

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Second Session — Seventeenth Legislature
11th Day

March 9, 1972

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. B.M. Dyck (Saskatoon City Park): — Mr. Speaker, I want to say how pleased I am this afternoon to introduce, through you, to this Assembly the students of Wilson Elementary School from Saskatoon. I understand that they are sitting in the west gallery. They are accompanied this afternoon by two teachers, Mr. Lamb and Mr. White. I hope that they have an interesting and informative afternoon and I trust that they will have a safe journey home.

Hon. Members: — Hear, Hear!

Mr. C.F. Loken (Rosetown): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to introduce to you and to this Assembly a group of 60 Grade Eight students from Rosetown. They are located in the east gallery. They are accompanied by their Principal, Mr. MacIntosh and their teacher, Mr. Wiebe. Also drivers of the other vehicles, Mr. and Mrs. Ken Kohovick, Mrs. Brown, Mr. McIvor and Mr. Cole. I know the Assembly will join with me in extending to them a hearty welcome and hope they enjoy a pleasant stay while in Regina with a trouble-free and safe journey home.

Hon. Members: — Hear, Hear!

Mr. W.A. Robbins (Saskatoon Nutana Centre): — Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Members of this Legislature I should like to extend a very warm welcome to a group of students from Haultain School in Saskatoon. I believe there are 42 of them seated in the Speaker's Gallery. They are accompanied by their teachers Mrs. MacKenzie and Mrs. Hogg. I hope they will find their afternoon in the Legislature educational and informative and I wish them a safe journey home.

Mr. A.E. Blakeney (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleague, Mr. Whelan, the Member for Regina North West, who is away in Britain on the business of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, I should like to take this opportunity to welcome through you, Mr. Speaker, a group of students from the Regina North West constituency from the St. Francis Elementary School. They are seated in the east and in the west galleries. They are here with their teacher, Mr. Nadon. I hope that we all wish them a pleasant visit with us and, hopefully, an instructive one.

Hon. Members: — Hear, Hear!

QUESTIONS

MAILING OF NEWS RELEASES

Mr. G.B. Grant (Regina Whitmore Park): — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could direct a question to the Hon. Premier. I am directing it to him in his capacity of Provincial Treasurer because I know that Provincial Treasurers are always very conscious of cost and I should like him to express his opinion on something which has come to my attention, namely the mailing of numerous news releases to one office in this building with a postage charge on each one of eight cents and worst of all the news releases are arriving a day late. They arrive a day after the date of release and they are from various Members on the other side, including Cabinet Ministers. It seemed to me, Mr. Speaker, that it might be well for him to review it and I should like to have his comments on it. I am prepared to table the documents.

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, as the Hon. Member will know there are many thousands of bits of mail mailed from this Legislative area every day. It is entirely possible that there could be some duplications. I certainly join with the Hon. Member in hoping that we could weed out this duplications. I know we are all familiar in getting in the mail two bits of mail from the same sender, Macleans magazine or whatever it may be. I know the same problem overcomes Governments. We should like to find the places where there is duplication and weed them out. I would invite the Hon. Member either to supply me with the information privately or to table it if he wishes so that we can pursue this and certainly save any money that can be saved in that way.

ARTICLE IN LEADER-POST

Mr. K.R. MacLeod (Regina Albert Park): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I have a question to direct to the Hon. Attorney General (Mr. Romanow). I refer him to a headline on the Women's page of the Leader-Post of yesterdays date. The headline is "Promises of Larger Bust Lines Fraud". It refers to a number of advertisements promising bigger, firmer bosoms and greater beauty in that area. It refers to them as the "Fraudulent advertisements for breast fertilizers and cultivators". I had thought maybe that should go to the Minister of Agricultural (Mr. Messer) but I wonder if the Attorney General is considering some investigation. I invite him to investigate the bust line fraud.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, Hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, all I can say is that the Hon. Member couldn't have picked on a more ill informed Member in that regard but I am certainly going to have my officials look into it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, Hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — It couldn't be in better hands.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, Hear!

SECOND READINGS

Hon. W.E. Smishek (Minister of Health): — moved second reading of Bill No. 33 – An Act to amend The South Saskatchewan Hospital Centre Act.

He said: Mr. Speaker, it is well known that changing one word in a phrase can entirely alter the meaning of a sentence. The short amendment to The South Saskatchewan Hospital Centre Act which allows the South Saskatchewan Hospital Centre to consist of two or more hospitals having such names assigned to them as the Board may determine, may have a substantial impact on hospital services and in health education in the city of Regina. Adding these few words to the Act offers the possibility of achieving a degree of integration and rationalization of hospital services and health education of hospital services and health education in Regina which previously has not been obtained.

Mr. Speaker, we know that co-ordination of hospital services is very difficult and will cause a period of anxiety and concern for those who are affected but in our view there is no alternative to hospital co-ordination and rationalization. For example, Mr. Speaker, if hospital costs continue to grow at their present rate the estimated operation costs for 1981 for the city of Regina and the city of Saskatoon hospitals alone will cost close to \$120 millions. This is almost 250 per cent greater than the cost in the present year. Hospital costs in other parts of the province are increasing at almost the same rate. Furthermore, hospitals consume by far the largest proportion of the health dollar. We must save money in the provincial hospital budget so that these savings can be re-channelled to meet other important new health programs. The greatest amount of saving is likely to be found by co-ordinating the services in the 13 largest hospitals in the Province of Saskatchewan. These 13 hospitals spend 74 per cent of the provincial hospital budget. This does not mean that we shall overlook the opportunity to obtain economy in the smaller 118 hospitals.

What bothers me Mr. Speaker, is that the large amount spent on medical and hospital treatment is indicative of our failure to provide a balanced health service. Adequate emphasis on preventive of escalation of health services were to continue it seems to me that our health failures may lead us to serious financial difficulties.

Mr. Speaker, the Members of the Opposition seem surprised at our Government's concern about rising health prices. The Liberal Members would like the public to believe that we did not have an interest in rising health costs when we were sitting on the opposite side of the House. This is nonsense and the public is not going to be misled by this kind of attack. If the Hon. Members opposite would like to take the time to check the past record of this House they would find resolutions and other documents in which I have expressed my concern for rising health costs and my concern for the ways that the former Liberal Government attempted to control costs. Mr. Speaker, so that the Members are fully aware I again draw their attention to our program New Deal for People under the health section, and I am sure they have copies of it. Under the health section we as a political party in our program expressed concern over the rising health costs. So when they attempt to try and mislead the public

that we did not have any concern prior to the election about rising health costs I believe our record as Members of the Opposition is clearly stated. For example, in Hansard of March 11, 1969 speaking to the Resolution to establish a committee to examine health programs I had this to say:

We in the New Democratic Party have a very serious and genuine concern about the rising costs of public health services.

I went on to say that:

We are equally concerned about the rising costs of health services which at the present time are not publicly financed and administered such as the cost of drug care, the cost of dental care and all those other health services our citizens need and have to pay for directly. Mr. Speaker, Members of our caucus have considered this problem on many occasions.

Speaking to the same Resolution I said this:

We also differ very strongly with the Government's methods of controlling health costs.

On April 3 of 1970 I was speaking to the Health Department Estimates and at that time I acknowledged that, "Rising health care costs is, I believe, a crucial question". At that time I submitted nine pages of suggestions of how the problem of rising health costs could be handled. My suggested alternatives were distributed to every Member of the House and it is silly to suggest that I have not in the past been aware and concerned about the costs of health care in this Province and throughout Canada.

Another reason, Mr. Speaker, for the urgent need to rationalize and co-ordinate hospital services is the rapid development of the very expensive and sophisticated medical techniques, equipment and manpower. The cost of these services limits the number of centres in which the services can reasonably be provided. Rational distribution of these services is not easily achieved within the present hospital structure. We have now arrived at a most difficult juncture, Mr. Speaker. All across Canada provinces have found that their limited resources prevent them from meeting the increasing demands for the highly specialized and expensive health services. At the same time more basic health services are demanded throughout the province. This places governments and health administrators in a position of having to choose between providing expensive services for a few needy people as opposed to providing less expensive services for many people. The problem remains, from the point of view of the individual who expects the full capability of medical science to be available to him in his time of need. This conflict of individual expectation and the difficulty for the Government was highlighted in the introduction of the report of the Task Force on the Cost of Health Services in Canada in 1969. The Task Force report stated:

At some point in a health system there is a need for those concerned to arrive at a philosophical balance between highly expensive services of limited general application and facilities which can be used by greater numbers of people.

The example given was, "Heart transplantation in a major city

versus the lack of any doctor at all in a rural town". It might equally well have been dialysis programs or intensive care units, or screening programs for cancer of the cervix, which while used by large numbers of people may not benefit very many.

Mr. Speaker, we do not claim to have the answers to the perplexity of the dilemma. We are, however, determined to provide a number of mechanisms through which the people of Saskatchewan may participate in resolving these conflicting health demands. We're not going to avoid our responsibility or evade it. As a Government these are some very difficult decisions for us to make. I should be irresponsible and it would be irresponsible of the Government to mislead the people that this problem does not exist or to leave the consequences of not dealing with it to another generation.

Mr. Speaker, you may wonder what the few words in the amendment to The South Saskatchewan Hospital Centre Act may mean in day to day terms. It means that there is a legislative vehicle through which a common administration for more than one hospital may choose to do things like the following:

1. Centralize laboratory services in one facility enabling efficient utilization of expensive laboratory equipment.
2. Allow certain facilities to develop specialized medical units avoiding duplication. For example one hospital may specialize in paediatrics and obstetrics and another may concentrate on other medical services.
3. Certain support services may be centralized for all hospitals thereby achieving the economies of scale. For example such services as laundry services are now centralized. Dietary facilities may be considered. Some pharmacy services and administration supportive services.
4. Acquire where desirable a number of different types of health facilities thereby stimulating patient flow and the continuity of health care. For example, hostel units, extended care units, rehabilitation services, acute general care services and a variety of emergency and outpatient services could be integrated.

Mr. Speaker, while rationalization and co-ordination of hospital services are necessary there are many ways to achieve these goals. Existing Saskatchewan Statutes allow for some ways. The amendment that is before us provides another means. Efforts to rationalize hospital services in Regina have included the establishment of the Regina Area Planning Council which was subsequently dissolved. On other occasions special task forces involving representatives of the Regina hospitals and the Department of Public Health tried to resolve these questions.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the former Minister of Health for making some of these efforts and proposing some ideas. The failure of these attempts to achieve improvement in the Regina area led our Government to accept the offer of the Grey Nuns' Sisters to sell the Regina Grey Nuns' Hospital.

The acquisition of this hospital may facilitate the process of hospital rationalization and co-ordination in Regina City. Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize that the Government purchase of the Grey Nuns' Hospital is not to be interpreted as a move by the Government to get involved in the long-term operation of hospitals. We believe that in certain circumstances the Government may play an expanded role to assist in the rationalization of hospital services. We have no intention of becoming immersed in the day-to-day operations of hospital administration. We have singled out the South Saskatchewan Hospital Centre to accept a leadership role in the provision of health services in southern Saskatchewan. The South Saskatchewan Hospital Centre is already designed to use services available in other Regina hospitals rather than to duplicate these services. Being a new institution it may play a more neutral role in the rationalization and co-ordination process since it has no traditions as yet to protect.

Mr. Speaker, the South Saskatchewan Hospital Centre will play a key role in the health education in our province. Our Government places a high priority on health education programs. We fully realize that the potential for maintaining and improving the quality of health services depends on the competency and the training of the people providing the service. Education is expensive in terms of facilities and manpower. These amendments may make possible the integration and co-ordination of several existing health facilities so that they can each contribute in a most effective way to the educational programs which support our health services.

The training program for health workers must equip the health manpower to work in the types of facilities we have in the Province of Saskatchewan. Confining education programs to large specialized institutions or hospitals is not good enough, Mr. Speaker. Through the South -Saskatchewan Hospital Centre we can bring health science education to Regina. With the amendment to the South Saskatchewan Hospital Centre Act we can further disperse the educational opportunity to other facilities and programs.

Mr. Speaker, I am particularly concerned about the education of Saskatchewan physicians. Of all the physicians participating in Saskatchewan only 13 per cent receive their education in the Province. This has resulted despite the fact that we are training enough physicians in our university to meet the needs of the Province. We expect to improve the retention of our own graduates so that we shall no longer have to be dependent on recruiting physicians trained in other countries. Mr. Speaker, I have talked with the educators and students of the University in Saskatoon of a partnership for health between the Government and the University. I have expressed my concern that our medical education program does not allow its students to develop an appreciation of our sensitivity to rural practice and to the health problems of the socially handicapped. I have asked them to become more active partners in the evaluation of the quality of service provided by the health professions. I have given encouragement to the health science disciplines to experiment with the roles and functions of the health manpower. I have given substantial support to the inclusion of public and consumer representation on such evaluation committees.

Mr. Speaker, as we enter a period of expansion of our health education services into the southern part of the Province

March 9, 1972

I want to be assured that these principles are incorporated in our training program. I am hopeful that this amendment to The South Saskatchewan Hospital Centre Act will be used to full advantage by the Board of The South Saskatchewan Hospital Centre. If the additional opportunities and responsibilities offered to the hospital centre through this amendment are fully development the people of southern Saskatchewan and in particular the people of Regina will enjoy the benefits of a better health program. Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 33, an Act to amend The South Saskatchewan Centre Act.

Mr. G.B. Grant (Regina Whitmore Park): — I am indeed sorry that the Hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek) spoiled an otherwise good commentary on the amendment to this Act. I refer to his suggestion that when we were in the Government and they were in the Opposition we misled the public of this Province in stating that the Members of the then Opposition, the NDP, did not fully appreciate the problems of rising health costs. Mr. Speaker, this is not a statement of fact, I think that they equally appreciated the problems of increasing health costs to the concern expressed by the Liberal Government and the concern expressed by every responsible citizen in this Province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, Hear!

Mr. Grant: — No taxpayer could be unresponsive to this concern because it is one of the most serious things we have and it is not restricted to Saskatchewan. Every province in Canada and the Hon. John Munro and the federal Department are equally concerned. If he hadn't dwelt on that point I would have endorsed everything he said, because I agree wholeheartedly with the aim of the Bill but I am wondering why we are worried so much about getting the explanation of the Bill because it took four lines to explain it and it took him 20 minutes to expound on their plans. Let me make it clear that this has been going on for some time and I appreciate the Hon. Minister making mention of my efforts as Minister of Health. It is a very difficult thing to integrate hospital services and one of the earlier starts was when we tried to get the Regina General and the Grey Nuns' Hospital to integrate under The Integrated hospital Act which was brought in a year or so ago. I still think this was a step in the right direction. I knew there were problems I had hoped that we could possibly reconcile and bring these two hospitals together to integrate their services but this proved to be a futile effort. We considered including the South Saskatchewan Hospital in that Act but purposely left it out at the time because we felt it would detract from the hoped for solution of getting the Regina General and the Grey Nuns integrated. Now that the Government has seen fit to buy the Grey Nuns' Hospital and I think this was the only alternative since everything else had failed. I would hope that they would invite the Sisters of the Order running that hospital to continue on because they have operated a good hospital for 60 odd years in Saskatchewan . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, Hear!

