

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Second Session — Seventeenth Legislature
21st Day

Thursday, March 23, 1972.

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Hon. A.E. Blakeney (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day and at this time, I should like to welcome to the House a Grade Eight class from McNab School in Regina. These students live in the constituency of the Member for Regina North West (Mr. Whelan), but as you know he is absent on the business of this House in Great Britain and it gives me a great deal of pleasure to perform a role that would normally fall to him. The students are accompanied by the Social Studies teacher, Mrs. Beverly Coulter and are seated in the Speaker's Gallery.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Members will know that McNab elementary school is named after the former Lieutenant-Governor, the Hon. Archibald McNab. I understand that these enthusiastic students have been impressed by the pictures and the history of the illustrious gentleman which are down in the lower corridors of this building. We can only hope that the Members here today will be equally impressive during the proceedings and that these students are going to have, this afternoon, an enjoyable time as well as one which will be educational and will assist them in their studies.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. J.C. Richards (Saskatoon University): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to take this occasion to welcome to the galleries students from Sutherland elementary school in Saskatoon. This school, as many will know, has a very excellent reputation for quality education program which it delivers. I trust that the visiting students will not be disappointed this afternoon with the debate they hear.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. G.F. Loken: — Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to introduce to you and the Assembly a group of 48 Grade Eight students attending the school at Rosetown. They are located in the east gallery and are accompanied by their Principal, Mr. MacIntosh, their teachers, Mrs. Wickett and Mr. Wiebe. I know that the Assembly will join with me in extending a hearty welcome and a pleasant stay with us and a safe journey home.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. W.E. Smishek (Regina North East): — Mr. Speaker, I should like

to take this opportunity to introduce to you and to the Members of the Legislature a group of students from St. Michaels School. They are seated in the west gallery and are accompanied by their teachers, Mr. Martin and Miss Dunn. I should like to welcome them here this afternoon and hope that they will have a pleasant stay in the Legislature. I hope that their experience here will help them in their educational studies in the months ahead.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. H.H. Rolfes (Saskatoon Nutana South): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to introduce to all Members in the Chamber a group of students from Hugh Cairns Elementary School in Saskatoon. I take great pleasure in introducing these students because many of them live either on the block where I live or across the street from where I live so I know many of them personally. I hope that their stay here and the proceedings that will occur this afternoon will be edifying to them. I know that the Members will join with me in wishing them a safe trip home. They are accompanied by their teachers Mr. Ron Boden and Mr. Earl Francis.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

PRIORITY OF DEBATE — EXODUS OF INDUSTRY

Mr. C.P. MacDonald (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I request leave of this Assembly to move that this Assembly to move that this Assembly give priority of debate to a definite matter of urgent public importance. Mr. Speaker, the matter of urgent public importance that I bring before the Assembly is that I move:

That the matter of the continuing exodus of established industries in Saskatchewan and the corresponding loss of jobs, wages and provincial revenues which has been climaxed today by the information we received that Smith-Roles of Saskatoon are moving to Alberta as a result of the Provincial Government's taxation policy, be given priority of debate under Rule No. 17.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — Mr. Speaker, by your leave, Sir, while you are taking this into consideration may I add a word as to the reason why the Opposition considers this of urgent public importance.

Mr. Speaker: — I don't think so at this time. The statement must be handed to the Speaker first and the Speaker has to make a decision before it can be debated. If the debate starts on one side other Members may wish to either concur or disagree and we don't want to get into debate before we have a chance to look at it.

I have received this statement from the Member for Milestone. I have had a few minutes to check it in accordance with the rules but I also have here a statement from the Canadian Press, a copy of a wire from the Canadian Press which I should like to read to the House. It is dated at Saskatoon, the Canadian Press:

Clem Roles, president of Smith-Roles Ltd., said today he will move to Alberta to avoid Saskatchewan's proposed estate tax and will make a decision soon on whether to take his farm equipment business with him.

Mr. Roles said his company which employs about 70 persons would be put out of business if something happened to him and the estate tax was applied to his assets.

The Federal Government recently withdrew from the estates tax field and a number of provinces intend to pick up the slack. The former Liberal Government had a policy whereby it rebated the province's 75 per cent share of taxed estate to beneficiaries. Mr. Roles said he will make the decision shortly on whether to relocate his business in Calgary or Edmonton.

In Regina, acting Opposition Leader Cy MacDonald submitted orders asking for an emergency debate in the Legislature on the continuing exodus of established industries from Saskatchewan with the corresponding loss of jobs, wages and provincial revenues.

I would say to the Assembly that from the information I have, a decision by Mr. Clem Roles at this time has not been made. He says he will make a decision soon as to whether to take his equipment business with him or not. Therefore I believe that until a decision is made by the Manager of the Company concerned we would be discussing hypothetical cases. Well, I would say that this could be a topic which could be a Notice of Motion given by any Member to discuss at a later time. But at this time due to the information I have I should have to rule that this does not comply to the rules of Priority of Debate No. 17. So I rule the motion out of order.

Mr. MacDonald: — Mr. Speaker, may I speak to the ruling please?

Mr. Speaker: — The ruling has been made, it's not debatable according to Rule 17.

Mr. MacDonald: — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order then. Sir, exactly your words are the reason why it is an emergency, because he is considering withdrawal. We talked to Mr. Roles this morning, Sir, he is now looking to relocate that industry in Alberta. It is 70 jobs, a \$2 million payroll, 600 distributors around the Province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker: — I wonder if the Member will stay to the Point of Order on which I have ruled on, and not the pros and cons of the case. If you'll stay to the rules of the Chair.

Mr. MacDonald: — Mr. Speaker, the reason that this is an emergency of which this House has never debated before is because he is now in the process of making that decision and looking for a new location. If something is not done immediately, Sir, we shall lose that industry for the Province of Saskatchewan. It is an emergency.

