connected with Jimmy Hoffa or in any way tainted by the fact that one of their people in the United States is found to be a law breaker any more than the electrical industry is tainted by the fact that three or four of the executives of General Electric found themselves in jail. I don't think we should paint organizations with this sort of brush. I think it is useful to comment that Hal Banks was perfectly frank in saying that the Seafarers' International Union has made substantial contributions to the Liberal Party. And I may assure all Hon. Members of this House that this union has made no contributions to the New Democratic Party.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — You will recall how Banks was the person who, as John

Diefenbaker said, was able to cross the border in his white Cadillac without any Liberal knowing that he was crossing the border.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER: — They had their rose colored glasses on that day:

MR. BLAKENEY: — They were also quite unable to find him until a newspaper reporter decided to go down and interview him. At this point he was found.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — There were suggestions that somehow a person who was a member of a Canadian Labour Congress union would not be able to stand for any party other than the New Democratic Party. I found that rather amusing because the Liberal Party candidate in Regina North West last time was a member of the Steel Workers Union. He perhaps didn't know that he was the candidate for Regina North West — I saw his signs in my riding saying that he was the candidate for Regina Centre — but that was a difficulty which he had among the many difficulties, not least of all getting elected.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — But he was indeed, in the 1967 election, a member of the Steel Workers' Union and a candidate for the Liberal Party. I don't quarrel in any way with that. I think that he should be able to be a candidate for the Liberal Party.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — And I don't want anyone to suggest that he should not be able to be a candidate.

MR. BROCKELBANK: — I've got one of those union bosses running against me, Al!

MR. BLAKENEY: — There were two or three other minor matters I wanted to mention. I should like the Attorney General (Mr. Heald) when we consider this matter in Committee to consider whether it might not be possible to provide in the Bill a method whereby disabled persons could vote when they cannot get to a polling station. This has its problems. I think essentially what I am suggesting is that it be provided that one of the advance polls be placed in an area where wheel chairs can get in and where people who are similarly disabled can reach the poll. It's a point that is not a large point but it's a point which troubles a number of electors.

I have a belief that a permanent voters' list would have its use. I don't, by a permanent voters' list, mean a permanent list in the American style, or in the British Columbia style. What I am really talking about, I think, is a running enumeration rather than a permanent voters' list.

I tend to think that there is something wrong with the system whereby we send one set of enumerators around the city to take an enumeration for a civic voters' list and another set for the federal voters' list and another set for the provincial voters' list, when the voting qualifications are almost precisely the same. I should like to think that we could have somebody who was given the responsibility of maintaining, perhaps on an annual basis, an up-to-date enumeration and he could then provide this list to the enumerator who went out thereby speeding the process of enumeration and making it very much cheaper.

Incidentally this running enumeration could be made available to candidates and MLAs or political parties so that they could keep in touch with their electors. I know and I am sure that the Member for Regina South West (Mr. McPherson), the candidate for Lakeview, has trouble keeping any mailing list which he might have up-to-date. I have trouble keeping my mailing list up-to-date and I think that a running enumeration would provide a useful public service.

I want to draw the attention of the Attorney General to Section 27 which I think is too restrictive. It seems to me that any one who is sentenced to seven days in jail between the issue of the writ and polling day and is not incarcerated on the day the writ is issued and is not incarcerated on polling day, is still prevented from voting. This strikes me as being a little bit rigorous.

I want to make one other small point. I think the provisions with respect to the recount should provide that the judge should certify what the results of the recount are on a poll by poll basis. We have had in the past some cases where recounts have varied fairly substantially from the final count on election night. Nobody knew where the differences were. The judge conducting the recount did not certify it on a poll by poll basis and everyone was left in a state of uneasy mystery.

I should like to refer to the remarks made by other people in this debate and which I shall not take time to repeat on the desirability of attempting to have some provision for absentee voters.

I should like similarly to reinforce the arguments made by people on both sides of this House and particularly on this side of the House, with respect to election expenses. I believe that the time has come for the disclosure of election expenses. I see no reason why this would not be acceptable to Members on this side of the House nor to Members on the other side of the House. I think that I might quote a point of view along these lines that:

Democracy will only thrive if there is widespread public interest in political and social affairs. Democracy based upon popular representation and the responsibility of those governing toward the government requires a public familiar with the ways of democratic action.

(And then going on):

One of the highlights of the Saskatchewan Liberal Party is that it is built and financed by contributions by thousands of interested citizens in the province. Our Party is a grassroots organization unlike the NDP. It

is not controlled by labor bosses or Wafflers. Liberals support our Party because they want to voluntarily.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Who said that?

MR. BLAKENEY: — That's the Member for Milestone, the Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald) and I am sure that if, as he asserts, their Party is built and financed by contributions of thousands of interested citizens throughout the province, there would be no objection on their part (provided that there is a reasonable limit — let's say \$100) to disclosing contributions of over \$100. There would be remarkably few that is, if their Party is supported by thousands of people throughout the province.

After all, I know just how well all of the Liberal Members provided their funds in Albert Park and I am sure that they wouldn't mind people knowing of their adherence to the Liberal Party.

Mr. Speaker, there are really only one or two other points that I should like to make. In the area of absentee balloting, I think the problem here was not one of the balloting, but rather of counting and recording and I see no reason why appropriate measures could not be arrived at, which would permit absentee balloting to be proceeded with in the way in which it used to be but has now been removed from the Act. I don't like the recount provisions in this Act. Particularly, I don't like the provisions with respect to limited recounts since it permits people to play games with limited recounts, forces a cross appeal and puts anyone at a very, very serious disadvantage who doesn't have almost instantaneous legal advice. It is entirely possible for someone to play games with the restricted recount provisions. I know that this is not specifically provided in the legislation but the Controverted Elections legislation in this province is primitive and I know that it will be looked at by the Attorney General.

Before I sit down I did want to say something about poll boundaries and about whether or not this Act should not provide some more appropriate way of defining poll boundaries. You know one of the reasons why the public has misgivings about . . .

HON. D. V. HEALD: (Attorney General) — On a point of order. I raise the question — we let the Members of the Opposition roam far and wide in this debate on the question of poll boundaries. This Act does not involve . . . I'm sorry, you're talking about poll boundaries, not constituency boundaries?

MR. BLAKENEY: — I talked about poll boundaries but I intend to talk about constituency boundaries so you might as well raise the point of order.

HON. D. V. HEALD: (Attorney General) — Well, I raise the point of order, Mr. Speaker, then in advance. I think that the poll boundary discussion is quite germane to the issue and within this Act but I should submit, Mr. Speaker, that any discussion of constituency boundaries is not relevant to this Act. It comes under The Legislative Assembly Act and while it is true that the other day a great deal of leeway was allowed, I think it was out of order and I

submit that a lot of the discussion the other day was out of order and it wasn't raised but I'm raising it now because I think that there comes a point when we should perhaps try to talk about the Bill that is before the House at the particular time. So I raise that in anticipation of a discussion about constituency boundaries.

MR. BLAKENEY: — I'd like to speak to the point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: — We'll deal with points of order as they arise. There can be no point of order in this case because the question of the internal boundaries of the polls within the constituency boundaries are subjects of The Election Act.