Mr. Grant: — . . . and I am sure they can continue to contribute to the health and welfare of the people of southern Saskatchewan.

I should like to bring to the attention of this House, Mr. Speaker, that we did move strongly forward in many of the directions expressed by the Minister. I refer to one of the earlier moves that we took when we brought the so-called Wascana Hospital under the South Saskatchewan Hospital. I think that Wascana Hospital or the Geriatric Centre as it used to be called was possibly one of the poorest large hospitals in Saskatchewan and I am sure that the hon. Premier will agree with that because it was in pretty sad shape back in those earlier days. Now this is a rehabilitation hospital and there are a lot of people processed through that hospital, put back into the stream of life and it is no longer an end of the road hospital for geriatric type cases except to a limited degree.

The integration of laundries mentioned by the Hon. Minister was certainly a move undertaken during our regime and I think this is a type of integration that is necessary and one that I believe is proving successful.

We had hoped that the integration of the Regina General and the Grey Nuns would result in a Union Hospital district type of administration in this area and I would assume that some thought is still being given to that and I welcome the expression that the Government of the day has no intention of becoming immersed in the day to day operation of the hospitals. If the Government had any ideas of such participation I am sure the Minister of Health would soon dispel them because I doubt whether anybody wants to be Minister of Health the day that the Government takes over the day to day operation of all the hospitals. I agree wholeheartedly with the present Minister and I hope he continues that attitude.

Mr. Speaker, with those remarks, I'll indicate that this side of the House will certainly support this Act, and wish the Minister and his Government every success in integrating these services in Regina.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, Hear!

Debate adjourned on the motion of Mr. Blakeney.

Hon. G. MacMurchy (Minister of Education): — moved second reading of Bill No. 1 – An Act to establish the Department of Continuing Education.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to move second reading of an Act to establish the Department of Continuing Education.

The Department of Continuing Education is a new division of Government which will have responsibility for establishing a community college system in Saskatchewan. The new Department will also have responsibility for university affairs and for the technical institutes. It is being established for one central purpose, to co-ordinate our work in post-secondary education. Mr. Speaker, that area of education outside of the Grade One to Twelve school system is going to be more and more important in the next few years. Of the various aspects of education the field of continuing education is going to be a major growth area. We are already involved in re-education, heavily involved in upgrading and extension programs, in counselling, in work training and so on. A great deal of public funds are devoted to this area. It is urgent that we anticipate

developments in education instead of merely reacting to them. We are establishing a new Department of continuing Education for this purpose, to co-ordinate, to plan, to plan to meet the needs of Saskatchewan people in this rapidly expanding and important area.

I have indicated, Mr. Speaker, why our Government believes we must give some priority to continuing education. The next question that obviously comes up is: why are we doing this through a new department? Why not just include this responsibility in the present Department of Education? The answer to this question has two parts. One of them is administrative. In our present Department of Education we have already a large and complex operation. The larger an organization becomes the more difficult it is to manage, the more likely it is to become bureaucratic. I have said on many, many occasions that education is by definition, a personal thing, something that simply does not flourish in large bureaucratic situations. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, we wish to decentralize and operate on a smaller scale with authority dispersed as widely as it is possible.

The existing Department of Education structure is one in which we hope to implement many changes. It is a structure whose purposes and whose goals need to be re-defined. The re-organization is going to be a very demanding task, a task that will occupy our staff quite fully without the addition of more responsibilities. In light of these considerations we believe that the addition of heavy new duties to the work of our department would simply be inadvisable.

Mr. Speaker, the second reason for establishing this department separately involves its experimental nature. We shall be or at least, we hope to be breaking new ground in education with a community college system. There will be a great deal of new work done in our relationship with the university, as well we are seeking ways of giving added stature to our technical education. Because of the nature of the work to be done by the new department it will have an orientation different from that of the Department of Education which administers an already established system. In order to accommodate this difference we felt a new structure would be most suitable.

To sum up, then, Mr. Speaker, we have two basic reasons for creating the Department of Continuing Education. One reason is that we do not wish to overload the present department at a time when it is itself undergoing major changes. We want to avoid the possibility of a massive bureaucracy developing. Secondly, we believe the new department must have leeway to adapt to its work, most of which is new. The separate structure should meet these two objectives.

Mr. Speaker, I can assure you that we are providing for the possibility that at some future date it may be very desirable to combine the two departments. We are providing for the sharing of several basic services. We are providing for co-ordinated planning, harmony between the two operations is essential and every possibility is being taken to build this into the new system. The Department of Continuing Education will have responsibility in three areas: university, technical education, community colleges. I should like to deal with each one of these very briefly.

In university affairs, Mr. Speaker, our purpose is to

bring together in one place all those aspects of government that deal with the university. At present the university reports directly to Cabinet on certain matters such as operating budgets and capital budget; to the Treasury Department on other questions; to the Department of Education on yet another aspects and to the Department of Public Works in still others. Additionally, the university has relationships with most other agencies of Government in a variety of ways. One of the results of this multiplicity of connections is confusion and red tape. Things can be delayed, are delayed and even lost in this maze. By placing overall responsibility for the university in the hands of a single agency we hope to clear up at least some of these problems.

Mr. Speaker, several other provinces have faced this very same problem. Saskatchewan is the fourth province to set up a single separate agency for post secondary education. Ontario, Manitoba and Alberta have already taken this route in the last two years.

In developing our new department we shall be able to learn from mistakes made there. We shall be able to learn from experiences gained in these other provinces. In considering the university affairs aspects I should note that some other provinces have set up what they call university grants commissions, often in addition to their post secondary departments. We have, Mr. Speaker, given this idea some thought.

There are some advantages to be had in a grants commission. For instance, it can provide a buffer zone between university and Government should disagreements arise. On the other hand, the idea has disadvantages too. It creates another agency dealing with essentially the same thing. It can insulate the government and the university from each other. It can cause delays. Mr. Speaker, we have weighed the pros and the cons and come to the conclusion that the grants commission would not provide enough advantage to outweigh the negative aspects. Neither of us should want to hide from the other behind the intervening agency. If our purpose is to develop a clear and more workable relationship, the new department will fill the need adequately and should not be given a handicap right from the outset.

Community college development, Mr. Speaker, constitutes the major new role to be filled in the Continuing Education Department. The college program is entirely new. It is not the same program left to us by the old Liberal Government. We scrapped that proposal since it was of little value in the rural areas and, in fact, didn't amount to anything more than some new technical schools. Our community college work emphasizes meeting educational needs in our rural communities and it emphasizes education as a means of community development. We believe it will break new ground in Canada. Community colleges under our Government will live up to their name. They will contain a strong element of local control. They will be experimental. They will attempt to generate a wide involvement of the people whom they serve. Decentralization of the power to make decisions to carry them out is at the centre of this idea. The college idea is to co-ordinate educational services. The college idea is to help people help themselves in determining what new programs may be useful. We do not plan to build a whole new series of buildings and other expensive items. Instead, the colleges will utilize existing facilities and they

March 9, 1972

will initiate programs as the needs arise using people in the area as teachers, using people in the area to administer them. Community development staff will be co-ordinated by the new department but to a very significant extent the educational decisions will be made locally or regionally. In short, the community college aspect will constitute an experiment in local decision-making education. The idea itself isn't new but the actual practice of it is.

Community colleges will play a key role in generating reform throughout our educational system. Mr. Speaker, the initial step to be taken is transferring the advisory group on community colleges to the new department. Following public hearings and conclusion of the committee's work, the new department will assume direct responsibility for developing the colleges' program.

I could continue in a general way, Mr. Speaker. However, specific details are not available because this project is still in the early stages. Community colleges will demand very careful attention to ensure that local autonomy objectives are given every opportunity to be met. They are the basic experimental ingredient in the new department, a very important ingredient both there and in the total education operation.

Mr. Speaker, the third area of responsibility of the new department is technical education. The technical institutes in Saskatoon, Moose Jaw and Regina will move from the Department of Education to the Department of Continuing Education. In large part, technical institutes are post-secondary institutions and they fall logically under the new department. The transfer is being made for that reason but also to move toward the recognition of the importance of technical training. We want to give more stature to technical education and to administer it in co-ordination with other advanced programs.

In conclusion, I shall restate what the new department is intended to achieve. The overall objective is to co-ordinate our programs in education that extend beyond the regular school system. We believe it is highly important to establish early a consistent pattern in continuing education. We believe it is highly important to plan for the demands that are going to be made for education in this area. The particular objectives relate to the three basic areas of responsibility. We need to develop a consistent and organized relationship with the university. Secondly, the development of community-oriented education throughout the province requires innovation. It requires experimentation. This is the community college area. Third, technical education must be recognized as an area of increasing importance and be geared with the total advanced education picture. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Continuing Education will permit us to prepare for the future needs for on-going education throughout life. It will break new ground in decentralized, community oriented education in the community college program. It will provide a much higher quality of educational services to adults in our rural area. It will accord greater recognition to technical training. We hope, Mr. Speaker, the new emphasis it will place on education as an on-going process as an integral part of community life will be valuable in reforming our schools. For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to move second reading of this Act to establish a Department of Continuing Education.

Mr. J.C. McIsaac (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, the Bill before us to establish a second Department of Education is one of the Bills that was certainly indicated to us in the Throne Speech which we debated earlier this week. And of course, as Members will be aware, it is one of five new Government departments that has been proposed by the Throne Speech and by the Members of the Government opposite.

Initially, Mr. Speaker, I have no quarrel with the three definite fields of endeavour that the Minister proposes to put under the new department. I do have some questions and some concern as to whether or not that second department will do the very things that the Minister hopes for. Now, what is the purpose and what is the reason and why do we need a second department, Mr. Speaker? The Minister went on to give us some reasons and one he mentioned, the massive bureaucracy that now exists in the Department of Education. I don't see, Mr. Speaker, how another Bill establishing another department is going to do anything but add to that government bureaucracy which we now have which is unavoidable to some extent, the bureaucracy part of it. By establishing a new department, we are going to appoint a new deputy minister, new executive assistants, new clerks, stenos, new staff all the way through.

Now, what is the picture in education in Saskatchewan today in a general way? There are perhaps 18 or 20 statutes dealing with education from Grade One to Twelve and these, for years, have been administered by the Department of Education. At the other end of the scale, Mr. Speaker, we have the University of Saskatchewan. And that has been operating in this province for 50 odd years under the one piece of legislation, The University Act which has been revised from time to time and the last time, I believe, was two or three years ago. The University, as everyone is aware, is set up and is largely autonomous. We'll only need two or three people in the new department to deal with the university because unless that University Act is changed and changed considerably, we shall not need more civil servants to deal with them from the Provincial Government. We only have one university albeit two different campuses, one in Regina and one in Minister, and as I say, the new department will really not have that much to do with the university in its present form.

The Minister mentioned that Ontario, Manitoba and Alberta have established a department similar to the one he proposes and this, of course, I am well aware of. But let us look at the situation in Ontario, Mr. Speaker. Something over five million people as opposed to our one million people, I believe 18 or 19 universities, if memory serves me correctly as opposed again, Sir, to our one university and one board of governors. The province of Manitoba, five universities over there in that department. Alberta, four or five universities as such where they also have a department of university affairs or continuing education. Incidentally, in those other provinces in practically all cases to date, there may be a change today, I don't know, but oddly enough, having established the two departments, those provinces practically all saw fit to leave the one minister in charge of both departments. Unless there has been a very recent change, in all conferences that I have attended there has been one minister representing both departments.

That leaves us with the other aspects of education that the Minister spoke of. You have the university and the Grade One to Twelve at both ends and that whole area that has been called

‘middle range education’ to quote an old phrase, trades training, technical vocational training, job training, the farm management short courses that are going on in the country today and many, many others that could be mentioned. There is no question, Mr. Speaker, that this middle range area of education is a growing and an important one and one that needs more emphasis and in this we will certainly concur with the Government. But here again, I would beg to differ with the manner in which the Minister is going about it. There are certainly many problems in education today, problems of priority and how to arrive at decisions. The Minister himself has set up various committees in this regard. May I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the answer doesn’t lie in looking at each and all of these things in a piece-meal fashion. And I am satisfied that by setting up a second department he is going to add to the complexity and the bureaucracy and the confusion that I realize he is concerned about. By setting up two departments it is going to be that much more difficult to get the kind of co-ordination and continuity that I am sure he is concerned about. There is no way you can divorce the school system and the schools in the province and the university from all of these other aspects of education and neither we should. And to have them under one department, I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, will result in a much better kind of evolution of the middle range or continuing employment program that the Minister is concerned about.

Mr. Speaker, I’ll have more to say on this particular Bill later on and I will, at this time, beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

Mr. G. MacMurchy (Minister of Education): — moved second reading of Bill No. 2 – An Act to amend The Teacher Salary Agreements Act, 1968.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to move second reading of the Bill to amend The Teacher Salary Agreements Act. This Bill proposes four changes to the Act. Two of them deal with boards of arbitration and their operation. Another deals with compulsory arbitration. The fourth deals with procedures used to define certain terms in salary agreements.

The most important of the four amendments concerns the repeal of section 14A. Under this section the Minister is empowered to impose compulsory arbitration on trustees and teachers. This power is to be abolished. Mr. Speaker, the New Democratic Party is committed to the principle of free collective bargaining. As a Government we intend to make this commitment into a fact of life in Saskatchewan. Section 14A contains provisions which are not consistent with free collective bargaining. That is why it is being removed. No doubt there are all sorts of arguments that could be made on the pros and cons of collective bargaining and I think we’ve heard most of them in the last seven years. Certainly this system of arriving at agreements has its faults and it can be very difficult. At the same time, however, it remains the best short run means, the best long run means we have for getting the job done without trampling on the rights of those concerned. Compulsory arbitration as provided by Section 14A constitutes an intrusion into the bargaining process by an outside party. It stands as a threat to free bargaining as long as it remains on the statute books. For collective bargaining to develop, for collective

bargaining to work, we must place our confidence in it, we must demonstrate this confidence publicly. Those who are parties to the bargaining will find no reason to take their work at the negotiating table seriously if there are still a variety of other outs provided by legislation. Mr. Speaker, our Government is prepared to place its trust, to place its confidence in collective bargaining.