Mr. Speaker: — As I tried to point out to the House and I think I have done this after some consideration, after having received as the House is aware, that the Notice of Motion is given to the Clerk's Office, copies are distributed under Rule 17 to the Leader of both Government and Opposition. I obtained a copy of the Canadian Press release and as I tried to point out earlier that a decision will be made, but the decision is not made, so right now it is a hypothetical case. But if any Members wishes to put a Notice of Motion on the Order Paper, it is only 48 hours notice, then a motion can be debated. Then we can discuss the pros and cons whether it is hypothetical or not, it doesn't much matter. So my ruling is that this does not comply with the Rules of No. 17. I have given a great deal of thought to this. I have tried to make sure that I was ruling in the fairness of what No. 17 intends to do and in fairness to Members of all sides of the House.

Mr. J.G. Lane (Lumsden): — Speaking on the Point of Order, Mr. Speaker, I believe the motion reads, "Which was climaxed today by the information that we received." We received information that Smith-Roles were moving to Alberta and you are . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order!

Mr. Lane: — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! The Speaker is on his feet. Will the Hon. Member kindly take his seat. There is nothing in Rule 17 that says that the Speaker shall read to the House the motion handed in. It was read by the Member. "He then hands a written statement of the matter proposed to be discussed to Mr. Speaker, who, if he thinks it in order and of urgent public importance, reads it out and asks whether the Member has leave of the Assembly." Due to the information I have been able to obtain I do not believe it to be of urgent public importance because I say it is hypothetical. Decisions have not been made, the decision on this is of a personal nature and it is Mr. Roles' personal business whether he wants to go with his assets to another province. That's his personal business, it is not public business as to whether Mr. Roles or anyone else wants to leave this Province.

Mr. Lane: — Mr. Speaker, a Member of this House has said that he has received information and we are now getting a press statement that disagrees with that information and I think the word of the Member should be upheld.

Mr. Speaker: — I have ruled on this according to the information I have and the Members have a right to challenge my ruling but they do not have a right to debate it.

Mr. G.B. Grant (Regina Whitmore Park): — Well, Mr. Speaker, I challenge your ruling.

Mr. Speaker: — The ruling of the Chair has been challenged. Is

the ruling of the Chair sustained? I declare the ruling upheld.

Ruling of the Chair sustained on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 40

Messieurs

Blakeney	Meakes	Woods
Smishek	Romanow	Messer
Snyder	Bowerman	Thibault
Larson	Kowalchuk	Baker
Brockelbank	MacMurchy	Pepper
Michayluk	Byers	Thorson
Kwasnica	Carlson	Engel
Tchorzewski	Owens	Robbins
Matsalla	Cowley	Taylor
Faris	Cody	Gross
Feduniak	Mostoway	Comer
Rolfes	Lange	Hanson
Oliver	Feschuk	Kaeding
Flasch		

NAYS — 15

Messieurs

Steuart	Coupland	Loken
Guy	Grant	Boldt
MacDonald (Milestone)	McIsaac	Weatherald
MacLeod	McPherson	Lane
MacDonald (Moose Jaw No.)	Wiebe	Richards

Mr. A.R. Guy (Athabasca): — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order, I should like with deference to suggest that your interpretation of the motion was not in keeping with the motion as it was presented by the Member for Milestone. The motion is not concerned primarily with whether Mr. Roles has made the decision to move his . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! This has been decided by the House.

Mr. Guy: — Sir, on a Point of Order!

Mr. Speaker: — I shall not because this has been decided by the House. The House has decided on the Point of Order.

An Hon. Member: — Not that one. You don't know what a Point of Order is.

Mr. Guy: — On another Point of Order. The House did not decide on the Point of Order, the House decided on whether your ruling would be sustained or not. I have now risen on another Point of Order which if I could have the co-operation of all Members of the House I will make it just as quickly and succinctly as possible. My Point of Order is that the motion was misinterpreted in the facts that the real basis for this motion is in the first two lines, that it is the matter of the continuing exodus of established industries from Saskatchewan. And we can

name them, there is Burns, there is Quaker Oats, there is Anglo-Rouyn and you can go on and on and I suggest that this is the real . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! Will the Hon. Member take his seat.

Mr. Guy: — . . . one particular industry.

Mr. Speaker: — The Hon. Member well knows the rules of the House and when the Speaker rises he should take his seat. I have the motion and on this kind of information I have ruled that this did not comply with Rule 17 and my ruling has been sustained. That ends the debate for now. Members can put it on the Order Paper if they wish for a Notice of Motion. This was taken into consideration by my ruling.

Mr. D. Boldt (Rosthern): — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order. I believe that the Hon. Member from Athabasca has a good case. I have never seen in this House where on page 14 of the Orders of the Day we have a motion that has criticized your ruling. And I want to say to you in all sincerity, let me state that I am just fed up with your ruling.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! Will the Hon. Member take his seat. We are not debating adjourned motions at this time. We are now on the Orders of the Day. That's what we are on and that is what we are dealing with.

Mr. Grant: — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, could I direct a question to the Hon. Member from Souris-Estevan (Mr. Thorson) the Minister of Industry and Commerce? In view of the fact that we are discussing the exodus of business from Saskatchewan such as the Quaker Oats and the Smith-Roles plant and Burns and Anglo-Rouyn and such plants all of which is pretty serious to the economy of the province.

Mr. Speaker: — Will the Hon. Member not preface his question.

Mr. Grant: — I'll get to my question if you will just give me a little time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — Well, then do it under the rules of the House, please.

Mr. Grant: — Well, you keep saying that you don't make the rules, you enforce them, but I'd like to know who makes them. I am beginning to think that you make them.

Mr. Speaker: — I have read them to you before. Page 147 of Beauchesne says what questions must or must not do and Item K says, "be a speech however short nor be of unreasonable length." No question can have a preamble.

Mr. Grant: — Mr. Speaker, I haven't been

one to violate the rules of this House too frequently, you know perfectly well. And you started out this Session with a pretty unbiased view, but I maintain that your views are biased now and unfair to this side of the House.