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I should also like to speak on the matter of the boundaries of constituencies since I think they are to be discussed in this House. I'd like to sort that out because with respect to poll boundaries I shall say very briefly that these should be provided to candidates in advance as far as possible and should remain consistent as far as possible.

Incidentally, there is a small provision in the Act with respect to enumeration which permits a returning officer in a city riding to enumerate on the basis of the alphabetical names of the electors rather than the street addresses and, if that were ever used, total chaos would result it seems to me. And I should like to see that provision eliminated unless there is a good reason for it of which I am not aware. I have never seen it used but if it is used in the civic elections, it is a most unsatisfactory way of setting up a voters' list.

I turn now to the question of constituency boundaries and one of the reasons . . .

HON. D. V. HEALD: (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I should now make the point of order that a discussion of constituency boundaries when we are discussing second reading consideration of this Bill is irrelevant to this Bill because this Bill does not deal in any way with constituency boundaries. The matter of constituency boundaries in the Province of Saskatchewan is dealt with under The Legislative Assembly Act.

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, may I speak to the point of order?

MR. SPEAKER: — I'll listen to the Leader of the Opposition on a point of order.

MR. BLAKENEY: — The point of order is that while it is true that this Bill does not deal with constituency boundaries, it could deal with constituency boundaries. That's an entirely appropriate subject for an Election Act. In fact, in most other provinces or at least several other provinces of Canada the constituency boundaries are set out in the Election Act and . . .

MR. P. M. McPHERSON: (Regina South West) — Not here!

MR. BLAKENEY: — Not here but we're saying that they should be and what should be in an act logically is a perfectly proper subject for discussion . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: —. . .even though it may be covered by another act at the moment in our province.

HON. D. V. HEALD: (Attorney General) — Just replying to that point of order, Mr. Speaker, I should agree with the Hon. Leader of the Opposition if the matter of constituency boundaries wasn't dealt with in another statute but the matter of constituency boundaries is dealt with in this province in The Legislative Assembly Act so you can't say that you are precluded from discussing the matter of constituency boundaries in a statute.

MR. J. E. BROCKELBANK: (Saskatoon Mayfair) — Mr. Speaker, I should like to speak to the point of order if I could. I have here before me, Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne and under the section headed Electoral Reform it says:

Using the committee's report, final report, as a basis at the current Session my Government will propose certain far-reaching changes in The Election Act and The Controverted Election Act.

What we are discussing right now is The Election Act. The Throne Speech said that they were going to use the special legislative committee report as a basis for this far-reaching reform and I think it is quite in order because the stage was set some time ago that we should use this report as a basis, and in that report is contained a section that deals with constituency boundaries. I can understand the Members are concerned about the subject . . .

HON. D. V. HEALD: (Attorney General) — Mr. Speaker, answering that point of order. The matter before the House is not the committee report. The matter before the House is the Bill.

RULING BY MR. SPEAKER

AN ACT RESPECTING THE ELECTIONS ACT, 1971

MR. SPEAKER: — The question before the House is that Bill No. 12 be now read the second time; Bill No. 12 being a brand new Election Act.

I deal first with the question raised by an Hon. Member who says that in other provinces The Election Act and the boundaries are combined or the boundaries of constituencies are incorporated in The Election Act. I draw the attention of the Hon. Member who raised that point of order that in this particular province the boundaries of the constituencies are set forth in The Legislative Assembly Act. What other provinces do

is the affair of other provinces. What this province does is strictly the affair of this province.

I think all Members would resent some other province interfering with the affairs of this province. I doubt if that is a sufficient precedent to say that just because some other province does it that way, we should do it that way also.

I turn now to the question raised by the Member for Saskatoon Mayfair (Mr. Brockelbank) who said that because the matter was raised in the Speech from the Throne it should be raised here on second reading of this Bill. I draw his attention to the fact that if he wished to speak on the subject that was mentioned in the Speech from the Throne, he should have done so in the Throne Speech Debate and if my memory serves me correctly, he did.

Just in connection with the second reading of a bill, I would draw the attention of all Hon. Members to the fact that what is debated on second reading is the principle of the bill, that is, shall this thing or shall it not be done. Members had an opportunity to debate constituency boundaries when The Legislative Assembly Act was before us at a previous session of the House. Earlier they debated it in the Throne Speech Debate of this Session where they had a perfect right to do so, subsequently they also debated it in the Budget Debate where they also had the perfect right to do so and in my view and opinion, they will have a further opportunity to raise the subject on the Estimates when they come before the House.

On this particular occasion we are on the second reading of a bill entitled An Act respecting Elections of Members of the Legislative Assembly. I can't agree that the boundaries of the constituency are any part of this Bill. They are part of The Legislative Assembly Act in this province and what they are in any other province is the concern of the other provinces.

If Members wish them combined in this Bill of course they should move an amendment to that effect or move a motion in the House in the proper way under notice.

I must agree that the point of order raised by the Attorney General (Mr. Heald) appears to me to be well taken and I suggest that Members should restrict their remarks to the subject matter of the Bill which is "An Act respecting Elections of Members of the Legislative Assembly" and there is not a word about boundaries in this Bill other than poll boundaries. The poll boundaries, it is true, are part and parcel of this Bill so it would be proper to discuss them.

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I accept your ruling. I shall, therefore, delay my remarks on this area until a more appropriate occasion.

MR. E. KRAMER: (The Battlefords) — . . .muzzle:

MR. BLAKENEY: — Because the Bill does not . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order: Now I rather resent that snide remark from the Member for The Battlefords about the muzzle. I haven't muzzled you in any degree. You had the privilege of saying everything you wanted to say in the Throne Speech Debate.

MR. KRAMER: — I . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! You said everything you wished to say in the Budget Debate and I defended your right to do so. You said everything you wished to say when The Legislative Assembly Act was before the House previously and I defended your right to do so. When you get into Committee I shall not be able to defend your right to do so because I won't be the Chairman of the Committee. That will be another day and another deal and I rather resent the insinuation that the Chair has in any way muzzled your right of freedom of speech.

MR. KRAMER: — Mr. Speaker, I was not directing my remarks to the Chair. I was quipping the Attorney General (Mr. Heald).

MR. SPEAKER: — Well, I suggest the quip was in poor taste.

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, because the Bill fails to introduce into the Act changes in the election law of this province which were recommended by the committee and recommended by all members of the committee, and because the Bill fails to introduce into the election law of this province further worthwhile provisions in the election law which were contained in the minority report, I think that while the Bill has many worthwhile features and does offer some improvements in what was archaic election law, I think on balance it cannot be supported and I will be opposing it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. A. C. CAMERON: (Minister of Mineral Resources) — Mr. Speaker, I should like to take a moment or two just before the debate ends and it looks as if it is. As a member of the committee we worked long and diligently, I think, trying to draft what we considered needed reforms in The Election Act. I think, in the main, we received unanimity among the committee.

I am rather surprised at the number of Members today who have sponsored suggestions that were definitely opposed by the committee that they appointed to make recommendations. I must point out to the House that one of the things which the committee opposed and did not put in the recommendations was the absentee ballot. We gave it a great deal of study. We looked back over the past history of the problems that were created when the former government instituted the absentee ballot and the reasons why they discarded it. I am surprised that so many of those Members fly in opposition to the committee's report and to the report of their own Members in regard to absentee ballots. To hear particularly, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Blakeney) today, stand up in support of the absentee ballot and regretting that something wasn't done to incorporate this into the new Election Act.