We may have to take some lumps for this at certain times but as I stated, we believe the long-term results will justify the move and more than compensate for any difficulties. So that there is no mistake about it, Mr. Speaker, I should note that collective bargaining can be very productive, collective bargaining can get results rapidly. And I would refer Members of this House to the teachers' salary settlement which was reached two weeks ago in Area 13. This settlement was negotiated by officials of the Department of Education and the Northern School Board with the teachers of the northern area. Negotiations in this area demonstrate that collective bargaining can get results. Results that are satisfactory to both parties.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacMurchy: — In the case of Area 13, it is estimated that the total increased cost to the northern board will be 7.72 per cent. Mr. Speaker, the teachers, the northern board, my department are satisfied that this is a reasonable and a fair agreement. It is solid evidence that we can place our confidence in free collective bargaining.

In concluding my comments on this portion of the Bill it is worthwhile noting that provision remains in the Act for arbitration of disputes on a voluntary basis. Arbitration may still be used if both sides agree to it. Clause 3 of the Bill provides that where the parties have agreed to voluntary arbitration and have nominated their representatives, but cannot agree on a chairman, the Chief Justice of Saskatchewan shall nominate the chairman. At present, Mr. Speaker, this power to nominate a chairman, lies in the hands of the Minister of Education.

Mr. Speaker, transfer of the power to appoint a chairman from the Minister to the Chief Justice should eliminate any possibility of interference by the Government. It should eliminate any possibility of allegations of interference which in itself is harmful to free collective bargaining.

I would hope that in nearly all cases that voluntarily go to arbitration the parties could agree on a chairman. However, where this is not the case we deem it preferable to shift responsibility for selection of a chairman to a person whose impartiality simply cannot be questioned.

Mr. Speaker, both the Saskatchewan Teachers Federation and the Saskatchewan School Trustee Association support this transfer. Clause 4 of the Bill provides for the determination of a settlement in cases where all three members of a voluntary arbitration board disagree. Such a case will be very rare. Nevertheless, should it arise this clause provides for solution of the question at the initiative of the party most likely to be impartial.

March 9, 1972

Clause 5 is a housekeeping amendment. It will simply clear away the red tape involved in defining terms in collective agreements.

Mr. Speaker, this Bill puts into force a principle upon which the NDP was built, a principle upon which the New Democratic Party was elected. It proposes changes to introduce impartiality into salary talks. I believe, Mr. Speaker, it is a worthwhile measure. I commend it to the Members.

Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to move second reading of a Bill to amend The Teacher Salary Agreements Act.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIsaac (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 2 which the Minister has just moved second reading of, is a rather interesting one. It does contain one major amendment and several very minor ones.

It certainly isn't the Bill I expected he would be bringing forth in the House Mr. Speaker. After all of the noise that we heard from him and from others opposite prior to the election about what a terrible piece of legislation this was, here he comes into the House today and amends the Bill and indeed gets up and tells us how well it has worked a few weeks ago in the northern areas. I'm completely surprised that the Minister is accepting and making minor changes in a Bill that he condemned so often in the past.

Now I submit that the amendments he has brought forward here — three of them are certainly of a minor and inconsequential nature.

This particular agreements Act, The Salary Agreements Act of 1968 was put on the statute books by the former Government, is happy that this legislation is working so well. The agreement that he referred to provided a grid increase of 2.74 per cent to the teachers of the northern school board. That's the lowest of any increase that's been negotiated under this Bill, and the Minister proudly spoke of the accomplishments of this particular Bill.

I should have expected the Minister to repeal the Bill. But since he didn't I shall discuss the amendments the amendments that he has put forward here. The provision that he is repealing, Mr. Speaker, is one providing for the Minister to establish a board of arbitration and that provision was put there last year for the very good reason that there could well be situations develop where either side, or both sides could become embittered in the course of a dispute that's become prolonged, become quite extensive, and for one reason or another get their backs up and they get in a corner and don't agree jointly to apply for arbitration as the Bill now, of course, provides for.

The former Government believed, Mr. Speaker, that there should be some machinery to resolve disputes such as the situation that I referred to that could well arise under the present legislation.

In any tug-o'-war, Mr. Speaker, the more evenly matched the teams, of course, the more difficult to arrive at a conclusion or a winner. And there is no question but I certainly

subscribe to the free collective bargaining principle as far as arriving at salaries is concerned. There is no question about it and this side entirely subscribes to that theory and those principles. I can say, also, that we do subscribe as well to having some machinery there to arrive at a settlement of a dispute where not only the people involved in the dispute are affected as in the case of teachers and trustees in this instance, but where possibly a quarter million school children in this Province could well be involved by prolonged and major disputes and settlements.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I'll have more to say on this particular Bill later on. At this time I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

Hon. J.R. Messer (Minister of Agriculture): — moved second reading of Bill No. 12 – An Act respecting the Protection of Animals.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in many ways the Animal Protection Act is a most significant Bill to be introduced at this Session.

The criticism and the comments that the Members give to this Bill will show whether or not they care for all the creatures that we have in this Province that are not able to care for themselves.

This Bill is intended to ensure humane treatment for animals both pet and livestock, birds and fish that are in distress. These creatures are ill equipped to cope with injury, sickness, abuse, pain, suffering and hardship, privation and neglect. Where an owner or person in charge of an animal does not relieve its distress or cannot be located a Peace Officer may take custody of the animal, care for it or deliver it to an approved Humane Society. Some attempt must be made to notify the owner if he is not present.

The Bill provides authority for a Peace Officer to enter vehicles or premises, other than a dwelling place, with a minimum of force and after attempting to locate the owner, to search for and to care for or to take custody of an animal in distress. The Peace Officer must have reasonable and probable grounds for relieving an animal that is in fact in distress.

The conditions under which an animal can be destroyed are set out. An approved Humane Society may recover certain costs related to care or transport of the animal or resell or give the animal away, or destroy that animal.

Part 2 of this Bill provides for the killing of vicious dogs, except on the owner's enclosed land. The Justice of the Peace may hear complaints and may order the killing of a dog or other wild animal, or may in fact, impose a fine. The owner of the animals that were injured may take action to recover damages even where the owner of the dog believed the dog may not have been vicious.

The Bill also provides for some penalties. That is a quick review of the Animal Protection Act.

I turn, Mr. Speaker, to some of the very serious aspects of the Bill. I should mention first of all the important

contribution that the Humane Society has made in the formulation and drafting of this Bill.

The Members of the Society have had a very useful dialogue with the officials of my Department. All of us, I think, recognize the Society and its members as a capable group of people who put compassion ahead of self-interest and whose concerns for all the members of the animal kingdom are sincere and deeply felt.

I want to pay tribute to the work that has been done in our Province by that Humane Society.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — I want to acknowledge with gratitude the encouragement and assistance of the preparation of this Bill given to us by the Humane Society. The ways in which the Society will become involved under the operation of The Animal Protection Act will be made clear as I proceed with the Act.

I think we all recognize that of all creatures, man is particularly blessed with the capability to consider the moral quality of his actions, not only in respect of his relationships with other men, but also in terms of his responsibilities and relationships to the other creatures that inhabit this world. I hope that the Members on both sides will feel, as I feel, that The Animal Protection Act is a joint declaration of our concern for the well being and the humane treatment of animals, birds and fish.

Mr. Speaker, I think all of us know the joy that we, and especially our children, derive from having family pets. But in our Province animals have served more utilitarian purposes than merely as pets. The early pioneers relied on animals for work as well as income as we now do in this Province.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that it's very important that we, who are adults in our society, should set a good example for our children by enacting a piece of legislation like this Protection of Animals Act, to ensure the humane treatment of animals.

It has been my experience that children who learn through the care and feeding of pets, are kind to these dumb creatures, who in later years accept the responsibility to be generous, straightforward, kind and cheerful in their relationships with their fellow-man.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we are all familiar with the number of instances in which the various creatures have suffered pain, hunger and loneliness. In most cases the distress and hardship experienced by the animal was the result of some accident. But there are cases where pain, suffering and privation of the animal was a result of a lack of care and concern on the part of the owner or the person responsibility for that animal. The lack of care and attention on the part of the person responsibility may have resulted from some temporary disability or problem faced by the owner. The mere fact that the owner, himself, was experiencing difficulty or hardship through sickness or injury, or in a few cases through derangement, is not any reason that the animal in his care or custody should suffer at the same time. Whether the domestic animal has an owner that is capable or willing to

care for it is not relevant to the needs of the suffering of the distressed animal.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, in a number of cases the animals that may be protected through this Protection of Animals Act may well be wild animals.

The Act provides that the Peace Officer, subject to certain conditions, may take the action which he considers necessary to relieve the distress of a suffering animal. The Peace Officer who finds an animal in distress may take custody of the animal and arrange for any necessary food, shelter, care and medical treatment for this distressed animal. He may arrange any necessary transportation and deliver the animal into the custody of the Humane Society if that appears to him to be necessary or desirable. The Peace Officer will be under an obligation to take reasonable steps to find the owner or person in charge of the said animal. If the owner or person in charge is in fact found the Peace Officer is obliged to try to obtain the person's co-operation in relieving the distress of that animal. If, however, the owner of the animal is not nearby or cannot be found quickly and told of the animal's distress then the Peace Officer or a Humane Society representative may take the animal in custody and will be required to take reasonable steps to find the owner at a later date. When the owner is found the Peace Officer or Society will inform the owner of the action that was taken to provide care, food, shelter and, or, medicine and transportation for this distressed animal. I should point out, Mr. Speaker, that the term 'Peace Officer' as it is used in the Bill is not restricted to a member of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police or a member of a municipal police force. A police officer may be appointed by the Minister for the purposes of caring for distressed animals as set out in the Bill.

Without this legislation persons who are inclined to relieve the distress of suffering animals would be very reluctant to do so because of the fact that even though they really assist the animal in a kind and humane way, they might none the less face a civil court action initiated by an ungrateful or unappreciative animal owner. The Animal Protection Act will provide protection to Peace Officers and Humane Societies and to the personnel of the Humane Society by preventing any action against those persons when they themselves act in good faith and under the provisions of The Animal Protection Act.

The definition of the term 'Humane Society' will be subject to the regulations under the Act. The Minister may approve as a Humane Society for the purposes of the Act, any organization having as its principal object that prevention of cruelty to animals. The Minister may designate a Humane Society and naturally, Mr. Speaker, he is also empowered to suspend or revoke the approval that he may have given.

If we are to be realistic I think we must recognize that there are circumstances in which the humane course of action is to destroy an animal. I would, however, emphasize that the Act contains some very specific provisions to ensure that the animal destroyed is only destroyed after it cannot be relieved of its distress in any other way. In the event that an animal is provided shelter and care by a society, this society may, after some specified period of time, offer the animal for sale or give it away or in some circumstances destroy the animal. Special consideration will be taken where the animal appears,

March 9, 1972

by reason of brand or a tag or a licence to be a valuable purebred animal, then the Society will be obliged to wait ten days before selling or giving away that animal.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we have an obligation to make the lives of animals comfortable and satisfactory. And I hope that when the vote is taken on this Bill that all Members of the House will remember that obligation and will vote in favour of that Bill.

I therefore move second reading of the Bill.

Mr. D.F. MacDonald (Moose Jaw North): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to start out by stating that I enthusiastically support this Bill, The Protection of Animals Act.

I have had a very close relationship with the Humane Societies for many years as a result of the nature of my profession. I must say that this relationship has always been mutually beneficial.

During this period, I have given substantial consideration to this type of Bill. I have consulted with various members of Humane Societies as to the different aspects of this legislation. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I took the liberty of writing to the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) early this past summer urging that this legislation be presented at this Session.

I should like to say that I am sincerely thankful to the Minister for introducing this Bill at this time. I am also very happy that he acknowledged the contribution that the Humane Society made in formulating this Bill. They did a magnificent job — I agree.

I should like to say, Mr. Speaker, that I support this Bill because it gives certain powers to the Humane Societies which will not be guaranteed by law. I support this Bill because it grants certain rights to the Humane Societies. I support this Bill because it enables official approval of organizations as Humane Societies for the purpose of this Act.

Mr. Speaker, I support this Bill because I feel that this Act will unofficially recognize the value and function of Humane Societies to the public. This is a very important purpose in this Bill. There is a certain segment of the public, that in the past has viewed organizations such as Humane Societies with a rather jaundiced eye. There has been a feeling by some that such organizations often have misdirected objectives and energies and that they operate in too emotional a manner.

Mr. Speaker, these feelings are unfounded and this Bill, will in part, officially recognize the contributions being made by Humane Societies by the public. It should be remembered that Humane Societies have a voluntary membership and largely carry out their objectives without the aid of tax dollars. They do this by use of enthusiastic volunteer services and by many local money-raising projects. It should be realized by the public that the services provided to the same public are indispensable. And if these services were not provided by Humane Societies then some form of government would become responsible. In my opinion no type of government agency, local or provincial,

could duplicate either in quality or efficiency the type of service provided by these voluntary organizations.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — There are a couple of minor amendments that I am prepared to make in Committee of the Whole. They certainly won't change at all the intent of this Bill, but I want to assure this House that this side of the House supports the principle of this Bill.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

Hon. Messer (Minister of Agriculture): — moved second reading of Bill No. 22 – An Act to amend The Conservation and Development Act.

He said: Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I rise to speak in favor of the Act to amend The Conservation and Development Act.

The Conservation and Development Act authorizes the establishment of local government bodies known as Conservation and Development areas. Their principal activity has been to undertake water control programs designed to relieve flooding problems on agricultural lands. It is often necessary to cross railroad company lines with canals and ditches to carry surplus water to satisfactory and safe outlets.

Crossing a railway with a ditch or canal can be, and in many instances is, an expensive undertaking. Naturally enough such works must meet designed standards approved by railway and Canadian Transport Commission engineers.

Section 273 of The Railway Act states that the railway is subject to the same drainage laws of a province as are other lands in the province. And that when such a crossing is necessary the company has the option of constructing the necessary work. However, if the company does not exercise its option within a reasonable time, the work may be constructed or completed as in the case of the rest of the project and according to the laws of the province.

The section goes on to say that the cost to be borne by the railway company in all such cases will be based on the increased cost of the work due to the construction and operation of the railway. The Drainage Act of Ontario carries a section complementary to Section 273 of The Railway Act. However, the Conservation and Development Act of Saskatchewan has not until this time, contained such a provision. As a result whenever a ditch or canal crossed a railway the entire cost of the structures and excavation necessary was borne by the province, and/or the conservation area authority.

The Bill No. 22 is presented in view of putting a conservation area in position to assess the increased costs of carrying out a ditch or canal through a railway bed against the company. These new sections of the Bill added to The Conservation and Development Act will impose a greater responsibility on pipelines, gas transmission lines, on telephone lines, as well as railway lines. They will relieve conservation areas and the farm

lands contained in them of the added costs that are incurred when it is necessary to cross such installations with canals and/or ditches.

It is, therefore, with great pleasure that I move second reading.

Hon. T.M. Weatherald (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, I wish to make what I think are a considerable number of substantial suggestions on this particular Act.