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, may I rise on a Point of Order? Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, I think that these unwarranted attacks on the Speaker have got to stop. If Members opposite feel that the Speaker has done anything wrong they have a perfect right to put a resolution on the Order Paper and we will debate it. But don't put the Speaker in the position where he has to debate it from the Chair. I think that this is quite unfair. We were in Opposition for seven years. We had lots of rulings that we didn't like and we didn't harass the Speaker. We didn't harass the Speaker. We didn't like lots of them.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — My Point of Order is that I am asking the Speaker to enforce the rules and I am asking all Hon. Members who believe the rules are being misinterpreted by Mr. Speaker to put a resolution on the Order Paper so we can debate it in the proper manner. My Point of Order is I am asking the Speaker to enforce the rules as laid down in the Order Book and as we have agreed to.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. C.P. MacDonald: — On a Point of Order, Mr. Speaker. We have been challenged so many times in this House on the length of a Point of Order and that was a five minute speech.

Mr. T.M. Weatherald (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order. The record will show over the past five or six years that the Members opposite when they were in the Opposition had at least four special debates on emergencies. Everyone of those four were held on emergencies which were dealing with the Federal Government and were not dealing with the Province of Saskatchewan or the Government of Saskatchewan. Those were allowed, Mr. Speaker, by the Speaker of the day. And that is why we are dissatisfied today with your ruling.

Mr. Speaker: — I would remind Members of the House after the Committee sat, these rules for emergency debate were amended at the suggestion of my predecessor and were made the rules of this House in 1970 because the former Speaker felt that these should be amended and he was the one who was responsible in helping to draw these up.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Grant: — Mr. Speaker, my statement wasn't that you were misinterpreting the rules. My statement was that you were making the rules. And in your own words you said that it wasn't your responsibility to make the rules, it was to interpret them. And I maintain that today you are making the rules. Now, if I can continue my question.

An Hon. Member: — On the advice of the Premier.

Mr. Grant: — Yes. Why the Speaker has to read news items such as you did today, I don't know. I can tell you why, because the Premier told you to read them.

Hon. E.I. Wood (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — On a Point of Order. It is a well known rule in the rules that the Speaker may not be criticized incidentally in debate at any time.

Mr. Grant: — Well, I am criticizing.

Mr. Wood: — The Speaker may not be criticized incidentally. If the Opposition has reason to criticize the Speaker it may be done by a motion brought into the House. But the Hon. Member is strictly out of order to stand in his place and criticize the Speaker out of hand.

Mr. Grant: — Well do something about it then.

Mr. Boldt: — On a Point of Order. When the Speaker is biased and I think we have the right to voice our . . .

Mr. Wood: — Order, order! These are words that should not be said in the House. If there is reason to criticize the Speaker it is to be done by a motion and this has been known for years.

Mr. Guy: — We have just seen an example of what we are criticizing today. Here's a man who stands up and who is on that side of the House and he is calling us to order and he's got no business calling us to order. What right has he got as a Member from Swift Current to call us or anybody else to order in this House. This is your responsibility and you've abrogated it to everyone on that side of the House. The Premier and everybody else, they jump up like jack rabbits hollering order, order. The Member from Estevan the other day called me to order. He had no right to call me or anybody else to order in this House.

Mr. Speaker: — It is a well known rule in this House that Members can place a motion on the Order Paper as has been mentioned if they wish to change the rules, to clarify the rules, to amend the rules or anything else or to criticize the rulings. And that I shall be glad to entertain if you wish to.

Mr. MacDonald (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to direct a question to the Premier. What has he done about Smith-Roles? We understand it took him over two months to answer or even reply to a letter asking for an invitation to discuss it. What has he done to hold Smith-Roles firm in the city of Saskatoon?

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, the information that the Hon. Member has on that subject is wrong as it is on other subjects. I happened to bring the file containing my correspondence with Mr. Clem Roles. There are some short gaps. I received a letter dated January 10 on January 11. I answered that letter on January 28. I got a reply back February 7 which I answered on February 17. I have a further letter from Mr. Roles which I received on March 3. I admit there are some small gaps of 10 days or so in answering letters and these are detailed letters of several pages. But I do not agree that there are any two month delays.

I am corresponding with Mr. Roles. I am urging him to maintain his business in Saskatchewan. I gather from the information, which I have not seen, that he has made no decision to move his plant. I have pointed out to him that he developed this business in Saskatchewan over a period of 25 years under succession duty laws much more onerous than the ones that are likely to come and I am urging him to reconsider his position if in fact he is proposing to relocate. We certainly have kept the doors open to Mr. Roles to discuss the matter. I want to assure Hon. Members that we propose to take every effort we can to maintain the Smith-Roles organization in Saskatchewan. I have already instructed the Minister of Industry to get in touch with Mr. Roles to see if we cannot meet some of the points of disagreement that we may have.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. D.G. Steuart (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. I talked to Mr. Roles, on the phone today. I would like to ask the Premier exactly what his Department of Industry and his Minister of Industry is doing and what he is doing when he hasn't got the information that Mr. Roles has already left this province. This is common knowledge. He now lives in Edmonton. He told me today, Mr. Speaker, regardless of what you read in the Canadian Press that he is now in the process of either locating his plant in Edmonton or in Calgary. My question is, Mr. Premier, with that information, how can you have any confidence in your Department of Industry when they are not even up-to-date and you are not up-to-date on that kind of information? The man had already left Saskatchewan before the end of the year.

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, perhaps I didn't make myself clear. I am not dealing with where Mr. Roles personally might choose to reside. That wasn't what I was directing my attention to. I was directing my attention to whether or not Smith-Roles Limited, the joint stock company would continue to reside and carry on business in Saskatoon. I have no information, notwithstanding what the Hon. Member has, that Smith-Roles Limited has decided to move any operation from Saskatoon. That decision may have been made. I have no information which confirms that. All I can do is to assure the House that the Minister of Industry is looking into this matter and that we are anxious to maintain in Saskatchewan the Smith-Roles Limited organization and the manufacturing operation which it carries on.

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker, having now been given this information, would the Premier join with us in asking the Speaker to

reconsider his decision to consider this a matter of urgent public importance?