I find that the Member for Moose Jaw South (Mr. Davies), who was on the government benches, I believe, at the time and was very conversant with the turmoil the province was thrown into, he, too, regrets that the committee didn't do something

to institute the absentee ballot. He cried crocodile tears about the number of people who may be away on holidays down in Florida or East Germany or somewhere else and not be available to vote and therefore there would be inequities in the voting pattern. He spent a great deal of time saying that three hours is not enough away from work; that an election should be a holiday, and that there were inequities here that should be looked after.

Has he no confidence in the members whom he appointed to the committee to look into these things? And then the Member for Kinistino (Mr. Thibault) raised the point when he said that he objected to the ballot which was proposed by the committee. The committee did a great deal of study on ballots all across Canada and in the United States and suggested what they considered was the most appropriate ballot in order to eliminate all the possibilities of errors in recount, in order to help the voter in voting without error, and to speed up the election count. That apparently is objected to by the Member.

I wonder sometime, Mr. Speaker, what is the purpose of setting up an Intersessional Committee. I don't believe that the Members over there even read the report of the Intersessional Committee. Certainly they didn't support the Member from Regina North (Mr. Whelan) and they didn't support the other Members over there who brought in unanimous recommendations from the Committee. They tore everything apart. The Member for Kinistino said, "Why this is no Act. We should have a definite election date in the Act." So he wants the date fixed in the Act. I don't know whether the NDP favor it or not but he says, "This is no good." Another Member says that the boundaries should be in The Election Act. This has nothing to do with The Election Act as was just pointed out. Others say that The Election Act should have provided for an Election Boundary Commission — drag that into The Election Act.

The purpose of The Election Act is to guide the voter in exercising his democratic right to elect the Members to this House; to do it as expeditiously as possible and with as few errors as possible. I believe that was the guiding principle that guided the committee in the proposals which they made.

It is nice to cry, as the Member for Redberry (Mr. Michayluk) did, about all the Members who were disenfranchised because somebody had to go 15 miles to vote and somebody else had to go only two. Some go 47 miles. He, as a school teacher, ought to know that there are no equal rights hardly in anything anymore. Some school children have to go 47 miles to school. Others go across the street. Is that equal rights in education.

The Member for Moose Jaw South (Mr. Davies) was bothered by the fact that some people didn't have equal rights in voting, that some people were nearer to polls than others, that some people had to go home because his work was not wholesome and he had to take a bath before he could take his wife to vote, therefore, he didn't have a full three hours to vote.

This is the sort of drivel that we had to put up with in this House on this Election Bill. I want to say that the Committee desired the shortening of the time of election and the simplifying of procedures required to determine the final winner of an election and rejected the idea of reinstating the general absentee ballot. That is the unanimous recommendation of the Committee.

MR. DAVIES: — Who is asking for it?

HON. A. C. CAMERON: (Minister of Mineral Resources) — You are asking for it. The Leader of the Opposition was asking for it. The Member for Redberry was asking for it. They are all asking for it.

I say, Mr. Speaker, the only thing that the minority report said was that the chief electoral officer should be appointed by the Legislature. Well, there is something to be said about that and yet the committee in its wisdom rejected it. The absentee vote, they rejected that, and you had a minority committee report supporting it. Much was said by the Member for Regina North West (Mr. Whelan) about the inability of the candidate or his workers to get into apartment blocks to visit the people there. He said that no landlord should have the right to prevent anyone from coming into the block to seek support in an election. We didn't buy that on the committee and there was a certain reason why. Most of the modern apartment blocks today have a signalling device below and if you want to see a certain family within an apartment, you buzz that number and if they want to let you in they will open the door. And if they don't want to let you in they don't open the door.

Why haven't they the right to have their apartment in an apartment block in privacy the same as they have in their home? Simply because some people live in apartment blocks, why should they be subjected to every politician who wants to come in and disturb their peace of mind and their homes. In the committee I was one who opposed that because we have privacy of the home in the apartment block, I hope, the same as you have privacy in a home. He said that the candidate has the matter of right to go into these apartment blocks.

Some of the committee said in the minority report, "Any Saskatchewan citizen should have the right to run for political office and he should not be discouraged or deterred from doing so because of the prejudices which his employer may have." And I think that the Member from Moose Jaw South (Mr. Davies) sponsored that point. "He should obtain leave of absence from employment to campaign and serve in the Legislature." The committee did not see fit to support that recommendation.

Mr. Speaker, I say that the committee did do a good job. The committee was a diligent committee. The committee heard representations from a great number of people and it sought out the advice and the assistance of those who had a wide experience in elections and in administration of The Election Act. I am surprised and somewhat disappointed, and yes, downhearted, to hear the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Blakeney) stand up and say that he does not propose and I suppose that he is speaking for all his people — at least I hope he is or he has had difficulty in interpreting their wishes — that he does not propose to support this Bill. I ask him: what was the use of the Intersessional Committee? What type of confidence did you have in the Members whom you put in over there? Why do you ask the taxpayers to vote for sums of money to have an Intersessional Committee who devoted hours and hours and days of work to bring in these reforms into the House and then reject them on some trumped up charges because it doesn't provide for electoral boundaries within The Election Act? This has nothing to do with The Election Act, because it doesn't permit the politicians and the yippees and the others to invade the apartment blocks and to disturb the peace of the people in there.

So they are going to vote against it. I say, Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the Members of that committee on both sides of the House for the diligent work that they did and the approach that they took to streamline an Election Act that would be in the interest of the people. It will speed up the election and there will be fewer recounts and will determine the elected member as quickly and expeditiously as possible with the least inconvenience to the people. That should be the guiding aim. In that I think they did a good job and I am disappointed that they cannot support the Bill of this House.

MR. W. E. SMISHEK: (Regina North East) — Mr. Speaker, I regret the remarks of the Hon. Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron). I had wished that the Minister would have made a speech where he would have taken issue with some of the things that are in the Act especially since he was a member of the committee. I had hoped he would have noted and brought to the attention of this Legislature the numerous recommendations that were made by the committee, the numerous recommendations that he supported in the committee that are not included in this Act.

Mr. Speaker, if the Minister had done this he would have made a useful contribution. The statute that is before us does not contain all the recommendations with which the committee was in agreement. If he had supported the committee in this way he would have been making a contribution to this Legislature. But to go on in the way as he did and criticize our people because they expressed criticism of the fact that the recommendations of the committee were in many respects ignored.

I am advised that on a question of people having the right to enter an apartment block and to canvass them and to talk to voters during an election campaign was part of the draft Bill, Mr. Speaker, which the committee supported. Yet it is not included in this Bill. It is these kinds of objections that we must take notice of in this House, that the recommendations of the committee are not incorporated in many ways in this Bill and for that reason we must criticize and take issue with it and vote against it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MacDOUGALL: — How many of those were . . .

MR. SMISHEK: — The matter of the Election Reform, the matter of control of expenses, on page 18, I commend it to the Hon. Member. Then there are those provisions that have been recommended by my colleagues. They made these as individuals, as I have already stated. Initially this was provided in the draft to permit people to canvass in apartment blocks. Here it is. Section 194(1):

No landlord or agent of the landlord shall prevent the candidate or any person acting on behalf of a candidate from having access to a building or structure under the control of the landlord or his agent for the purpose of communicating with electors who reside in such building or structure.