I don't want to go into any great detail this afternoon as I have not had the opportunity to make a complete study of this Act. I do want to say that I should want to suggest to the Minister some very major changes in this Act as far as his Department is concerned.

The first one, Mr. Speaker, which I find to be totally outdated is the provision under the Act and in the Department of Agriculture of paying 75 per cent of the cost through the taxpayers of the province on many projects concerning both conservation and development and improvement of land that are now currently being paid by the taxpayers of the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, we find increasingly through conservation groups and people that are interested in the environment that very frequently the province is paying a 75 per cent portion of the cost of developing a project, a project which many individuals benefit from in their own right.

Mr. Speaker, there is as yet no provision for the public making their views known on the subject in a manner which would be satisfactory to them and often they are finding a contribution from the taxpayer in our province being made to the drainage of a large marsh or to the clearing of land which they object to.

Mr. Speaker, also in the development of many of the conservation areas which we have and which are legally developed so that they may receive a grant from the Province, we also find the voting procedures to be very irregular in a number of ways. I could bring to your attention at least one case that I am familiar with where the vote was actually taken, Mr. Speaker, and the part of the land which would normally rate one vote, was allowed a number of votes up to about four, simply because that particular quarter section was in an estate.

Mr. Speaker, it is easy to see then that the vote would carry particularly when that group had about four — I think even up to five votes — on one-quarter section.

The voting procedure, I think requires something in the neighbourhood of a 60 per cent vote. I am not 100 per cent clear on the total number of votes required. In that particular instance and in others like it where the land is a part of an estate and a multiple number of votes are allowed on the portion of land it becomes very unfair to those who are opposing the project.

Mr. Speaker, there is a drastic need for thorough overhauling of this Act. When it comes to Committee of the Whole we will be proposing a number of amendments which we hope the Minister will give close consideration to.

I don't think there is much of a political nature to the changes that we would advocate, but I think that those changes we do advocate are desirable at the present time.

Mr. Speaker, because of the complexity of this Act and the changes which we should like to advocate now that it is before the House, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

Hon. Messer (Minister of Agriculture): — moved second reading of Bill No. 23 – An Act to amend The Live Stock Loans Guarantee Act, 1970.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the amendment to The Live Stock Loans Guarantee Act extends the Act to the 31st day of August 1973.

The Loans Guarantee Act has assisted the growth of our livestock industry. The Loans Act was one single step taken by the previous Government. But that Government made no other significant effort to encourage the growth and diversification of the livestock industry in a meaningful way in the Province of Saskatchewan.

The entire farm sector needs expanded credit and this is certainly true of the Livestock industry which this Province and this Government will be assisting to expand and to further diversify. The Loans Guarantee Program will, therefore, be continued and made part of a carefully considered will developed and well executed strategy for an ever-increasing livestock industry.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — The potential for livestock production in our Province is great. We have the land, the grass, the feed grains and good and efficient cattlemen. What was lacking was leadership by the former Government, but now we intend to provide that leadership with a new emphasis on quality products in market development.

The cattle population in Saskatchewan reached a total of 2,282,000 in December of last year, an increase of the previous year of an excess of 7 per cent. We are looking forward to further expansion of our provincial cattle herd and I can confidently predict that we will have an all time record high cattle population in the June survey of 1972. Our cattle industry has been one of the bright spots in our agricultural economy. The evident liking of consumers for beef, the increasing population of Canada and the United States, leads us to believe that the long-term future of the industry is indeed a bright one. The producer of beef cattle is rated by economists generally as a sector of our agricultural industry that can and should be further expanded.

Members of this House will note a number of programs to be introduced this year in support of this industry. I would only mention now, improved veterinary services, stockyard inspection, the penalty on horned cattle and the projected meat mission to the western United States. We are currently examining the programs of the Department and we will be proposing in the future further activities and policies in support of this most

March 9, 1972

important industry. We will continue to look for ways to assist the industry in quality improvement practices and in health services. A major thrust will be in terms of market development, through added staff and through direct encouragement of market exploration.

It is therefore, Mr. Speaker, with great pleasure I move second reading of this Bill.

Mr. J. Wiebe (Morse): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to congratulate the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) in presenting this Bill and moving it for second reading.

This one Act alone put in by the previous Government did more for the agricultural industry in this Province than 20 years of CCF administration.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wiebe: — The presentation of this Bill clearly indicates the Minister's endorsement of the progressive agricultural programs and policies of the former Liberal Government and their ability, Mr. Speaker, to recognize agricultural problems in this Province and do something about the problems that apply to their jurisdiction.

The fact that the Agriculture Minister extended this legislation clearly indicates that it was good legislation. It was legislation that enabled Saskatchewan farmers to diversify their operations and in turn greatly benefit the livestock industry in this Province. The former Member for Morse worked hard to introduce this Bill as he realized the great importance of agricultural diversification to this Province.

The former Liberal Government should be congratulated on their foresight in this regard. It allowed farmers to diversify their operations from straight grain production to a mixed farming enterprise that helped tide them over the difficult wheat sale periods. In many cases it allowed them to show a large increase in farm income. It allowed farmers to diversify farm operations to survive this period with little or no hardship. It clearly indicates that even with a high level of wheat sales the necessary for diversification in Saskatchewan agriculture is of utmost importance. It reinforces my belief that a well-balanced, diversified farming program is very essential in this day and age.

This program, Mr. Speaker, has put the livestock industry in this Province in the forefront of Canadian Livestock production, as it enabled farmers and cattlemen to expand or establish livestock enterprises on Saskatchewan farms.

This program also, Mr. Speaker, enabled the marginal farmer to establish a better farm operation as well as enabled the young farmer to obtain the credit needed to begin or expand their operation.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with this legislation, however, I must criticize this Bill for lack of content. When this Bill was first passed in 1970 interest rates were high and the former Liberal Government put some of their money behind this

Act in subsidizing the interest rate to 7 per cent.

As the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) knows the prime interest rate is now six per cent and I feel this Government should, in turn, give this benefit to the farmers of Saskatchewan and subsidize the interest rate at six per cent. I should like to use the Minister of Agriculture's own words in emphasizing this fact and I quote from Debates and Proceedings, 1970:

Taking into consideration that the Government does not underwrite the first seven per cent it still does by no means protect the farmer from paying high interest rates when he is seeking capital which comes at a high interest rate and is hard to get.

I now ask the Minister of Agriculture to show his concern today as well and give the farmer the benefit of the prime interest rate by himself moving that amendment during Committee of the Whole and stating that his Government will subsidize the interest rates above six per cent. If the Minister does not present such an amendment then I shall move such an amendment during Committee of the Whole.

Mr. J. C. McIsaac (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, I can't let this Bill pass without remarking how amusing it was to listen to the Minister of Agriculture now bragging and taking credit for the tremendous development in the livestock industry in this Province over the last several years. It is particularly interesting, Mr. Speaker, when one recalls the speeches he was making last spring in the course of the June election campaign. I can remember seeing headlines in the Star-Phoenix, and the Leader-Post, where the then Member from Kelsey, (Mr. Messer) was condemning the diversification programs introduced and implemented and developed by the former government and in particular by the former Premier of this Province. So it is not interesting and gratifying really to see that the Minister has changed his thinking in this regard and that he is going to continue good Liberal legislation in this regard to help develop and build to an even greater degree the livestock industry in the Province of Saskatchewan. As I say, I commend him and I am glad that he is big enough to admit that he was wrong last June in the course of the campaign in condemning diversification and that today we see him here bringing in an amendment to a piece of legislation that will further help the livestock industry in the Province of Saskatchewan.

The Member for Morse (Mr. Wiebe) pointed out, Mr. Speaker, it is one piece of legislation they are bringing in and there still hasn't been a single penny of Government money pledged in support of this as it was under the former government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIsaac: — Despite all the things that the present Government is going to do for agricultural, so far we haven't seen them spend a single penny. The one move and the one measure that the Minister brought in the other day will ensure that the cattlemen themselves continue to pay for some of their own improvements and so of their own developments. This I don't really take exception to and I don't think too many cattlemen do but,

March 9, 1972

Mr. Speaker, the interesting part of this Bill is the complete change, about face, of the Minister and I congratulate him for it. Also the fact that it is another piece of legislation supposedly in support of agricultural in Saskatchewan without a single Provincial Government dollar in it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. G.P. MacDonald (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, I just want to add one little comment to the remarks of my seatmate and make one little recommendation to the Minister of Agriculture. I should like to recommend this principle that is endorsed in this Bill in consideration of the Land Bank legislation. In this Bill the principle established is that in order to help the farming community in the Province of Saskatchewan when interest rates go beyond what is in his capacity to pay that the Government then assume some responsibility for the overall good of the industry. And in this Bill it is the Government that subsidizes the interest rate. In the Land Bank proposal the Minister says, “Oh, no, we can’t subsidize the interest rate, we will subsidize the principal and the administration costs so we get title to the land”. In this particular principle here by subsidizing the interest rate instead of the Government owning the land or the cattle, the farmer himself owns the cattle, the farmer himself gets the benefit of his work and his time and his investment. And I should like to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that you consider very carefully this principle in the formation of your Land Bank legislation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we are very concerned about finding out a little more about the amount of the money that will be invested, and a little more about the prime interest rate because we are very concerned that the Government doesn’t make this window dressing. Because up until now, from what the Minister has said, it is nothing but window dressing, because the interest rate in the legislation is seven per cent and all of us know that the Government of Saskatchewan should be able to get money cheaper than seven per cent and, therefore, in reality is it doing anything for the farmers? Is it doing anything for the livestock growers? As my colleague, the Member for Morse, (Mrs. Wiebe) has pointed out, until we investigate that a little more, Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

Hon. Messer (Minister of Agriculture): — moved second reading of Bill No. 24 – An Act to amend The Department of Agriculture Act.

He said: Mr. Speaker, these amendments to The Department of Agriculture Act show the continuing efforts of the Saskatchewan Government to improve the efficiency of its structure.

The new section 6A remedies a long-standing defect in our law. It confers on the Minister the authority to render various services to farmers and to charge a fee for doing so. Now such programs as The Dairy Herd Improvement Service, the ROP programs for beef, hogs and sheep and Pullorum testing of poultry and turkeys will be conducted under secure authority.

The addition to section 12 will clear up a problem that I

understand has existed since 1963, that is, what to do with surpluses or deficits in the Agricultural Supplies Advance Account administered by the Plant Industry Division. I am told that the problem had mainly to do with who picked up the deficits. I must assume that Provincial Treasurers in the past have been having problems interpreting the requirements imposed on them by the Legislature in publishing a statement of advance account operations in Public Accounts.

The Bill before you will repeal section 15 and it is replaced with a new section that sets out the requirements of the material to be published in Public Accounts more clearly.

While I have perhaps treated these amendments in a light-hearted vein I do, nevertheless, recommend this Bill to the Legislature seriously. They will correct some inadequacies and more clearly define the authority which the Legislature has conferred on the Minister in the conduct of some important long-standing services provided to farmers. They also will spell out more clearly the required procedures of handling the Agricultural Supplies Advance Account that they have requested of us in various reports by the Provincial Auditor.

It is therefore, Mr. Speaker, with pleasure I move an Act to Amend The Department of Agriculture Act.

Mr. E.P. Gardner (Moosomin): Mr. Speaker, I haven't had the opportunity yet to peruse the Minister's remarks and I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

Hon. Messer (Minister of Agriculture): — moved second reading of Bill No. 25 — An Act to amend The Noxious Weeds Act.

He said: Mr. Speaker, The Noxious Weed Act is administered at the municipal level by rural and urban councils through local Weed Inspectors. The principle behind the Act is that of 'education' is preferable to 'legislation', as indicated by section 13, subsection 3 which states that:

If the occupant resides in the municipality, the inspector shall confer with him regarding the methods of control to be applied, with a view to the most satisfactory treatment from the standpoint of the occupant as well as the community.

He may then sign an agreement with the occupant, or if an agreement cannot be reached, orders for destruction may be issued by the inspector.

In the event that the occupant is not at his place of residence on two separate visits by the inspector, the inspector may issue an order by registered mail.

The chief administrative officers of the cities of Saskatchewan have requested the proposed amendment in the Act to allow an order to be issued for the destruction of noxious weeds after only one visit to the occupant's residence.

In this age of affluence many urban residents have lakeside

cottages or take extended holidays during the time when weeds are most likely to be troublesome. Often these are the residents whose weed problems are most likely to become troublesome and they are also the most difficult to reach personally. In addition, in many urban families both husband and wife are working and many residences are vacant during the working hours of the inspector.

In most instances if the first visit is not productive, the second is not likely to be. Duplicate visits often add more the administration costs than the cost of the weed control to the individual.

It must be noted that the change affects only urban areas where weed control costs are usually minimal.

Mr. Speaker, the chief administrative officers of the cities of Saskatchewan have also requested changes in section 15 and section 17 to make allowance for the cost of weed control on parcels of land not subdivided into lots. Administrators point out that on occasions it is necessary to destroy weeds three times or more each year depending on weather conditions and the maximum cost of control allowable on lots is not generally sufficient to cover the cost of control on most parcels which are not subdivided. Section 15, subsection 3 of the Act has been revised to account for those parcels of land within an urban municipality which are not subdivided into lots. Many urban areas contain tracts of land in this category and no maximum has been hitherto placed on expenditures which might be made on them. An expenditure in this case cannot be made unless previous notice has been given to the owner in which case he may undertake his own weed control measures.

In the case of section 17, subsection 2, it has likewise been revised to place a maximum on the expenditures which can be made on unoccupied parcels of land which have not been subdivided into lots. In such instances, such control must be authority in the Council and the maximum expenses allowed are somewhat less than where the owner has had the opportunity to exercise his own control measures.

Mr. Speaker, we are aware that the councils and Administrative Officers of our rural and urban municipalities are concerned with the cleanliness and beauty of their municipalities, cities, towns and villages. We are convinced that it is imperative that we support them in every way possible. Providing them with satisfactory legislation in order that they may adequately control weeds is only one of the many ways which we can do so. We are, therefore, pleased to present the changes which have been recommended. I am, therefore, pleased to move this Bill.