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, the answer to that is that the Speaker has made his ruling. He made it on the basis of the press information. This is absolutely the traditional way of making it. I know of no occasion when a priority of debate resolution has been acceded to on the basis of private information brought into the House by an individual Member. None. And I have looked at some records. And if you know some you might have raised them. Therefore, on the information property before the Speaker he made what I thought was a proper ruling and I certainly will not ask him to reconsider.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Privilege. This is not private information. The matter of the continuing exodus of established industries I refer to Quaker Oats, to Burns, Anglo-Rouyn . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! Would the Hon. Member please try to get the House back on its proper routine work. This subject matter I have ruled on and the House has sustained is not a matter of urgent debate. I have said it can be placed on the Order Paper. It can be placed on the Order Paper at any time for debate if any Member wishes. Now what is before the General Orders of the Day is Questions.

Mr. K.R. MacLeod (Regina Albert Park): — Mr. Speaker, I direct this to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Does he agree with the ruling of the Speaker that the loss of 70 jobs is not a matter of any importance at all?

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! That question is out of order because you can't ask Members to make personal decisions on the ruling of the House. The House upheld the Chair.

Mr. Weatherald: — Mr. Speaker, is the Hon. Premier willing to table the information that he quoted from regarding correspondence?

Mr. Speaker: — He didn't quote from correspondence, he just said the dates that he had replied to. He didn't quote as to what the reply was so . . .

Mr. Weatherald: — Mr. Speaker, if I may, I should like to have the Premier answer the question as to whether he is willing to or not.

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, the correspondence is private correspondence with Mr. Roles. I fancy the Members opposite have it already available. I will certainly table my end of it and they can get their end from Mr. Roles since their contacts are

rather good. I think, therefore, they would have the full information.

HOG ENTERPRISE BY-PASSES SASKATCHEWAN

Mr. J.C. McIsaac (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I should like to direct one final question, Sir. I hope this will be in order as it is intended to be, to the Minister of Industry (Mr. Thorson). I have here a copy of the Star-Phoenix dated March 18 and the headline reads: "Hog Enterprise by-passes Saskatchewan Initiatives for Alberta." I wonder if the Minister could tell the House what discussions he has had with this particular group. I know they had been meeting with the Government prior to June 23. And what efforts he had made to attract this industry with something over 1,500 jobs to the Province of Saskatchewan.

Hon. K. Thorson (Minister of Industry): — Mr. Speaker, I don't know which organization the Member for Wilkie refers to. If it's one we investigated, it was a proposal which the officials of the Department of Industry and Commerce had looked at for some time and on checking out had found that on the basis of the figures submitted something like 140 per cent of the hog carcasses were to be marketed. We were of the opinion that this particular proposal and I rather think it is the same organization, was not one which we wished to pursue and that, in fact, nothing substantial would come of it.

Mr. McIsaac: — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Why in the world the Minister could now understand why the Province of Alberta is interested and is going ahead and developing with this very company that he speaks of that was going to process thousands of hogs in the province all of which were for export out of the province, out of the country even?

Mr. Thorson: — I am more convinced than ever that it's the same bogus organization, Mr. Speaker, that he refers to.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Romanow that Bill No. 10 — **An Act respecting the Age of Majority** be now read a second time.

Mr. D. Boldt (Rosthern): — Mr. Speaker, on Bill No. 10, I don't want to keep this debate longer than is necessary. My main criticism is directed to the Government and particularly to the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow). The content of this Bill is a sure indication that the Government was well aware of what the Liquor Commission's recommendations would be and they denied this information to this House and the public. I must severely condemn them for giving such high priority to this Bill.

As you will all know, this Bill appeared on the third or fourth day when the Session opened. It appears on the Order

Paper as Bill No. 10. It has passed the stage of first reading and has now had considerable debate on second reading. And it was only yesterday that the Government had the courtesy to table the report. This was denied the Opposition and the public the opportunity to debate intelligently some of the contents of the Bill.

The other day the Attorney General had high praise for our young people claiming they exercised responsibility and were quite capable at this time to take on further responsibilities. I, too, want to commend our young people particularly those that see fit to refrain from indulging in liquor. The Attorney General commends the responsibilities and the capabilities of our young people and yet by your own admission as indicated in the Bill you do not trust the 18-year olds and are demanding of them identification cards with full names, address, signature and picture. You will also invoke stiffer penalties to licensees for serving alcohol to minors and to minors for entering licensed premises. These minors, Mr. Speaker, could be one day less than 18 years of age. So I want to tell the Attorney General that he can sing high praises of our youth, the Bill does not indicate that he has that much confidence in our youth today.

I want to say, again, before I sit down that alcohol is our greatest social problem facing our society. It would, in fact, and is by its indulgence lowering our moral, our behavior standards, increasing our welfare problems, the cause of most of our highway accidents, divorce and separation cases. Alcohol will haunt this nation and future generations for years to come and we as legislators have a little more responsibility than to just look for votes. I am absolutely convinced that lowering the legal age is a serious mistake and I shall not support the Bill.

Mr. H. Owens (Elrose): — Mr. Speaker, when this Act was first introduced we heard some presentations from some of the younger Members of our Assembly, now it appears quite appropriate to hear some from the older Members.

I have a great respect for our youth, I've spent a good many years in working for their well being. Most of the young people are well respected and very responsible members of their communities. We hear much about the few who are irresponsible. These get too much publicity. But herein is one important factor in our society where the responsible youth must forcefully show their responsibility and their respect for others by taking an active role in leadership within their own age group and chastising the irresponsible. It is of little use for older members of society to try to change youthful attitudes and actions. It is a different story when the youth themselves energetically work for change for the betterment of society. Their superior education and their ability to communicate are some of their most cherished assets but all too often their urgent desire to change the basis of the status quo quickly and without thorough research as to the final consequences leaves them frustrated. And all too often this irritates them to the point where they lose their tact and co-operation they so earnestly strive after. Mr. Speaker, oldsters are all too often jealous of the foresight and wisdom of youth and are too hesitant to give them the responsibility they are willing to accept and waiting to accept. It is our prerogative

to decide and determine how far we are willing to concede. Just how broadminded and progressive are we as legislators or are we being asked to go too far.