Mr. Speaker, this was part of the draft. Why did the Government decide to omit it? It is fine for the Hon. Member (Mr. Cameron) to be taking issue with it. How many apartment blocks

does he have in his constituency? But in the case of Regina, he talks about the electrical devices that you can buzz the people in a particular apartment block. There are some apartment blocks that have these kinds of electrical devices. In my constituency in the last three years dozens and dozens of apartment blocks have been built which do not have such devices. We know that landlords do instruct caretakers to post signs, "no canvassers permitted." Therefore, people who reside in these apartments are denied rights, that should be given to everybody, the right to discuss politics and the right to question their candidates. Yet, this Government at this stage even though the committee agreed to that provision, even though it was in the draft, cancelled out that particular section.

The Attorney General (Mr. Heald) is another Member, where in his constituency there are no apartment blocks. He doesn't worry about it but certainly people will be denied rights and freedoms by not having that particular section in the Act.

Mr. Speaker, let me refer to another very important provision that is not included. I believe it should be the right of every citizen to participate in election campaigns. It should be his right to stand as a candidate. At the present time under this Election Act as in the past, ordinary Citizens, many are workers, who do not have that right because by standing as a candidate they are not given the right by their employer to leave of absence to campaign during an election and if he gets elected, to attend to the duties of that office. Democracy is hampered, Mr. Speaker, in that respect. This applies primarily to the wage and salary earners. When it comes down to people who are in managerial capacity, it happens that they are not denied the opportunity for leave of absence and the right to attend to that office. I know that many people, ordinary wage earners, are prohibited and denied equal opportunities to participate in the election campaigns and to stand for election office.

I would ask the Attorney General to bring in a House amendment to include that provision as an essential provision so that every citizen has the right to participate freely and directly in the democratic process of our government.

Mr. Speaker, may I also draw attention of the Members to another committee that we had. The Hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) said why establish intersessional committees when after the intersessional committees have completed their work we have to continue with this kind of, an argument and that we have wasted a lot of public money and a lot of time. Mr. Speaker, Members will recall the Rules and Procedure Committee that was established last year and what the Government did in a whole host of committee recommendations. There was complete and unanimous agreement in committee but the Government came in and made a farce of the report by introducing numerous amendments in this respect. The very same thing is happening now, Mr. Speaker.

My colleagues have also brought to the attention of the House the importance of having a disclosure in respect of election expenses. I think it is important that a provision be included controlling electoral expenses, as well as the publicizing of all election expenses. The expenditures made by candidates should be made public, Mr. Speaker. If democracy is to serve us and serve us well this ought to be done.

Today, as I read the young people, the things we are doing or are failing to do is the area where they find themselves in disagreement with our system. We have to keep up with the times if we are to build confidence in the democratic processes that all of us cherish. But democracy also means providing more and more information to people and to take democracy out of the clutches of secrecy whether it is in respect of expenditures that are made by candidates, or the way our political system functions, these things should be made public. Mr. Speaker, I find myself in disagreement with the Bill in many areas. I should like to have more to say on it at a later date. I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Adjournment negatived.

The debate continues on the motion.

MR. SMISHEK: — Mr. Speaker, I was hoping to prepare more remarks on this. At this stage I have said all I wanted to say today. Perhaps I shall have an opportunity to say more when the Bill is in Committee. I should have hoped that the Government would have agreed to adjourn the debate. We have told them before that one of our colleagues is away sick. He would have liked to have the opportunity to speak on this Bill. I wish they would agree to hold the Bill until he returns to the House. I cannot support the Bill in its present form.

HON. D. V. HEALD: (Attorney General) — Mr. Speaker, a few years ago we appointed a Select Standing Committee in this Legislature to deal with matters of traffic safety and motor vehicle administration in the province. That Committee was a very useful committee because it brought in a lot of recommendations, very useful recommendations. After I had sat on that committee I was of the opinion that probably there was a "very useful purpose to be served in appointing a number of Select Standing Committees of the Legislature to do this kind of work on a particular problem. After listening to the debate of the last two or three days on this Bill and after witnessing the almost incredible change of pace or change of attitude of the Members opposite on this Election Bill, I am beginning to have very serious doubts — as the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) had indicated — about the wisdom or advisability of having Select Special Standing Committees of the Legislature. I think that this Bill, Mr. Speaker, which I gave second reading, or rather to which I moved second reading a few days ago, is an honest effort, it is a concentrated effort, it represents the work of many Members of this Committee over a period of a year — a year and a half. For me to sit here and listen to the speeches of the Members opposite, many of which were irrelevant, repetitive and certainly abusive over the last two or three days, you would wonder that the Members opposite had ever sat on this Committee at all. When you listen to some of them get up and take a complete change of attitude, complete change of opinion, from opinions which they obviously expressed in Committee, certainly it makes one wonder whether there is any use at all in going ahead with Select Standing Committees to make recommendations to the Government.

I am going to deal briefly with some of the comments of some of the Hon. Members and I'll try not to be abusive and I'll try not to be repetitive. I should like to congratulate one of the Members opposite who made a good speech, I thought, because

it was a very thoughtful speech and that was the first speech. Now we heard it repeated in different versions four or five times afterwards. But the Member for Regina North West (Mr. Whelan) who was a member of the Committee made a thoughtful and well considered and a constructive speech. He was making constructive criticisms and was bringing to the attention of the House the things that were bothering him in the Bill. I am going to deal with some of the comments that he made. He objected to our retaining the concept of the appointment of a chief electoral officer by the Government. He felt that the chief electoral officer should be appointed by the Assembly by the Legislature, rather than by the Government. Well, of course, I would remind him that this is a death bed repentance because they were the government here for 20 years, they had ample opportunity to provide that provision in the Act and they didn't do it. However, I don't agree that this is necessary. I think that the chief electoral officer, Mr. Speaker, should remain responsive to the policy decisions of the government of the day, the same as any other department head or deputy minister.

I have had experience with the last two electoral officers in this province, Mr. Vansickle and Mr. Harrington. I went through the Turtleford Controverted Election with Mr. Vansickle. Everyone knows that he was and is a strong supporter of the Members opposite, the New Democratic Party. But certainly so far as I am concerned, I am convinced that he performed his duties as Chief Electoral Officer in a proper fashion and there was never any suggestion, so far as I was concerned or so far as anybody associated with us in that Turtleford election was concerned, of any improper actions on his part. I think the same can be said for Mr. Harrington, the present incumbent. I think it is a kind of reflection, Mr. Speaker, on the integrity of these people to suggest that they won't do an honest job in an honest way unless they are appointed by the Legislature. They are the same as any other civil servant and I think they have to be responsive to the policy decisions of the government of the day. I do not agree that the Act would be improved in, any way by the chief electoral officer being appointed by the Assembly rather than by the Government.