Mr. Gardner (Moosomin): Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Bill is in the nature of housekeeping I believe and we understand that the cost of eradication of weeds has certainly been upped by the cost of labour and chemicals. We have no opposition certainly to parts of this Act. However, I would like to say to the Minister that now that he has some amendments to The Noxious Weed Act perhaps he may look at one or two other sections and perhaps bring in house amendments. I am thinking particularly of sections 23, 24, and 25 which appear to be a bit out of date. They say, in effect, that every person moving a swather or combine from one farm to another shall sweep it off and this is fine. This is

section 23; 24 says, for example, that: 'A legible card containing the provisions of subsection 23 shall be kept posted in a conspicuous place on all machines used for threshing or cutting and threshing when in operation'. In other words that every person who has a thresher or combine has to have this card on it. It also says section 25: "The Secretary Treasurer of every RM shall record a list of all thresher men to whom cards were issued during the year and shall mail a copy of the list to the director not later than the very first day of December in the year to which it refers". Now I would suggest that perhaps there is need for some cleaning up on these sections. I doubt if many people that are moving combines or swathers have this card attached at all times to the swather or combine thus putting the farmer in a position where he is breaking the law. I doubt if Secretary Treasurers are making this report as faithfully as they are supposed to here and perhaps he would take a look at these also.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

Hon. G. MacMurchy (Minister of Education): — moved second reading of Bill No. 21 – An Act to amend The Education of Soldiers' Dependent Children Act.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to move second reading of Bill 21. Mr. Speaker, this Act will expand the scope of the education of soldiers' dependent children by including a larger number of veterans and relaxing the definition of a veteran.

The Act as it now stands, Mr. Speaker, covers only children of veterans of the two World Wars who received a pension from The Canada Pension commission. Korean War veterans are not covered and those who receive assistance under The War Veterans Allowances Act are excluded. These men are often referred to as the 'burnt-out' veterans and they are now assisted only by The Canadian Legion. The number of children now receiving assistance under the present Act is some 25 to 30. The Legion has had its financial problems giving assistance to the children that are excluded under the present Act and which it was covering; therefore, we bring forward the amendments.

The amendments proposed will permit the Government to provide assistance to children of veterans of both World Wars, provide assistance to children of veterans of the Korean War, whether the veterans are deceased, disabled or as I used the term 'burnt-out'. Also the resident qualification will be changed to allow any veteran who lives in Saskatchewan to apply rather than restricting the coverage to men who enlisted here only.

Mr. Speaker, the money involved in this Bill is small in terms of the provincial budget but for the 50 to 60 persons who will now be eligible for aid the difference will be significant. I am pleased, Mr. Speaker, to move this Bill, the Bill to amend The Education of Soldiers' Dependent Children Act.

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

March 9, 1972

Mr. J.C. McIsaac (Wilkie): Mr. Speaker, just a few very brief remarks, I concur almost entirely with the remarks of the Minister in this regard. It is a good piece of legislation and it's one that we would wholeheartedly support and I commend him for bringing it before this House. We are supporting this Bill.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

Hon. R. Romanow (Attorney General): — moved second reading of Bill No. 20 – An Act respecting Assignment of Wages.

He said: Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to move second reading of a new Bill, a Bill respecting the Assignment of Wages. As Hon. Members will note this Bill is not an amendment to any existing law but is in fact a new statute which relates to the assignment of wages. It is the opinion of the Government that many employees have suffered undue hardship because of their assignment of wages for the payment of their debts. This Bill is designed to protect the wages of employees against assignments for debts. The Bill provides that an assignment of wages given after July 1st of 1972, to secure payment of a debt will be invalid.

The rationale behind this Bill is basically along these lines. In our experience, an assignment of wages is very often obtained in somewhat dubious circumstances. That perhaps is a bit of a harsh word to describe it. Very often though a creditor will come to an employee and say that unless the employee agrees to giving an assignment of wages the employer will be notified of the employee's bad credit or whatever the situation happens to be with respect to the file. Very often the employee feels compelled to sign an assignment of wages in order to protect his employment. He then agrees to certain terms and conditions which turn out to be very onerous, in fact, far more onerous than they would if he just simply sat back and waited for a garnishee summons. Very often he is afraid of the garnishee summons because the attitude of certain employers is that once a garnishee is filed it may terminate the employment of the individual concerned. So the result is, that the employee is caught in what we term to be a very unfortunate and very unsatisfactory situation. Therefore, this Bill will, as I have said to the Members of the House, provide that an assignment of wages given after July 1, 1972 to secure payment of a debt will be invalid and the creditors will have to follow the normal and usual remedies of the law, as all others.

Wages will include, for the purposes of the Act, Mr. Speaker, any pay, commission or compensation for personal services whether based on time, piece work or otherwise. The Bill, however, does not prohibit an employee from authorizing deductions from his wages for such purposes as pension plans, charities, savings plans and trade union dues, nor does the Bill affect an assignment of wages to a credit union operated by the employees of the employer to whom the assignment is directed.

You can see the exemptions. There will be an assignment right on the top of your wages to pension plans, charities, savings plan, trade union dues and also to those employees who are members of a credit union, which is known as an employees credit union. I think a good example is SAGE, Saskatchewan Government Employees' credit union. The theory behind the

exemption for the employees' credit union is that there the employee has some control and some say in the conduct of the credit union itself. That is to say, if he is encumbered in a debt to the employee credit union because he is a member of that credit union, he will have some say as to the nature of the debt and in the operation of the credit union. He, therefore, should have concurrently the right to assign a part of his wages to the employee credit union as to all the other activities.

Any assignment of wages that has been given, Mr. Speaker, prior to July 1st of 1972 will not be valid after July 1st, 1973. that is, if an assignment of wages is given by any employee now until July 1st of this year or has been given already, it will be valid for a period of one year. After July 1st of 1973 it is no longer valid. The obvious reason for this, Mr. Speaker, is to allow a period of readjustment because there are a series of wage assignments that are undoubtedly out now and will have to run their course. They were obtained within the provisions of the law but we are giving fair notice. If the House sees fit to approve this Bill, the assignment of wages will be invalid, illegal after July 1st of 1973.

The Bill is, as I have said, a fairly short Bill and that is the effect and the sum and substance of it. Before I take my chair, Mr. Speaker, let me say that this Bill is another step forward, in addition to the consumer legislation, that this Government will seek to build in the years ahead. The ideas in this Bill have already been tried in the province of Ontario and have been accepted in that Legislature and are working fairly well there. We expect no problems. We say this is a significant step forward for consumer protection and employee protection in the Province of Saskatchewan. I think the employers and creditors alike can live with it. I urge all Members to vote and support this Bill in second reading in principle. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to move second reading of an Act respecting the Assignment of Wages.

Mr. D. MacDonald (Moose Jaw North): Mr. Speaker, at this time hesitate in supporting this Bill. There are certainly some questions that I want answered myself. First of all I think that it is agreed that employers do not like the assignment of wages. I think that it is an onerous task for them and they will appreciate this particular Bill that will stop this practice. I am not sure, however, just exactly how the employees will feel about this Bill. I have no doubt that certain assignments are obtained, under as the Attorney General says, dubious circumstances and I also think that the assignment of wages may be one of the few sources of collateral that some employees have and to take this advantage away from them might be discriminating against some of the lower wage earners, so I do hesitate in that respect.

Also, I have some other questions. I notice that it does not prohibit certain things, but I wonder about the United Appeal for example, or the Community Chest. I also wonder about the aspect of the credit union and as the Attorney General says that the employee would have some control in his own credit union. He may have some say in his own credit union but I think that this may often be very little say as the credit union becomes larger and larger, so I am not sure that this exemption is necessarily a good one. But if it is, then I wonder also about whether or not the exemption should also apply under employee profit sharing plans. These are some of the questions. The

March 9, 1972

other one, of course, is that I think that this Assignment of Wages Act will encourage the garnishee procedure and this can be very onerous also. At this time I would beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

Hon. R. Romanow (Attorney General): — moved second reading of Bill No. 11 – An Act to amend The Cost of Credit Disclosure Act, 1967.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this Bill is the Bill amending The Cost of Credit Disclosure Act, 1967. This Bill is a fairly straight forward amendment which I hope the Members opposite could see fit to support and perhaps support even today. The Bill is designed to provide a measure of protection to a person who purchases goods on credit and whose debt or promise to pay has been signed over to a third party. The third party by reason of this amendment will not have the same obligations, liabilities and duties of the buyer as the seller of the goods would have in the first instance. Previously a third party who has received such an assignment was very often able to enforce payment of the entire debt from the purchaser even though the buyer had a legitimate claim against the seller over delivery, performance, service, quality, warranties or some other aspect of the sales contract. Under this amendment the lender or the finance company, and that is usually the most frequent example of the third party where there is the assignment of the note, will, as already stated, be in no better position than the seller to enforce the payment of the account. The situation is the same with respect to the seller of services or to the lender of money.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if I may, to give you an example and this may not be a fully accurate example on all aspects, but I think it will highlight the point. If, for example, I am one who enters into a contract to buy from a merchant, a refrigerator on time and the merchant assigns that note for the purchase of that refrigerator over to a third party, very often the assignment documents contain what they refer to as a cut-off clause. That cut-off clause had the effect of denying me certain rights and privileges against that finance company that I would have had against the seller, the person who sold me the refrigerator. The result is that the assignee or the third party is in a stronger position than the person who entered into the contract in the first instance with myself or with the purchaser. And I think that all Members would agree that in equity and in law that is not a proper approach or a proper position for anyone to be in.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we take the lead in introducing this legislation as a result of the federal Government's action in this area. The federal Government introduced an amendment to the Bills of Exchange Act Canada which came into effect November 1st, 1970. It is basically what this complementary legislation will do provincially in this area. All that this Bill does, therefore, is to complement the terms of the Canadian Legislation with those effects that I have outlined. I say again, Mr. Speaker, although it is a small amendment it is a significant amendment. I think it is advance again the area of consumer protection legislation for the people of our province. I am very happy the Province of Saskatchewan has stepped into line with what are the developing trends in this areas across Canada. Therefore, it gives me great pleasure to

move second reading of a Bill to amend The Cost of Credit Disclosure Act 1967.

Mr. J.G. Lane (Lumsden): — Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Attorney General, we certainly welcome this piece of legislation. For the information of the Members of the House, for all practical purposes the legislation is not really necessary in that the Federal Government's amendments to the Bills of Exchange Act brought this into effect in November of 1970. And I would hope in this particular field that we are dealing with in the matter of consumer notes that the Attorney General would have his officers investigate the practice of many finance companies or in some cases some banks I understand, which do not stamp a consumer purchase promissory note with the words 'consumer notes' as is required under the Federal bills of Exchange Act. As I have stated, Mr. Speaker, this is a complementary legislation to legislation passed in 1970 by the Federal Government. It is far reaching legislation and much needed legislation. I think that will proper enforcement the legislation as implemented will mean a great deal of protection for the consumer of Saskatchewan and Canada. We heartily support this Bill and I would hope the Attorney General would take under advisement the question of enforcement with regard to the stamping 'consumer notes' on the promissory notes.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

Hon. R. Romanow (Attorney General): — moved second reading of Bill No. 10 – An Act respecting the Age of Majority Act, 1972.

He said: Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure today to introduce this Bill, The Age of Majority Act, 1972. Mr. Speaker, this proposed new Bill, The Age of Majority Act, 1972, is a new composite piece of legislation whereby the age of majority in the Province of Saskatchewan will be reduced from the present legal age of nineteen to eighteen years in all respects. The Coming of Age Act, 1970, which was introduced by the former Liberal Government will be replaced in its entirety by the operation of this Act. For the purposes of uniformity the proposed Age of Majority Act, 1972 will more closely follow the legislation that now exists in Ontario, Alberta and Manitoba. The legislation is intended to provide in a more precise way for the alteration of the age of majority. The previous Act was quite general in this nature and my law officers feel that in that regard it was deficient. Several specific provisions have been inserted in this new legislation. For example, specific provisions are contained in section five providing for the change in any Act regulation, rule, order or bylaw or any reference to the age of 21 or the age of 19 so that such references shall at law, henceforth, read as a reference to the age of 18 years. Similarly, in any Federal Statute adopted by and made applicable to provincial matters and within the jurisdiction of this province any reference to the age of 21 years is to be read as a reference to the age of 18 years. Court orders and the like made before this Act comes into force and containing references to any age between 18 and 21 are to be read as references to the age of 18 years in the absence of any contrary intention.

The Act does not prejudice a right of action or a defence based upon the age of one of the parties where the right of action, or defence is in existence when the Act comes into force. I think the lawyers particularly will know what this section

March 9, 1972

refers to. Under the common law a person is said to reach a particular age on the day before his birthday because the law as stated does not take cognisance of the part of the day. The Criminal Code, a Federal Statute takes the opposite position and the person attains a particular age on the day after his birthday. It is considered that to the general public a person attains a particular age on his birthday and this Act, therefore, contains a provision coinciding with this public understanding and clarifying the present legal situation.

Now the previous legislation, The Coming of Age Act, was more general in its nature as I have said, Mr. Speaker, than this new Bill. Probably most of the specific provisions contained in this legislation were adequately covered by those general provisions. However, as our neighbouring provinces have enacted statutes of a more specific nature in the areas of wills, deeds, trusts and so forth and it was felt that this province should enact a more uniform type of legislation in this field so that more certainty will exist in the interpretation of legal provisions with respect to the age of majority.

A good deal of the Bill concerns itself with those mechanical amendments required to alter the many specific statutes wherein reference is made to the age of 19 years. These are basically routine and housekeeping once the principle of the Bill is accepted by the Members of this House. The Act is to come into force on the day to be fixed by proclamation to allow a transitional period and to give those persons and businesses affected an opportunity to consider and prepare for the effect of the statute, although we don't expect that very much of a lead time will be necessary in this case because the notice that will come to our community by virtue of the introduction of the Bill today and some debate on it today.

Well, Mr. Speaker, thus far I have limited my remarks basically to some detailed explanations of the legal provisions of the Bill. I think that this type of a Bill and any explanation can be best handled in Committee of the Whole. Members may have questions with respect to the legal effect of a particular clause and why the necessary for it. I'll do my best, with my officials assisting, in Committee of the Whole, to answer them. I think it is best here for the Members really to concern themselves about the principle of the Bill in second reading, namely whether or not it is in the public interest to lower the age of majority in all areas from 19 to 18 years.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, that as far as the Government is concerned in this area there will be some on this side, and I am sure some on the other side, who will object to the principle of this. As far as the Government is concerned this is not a Bill where we are going to apply strictly to the traditional and usual practices with respect to the question of a vote on the particular issue.

Some will speak for it and some will speak against it. I personally am for it, obviously, because I introduced the Bill. I think very often we tend to highlight a debate of this nature really around the provision that relates to drinking at the age of majority. I recall when the first Bill was brought in by the Liberal Government, although this is a very valid concern by all Members, I thought it was a bit regrettable that all of us tended to relate our remarks about what could be possibly the bad effects when a 19 year old person at that time had access to

liquor as if he was of full age of majority at that time of 21. I think that's regrettable, Mr. Speaker, because the Bill does far more than simply open the pubs to 18 year olds if it passes this House. I think the experience with respect to lowering the age to 19 has been a good experience in Saskatchewan. Predictions of young people flooding beer parlours or showing legal and moral irresponsibility, I think, are not substantiated by the statistics or the facts. I commended the Government of the day and I do so now for taking the courage in lowering the age of majority then to 19. We're at this juncture, Mr. Speaker, now where other provinces have lowered the age to 18, rightly so, because I think 18 is much more of a natural break after high school. After high school and 18 years of age you are usually able to get employment or continue on to university or some other form of endeavour. But 19, I always felt, was a bit of an unnatural age upon which to base the age of majority.