Mr. Speaker, The Age of Majority Act will place the responsibilities and the burdens of adulthood directly on the shoulders of the 18-year old youth of Saskatchewan. Are our youth as mature as their counterparts in other jurisdictions? My answer is an unqualified yes. However, in my mind there are a few grave areas of concern and the main one, of course, is the access to alcohol beverages and the drinking of the same. If we are prepared to allow this age group adult status and admittance to beverage outlets of all kinds then we must also be prepared to educate them in the proper use of alcoholic beverages and the effects of their excessive use. They should be informed before they reach the age of majority of the morality that is expected of them and the degrading effect of alcohol especially if used irresponsibly. In my mind our greatest responsibility lies in our own lives, our own actions and attitudes, our concern for others and the examples we set. These examples must first be apparent in our homes followed by our churches and communities.

Mr. Speaker, the pattern of life we choose will to a large degree be the pattern followed by our youth. If we find fault and condemn our youth for their actions and attitudes then, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that we should take a hard searching look at ourselves. The patterns we set, the approach to our friends and neighbors, the paths we leave for our sons and daughters to follow. Mr. Speaker, I have great faith in our youth. I am confident that with proper leadership from their elders The Age of Majority Act will be accepted by the youth affected with a sense of pleasure and genuine responsible attitudes and it is my fervent hope that these actions and activities will have a beneficial and sobering effect in our society.

Mr. Speaker, I will support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. A. Oliver (Shaunavon): — Mr. Speaker, as I rise to speak in favor of the Act of The Act of Majority, I should like to refer to Hon. Member from Assiniboia-Bengough and friend, David Lange, who said we are in the Age of Aquarius. I believe this is possibly fact but I think we are still in the Age of Identification. Everyone wants to be identified with the “in” group or the “swingers” as they are often called. They believe their group is unique and it then gives them pride and joy to belong to such a group. Now fads, I think, are the vehicle people use to identify themselves with and these fads come in various stages. I think these begin in early life and are followed through to adulthood. The early childhood fads of course are the ones where fads are very prevalent with cereal give-aways. You know, the 25 cents and the several box tops for guns, games, etc.

Then you come into the pseudo-adolescent age or the early teenagers where they are very, very conscious of the gang or the group. Here they become aware of the social pressures of the group. They wear beanie hats, cowboy boots, belts, etc. This is the age that they begin to demand a voice in family decisions. Then the third stage is the later teenager stage or group much more serious and where they are very conscientious

of styles, and social acceptance is very important to them. Social position in the family and in the school is asserted and in the school it is often accepted by their peers. They begin to accept their responsibility in the home and community at this age as was pointed out by the Hon. Member for Elrose. They usually want to try to support themselves. I know this isn't always possible but they do make a good try at it. They want to work out part time and so forth.

Then comes the last stage, adulthood. Now here fads become more dramatic and costly. They worry about social position where they have cars, fancy houses, lakeside cottages and competition to see who can put on the best party. I think fads cause social change. They have late model cars, which of course demand higher speed limits which demand better roads which demand better services and the tendency is a trend away from the home to further away places. They have established trading habits in distance centres which really changes family life.

I think fads also cause a relaxing of morals and ethics. Sometimes to me this is very disturbing and frightening. I can point out as one example the unwed mother. At one time not too long ago an unwed mother was a very shameful thing to have in the family but now it is almost fashionable. This image, the single parent image and the divorce image, has been promoted through television, movies, books, magazines and so forth. I think this causes an erosion of the institution of marriage and I should like to take exception with the Member from Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) when he said that the number one drug was alcohol that is bothering our children and causing breakups and so on and so forth. I don't think it is. Number one drug is parent apathy!

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Oliver: — The children become insecure which often leads to doubts of their parents' insincerity, their parents' judgments and then finally it comes as an outright revolt which may take the form of alcoholic use or drug use just so the parents will take notice of them. And sometimes they may do it to get even with parents for not showing love or concern for them. The Member from Rosthern also said that the lowering of The Age of Majority will cause an up-swing in broken marriages, through the marrying at an early and immature age.

I think that this is a rather immature reference to our young people and their ability to make intelligent decisions on matters that concern mostly themselves. I think that everybody makes a judgment based on his own personal experience and if the Member was making his judgment based on his experience, when he was eighteen, I think that he should stop and take a look at the young people of today and listen to them. Listen to what their views are, then I am sure he will realize that times have changed and he should be willing to accept those changes. Teenage marriages are not necessarily doomed to disaster as he has suggested. I am thinking now of teenage marriages at the age of 18 and 19. I think the basis of marriage is still love and I think love is a growing thing. I am of the opinion that it must be taught at a very early age so that it may blossom into the mature love required for a successful marriage. Now the teaching of love is the direct responsibility of the parents, the church and the schools. The Hon.

Member from Rosthern also stated that the parson was afraid of the parishioner, the teacher afraid of the pupil, the parent afraid of the child. Mr. Speaker, I can definitely state that my pastor isn't afraid of his parishioners nor am I afraid of him. I am not afraid of the students I teach and I am certainly not afraid of my own two children.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Oliver: — When the preacher, the teacher or the parent shows any amount of compassion or love there can be no fear because with love comes understanding. The whole matter of marriage is tempered by the sphere of the influence of the parents. This sphere of influence will determine the age of dating, when it will begin, whom the date is with or the suitor, where they will go, time, so on and so forth.

In other words the whole courtship will be influenced by the background of the parents and the young people involved. Parental responsibility is the whole crux of the matter. When this breaks down or is neglected then the children find another substitute for their affections. Homes and churches have failed in their responsibility in the rearing of our youth. All churches can be criticized for being too self-righteous. They take the attitude, "Thank God we inside the church are different from those outside," when it should be really a progressing, an active and growing type of religion where they go out and spread the word to the unbelievers.