Now, apartment block canvassing. My colleague, the Minister of Mineral Resources, has given the view of the Government in this regard. We believe that the invasion of apartment blocks by scores of canvassers, maybe even picketers, Mr. Member for Regina North East (Mr. Smishek), would be an invasion of the privacy of individual citizens. If individual citizens do not wish to be bothered by election canvassers their right to privacy should be guaranteed and insured. We haven't had any evidence of any particular difficulties encountered by candidates or their canvassers in having access to the voters. If somebody wants to talk to you about the election, of course you can come up as an invited guest. Why should the people in an apartment block, in a home or any place else, be subjected to canvassers, whether they be political canvassers or any other canvassers they don't want to be associated with or they don't want to discuss anything with.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the independent boundaries commission referred to by many of the Members opposite. As was indicated, the comments by all the Members on redistribution, etc. were out of order. We probably should have raised the matter earlier but then we should be accused of throttling free speech. However, constituency boundaries, as has been pointed out, is in The Legislative Assembly Act and not in The Election Act.

Recount procedure, the Member for Regina North West expressed some reservation about the recount procedure. I would remind Members that, generally speaking, the Bill incorporates the recommendations of the Committee on recounts. As I understand it and as I read it, the Committee recommended that the right to apply for recount should be limited to a candidate or his business manager. This has been adopted in the Bill. The Bill adopts the important principle that a candidate or his business manager has an absolute right to obtain an order for a recount. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the Bill goes farther than the Committee recommended insofar as an absolute right for recount is concerned. It was my understanding, and I stand to be corrected because I wasn't a Member of the Committee, that the Committee agreed that the absolute right to recount be restricted to a candidate or his business agent. I think there is a reason for this, it will eliminate frivolous applications.

Now, election expenses have been raised by a number of the Members opposite. Mr. Speaker, I do not agree, the Government does not agree, that election expenses should be controlled by statute. We have a higher opinion of the integrity of candidates for public office than to have this kind of a requirement. We also have a higher opinion of the good judgment and the ability to assess the integrity of candidates by electors. We believe that statutory control of election contributions would materially restrict the right of any individual voter or citizen to support a particular candidate or candidates. Surely, Mr. Speaker, any statutory restriction would be an invasion of privacy of individuals and would be open to abuse. The Leader of the Opposition suggested \$100. What's wrong with somebody making a contribution of \$150? Should this have to be publicized all across the country, all across the province, if he wants to support a particular candidate. If he wanted to give the Member for Wadena (Mr. Dewhurst) \$200 to run in Wadena for his party — maybe I wouldn't want to advertise it — but if I wanted to do it, what's wrong with it? What's wrong with it? Why do you want to put fences around all these things? Why do you want to take away people's individual liberties all the time? You are real experts at that. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that this kind of a restriction could result in intimidation and threats in various ways. We also believe that any such statutory control would be impractical and very difficult if not impossible to enforce or police. It would be impractical legislation, Mr. Speaker. I also think that payment by the public purse of election expenses would be another tax on the hard-hit taxpayer. You talk about today having a limitation of 25 cents or 50 cents or 60 cents per person. Tomorrow it might be considerably more. I suggest this would add considerably to the already very high cost of conducting elections. Mr. Speaker, the controls recommended by the Members opposite would place more fences, more road blocks, more restrictions on the civil liberties and the civil rights of our citizens and their most priceless heritage, namely the free, secret and unfettered vote. That's what is wrong about your suggestion.

Then they came to a dandy, a number of them made speeches in the last two or three days about control of the mass media. Mr. Speaker, surely this is a distasteful recommendation. I reject it outright. You advocate the appointment of an election registrar, who if one was uncharitable might be nicknamed 'the election commissar'. The recommendation is that this commissar would control and apportion election time on the basis of percentage of election votes obtained by a particular party

in a previous election. How about independent candidates? How about any parties not represented in the previous election such as Social Credit, Progressive Conservative, Canada West, Communist? Because you received a certain percentage or because we received a certain percentage, would you say that nobody else would be entitled to any time in an ensuing election? I am always amused that we get whenever we talk about the mass media. There isn't a group of people anywhere who are treated any more fairly than the Members opposite insofar as the press are concerned. Yet every chance they get, they get up and start to howl about, well, the press is controlled by this person, the press is controlled by somebody over here. You get the kind of publicity you deserve, Mr. Speaker, we all do. You haven't got any right to stand up here and pass snide comments about the media not looking after you, or the media not giving you a fair break. This is a hypocritical recommendation and it doesn't deserve to be accepted.

Now I should like to refer to some of the comments of some of the other Members when they were speaking. I was particularly amused by the comments of the Member for Redberry (Mr. Michayluk). The Member for Redberry, Mr. Speaker, is always good for a laugh and he spent some time concerning absentee votes. He said, "I used to be a returning officer myself before I was an NDP Member in this Legislature. They used to appoint me as a returning officer." Well, that's fine, good neutral election machinery. He said, "The machinery worked well when we were the government. We had no trouble with the election machinery when we were the government, it's when you people got into office in 1964 that we started to run into difficulty with the election machinery." You know, it is sometimes interesting to read back about what some of these gentlemen said a few years ago. I think maybe the Member for Redberry should have read the speech of Mr. A. E. Blakeney, now his Leader, the Member for Regina West in 1965 in this House. You remember, Mr. Speaker, we had been in office only a few months. And the 1964 election run by the Members opposite when they were the government was such a mess, there was so much chaos in this province that nobody in this province knew who the government was going to be from the 22nd of April, the day of the election, until the 22nd of May, 30 days, because of the kind of mess they made. Here is what Mr. Blakeney said in 1965, in speaking to some amendments at that time. He said:

I think that all of us are aware that The Election Act which is being amended requires amendment. The Act was drafted by persons who went to very great lengths to put in provisions which they thought were fair and which provided for fair solutions to a great series of problems. While the Act worked successfully in 1952, 1956 and 1960, I think we must admit that in 1964, (run by them) it creaked under the strain. It is no answer to say that it worked successfully in three elections, if in a fourth election it did reveal defects. Certainly the minimum requirement for appropriate election machinery is that it will work when put to a severe test, not that it will work generally or most of the time. I think therefore we must concede that the Act which has served us in the Provincial election indicated infirmities and defects in the 1964 election and infirmities and defects which called for attention from the government.

It is obvious, Mr. Speaker, that the Member for Redberry and the Member for Regina West were in different elections because the Member for Regina West was honest enough to concede that the whole election machinery broke down in 1964.

Then the Member for Regina West, now the Leader of the Opposition went on, he said:

I noted their solutions to the problems, I commend them for the additional advance poll provisions. These compensate in some measure for the removal of the absentee voting provision. I would urge the government to look at the advance poll provisions to see whether they might not be strengthened, either legislatively or in practice to ensure that there are two or three advance polls in most ridings.

Then he goes on:

I regret the passing of absentee voting. I think it was a real attempt to provide that everyone enjoy the franchise, but again it was complex and there were real problems in staffing every poll in the province with people who understood the absentee voting requirements.

Here again, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Regina West:

I think that on balance once again it is probably just as well to see these provisions go (that's the absentee voting provisions).

Yet, the other day, Mr. Speaker, we listened to a parade of speakers refighting the battles of 1965 and 1960 and say, oh, but you should have absentee voting provisions in. That's not what the Leader said, Mr. Speaker, the Leader was realistic enough to realize that of course the absentee voting provisions were good, if they would have worked. There is only one thing wrong with them, they are like Socialism, they are good in theory but they don't work in practice.