Now I don't want to make this into a flowery speech about the virtues of youth, Mr. Speaker, but I have always felt personally that a person reacts positively to a responsibility if we give that person responsibility. If we deny or seek to shelter an individual, with certain physical years of maturity and emotional years of maturity from responsibility, then we foster in that individual irresponsibility. Today's 18 year old has the benefit of probably the best educational system that our society has been able to produce. Today's 18 year old in his schooling system has seen three men go to the moon and come back and he has seen it on coloured television. This is something that the teacher who was lecturing to him about Physics never saw during that teacher's period of learning.

That 18 year old now has experienced that technical impact, has experienced the overly used phrase of living in the global village now. But to state exactly what I mean, with the impact of that global village on him I say he is as mature and as responsible as anyone of us in this Assembly. He is given the right to vote, he is given other great responsibilities by this country of ours and I say he reacts well to this responsibilities. Not such a big step, I suppose, in some people's minds to lower it from 19 to 18. I hope that's the case. I urge certainly all Members to support the main principle and thrust of the Bill and to show confidence and support of the young people of this province and of this country.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to move second reading to this Bill.

Mr. G.P. MacDonald (Milestone): Mr. Speaker, I don't want to make any lengthy remarks at this time about this Bill but there are a few comments that I should like to make. I, of course, endorse the principle of this Bill. I have always been in favour of the reduction of the age of majority, first of all by the Liberal Government from the age of 21 to the age of 19 and I think you will recall, Sir, that the Liberal Government in the Province of Saskatchewan led all of Canada in this reform. I should like to point out just as the Attorney General did, that what did concern me is the fact that people recognize that in this Bill expands the responsibilities of adulthood to a young person at the age of 18. Even though it does extend also the privileges of adulthood to a person at the age of 18 it is equally important that we recognize the responsibilities that are enhanced in this Bill as well as the privileges, which are usually centred around the privileges in relation to licensed premises. I want to point out that this

March 9, 1972

is one of the recommendations of the Legislative Committee on alcohol and that during the course of the last few months this particular principle has been recommended by 23 briefs submitted to that committee, including the RCMP, City Police, hotel operators, other licensed premises and so forth. The interesting part of the briefs and the submissions to the Alcohol Committee were the fact that it indicated that young people in Saskatchewan have reacted to the increased responsibility at a younger age in a very positive manner.

First of all it had no significant impact on the accident rate of youthful drivers. Also, contrary to what many people suspected or feared, that the decorum or standard of conduct, standard of behaviour of young people in licensed premises throughout Saskatchewan improved in decorum within those places. We found and the police found and the hotel operators found that young people reacted with a great deal of responsibility, instead of young people going outside and being forced to go into cars and on the highways and byways to consume alcoholic beverages and sometimes to over indulge because of the circumstances of the environment. I think that this Bill is a growing recognize of the fact that young people do mature at a much younger age in 1972 than they did in the 1950s and the 1940s. Perhaps, as the Attorney General has pointed out, all of us can relate it to the instantaneous communication of today when a young person can react spontaneously to something that has happened in Peking or Czechoslovakia or West Germany or London or wherever it may be, in four or five minutes because of television and other media communication. Certainly young people are now growing up much faster, they have a great deal more maturity and, therefore, it is equally important that we give them with that maturity a greater degree of responsibility. I am very much in favour of this Bill I do hope that the majority of Members on this side of the House will support the Bill but I should like to tell you, Mr. Speaker, and the other Members of the House that as far as the Opposition Members are concerned this will be a free vote. I think in a question that is not of a political nature, as this one certainly is not, it is of a social nature, that it demands and requires on behalf of the public interest in Saskatchewan, open and free debate.

I would hope that Members on both sides of the House who have an objection would stand on their feet and express that objection. I do hope that Members on this side of the House that do feel this way will stand on their feet and express this concern and also those that favour the principle, so that the public Saskatchewan will know that we have carried out our responsibility in a very wide field and in a very free debate and that each Member will vote according to his own conscience. I do recommend that this Bill be debated widely in this Assembly.

Hon. J.E. Brockelbank (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I'm not necessarily prepared to speak on this debate but I do feel that I should say a few words in support of the Bill that is before the House now.

I want to say that I support this Bill fully as I supported the Bill before which lowered the age of majority from 21 to 19. I was interested in the remarks of the Hon. Member from Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) in suggesting that the Liberal Party somehow led Canada in lowering the age of majority to 19. This, I think, is

quite a significant honor for them to take upon themselves but I think it is worth noticing that in Canada the CCF party, prior to the Liberal Party taking power in 1964, had lowered the age of voting in the Province of Saskatchewan and had led all of Canada in that endeavor. I think that that is equally as significant as this move, Mr. Speaker, except that that was truly a pioneering move in Canada at that time.

I was a bit concerned with the remarks of the Member from Milestone in that he, at this time, purports to reveal the recommendations of the Interim Committee on liquor legislation. That report has not been tabled in this House, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MacDonald (Milestone): — On a Point of Privilege, I in no way indicated what the recommendations of the Liquor Committee were. I merely indicated that there were 23 briefs, at least according to my calculations, that had recommended this change. I in no way indicated what the Liquor Committee would eventually recommend itself.

Mr. Brockelbank: — I will take the Member's word until such time as he may check the record, Mr. Speaker, and you will see when you check the record that the Hon. Member for Milestone said, 'and that is one of the recommendations of the Committee'.

Mr. MacDonald: — To the Committee.

Mr. Brockelbank: — No, 'of the Committee', Mr. Speaker, and I'll stand on that. If the Member for Milestone wants to check the record he'll find that's what he said because I listened very carefully to what he said. I think, possibly, it is not proper that we reveal the recommendation of a committee before the report is laid on the table of the House.

Now it is true that a number of recommendations were made to the Committee by interest public bodies and by individuals about lowering the age of majority from 19 to 18. there were also some recommendations made to the Committee that the age of majority should be raised to 21. I respect those people who submitted those types of recommendations to the Special Committee. However, I do not agree with them all and I suppose that in due course the recommendations of that Committee will be revealed to the House. I think that probably the House at that time will endorse the recommendations.

In conclusion, I just want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I reiterate my support for this Bill at this time before the House. I take the position that the young people, given the responsibility and given the power to act in these areas, will be more responsible because of it, not only because the age of majority has been lowered, but in the past, as I referred to earlier in my remarks, the age of voting was lowered from 21 to 18, and the young people of the province accepted the responsibility there. I believe that they because more politically attuned because of that opportunity of getting out and voting at the age of 18, rather than waiting for the age of 21.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I support the Bill.

Mr. T.M. Weatherald (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, I only have one brief comment which is provoked by the statement by the Member from Saskatoon (Mr. Brockelbank) involving a report. This is an observation by a person who has nothing to do with the Committee and has no knowledge whatsoever of what is in the Committee report, and that observation is simply this: I think the Government would be much better advised if they presented the report to the Legislature before we received the legislation. We are expected to pass judgment on what the people of Saskatchewan think.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Weatherald: — We are expected to pass judgment on what the people of Saskatchewan want in this regard and it is one of the purposes for which we had the Committee set up. I'm not on the Committee, I've no knowledge whatsoever expect what I happened to read in the Press about what the Committee is finding. Yet all of us are expected to vote intelligently on this new legislation which reduces the drinking age. I might say, Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to vote against this legislation but I certainly would be remiss if I didn't say I have a certain number of trepidations as far as it is concerned. I know at the time, it was brought that by reducing the drinking age, which is only a small part of the Bill, by reducing it to 18 you are certainly opening it wide open for all young people that are attending high school. This is something that the previous Government did try to avoid and it was the real reason for deciding on the age of 19. I think this will be of concern to some people in the province the fact that many young people who are still in Grade 11 and 12 are only 18 years of age and now will have legal access under the liquor laws. Now this may or may not be desirable but I think that is of concern to quite a number of people, and something that didn't exist to any large extent while the age was 19.

I want to reiterate, Mr. Speaker, that I think the Government would have been much better advised if they brought the report to this Legislature and we had the opportunity to read that report, study it and make a good judgment upon what that report says and then brought the legislation. It appears that they have decided to do it in reverse. In my estimation they are not using the proper perspective in reference to the report and to this Bill.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, would the Hon. Member permit a question? Was the Hon. Member aware that the recommendations that are contained in the Interim Report are unanimous?

Mr. Weatherald: — No, I am not aware of anything concerning the report, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! I think the question was out of order because that Report is not before the Committee and no Member has any reason to know whether it is unanimous or not.

Mr. Weatherald: — On a Point of Order, Mr. Speaker, I accepted the

question and if you allowed him to ask it you should allow me to answer it.

Mr. Speaker: — But you will realize that I cannot restrict a Member from asking a question if I don't know what the question is.

Mr. D.H. Lange (Assiniboia-Bengough): — Mr. Speaker, as one of the youngest Members in the House, I should like to speak in support of the Bill to lower the age of majority.

I am speaking on behalf of the youth and in their defence, assuming of course that the House will appreciate my unbiased opinion.

We are in the age of Aquarius and of course, in the age of hair. For today the length of your hair is a highly controversial subject. Length of hair is the outward manifestation of life styles and morals of opposing generations. It is the vehicle through which young people are expressing their changing attitudes and feelings. Clothing styles and colours are another way the young identify themselves and this has spread to all ages. How many of us have cast aside the purity of white shirts and have fallen into the clutches of sinful red, virile blue and dramatic gold? Monotony is a product of the past. Life was not made to be dull. Among the younger generation there is a disregard for the censorship of society. And why should this be? Because the young are finding much in that society to criticize. They refuse to bend to a society that they feel is unwise and they refuse to please a society that they find displeasing to them.

Youth has a new level of awareness which has come as a result of the past 20 years of affluent living. We haven't had to be concerned with making a living since this has been done by technological advancements. This advancement has given us the facilities with which to have a higher level of awareness. But this awareness is also the product of the contradictions and failures of the business world and government. The awareness of youth had its origin with the hippie movement and has spread to the universities and schools. It is now suffusing all of the social strata. It is because of this higher level of awareness that youth are able to handle decisions at a lower age. I will try to show why the young are responsible enough to cope with a lower age of majority.

If you find my comments interesting, I hope you will remember them and that they represent the foresight of youth. If you find my comments provocative, I hope that you will think about them and remember that they represent the imagination and optimism of youth. But if you find my comments dull and boring, I hope you will forget them and remember I am young.

The young have developed a new culture that is alienated from their elders and that is reflected in not only their dress and life styles, but in their impatience in seeking solutions to the major issues of war, social injustice and university reform. Among the members of this student culture is a growing lack of tolerance, growing insistence that their own views must govern and impatience with slow procedures of democracy, a growing

March 9, 1972

denial of the humanity and goodwill of those who urge patience and restraint and particularly of those whose duty it is to enforce the law.

There are almost an infinite number of ways to differentiate between the old and new generations. The old, when forced to choose, tend to give preference to property rights over personal rights, technological requirements over human needs, competition over co-operation. The ideas of youth tend to reverse this.

The basic assumption of the older generation is scarcity. Everything in it rests upon the assumption that the world does not contain the wherewithal to satisfy the needs of its human inhabitants. From this it follows that people must compete for these scarce resources. All scruples are lost in the competition. Those who can take the largest share of the scarce resources are said to be successful. The only measure of success is materialism. The fact that property takes precedence over human right in the old culture also follows logically from scarcity assumptions. If possessions are scarce, relative to people, they come to have more value than people. Many possessions on the other hand entitle the owner to a status of somewhat more than human. But, as society becomes more affluent, these priorities begin to change. Human life increases in value and property decreases. Youth challenges the high value placed on property.

The key flaw in the old culture is that scarcity is spurious. It now exists only for the purpose of maintaining the system that depends upon it. We continually find ourselves in the position to having to kill someone to avoid sharing a meal which turns out to be too large to eat alone.

The philosophy of youth, on the other hand, is based on the assumption that important human needs are easily satisfied and that the resources for doing so are plentiful. Competition is unnecessary and the only danger to humans is human aggression. There is no reason outside of human perversity for peace not to reign and for life not to be spent in the cultivation of joy and beauty. Those who can do this in the face of the old culture's ubiquity, are considered beautiful.

Man is in a way like cattle – he cannot be led, he must be driven. He moves by passion and not by reason. In the past, the driving force has been religion of one sort or another which has caused him to progress. Patron saints, for instance, have been inspirations for centuries after their deaths. This inspiration is the only way man has risen from the depths of squalor. Recently the driving force of man has been industrialization and his religion has been materialism. Now production is solved. There is an abundance of everything. The problem now is distribution.

Youth has a greater consciousness about this problem than has every before existed. We realize that individually man makes himself a slave. Collectively he finds his freedom. We, therefore, despise the menial work and seek to put our time and minds to more constructive activity.

It should be stressed that affluence and economic security are not in themselves responsible for the ideas of youth. The rich, like the poor, have always been with us to some degree but the new culture has not. What is significant in the new culture is not a celebration of economic affluence but a

rejection of its foundation. The youth is concerned with rejecting the artificial scarcities upon which material abundance is based. Society becomes unhappy and vicious because our preoccupation with amassing possessions, obliterates our loneliness. Youth are not merely affluent – we are trying to substitute an adequate emotional diet for a crippling addiction.

The culture of youth, is nevertheless a product of the old, not merely a rejection of it. It picks up themes latent or dormant or subordinate in the old and magnifies them. The hippie movement, for example, is brimming with nostalgia, nostalgia peculiarly American and Canadian. This nostalgia embraces Old West, Indian culture, the wilderness, the simple life and the utopian community — all vibrant tradition.

We must remember in our observation that there are as many bad aspects in the new trend of thought as there are in the old. Youth, for instance, advocates communal living and co-operation and at the same time contradicts itself by saying, “do your own thing”. We must be able to meet the previous generation half way. There must be continuities between the old and the new.

If there is not, there is a good chance that the results of this philosophy of youth will lead to nothing more than a perverted and caricatured form of the last generation. It makes no sense for many of the brightest and most sensitive young merely to drop out or confront society with hostility. This cannot lead to social reconstruction. The complicated and confusing condition of modern times needs knowledge and fresh thought and therefore long acquaintance and participation precisely by the young.

It is easy to criticize the now-generation. It is easy to criticize their life styles and consequently their hairstyles. But what is being done is basically putting a stifling restriction on their individuality. When we cannot express our individuality, we cannot express ourselves. And what is life but a form of self-expression.