I think this hypocritical attitude must change if the church is to fulfil its role in society. The total act towards youth must change for we can't be hypocritical in the criticism of our youth, especially after the behavior in this House over radio time on March 3rd and again today. How can we dare criticize any teenager for the lack of responsibility without declaring ourselves blatant hypocrites. This Act will permit marriages of those 18 years of age without parental consent. I strongly disagree with those who suggest that this Act will encourage those younger than 18 to rush into marriage no more than it did when the Age of Majority was 21. The present marriage laws stipulate that parental consent is necessary is either or both of the young people involved are below the age of 19. It is possible for those age 13 or 14, for example, to be legally married. I can speak from personal experience in this as we have some in our own community that were just recently married. It was very unfortunate and I feel that they were forced into this situation.

I have absolute confidence in our youth. I believe in the future and the future is our youth. I am not saying there won't be misuses of this Act because there are going to be some 17-year olds who will try to sneak into the pubs, but this can be easily remedied if the controls suggested in the Liquor Commission's Interim Report are accepted, namely, the use of voluntary ID cards. Of course this will benefit those that are 18 years of age because it will definitely help them along. Let's give a vote of confidence to our youth and to our 18-year old citizens. Let's vote Yes on The Age of Majority Act.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. E.I. Wood (Minister of Municipal Affairs): - Mr. Speaker, I should like to rise to speak in favor of this Bill.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Wood: — Don't be too surprised. I believe there is nothing amiss, Mr. Speaker, in the 18-year olds assuming their responsibilities and the privileges of adulthood. After all for years we have required them to go to war and we have allowed them to vote and I think that in one instance we owe them a great deal and a real debt of gratitude and I think in the other that they have carried themselves well and I think that we have no reason to regret that they have had the ability to vote in this Province for close to 30 years — 25 years or so. I think that what has been said by these speakers today is entirely right. I agree with them 100 per cent that the youth of today are a credit to our nation in the main. There are of course some that I wouldn't want to say were very much of a credit and I know some older people of my age that maybe aren't much of a credit to the nation either.

An Hon. Member: — They are all sitting opposite.

Mr. Wood: — Mr. Speaker, I must protest interpretation being put upon what I am saying. But I do maintain that we do have in the main a very good group of young people and I think that we must welcome them to take a place in our community and a place in our society. I think they are able to do so and I think that this Bill in this regard is very good.

I do have some thoughts however concerning those sections of the Bill which include the use of liquor and extending the opportunity to go into licensed premises and to purchase liquor to 18-year olds. A couple of years ago when the Bill was before the House lowering the age of majority to 19 at that time I spoke along these same lines and I feel that I must be consistent even though it is a Bill being brought in by the Government of which I am a Member. I must point out the same things only I think a little more pointedly in regard to 18-year olds then what there was in regard to 19-year olds.

Some of the other Members have spoken about the possible dangers of 17-year olds going into beer parlors and licensed premises and I think this is very true. I think that possibly safeguards can be taken. It is possible that we may be able to come up with certificates to show that people in a certain limited area are indeed of age and the people who look suspiciously young and don't carry one of these cards could be automatically barred and we could increase our penalties upon those who allow them to come in as well those that do come in. I think, Mr. Speaker, that these are precautions that must be taken. But in spite of these precautions I fear that by bringing in this Bill is going to make it that much more difficult for operators of licensed premises to keep out the young people — the 17-year olds. And when it comes to the use of liquor I think that most of us will say that there is a point where it is not desirable that young people have the use of intoxicants. I think when you are getting down to the 16-

and 17-year old area that you are getting into an area that is not desirable.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I don't want to endeavor to try to impose upon the Members of the House my own ideas of morality or what I think should be done in regard to the use of liquor. I think this is pretty much a personal question and I think quite probably that many of these young people are quite able to carry their liquor as well as some of the older people. I don't want to make this an issue. But, I do say that so long as we are putting surcharges on drivers' licences and surcharges on insurance policies for young people, that is a very plain indication that the insurance companies and the Government of Saskatchewan itself thinks that young people do not drive their automobiles as well as older people do. That there is a higher percentage of accidents, and there is a proneness to accidents in this age group in regard to their driving on the highways that is not present in older people.

I maintain, Mr. Speaker, that what I am saying here now is not a matter of morality, it is not a matter of my ideas of morality, it is a simple matter of hard dollars and cents and pain of people and suffering, perhaps even death that I am talking about. I put it to the Members of this House that the lowering to 18 of the age in which young people are allowed to go into licensed premises and to purchase liquor is going to make liquor and intoxicating beverages that much more available to the young people. But as sure as day follows night and night follows day, this cannot but help but have an influence upon the accidents that we have on our highways. Our insurance rates across the country are going up due to several things. One of them is an increase in accidents. I do know that so far as the records of fatalities on our highways, these have shown a very good tendency over the last few years, particularly since 1967. They were then 292 in the province, the next year 265, the next year 240 and the next year 207. I think this has been largely been brought about by the legislation which has made the .08 percentage of alcohol on the breath the maximum that may be carried by any individual while driving a car. I think the enforcement of this legislation has had a real bearing on this situation.

I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that the last year this tendency, in spite of the operation of the law and the enforcement of the law in this way, has risen in the province. And this year we have now 214 traffic deaths in the Province of Saskatchewan as compared with 207 last year. It is now on the rise again. I think we cannot be complacent about the situation. And I do think that in giving more liquor to our young people that we are making a move in the direction of not encouraging possibly, but opening up the door to more accidents on our highways in Saskatchewan. I feel that I have to speak against this at this time.

As I said earlier I think highly of our young people. I have a boy myself whom I think a lot of. As I see him growing towards manhood, I want to do what I can to help him. I think, we in this House, want to do everything that we can towards helping the youth of our country. I think we want to do everything here in this Legislature of ours and in this Government of ours, to do whatever we can to help young people to make their lives happy and productive and successful.