Then he goes on, Mr. Speaker, about the students:

On balance then, while I regret the fact that the provisions which I think were evidently fair, have been found to be too complex to be thoroughly workable under the strain of a close election. I must admit that it is a fact in many constituencies. I commend the Government for tackling these problems and for the most part I am in general agreement with the principle of the Bill and will raise small points of difference in Committee.

So, Mr. Speaker, here we are several years later with the Members of the Opposition now re-hashing something that was tried by them and it was a good try, everybody generally conceded in 1965 that it wouldn't work any more and the result was that we tried to strike a balance between removal of the absentee ballot provisions and putting in a larger number of days for advance polling. We think that that has worked reasonably well and we think it will continue to work reasonably well.

Now, the Member for Redberry, Mr. Speaker, advocated a provision, as I understood him, making it mandatory to incorporate centrally located polls. I would refer him, if he has

read the Bill, to Section 30 of the Bill, subsections (1) and (2) of the Bill where in effect it is and has been in the old Act mandatory for the returning officer to have a polling place and I quote:

in the most central or the most convenient place for the voters.

Now that's there. It was there before and you could have used it before. If this is not being done by the returning officer, the candidate has only to complain to the returning officer and failing satisfaction, I would suggest, should complain to the chief electoral officer. It doesn't say in his opinion, it says that it is mandatory for the returning officer to have a polling place in the most central or the most convenient place for voters. You've got all the protection you want.

Then there were some comments by the Member for Kinistino (Mr. Thibault). He said they didn't have time to study the Bill. Well, they had a week. The Bill was printed and on their desks, I think, by the 8th of March so they had a week including the weekend to study the Bill. Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that the Opposition can't have it both ways. The Member for Kinistino said it was a very complex and difficult Bill and they hadn't had time to study it. Yet the Member for Canora (Mr. Matsalla) when he was speaking said: "Well, there is nothing to this Bill. It is really just a housekeeping Bill; there are a few minor changes to it — there isn't much to it." Well. I think they should have a caucus meeting and make up their minds whether it is a good progressive Bill or whether it is just a housekeeping Bill.

Now the comments of the Member for Prince Albert East-Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) he complained about provisions for bribery — I don't know whether he complained, maybe that's not fair — and corrupt practices. Well I would reassure him, if you look at the Bill, Mr. Member from Prince Albert East-Cumberland, I suggest to you that it contains ample provision covering these items and I would refer the Hon. Member to Section 161 and the following sections which cover this matter in detail.

Then the Member for Kelvington (Mr. Byers) I thought made some rather constructive comments. I think, particularly, the Member for Regina North West (Mr. Whelan) and the Member for Kelvington really made the only constructive comments; with everybody else it was just sort of repetition and rehashing. But the Member for Kelvington was concerned about the absentee ballot. I can only repeat what I said earlier in this regard. I'm sorry he is not in his seat. He was also concerned about university students and I will reassure him that there has been no change of the status with respect to the university students and the rules governing the same are contained in Section 29, subsections (10), (11), and (12). The university student and his wife living with him have two places of residence, the same provisions as they had under the old Act. This is no change. I don't think you are against that. Mr. Blakeney wasn't against that in 1965 and I quote:

The provision with respect to students which had them vote in their home poll and that essentially is the right solution. They should vote in their home poll. This again is a problem with respect to the increasing number of married students who are not quite sure where they live, where they would call their home. If they move

to Saskatoon and have an apartment with a wife and a child they begin to think that Saskatoon is their home and I'm not surprised at that. Since there is obviously a problem in deciding this and since it was clearly drawn in the belief that all students were single students who simply went away to varsity and went back to their home and regarded their parents' home as their home base; and since this is increasingly not the case, again we had a complexity for which a solution has to be found. The Government has said, "Well, give them an option." This is in a sense an unfair advantage for students but on balance it is the best solution, I suggest, for this Province.

Mr. Blakeney agreed with that in 1965. We haven't changed that and I invite Hon. Members to agree with it now.

There is no change in the procedure for taking votes in hospitals and sanatoria excepting that there is now provision for the taking of hospital votes in by-elections which results in these ballots being counted on election night instead of being sent to the chief electoral officer in a sealed envelope. This procedure is dealt with commencing in Section 96 of the Bill.

Now the only other comment or complaint of a specific nature was raised by the Member for Turtleford (Mr. Wooff) and he raised the question about Section 70, subsection (1) of the Bill. Mr. Speaker, this represents no change. As a matter of fact this Section has been in the Act for at least 25 years without change and was there and I'm sure he must have voted for it when he was a Member for the government. The effect of this Section — what is the effect of this Section, a very simple Section and I submit a very necessary Section? The effect of this Section is to place the deputy returning officer in the same position as a scrutineer with respect to challenging a vote. The deputy returning officer may have reason to believe that a person is not qualified and this gives him the right to challenge and to require the person to make the declaration the same as a scrutineer. Now, surely, this is a reasonable provision. So, Mr. Speaker, I fail to understand or appreciate the concern of the Member for Turtleford insofar as that Section of the Bill is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a housekeeping Bill. This is a substantial Bill. It incorporates substantially the recommendations of the Committee. I commend it to all Hon. Members. There are some things that we can talk about in Committee. I've mentioned one in passing. One or two Members are concerned about the ballot, about the vertical line that's on the ballot in the Bill. I've had the printer run me off one without the vertical line and we'll take a look at this in Committee. You can see that here is the ballot as it might be if we took that vertical line out. This is something we might look at. I'll ask the Clerk, "Do you have those?" We have copies of this and we will distribute these to all Members so that when we get into Committee we can have a look at these but I think it might be a better ballot. There were one or two Members who mentioned that there might be a lot of spoiled ballots with that vertical line, that solid vertical line. I think we can have a good discussion about that. If Hon. Members have other things of this nature that we could take a look at, of course the place to discuss these things is in Committee.

I would really urge Hon. Members opposite to vote for this Bill. I think you are making a mistake voting against it. I think you have to realize that when you have a Committee of the Legislature they only make recommendations to the Government and the Government has to accept the final responsibility for any Bill. I think if you look at this Bill, on balance you will find that the great majority of the provisions and the recommendations of the Committee are in the Bill. I ask you in all sincerity to reconsider your decision to vote against the Bill because this is the work of a Committee which many of you have spent long hours on and it is the kind of thing that I should like to see continue in this House. It would be very discouraging, I think, to a lot of people if we had a Bill that was brought in, being largely the recommendations of a Committee and then have a large number of Members of the House vote against that Bill. I invite you in all sincerity and all humility to have a look at this Bill and vote for it on principle and we'll deal with the details in Committee.\

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SMISHEK: — Mr. Speaker, before the Hon. Member takes his seat I wonder if he will permit a question. Is it not right, Mr. Attorney General, that the Committee unanimously recommended certain specific recommendations regarding election expenses, regarding radio and television and regarding a registrar?

HON. D. V. HEALD: (Attorney General) — Well, that's not a question. That's either a fact or it isn't a fact and I can't tell you the answer right now. That's rehashing the debate. The fact remains, of course, that what I said is valid — that the Government has to accept the responsibility for the Bill.