Today's youth have no mode of expression except for clothing and hairstyles. They are unable to assert their individuality. In bygone days, an example of individuality was heroism or courage in war. At Vimy Ridge during the First World War, four divisions of Canadian troops pushed a German battalion (sic) back 100 feet (sic) and they have been talking about it for 53 years. But we do not have such examples of brash individuality in the Second World War. Few, because the Second World War involved little hand to hand combat. It was nothing more than mass murder with machinery. Man's individuality was disappearing. And now how would he fight a war? It would be no more than pushing buttons and individuality would be totally lost.

It is becoming increasingly more difficult for young people to be individual. They are competing with technology and with a society which is imposing upon them norms which they realize have no intrinsic value. Today's young are completely honest about how they think. They reject the hypocrisy of society with its class system, laws for the rich and another set of taxes for the poor, its management by the elite. Young people reject materialism as a basis by which to live and a goal for which to strive.

In our society all of our immediate goals are material.

March 9, 1972

We strive for new cars, houses and the latest in technological advances. And as long as the economy is booming, we sail along with no worries because our immediate goals are being satisfied. But in the event of an economic slump our feet are kicked out from under us because we can no longer satisfy our individuality with material things. We have no idealism, no faith in anything other than materialism, nothing to cling to in a depression. All of this because our society has taught us false premises. This is what today's youth are rebelling against. The utter futility of working for a reward that has no intrinsic value.

The older generation should be proud of the fact that they have fostered a generation so aware of the ills of society. A generation with a dynamic consciousness which manifests itself in a refreshing honest candour. The capability of youth in rationalizing the ills of society, demonstrates that they should be allowed self-expression through legal channels as well. This generation should be given recognize by lowering the age of majority.

I shall support the Bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J.G. Lane (Lumsden): — Mr. Speaker, as I rise to speak in this debate I think that I agree with the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) in the previous debate which I agreed that to view the reduction of the age to 19 was questioned mainly by an emphasis on drinking.

I don't think there was enough emphasis on the number of responsibilities that the previous legislation gave to the young people. I think this was unfortunately ignored.

There is a weakness to the Bill and there is a weakness to the previous Bill that was passed by the Liberal Government and that is, of course, trying to place an objective standard on maturity. Young people know full well that there are many of their peers who cannot handle the responsibilities or the benefits that will be given to them by this legislation. Young people also know full well that there are people over the age of 18 and over the age of 19 and over the age of 21 who cannot handle the responsibilities or benefits as given to them by society.

I don't think we should penalize the majority of young people for the actions of a few. I don't think that we should every penalize the majority of adults for the actions of a few. As I say, there are some young people who will not be able to handle the benefits or the responsibilities given by this Act but I firmly believe that the great majority of them will be able to handle it.

For that reason I am going to support this Bill. As I stated, I agree with the Attorney General and his remarks of the previous debate on the emphasis on drinking. Particular provisions I welcome — the statement in the Act as to the exact date that this Act will affect the person becoming 18.

I had no intention in my remarks of controversy, Mr. Speaker, however, I must make a comment on the remarks made by the Member from Saskatoon Mayfair (Mr. Brockelbank) with regard

to his accusation directed to the Member from Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) about making the Report of the Liquor Committee. I refer to Sections 46 and 47 of the proposed Bill, which deal with amendments to The Liquor Act and The Liquor Licensing Act, reducing the age to 18. I would strongly suggest to the Hon. Minister that it is the Government opposite that is leaking the provisions of the Liquor Committee Report by putting these provisions in the proposed Act. It is not the Member from Milestone. All you have to do is to read the proposed Bill to see what probably will be the recommendations of the Committee. If the Minister was sincere in his accusation then these provisions should not be in the Bill and they should be awaiting the tabling of the Report in this House of the Liquor committee.

As I have stated, Mr. Speaker, I don't think that there will be any doubt but that the vast majority of the young people in the Province of Saskatchewan — and I should like to see, of course, the Federal Government bring in similar legislation so that it applies all across Canada — that they can handle the responsibility and they can welcome the benefits of such legislation in a very responsible manner.

I support the Bill.

Mr. T.L. Hanson (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley): — Mr. Speaker, I rise in complete support of Bill No. 10.

As a former Queen's Scout and a 4H member and 4H leader for some five years I have nothing but admiration for people of this age group. But I want to bring to the attention of the Attorney General and also to the attention of the Minister of Education (Mr. MacMurchy) that I feel there is a great need to extend the educational facilities and scope in Saskatchewan when we do provide the matter that was brought forward in this Bill so that we can provide these people with a comprehensive course in education. A course that will bring them to down-to-earth-thinking in financing; cost of credit and the implications of it; responsibilities and principles of politics; drug uses and the implications of them whether it be cigarettes, liquor or the hard drugs. I want this type of educational program brought in so that we can prepare these people before they go into adult life so that they are prepared to face the responsibilities that adult life brings to them.

A lot of people seem to think that experience is the best teacher. But the thing that I should like to point out is that with present interest rates and the implications of long-term credit and the habits that you can get through indulgence of cigarettes or alcohol or whatever may haunt you for the next 5 to 50 years of your life. And I think that we definitely need a better educational province covering all the areas that I have mentioned. With this I will gladly support the Bill, but I wanted to throw out these suggestions to the two Ministers and I would hope that they would act on them.

Mr. R. Gross (Gravelbourg): — I have planned to enter this debate for several reasons. The main reason being that I happen to be the youngest Member in this House.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

March 9, 1972

Mr. Gross: — Let me assure, Mr. Speaker, I cannot steal all the thunder and that I am not alone in this category, for take one glance at the Members on side of the House and it would be noted that a large number of the Members are under 30 years of age, in the eyes of our youth a significant and rewarding change. I should like to take this opportunity to commend our young, dynamic and brilliant Attorney General for this action...

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gross: — ...for his action in introducing this Bill.

Mr. Speaker, the time is getting close to 5:30. I have other comments I should like to make on this matter, if I could call it 5:30 and resume afterwards.

The Assembly recessed until 7:00 p.m.

Mr. Gross: — As I was saying at 5:30, Mr. Speaker, the age of majority in Saskatchewan is a serious social issue, it requires a conscience in taking political action. It becomes strikingly evident in view of the number of pressing problems related to youth that young people must take an intelligent and active part in the affairs of Saskatchewan and Canada as a whole. Young Canadians throughout the nation form a unity unfounded by political convictions, but none the less amazingly conscious of Canada's greatest problems. Young people, idealistic as they are, are first of all humanitarians, the ultimate goal of true socialism. Here in Saskatchewan we must show the interest and initiative to grant those young men and women a legal voice and learn from their unique perceptions. The age of majority issue is not a minor one, since it involves all social problems the province and this country faces. Age of majority is inherently concerned with delinquency, social deviations, alcoholism, ecology, unemployment, crime, abortion, welfare and education. Youth are too often involved in the centre of their own phenomena. We accept the fact that youth have an opinion to express on these phenomena. We believe 18 year old men and women deserve the legal right to express their own opinions. The solutions to social problems concerning youth rests on the ability of youth taking a responsible part in alleviation of their problems.

First, let me consider the thesis of this presentation and present it as the means for ultimate solution of problems related to youth. By lowering the age of majority from 19 to 18 we automatically involve men and women 18 years of age in the need to form intelligent judgements on social and political issues and grant them means to do so through democratic election.

Young people are capable. Better and increased amounts of education have continued to raise the level of social consciousness among youth through the decades, and will continue to do so. Technology and job complexity demand higher trained and increasingly more qualified men and women. These issues involve younger people every year, needless to say.

National employment has become a problem of critical interest to youth. How must it feel for a young man or woman to be willing to spend one quarter of his or her life in academic training only to find there is no place for them in the job

market. These deep psychological consequences among youth in regard to this problem could only provide a vigorous motivation to aid in a solution. We once again find a necessity to grant 18-year olds a legal pathway to accomplish the ends they desire.

In ecology there is no group of citizens so conscious of the problems of pollution than our youth. It is they who have the great investment in today's environment, since it is they who will inherit all the problems the older generation will leave behind. Can we be sure that those who have lived the first half of their lives will tackle the environmental ecology with a passion and drive that a young person with over 40 years of life expectancy would? Certainly an 18-year old would, not to mention those younger who have a right to enjoy many of the things most of us did up until a decade ago.

Alcoholism, drug abuse and social deviancy. It may be alleged that the lowering of the age of majority will lead to the abuse of alcohol among our younger people. We have already found this is not the case. Our major problems associated with crime and social deviation are closer to drug abuse. Many of the problems previously associated with alcoholism among youth must increasingly be replaced by associations to drug abuse. This is not to state that marijuana causes crime as such, for all the scientific evidence so far has proved this to be false. As long as marijuana is legal we must accept the crimes associated with the use and sale of marijuana and other drugs. This will continue to exist, the best possible solutions to their problem whatever it may be must involve the active participation of youth. Prohibition has never been an effective way to combat the problems of this nature. By lowering the age of majority we can only gain by involving more youth in active solutions.

Abortion is an issue frustrating particularly to young women. An 18-year old woman is no less capable of bearing a child than is a 19-year old. The case of unwanted children is not significant higher among 18-year olds than 19-year olds. These young women by this token must be capable of participation in a solution of social problems such as this, if they are responsible for bearing the illegitimate children.

The last point which needs to be made concerning this issue is whether or not 18-year old men and women are politically conscious enough to make responsible use of the democratic process. The question requires a generalized answer. However, in this case it is impossible to generalize. There are undoubtedly people who go through life in this Province never attempting to understand any political issue. Certainly some of them are now 18 years of age.

An Hon. Member: — Just the Liberals!

Mr. Gross: — Just the Liberals. However, today's 18-year olds and many of those younger are more than capable of making accurate and social value judgements about present day future and social political issues. They must take an active role in determining their own future. The preceding points rest on moral grounds to a large extent when dealing with people and social interaction we must always concern ourselves with morals. Politics must take an increasingly humanistic approach in the solving of today's problems and in an increasingly technological age this will be necessary.

March 9, 1972

Saskatchewan is surrounded by Canadians who have seen fit to give their young people the rights they deserve. It is in the best interests of the people of Saskatchewan to lower the age of majority to 18 and to continue to involve subsequent generations at a lower age level, as the social conscience among the youth increases.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. D. Boldt (Rosthern): — Mr. Speaker, we have heard three or four, I should say seven or eight, maybe ten speakers on this Bill. It seems to me that this Bill will have unanimous support from that side of the House, although I want to say very emphatically that I will oppose this Bill. I am amazed at some of the statements that come from people opposite to the right of you, Mr. Speaker.

A good deal has been said about our young people over the course of the last five or ten years. I am the first to admit that we have some very fine young people and we also have some real bad young people. We have some fine older people and we have some bad old people. I would say that the majority of our young people are good, if this is the case, these are not the ones who will pressure the Government for lowering the legal age. The Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) and these Members of this House can well applaud our young people but much of it I am afraid is for political expediency only. Good homes make for good families, where the parents exercise good discipline and are not afraid of their children, good citizens will emerge from these homes, it will not come from government legislation. Today most parents are very much concerned about the future of their children. If the home breaks down, the school, the church and the government breaks down as well. I am afraid that this has occurred in Canada, in Saskatchewan and indeed on the North American Continent and elsewhere in this world. It has occurred to such an extent the much of the damage that has taken place will be very, very difficult to repair, perhaps not at all.

We talk about how responsible our young people are today. We talk about how much better they are educated today, as compared to some of those of my generation. Well, Mr. Speaker, and Members of this Legislature, I want to tell you that education does not necessarily produce character, it never has and it never will. If a person has not got a character 24 hours a day, seven days a week, then not too much faith and trust can be expected from that individual.

Several weeks ago the Star-Phoenix reported, and I speak from memory and I stand to be corrected, that there had been around 2,500 marriages in the city of Saskatoon in 1971. It also reported that almost 50 per cent or half as many divorces had taken place in the city of Saskatoon. It reported that those marriages under 20 years of age would all end up in divorce inside of five years. Do we call that responsibility?

Alcohol is drug number one in North America today, it is not LSD, it is not marijuana, it is not any of the hard drugs, it's alcohol and it will be for a long, long time. The Attorney General knows this. This Government knows this and yet in spite of it, it is anxious to give it another promotion, mostly for political reasoning. Liquor profits were up by almost \$2 million as reported by the Liquor Board. Could it be that these profits

came from the 19-and 20-year olds? If it did, these are the ones that want free education, free tuition fees. Car accidents increased by over 3,000 despite the fact that the Government told the electorate in June that we were losing hundreds and thousands of people in Saskatchewan. There should have been less drivers and there definitely should have been less accidents. I spoke against this Bill a year ago claiming that it would not be too long that university campuses, the students would ask for a bar or outlet at their campuses. Last year when Mr. Heald introduced the Bill on first reading, the very next day the Regina Campus students circulated a petition for an outlet. It makes good sense for them to ask for one. If a university student who is 18 years of age, wants a glass of beer, it will cost him 75 cents to get one, while the man that is uptown pays 25 cents, he has to take the bus to go to the hotel to get one and he has to take the bus to go back. So you are discriminating. I am telling you across the way that it will not be too long before you are going to have bars and outlets at most of our campuses and indeed maybe in some of our high schools.

When the former Government increased liquor outlets in the Province, we were chastised by the Opposition as throwing liquor to the wolves. My, how these things change when you sit to the right of the Speaker. That was just purely hypocritical and I can see the Attorney General standing over here chastising the Government for opening more outlets, he was opposed to everything the Liberal Government did, but when they are in they anxious to promote it for those under 19 years of age.

Our society today as recognized by the sincere Christian church is sick, very sick indeed. Our homes, our schools, our churches our governments as such are sick because many parents today are afraid of the children. The ministry today, and I understand you have two ministers of the United Church on your side of the House, the ministers today are afraid of the parishioners. The schoolteacher and the professor is afraid of the pupil, and the governments are afraid of the electorate.

The basic concern that I have today is how we as parents can set examples to our younger people. I am not that much concerned who is the Premier of the Province as I am of who stands behind the pulpit today. If the home and the church will live up to its expectations we shall be sending good men to our respective governments. I took a good deal of interest when the Liquor Commission had its hearings in Saskatoon last winter. Last spring when the Liberal Government set up this Legislative Committee and later, when re-appointed by Premier Blakeney, I advised a good number of friends and church associations that they should go to these meetings and hearings and present briefs and let the public and the government know their stand. If I recall right 19 briefs were presented at Saskatoon, the city of churches, but not one church, not one church felt it worthwhile to present and express its concerns and beliefs to this committee. Now that the Bill has come to the Chamber we hear a few rumblings from some of the churches. The only Christian Association that presented a brief in Saskatoon was the Saskatoon Christian Temperance League for which I am very thankful.