I wan to give the Government credit for what they are doing and for what they have done, but whatever is done, Mr. Speaker, I cannot say it is perfect. I think there are avenues yet to be explored. I think there are things that we can do to present a challenge and to help our young people to develop into the best citizens that is possible for them to be. I should like to say in this that so far as I am concerned that giving young people more liquor is a very poor substitute for some other things that we could be doing.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Wood: — I should like to say on this, Mr. Speaker, that you may not agree with me as to what constitutes the principle of the Bill. I feel that I can vote for this Bill in principle and I expect to vote for this Bill on second reading, but when it comes to third reading, when it comes to going through Committee of the Whole, I expect to oppose the bringing in of these sections in this Act, which will make liquor more available to the young people of our province.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. E.F. Flasch (Maple Creek): — Mr. Speaker, my remarks are going to be very brief. I think that as a teacher I have had ample opportunity to work with young people throughout the years and I must say that when they reach the upper limits of the high school, I have found them on the whole to be a very responsible group.

I will agree with the Member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) that there are exceptions but generally speaking I think one can say that by the time people reach 18 years of age character traits are pretty well established. I think the Communists, or in particular, Nazi Germany in the days of Hitler, worked on the premise that if they could indoctrinate or have access to someone until they were 18 years old, after that their character traits would change very little.

I know that by reducing the age of majority to 18 we are possibly allowing young people to enter into legal contracts, business contracts and so on at an early age and there is a danger that they may accumulate debts and burden themselves for the rest of their lives. But I think there is also the possibility that they may do well in the business world. If they can get one year's jump on the gun, I think, and give a good account of themselves they should be given credit for it.

One of the things that I have to mention and I am pleased to see but I have to differ from my colleague from Swift Current (Mr. Wood), here, is that the drinking age is going to be lowered to 18. I think there is some validity in falling into line with our sister provinces. This is particularly significant in areas of close proximity to inter-provincial borders.

In our area young people have been flocking across the border on weekends and so on or at night and have done more driving, I think, than they would have otherwise. They have had in some cases to go through very difficult country under certain conditions anyway — when one is inebriated. I can see that these excursions have at times resulted in some very

serious accidents.

I think that young people — irresponsible people, will always buy liquor for younger people anyway — that those who can handle it responsibly at 18 should be given the opportunity.

I can't agree with the stern moralistic approach taken by the Member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt). I don't agree with him either when he says that we are lowering the age of majority for the sake of political expediency. I think you only need to look back eight months and see when you lowered the age from 21 to 19 whether you got the vote of the young people. I don't think we want any part of that kind of expediency.

I know that teachers in large urban areas are perhaps a little apprehensive. I have been told that they are afraid that some of their pupils will sit in the beer parlors at noon instead of attending classes. I think, there again, the question of responsibility comes into play. If pupils decide to drink instead of going to classes, I don't think they are going to accomplish much at school, and perhaps their fellow students would be better off rid of them.

I know that in rural areas — small areas — when the age of majority was reduced from 21 to 19 there was certainly no wholesale flocking of young people into bars. I think my colleague from Swift Current has already mentioned the fact that if people are old enough to be called to serve their country in times of crisis or if they are old enough to accept the responsibility to exercise the franchise, they then should certainly be old enough to accept all the responsibilities of an adult.

Let me simply say, Mr. Speaker, that I will support the Bill.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. W.A. Robbins (Saskatoon Nutana Centre): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a few brief remarks with respect to this Bill.

I must say that I support the general principle and intent of the Bill but I have some reservations with respect to certain portions of it.

I noted that the Member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) made a statement the other day that one of the problems that we have in our society is that parents are afraid of their children. I want to assure him that I am not afraid of my children and I don't want my children to be afraid of me.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Robbins: — I think this is a reciprocal arrangement which demands and requires mutual love and concern, a love which I am sure theological people will understand when we say we describe it as agape love where we have some concern basically for the other person.

I really don't feel that simply to state an age of a person really has much bearing on whether or not that

individual has obtained maturity. I know young people of 18 who are much more mature than some people of 38 or 48 or 68, and it works in the other direction as well, of course. I agree basically with the contention of the Hon. Member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. Hanson) when he made the statement that the concern of government agencies and government departments should range far beyond a mere reduction of the age of maturity to age 18. I think we require a tremendous increase in a concerned education for people to alert them to becoming analytical in their approach to life, not just with respect to use of alcohol and tobacco and things of that nature, but in terms of the economic realization in use of their own resources.

I have some reservations and some fear with respect to people who might not be mature at 18, although they may be just as immature at 28, with respect to entering into contracts on credit arrangements, the use of chargex cards and Revolving Credit through department stores.

I agree with the Member for Rosthern that liquor is a basic problem in society. I should be a very happy individual if all the people of Saskatchewan decided tomorrow to quit using alcoholic beverages. I think, however, it is not realistic to assume that that is going to happen and therefore we have to face the reality of fact.

It is my contention that one of the weaknesses in the Bill is that we use the argument, and I don't agree with my colleague from Maple Creek (Mr. Flasch) in this respect, we use the argument that because 18 is the applicable age, say in Manitoba and Alberta, therefore we must reduce our age of majority to a similar age.

I also think there is a bit of inconsistency in the Act in relation to one other factor. I think it is attempting to show that 18-year-olds, can in fact, enter into contracts, legally be married without the consent of their parents, etc., but I note that we still grant driver licences to 16-year-olds. I wonder why we are not a little more consistent in this respect and simply say the age of majority is 18 and you wait until you are 18 until you get your driver's licence.

I know we have made some comments and Members have made comments with respect to the use of alcohol. I don't say this boastfully, but I do not use alcohol. I hope I have been an example to my children in this respect. I don't want to prejudge people who do use alcohol, however I frankly feel that we should be very, very stern with respect to the use of alcohol and the use of an automobile immediately thereafter.

This is where alcohol in my opinion takes the cake as the gay deceiver. A fellow takes a drink — at least I am told as I haven't experienced this — and he feels like a new man and then the new man has to have a drink. The first thing you know he is inebriated. I have had some severe problems on two occasions on the highway when I had to get my car off the highway rather quickly because of an individual who drove straight at me and in both cases the individual was inebriated. In fact in one case the individual definitely did not know that he was even in a car.