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

YEAS — 26
Messieurs

Boldt
Cameron
Heald
Guy
Barrie
Loken
MacDougall
Grant
MacDonald

Estey
MacLennan
Gallagher
Hooker
Heggie
Broker
Leith
Radloff
Weatherald

Mitchell
Gardner
Coupland
McPherson
Charlebois
Forsyth
McIvor
Schmeiser

NAYS — 17
Messieurs

Blakeney
Kramer
Messer
Davies
Dewhurst
Meakes

Smishek
Whelan
Snyder
Michayluk
Brockelbank
Baker

Pepper
Wooff
Kwasnica
Kowalchuk
Byers

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. G. B. Grant (Minister of Public Health) that Bill No. 25 — **An Act respecting Integration of Hospitals in Major Urban Centres** be now read a second time.

MR. W. E. SMISHEK: (Regina North East) — Mr. Speaker, we have already indicated agreement in principle with Bill No. 25. I merely want to raise a few questions for clarification. The Minister may answer when he closes debate on second reading. When the Minister introduced the Bill he said his colleagues had agreed to a capital expenditure of \$12 million for the Regina General and Grey Nuns' Hospitals and the Province would contribute \$8 million of this total. My questions are these: over what period of time is this capital expenditure projected, Mr. Minister, and are there any Federal monies available for hospital construction at this time, and if so, what is the new formula and how much would the Government of Canada contribute to the suggested construction program? I ask the question because I'm aware that the old program was to be phased out as of March 31st last year but I have not heard of any new Federal programs. Perhaps the Minister might comment and enlighten us in this respect.

I should also like to ask the Minister — and perhaps this could be asked during Estimates — about the capital expenditure in the Budget. I believe the Provincial Treasurer did mention that \$500,000 is to be contributed in the current Budget for the Regina hospitals for renovations that are to take place. Perhaps the Minister might be able to tell us as to which hospital this half million dollars is to be spent on, whether it is the General Hospital or the Grey Nuns' and what particular renovations are to take place.

Mr. Speaker, in the event that the integration proposal of the Regina hospitals for some reason is unsuccessful, will the \$12 million reconstruction grants still be proceeded with? I should also like to know how many rural municipalities in the Regina area are to be included in the plan? What may be the mill rate requirements for the citizens of Regina and surrounding areas to finance the proposed \$4 million of the municipal requirements? Mr. Speaker, I should also appreciate it if the Minister might comment on what way would the Wascana Hospital and the South Saskatchewan Hospital Centre fit into the plan and what co-ordination would there be to avoid unnecessary duplication and waste and what are the projected savings as a result of possible integration and how would services improve in Regina, omitting for the present, the natural upgrading of our hospitals which would result from capital expenditures? Mr. Speaker, the Minister may also comment on any specific suggestions for the first board that is to be established if the integration principle is approved by the burgesses and how might this board be established, possible size and what rural and urban representation might there be? Perhaps it's premature but the Minister did tell us that there has been considerable discussion on the idea of integration and I'm sure that those people who have been involved together with his Department have come up with some ideas. I'm sure the citizens of Regina are very interested in this since it is an important piece of legislation affecting them. I agree it may be tentative but any ideas that might be brought to them in advance I think would help.

Lastly, once the legislation is approved how soon will the integration plan be proceeded with? Have the discussions advanced far enough that the integration plan can be referred to the burgesses for approval in 1971? As I have said, this is tentative legislation at this stage, in the main it would apply to Regina. In the future it may also apply to Saskatoon, the people of Saskatoon may want to take advantage of it. I will support the Bill but should like the Minister to comment on the questions that I have raised. In the event that he does not have the information at his fingertips, he might answer these questions when the Bill is considered by the Committee of the Whole.

HON. G. B. GRANT: (Minister of Public Health) — Mr. Speaker, I can answer some of the questions at this time but there will be a couple I'll have to leave until Committee consideration.

The Hon. Member from Moose Jaw North (Mr. Snyder) indicated in his remarks that this Bill was really no panacea for other centres such as Moose Jaw and other urban centres in the province and I certainly have to recognize that that this is not "tended for that purpose, it is intended to overcome a problem existing in Regina and possibly might exist in Saskatoon.

First of all, dealing with the Hon. Member's questions from Regina North East (Mr. Smishek), his first question was over what period of time would the \$12 million expenditure be made. It would be made over the construction period required to carry out the renovation plans for the two hospitals which would eventually be approved by the Department. There are no strings attached on timing as far as our \$8 million is concerned. There will be no federal help to speak of because of the phasing out of the federal grants for this type of construction. The \$500,000 mentioned in the Budget is not designated to any one of the hospitals but is in there in the event they are able to proceed with integration and this would hopefully cover any of the initial planning that had to be done this year. I am not sure as to the number of rural municipalities but it would be quite a number surrounding Regina and I shall get the specific information.

The mill rate to finance \$4 million — I shall have to get that for him. I don't know what that is. There would be close co-ordination between Wascana and the South Saskatchewan Hospital Centre because there have been quite a number of meetings held already involving the four hospitals, the Wascana, the South Saskatchewan, the Grey Nuns' and the General. Co-ordination is taking place because the South Saskatchewan is not planning any expensive emergency services, they don't plan on having an extensive laboratory such as we recognize here in the Provincial Lab. There are no laundry services, there is no maternity department and such services as that.

The savings that might accrue would be largely those that would result from one board administering the two hospitals and the resulting reduction of duplication. I have met with the two large hospitals in the city of Hamilton which have gone,, through this in the last 10 years and I am satisfied that there are good-sized savings that can be made as a result of integration.

I shall bring back suggestions as to size and representations on the board.

His last question was how soon could the vote actually be taken in 1971? Yes, I think it is possible that the vote could be taken in 1971 depending on how quickly the two hospitals can shake out their discussions they are currently carrying on and I should certainly like to see it take place in 1971.

Mr. Speaker, I would now move this Bill be read a second time.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

SECOND READINGS

HON. D. BOLDT (Minister of Highways) moved second reading of Bill No. 42 — **An Act to amend The Highways Act.**

He said: — Mr. Speaker, this is a very short Bill. It is self-explanatory. What it does is set out the regulations regarding access and in accordance with this Section regulations were issued to restrict access to controlled access highways and they include a definition of what would constitute acceptable evidence in the case of prosecution. A Special Committee on Regulations advised that the foregoing Section of the Act does not grant authority to identify in regulations what would be acceptable evidence in the case of prosecution and so Section 77(a) clarifies this situation. Clause 2 identifies the penalties if these regulations are not adhered to.

MR. F. MEAKES: (Touchwood) — Mr. Speaker, we certainly will support it. I just rose to point out what I think is a good example of what a Regulations Committee can do and I think it is a good and worthwhile function.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

HON. G. B. GRANT (Minister of Public Health) moved second reading of Bill No. 34 — **An Act to amend The Public Health Act.**

He said: — Mr. Speaker, the most important amendment of this Bill relates to the compulsory admission and detention of unco-operative tuberculosis patients. The Act now authorizes a medical health officer to require an infectious tuberculosis patient to be admitted to a Tuberculosis Sanatorium. If the patient refuses to be admitted the medical health officer may obtain the assistance of constables and peace officers. The Act further states that the patient is to remain in the sanatorium until otherwise ordered by the medical health officer. Officials of the Saskatchewan Anti-Tuberculosis League have stated that each year a few patients are a source of potential infection to their families because they decide to leave the sanatorium and return home while the disease is still in the infectious form. The authority of the medical health officer is effective in causing such person to be taken to the sanatorium but it is not effective in causing him to remain. It is believed that a judicial order might be more effective in causing these persons to remain in the sanatorium until discharge than the order of a medical health officer. Accordingly it has

been proposed that a Provincial Magistrate be given the authority to consider cases of this kind and to make an order for the admission and stay of the person for a period not exceeding one year. Provision is also made for the Magistrate to order and extension of the patient's stay in the sanatorium in appropriate cases. It is also provided that should the patient's condition improve and he is no longer considered to be an infectious case, the Superintendent of the sanatorium may discharge him at any time. Authorization of this kind exists in Great Britain as well as in the Provinces of Ontario and Nova Scotia. It is expected that the provisions will be occasionally necessary to protect the health of families of the persons involved. This legislation has been recommended by the Saskatchewan Anti-Tuberculosis League.