Out of a total of 149 briefs presented to the Committee only nine came from several churches and a few associations related to churches. That the Committee has formed its conclusions based on briefs present, I can well expect what the report will be. In my travels throughout the province over the last

March 9, 1972

ten years, I can say without a doubt that the individual Christian and the Christian Church is overwhelmingly opposed to this legislation. Alcohol is evil and it is the source and root of most of our welfare problems as I am sure the Welfare Minister (Mr. Snyder) has found out by now. It is the root and source of most of the problems the white man has and also most of the problems that the native has today here in Saskatchewan. It is responsible for at least 50 per cent of our vehicle accidents on the highways. It is responsible for most of our murders and suicides in our country. I cannot see, Mr. Speaker, how we as a responsible body of elected representatives want to promote the use of alcohol and extend it to our young people. Because, Mr. Speaker, the Liquor Commission Report has not been tabled, we in the Opposition should like to know what the Commission's recommendations are. I would suggest to you and to the Leader of this House that we do not further debate this Bill until this report is tabled and I, therefore, beg leave to adjourn this debate.

Debate adjourned.

Hon. R. Romanow (Attorney General): — moved second reading of Bill No. 13 – An Act to establish The Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission.

He said: Mr. Speaker, it is a great privilege to introduce another Bill in second reading, a Bill respecting the establishment of The Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission.

Mr. Speaker, in looking back over the history of this province, I think it can be said that Saskatchewan has been a pioneer in the field of human rights legislation. I want to say in a purely, partisan and political way that, in my estimation, Saskatchewan has been a pioneer in the field of human rights legislation primarily and almost exclusively during those years when the CCF was in power and now when the NDP are in power.

The first Saskatchewan Bill of Rights, in fact, the first provincial Bill of Rights written anywhere was authored by the Government headed by the Premier of the day, Mr. Tommy (T.C.) Douglas. It was about the only Human Rights Bill in the statute books of a province for a long time, and though I haven't done a check, it still may be. It was followed up with fair employment practices legislation, fair accommodation practices legislation and so forth. The CCF established in the years of 1944 to 1964 that it was going to be at the forefront of human rights legislation in the Dominion of Canada. Regrettably, from 1964 to 1971 we were at a standstill. During the Liberal administration in the Province of Saskatchewan to my knowledge there was not one basically new, innovative piece of legislation introduced in the field of human rights. All around us in the Provinces of Ontario and British Columbia, Manitoba and Alberta, throughout all of the Dominion of Canada, provincial governments were moving to ensure protection of the liberties of their individual subjects. Everywhere, except in the Province of Saskatchewan, because the government of the day steadfastly refused to implement legislation.

And I know why they so steadfastly refused to present this type of legislation. Because in their years of power, Mr. Speaker, from 1964 to 1971, they exhibited the most cases, the most blatant use of political power ever exhibited by any

government in the history of this province.

I've read in the newspapers from time to time about the Opposition, the present Opposition getting up in the House and saying that this Government is misusing its power. One or two comments about this Government being arrogant, and one or two comments about what the present Attorney General is doing in making sure that the powers are misused. Those are very fine words coming from the Liberal Opposition. Very fine words, Mr. Speaker, when every basic, democratic right — civil liberties I'm talking about, Mr. Speaker, — were mutilated by the Liberal government in the gerrymander Bill of 1970. When Members of the opposite Liberal Party ask the people of Saskatchewan what the present Attorney General is doing to speak up for civil liberties, I ask them to tell this House what the former Attorney General, what the former Minister of Welfare, what the former Minister of Municipal Affairs and what every Member of the Liberal Government did when they mutilated civil liberties day in and day out from 1964 to 1971. Absolutely nothing. They were absolutely silent. They dismissed men without any notices. And they have the audacity now, seven months later to come back and to say to this Legislature, to say that there is an abuse of power by this Government today. Mr. Speaker, about the only thing that could be said about some of the boys when they were in power was that "we were going to it but somehow we never got around to doing it".

And those were critical years in the field of human rights and civil liberties, Mr. Speaker. Years when minority groups, our Indian people, our Métis people, were beginning to rediscover themselves, were beginning to fight tenaciously against stereotyping that we had exhibited towards them and inflicted upon them, were beginning to insist that the battle for their cultural survival be respected and be understood. In the past decade, cultural groups and individual groups, all intensified their efforts to recognize the basic human rights of women, the basic human rights of our young people, to make sure that we withstood the onslaught of technology and the deep depersonalising effects of a complex and complicated Government in the 1970s. Everywhere this was going about in the Dominion of Canada. Every Government in the Dominion of Canada saw the trend and acted, everywhere except under the former Liberal Government in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, happily on June 23, 1971, the people of the province for a number of reasons, returned the Government that I said at the very beginning, pioneered in the field of human rights legislation, the NDP. And, therefore, it is no surprise to the people of our province that at this first full Session of the Saskatchewan House we are moving immediately to take steps to enforce and to protect the basic liberties of our subjects. We've done so by the introduction of the Ombudsman Bill. That is already under debate, Mr. Speaker. And we do so now with this Bill, The Human Rights Commission Act of 1972.

Mr. Speaker, to place this Act in its proper context, this legislation represents the first phase of a continuing effort by this Government to provide for the people of Saskatchewan the kind of leadership in the field of human rights which they enjoyed in this province prior to and up to 1964. During the months and years ahead, I hope to be able to bring in new legislation which will consolidate all of the Bills that are before us in the area of human rights. For example, I look

March 9, 1972

forward to the enactment of a consolidated human rights code. The evolution of this work would involve the increasing dialogue between our citizens and our minority groups and all the other interested individuals of our province. In short, Mr. Speaker, this Bill, The Human Rights Commission Act, of 1972, this legislation is a beginning, it's the first step in what will be as the work of this Government progresses, truly the most advanced and enlightened human rights legislation in all of Canada again.

Mr. Speaker, more particularly with respect to the human rights Bill, what does this Act do? It will establish a body known as The Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission. This body, according to the proposed Bill, will be composed of not less than three members and there shall be attached to the three-man Commission a Director of Human Rights who will be the chief executive officer of and the secretary of the Commission, together with other duties that may be assigned to him. Subject to the direction of the responsible Minister, the Commission will administer The Saskatchewan Bill of Rights, The Fair Accommodation Practices Act, The Fair Employment Practices Act. Members of this House will know that there is complementary and consequential legislation with respect to those three Bills to be introduced upon passage of this major Bill.

Mr. Speaker, among the duties of the Commission will be an obligation to forward and to promote the basic principles upon which this democracy is founded including the paramount principle that every person is free and equal in dignity and in rights without regard to race, creed, religion, colour, sex, nationality, ancestry or place of origin. This is set out clearly in the Bill and I won't belabour it. Members can read it for themselves.

There are one or two other aspects in respect to the purposes of this Bill that I should like to draw to the attention of the Members and that is section seven sub (a) which forwards the principle of cultural diversity as a basic human right and a fundamental human value. This I believe and I stand to be corrected, is an innovation with respect to human rights legislation of this type, the recognition and the forwarding of the principle of cultural diversity. It's a very important advance to my mind, Mr. Speaker. The status of so-called minority groups in relation to our legislation and human rights legislation will continue to be the subject matter of more considerable study by this Government in the years ahead as we constantly seek a dialogue with the various diverse interests in our society to find out how they react to and become involved with these laws and to anticipate additional legislation to assist them in their true realization of their potential as citizens of our province.

This Bill also says that the Commission can in concert with these groups and societies conduct and encourage research in the field of human rights.

Mr. Speaker, the Commission shall investigate complaints of any person that an infringement of a right under an Act administered by the Commission has taken place and it shall endeavour to effect a settlement of the matter complained of. Such complaints can be easily submitted either orally or in writing. If the Commission is unable to effect a settlement after the complaint has been made then the Commission may conduct a formal inquiry. If, as a result of such inquiries, the commission finds that the complaint is supported by the evidence

then it shall recommend to the Minister the course that ought to be taken with respect to the complaint. Now, in this area, Mr. Speaker, I should like to draw particular attention of the Members to the way the Bill is worded. What I have just said is the way the Bill is worded. The Commission will make an inquiry and a recommendation to the Minister and the Minister will then do whatever is necessary to carry out the recommendations of the commission. The wording of this particular section was taken out of the forerunner of our human rights legislation the Ontario legislation creating the Ontario Human Rights Commission. We thought at the time of the drafting of the Bill that this was, in fact, an adequate provision. But I am not so sure that it is today. I've been very much impressed by the strength and merits of arguments that have been advanced by members of the Saskatchewan Human Right Association who say that we should deviate from the Ontario precedent to the extent that the Human Rights Commission itself should investigate and make the order finally without reference back to the responsible Minister and then that there should be the right of appeal from the final order made by the Human Rights Commission. In fact, there has been a recent case in the province of Ontario, a case which has been widely reported which has criticized this particular provision as it is written in Ontario and as it is written in the proposed Bill that is before the Members today on second reading. We think the criticism taken by the court in Ontario is well taken. We think the observations by the Saskatchewan Human Rights people are also well taken. And so, therefore, it will be my intention when we get into Committee of the Whole to change the wording of this particular section to allow the Human Rights Commission itself to investigate and to make final the order without any reference back to any Minister of the Crown and giving an avenue of appeal therefrom to a proper court of law along the lines of the criticism contained recently in the Ontario case. I think this will further strengthen and improve the basic provisions of the Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission and would and should alleviate the complaints raised in some quarters that this is a bad section.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, the Bill provides for penalty provisions to be contained in the Act for any person who fails to comply with a particular order. In the Act it says "of the Minister" should be changed in Committee of the Whole to the "orders of the Commission".

Mr. Speaker, I shall have a few words to say when I introduce for second reading The Bill of Rights and The Fair Employment Practices Act amendments. Basically, they will redefine the terms to bring them into line with The Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission Act which is before you on this day. The amendments will come into force on a day to be fixed by proclamation by the Lieutenant Governor-in-Council.

Mr. Speaker, as I said at the outset of my remarks, this legislation won't put Saskatchewan entirely in the lead with respect to civil rights action. What it will do is bring the Province of Saskatchewan on an even footing with what is developing and has developed in the other provinces of Canada in human rights. I think that there are one or two provisions of the Bill which will, if I may in honesty say, improve our Bill over the existing ones. I have already drawn the Members' attention to them. The first one is about cultural diversity as a right and the second one is about the Human Rights Commission making the final order with a right of appeal, although one or two provinces

March 9, 1972

have variations of this. It won't put us ahead. It will bring us equal. But I say, Mr. Speaker, tonight, in second reading, that this Bill is another step forward to the guaranteeing of civil liberties in the province by this Government of the Province of Saskatchewan. And in the months and the years ahead with the initiative and the enthusiasm of the Premier, I think the people of the province can look forward to better and more legislation ensuring and enshrining the civil liberties of the people of our province. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to move second reading of an Act respecting The Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission, 1972.

Mr. J.G. Lane (Lumsden): — Mr. Speaker, although we welcome the laudable lines of this legislation we certainly must question the Member who stands up in this House and criticizes the previous Liberal Government for firing people without notice after he fires a senior civil servant on 40 minutes notice and has to have his Deputy Minister go and do it for him. Until we had the statement from the Attorney General as to the withdrawal, I assume it's of section 11, on second reading, never has there been a human rights Bill introduced in a Legislature that was given so much power to do away with human rights and that is to be taken away by the Attorney General in the legislation that was proposed here today.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lane: — It makes you wonder about the thinking of a man who stands up and has stood up in this House and has completely opposed and chastised the Liberal Government for removing a right of review, and stands up and puts in this Bill, a complete waiver of review of an order of the human Rights Commission. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the thinking of the Attorney General behind this legislation certainly must come into question when we have a provision which does away with one of the basic human rights and that is a right to appeal to the courts. I'm very glad and I commend the Human Rights Commission and the other people who brought to the attention of the Attorney General the weakness and the danger of this particular provision.

Mr. Speaker, the thinking of the Attorney General in this legislation as it was drafted indicates that we were to have a czar of human rights in Saskatchewan and not a Human Rights Commission.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lane: — And I welcome the statements of the Attorney General that he is going to reconsider the principle.

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn debate, we wish to see the amendment as proposed by the Attorney General and I think it will affect the other provisions.

Debate adjourned.

Mr. R. Romanow (Attorney General): — moved second reading of Bill No. 14 – An Act to amend the Fair Accommodation Practices Act.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I shall be very brief on this, these are the amendments to the Fair Accommodation Practices Act, Bill No. 14.

I think the Bill is fairly self-explanatory. There are certain changes with respect to the definitions which are a consequence of the comments that I have made in second reading on The Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission Act. I think some further study of this Bill can be carried out in Committee of the Whole if the Members so like. I, therefore, move second reading of An Act to amend the Fair Accommodation Practices Act.

Mr. G. Lane (Lumsden): — I think is particular Act, of course, is predicated on the passing of the Bill for The Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission. I think we can assure the House that once we have the amendments we can get all these consequential Bills at the same time. In the meantime I would beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

Mr. R. Romanow (Attorney General): — moved second reading of Bill No. 15 – An Act to amend the Fair Employment Practices Act.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this Bill also Human Rights Commission. This is a Bill to amend the Fair Employment Practices Act.

Mr. Speaker, this Bill goes a little bit further than the other Bills because of proposed section 6. Proposed section 6 says — “No employer or trade union shall discharge, expel or otherwise discriminate against any person because he has made a complaint or given evidence, or assisted in any way in respect of the initiation or prosecution of a complaint or other proceeding under this Act”. And again, nothing perhaps turns much on that except that it is a bit of a restrictive power. In section 14 is outlined the penalty provisions. These are all basically amendments, Mr. Speaker, which dovetail with the Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission Act and, therefore, I would move second reading of An Act to amend the Fair Employment Practices Act.

Mr. Lane: — Mr. Speaker, for the same reasons we beg leave to adjourn debate on this.

Debate adjourned.

Mr. R. Romanow (Attorney General): — moved second reading of Bill No. 16 – An Act to amend the Saskatchewan Bill of Rights Act.

He said: On Bill No. 16, Mr. Speaker, again the same comments. This is the amendment to The Saskatchewan Bill of Rights. The amendment will in section 3 add the words – sex, nationality, ancestry or place of origin and will do so throughout in clauses 4, 5 and 6 and 7 and 9 of the Bill. In effect it brings up to date the Saskatchewan Bill of Rights Act in the sense that it will dove-tail and make this Act subject to the actions of the Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission.

March 9, 1972

On that basis, Mr. Speaker, and with those few words I would not move that An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Bill of Rights Act be read a second time.

Mr. Lane: — Mr. Speaker, one comment before the same criterion is applied. On all the Bills, of course, that have been introduced one of the major changes is the intent to ensure the equality of sex, and I think this particular aspect is a very welcome one. I refuse to get into the discussion as the Minister of Labour (Mr. Snyder) did when he referred to them as the 'fairer sex'. I think they are certainly the equal sex and the adjective 'fair', I don't think any longer applies if this legislation passes, Mr. Minister. I think that's certainly a welcome addition. However, for the same reasons we have given previously, we beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 8:47 o'clock p.m.