The only other amendment is of a minor nature giving somewhat broader authority for regulations to be made respecting buildings and premises.

Mr. Speaker, I move that this Bill be now read a second time.

MR. G. T. SNYDER: (Moose Jaw North) — Just a word or two, Mr. Speaker, in connection with the amendment that is before us. I think, in principle, we on this side of the House agree with the Minister in the explanation that he has provided for us and recognize the value of having a patient who has T. B. in the open or infectious form apprehended and I believe, as the Act suggest, conveyed, admitted and detained for a maximum of one year. I think generally, Mr. Speaker, the rule of thumb has been that a law is a bad law if it is not enforceable and the labor of my contribution today is simply to suggest to the Minister that it seems that the new provision would be either difficult or impossible to enforce under present circumstances. In order to detain a patient against his will I expect a provision would have to be made to hold him by force, to restrain him, in a way that hasn't been previously contemplated in provincial sanatoria in the case of T. B. patients. I hope that before the Minister closes the debate he will offer an explanation how he expects the patient may be detained against his will. I wonder if he visualizes something of a — I suppose maximum security isn't a good expression — but an arrangement with locked doors and bars on the windows or just what does the Minister anticipate in terms of detaining some patients who in the past have of their volition eloped from the institution when all medical advice suggested that they should remain. My only real purpose in asking the Minister to comment is to clarify that one particular point with respect to keeping a patient in a T. B. sanatorium against his will. Apart from that, Mr. Speaker, I support the amendment.

Mr. W. G. Davies (Moose Jaw South) — Mr. Speaker, what I have to say will also be brief. I have the same kind of reservations as my colleague from Moose Jaw North. I am familiar with the fact that over the years there has been difficulty in cases of this kind. Of course, the intent of the Bill is praiseworthy enough that we should restrict the movements of people who have an open or infectious form of tuberculosis which I think is the language of the Bill here. But, like the Member from Moose Jaw North, I wonder, first of all, about the enforcement of the Bill if we pass these amendments and indeed whether we should be able to accomplish that. I see that a person can be detained in a sanatorium for a period

not exceeding a year, if the Magistrate thinks this is necessary. This is a fairly long period of time. I wonder, too, what tuberculosis "in the open or infectious form" is. I suppose there are a fair number of people running around the streets who have tuberculosis in some infectious form, that is, in some circumstances, yet they have not been ordered into a sanatorium. There would be some inequity of treatment if you have one person who has been in a sanatorium who may be subject to the order of a magistrate and some other person whose own physician may know that his patient has tuberculosis in some form or another, that is, in some infectious form, and that person may not be detained. I just wonder — it seems to me that while the present situation is, Mr. Minister, probably not as satisfactory as it should be — if it would be more satisfactory to have the situation we now have than the situation that is envisaged and would result as a consequence of this Bill.

While, as I say, one can't but support the idea that it would be a good thing to have everyone the Bill is trying to cover in sanatoria at this time for the purposes of treating tuberculosis. But I should just be a little afraid of enforcement, how this Bill is to be enforced. Consider the fact that it may require a person to be detained for a period of a year, can see situations where a good many people would be very unhappy and I am not so sure that what we have now is not more desirable than what the Bill would do.

MR. H. H. P. BAKER: (Regina South East) — I just want to follow up what the Member from Moose Jaw South (Mr. Davies) brought up. I think the Bill is all right but I am still a bit concerned. I have noted over the years that some families, where the husband or wife have come home and through proper care in the home were cured perhaps much more rapidly than in the sanatorium. I think that there should be something in the Act to safeguard people who can give this home cure. It may be that the husband or wife or members of the family may have a greater resistance from getting the infection. I think that this sort of rest and peace of mind in the home and where the family wants to accept the responsibility should be considered. I have noted over the years in my experience where a wife was cured in the home and another case where the husband was cured in a home as well. I don't want them to be at large, the Bill is perhaps necessary where there are serious cases of infection, as this is the only way you could arrest the disease and keep others from acquiring the disease. I don't think that we should put them under handcuffs unless it is serious. If there are proper facilities to look after them and the family wants to accept the responsibility, and if there are no children around, a place may be set up to accelerate a cure. So, Mr. Minister, perhaps in your remarks you will assure us of these safeguards/because I don't think that you can cure a person who is kept under duress, in fact we might find it could do them more harm than good.

MR. A. E. BLAKENEY: (Leader of the Opposition) — Mr. Speaker, I certainly don't intend to say much. I wonder whether in closing the debate, or in Committee, the Minister of Public Health might refer to the fact of how he anticipates this Act will apply to Indian and Métis people and, more particularly, to Treaty Indians. I suspect, although I certainly don't know, that some of the people who most frequently

leave sanatoria before they are cured are people of Indian and Métis origin who find the environment strange to them and who find it, therefore, difficult to live at the sanatorium. I wonder whether or not the sanatorium to which they will be confined will in fact be one of our Provincial sanatoria, or whether it will be one of the Indian hospitals (let us say the Indian Hospital at Fort Qu'Appelle which is covered by the definition of a sanatorium) and perhaps the Minister could deal with that a little bit, since I feel that this is the area where some of us have some of the worst misgivings of just how this Bill can be applied. I think most of us are very unhappy about the way Indian and Métis people (or some Indian and Métis people I don't want to characterize them as a class) — but some Indian and Métis people have difficulty coping with magistrates and the whole apparatus of the courts. While the safeguards are there they never seem to operate very effectively on their behalf. Therefore, this is a source of misgiving which the Minister might be able to comment on either now or in Committee.

HON. G. B. GRANT: (Minister of Public Health) — Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the points raised by the Hon. Members and like all of these things there are certainly going to be problems in making them effective and I am encouraged by the fact that the Anti-Tuberculosis League actually made the recommendation and they know what they are asking for and I hope that they have the wherewithal to carry it out. But I shall make it a point to check with them on the specific questions .

I think that one of the points that will be helpful is that at the present time there is just no legal way that they can be held and a patient merely has to say to one of the staff or the doctor, "Well, who are you to tell me I have to stay in. Hopefully the fact that it has been given a legal status will help in this regard.

I agree with the Hon. Member from Regina South East (Mr. Baker) that in some cases possibly they could be handled in the home but these are not the ones we are concerned about. We are not concerned with the ones who are prepared to accept the responsibility and also accept the hazard. It is the ones who just go out on their own and could not care less who is exposed to the ailment that they have.

My understanding is that the Indian Hospital is not considered a T. B. sanatorium so to make it useful it would have to be so designated and I don't think we have any such action in mind.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:25 o'clock p.m.