I think that I have some very severe reservations in my mind in relation to 18-year-olds being able to enter beer

parlors. And, therefore, in terms of the basic principle of the Bill I support it, but, on that particular portion of the Bill in Committee of the Whole, I will oppose it.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. R. Romanow (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I want to say at the outset and I do not want this to be misconstrued, that the comments made by those Members who took part in the debate, no matter what the particular point of view or particular argument advanced, in my respectful and humble view are very worthwhile observations and they are honest and legitimate points of difference. I should like to deal with them in a minute.

Before I do, however, I should like to make one reference with respect to the comments made by the Member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) about the Attorney General tabling this Bill. The implication was to the effect all the while knowing that the interim report of the Committee was going to recommend 18, that there was a government committee, etc. and he continued on in this vein.

May I say to the Members of this House and with respect to the Member from Rosthern, that argument is a sheer and utter piece of nonsense. The fact of the matter is that this blue document which has been tabled is, as the headline says on the outside, and Interim Report of the Special Committee on the Review of Liquor Laws. Interim, Mr. Speaker, as opposed to a final report. In fact on page 8 the members of the committee say that the recommendations that follow are expected to be only a part of the final report.

The Member from Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) says that this is a Government report on alcohol. That was a comment he made a few minutes ago in second reading of this Bill. It is not a Government report. On page 6 it is stated very clearly, Mr. Speaker, that this committee is a result of a resolution constituting a Special Committee of the Legislature to conduct an inquiry. It's the report of the Special Committee of the Legislature, not a report of the Attorney General or a report of the Government. The important thing here is that it is an interim report. It may or may not contain these recommendations in the final report. We won't know until the final report comes in whether it contains the recommendation of age 18 or whether it contains the recommendations of the voluntary use of the identification card.

I regret very much that the Member from Rosthern saw fit to misinterpret the report in this light. I feel that his legitimate point of view was one that I know he has consistently held and for which I personally respect him for holding. But I do not respect him when he misrepresents the position of this blue interim report and the position of the Government in tabling the Bill. If he honestly believes it I can tell him he is totally mistaken in that regard.

Now the Member the day before when he spoke on the matter said that this Bill is being brought in for political advantage. That may or may not be so depending on your point of view. I personally feel that in terms of sheer politics, if we define as politics the garnering of votes for one political point of view or one posture as opposed to another, this Bill has as many

bad things going for it politically as it has good things going for it. It is no secret there is a substantial body of our people who adhere to the views expressed by the Member from Rosthern and to the qualified views expressed by the Member for Swift Current (Mr. Wood) and the Member from Saskatoon. That has a bad political effect. I am not so sure that it is good politics to saddle 18-year-olds with all of the legal liabilities that they will soon find themselves encumbered and at law responsible for. I say to the Member from Rosthern and those who would suggest that this Bill is being brought in for political advantage that is a legitimate point of view but I query whether or not it is an accurate point of view.

The third point made by the Member from Rosthern and I submit I am not misrepresenting his argument, that to me the Member interpreted this Bill and does interpret this Bill as a Bill in which the principle is to lower the drinking age to 18. I say to the Member from Rosthern, the Bill will do that among many other provisions. I say to the Member from Rosthern and to the people of Saskatchewan that out of the some 50 sections which are contained in this Bill referring to numerous Acts as diverse as Land Titles Office to Lunacy Act, of all these are various provisions, my count says there are only two or three, I haven't an exact count, that relate to the question of liquor. I say when I introduced the Bill and I say when I close the second reading that I hope that no Member or any person of society views this Bill as principally the reduction of the drinking age. That is not the principle of the Bill. The principle of the Bill is to lower the age of majority in order to allow the young people to have the rights and privileges of majority of which one is the question of alcohol. It is wrong in my respectful opinion no matter what your views are, whether they are right or wrong on drinking, it is wrong to say to the people of Saskatchewan that this Bill is a drinking Bill. It is not a drinking Bill.

The Member from Rosthern says that alcohol is our number one problem. He said this the other day. To that I agree. I think that alcohol is the number one problem above the problem of drugs even according to the statistics and the medical people. Then the Member suggests that the way to deal with this problem, as I interpreted his remarks, was to implement a ban on liquor. History has shown that any laws which seek to outlaw or ban or in effect restrict very seriously that which is in common access, have proven to be basically unsuccessful in curbing the evils of society. To my point of view the problem is not one of banning or restriction. The problem primarily was and is and likely will continue to be, a major problem of education; education, Mr. Speaker, and Members of this House, about the proper use of alcohol and a proper respect for alcohol. I for one do not believe that anything can basically be attained by hiding and keeping secret the provisions that relate to drinking. On the contrary, I will be the first one to admit to the Member from Rosthern that perhaps the NDP Government of Saskatchewan, in the nine months we have been in office, has not done enough on the education aspects. To that extent that the Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek) and others in the Government are putting more money in the budget on education, let's hope that the job can be done in a very meaningful way and will be continued by successive governments. The point that I am making here, Mr. Speaker, is that in my view to interpret this Bill as a liquor Bill and then to agree that the problem can best be met by outlawing liquor it is wrong.

May I make one other comment. It is a comment that has been made by many, many people in our society, that there are those who would argue that we ought to fear youth as some Members opposite do. I say that a society that fears its young people is a sick society. Any statements with respect to that matter in my respectful opinion are statements which are not designed to serve the best interests of society. As honestly as those opinions may be held, they are not designed in the best interests of assimilating the youth and the ideas of youth in the main stream of our culture.

As I said at the outset, Mr. Speaker, I want to commend all the Members who took part in this debate no matter what their position was. I have dealt at length with the Member from Rosthern. May I say that I think the speeches from Gravelbourg (Mr. Gross) and Assiniboia (Mr. Lange) were very good speeches from two very young men who have been elected to this highly responsible position of this sitting Assembly. Many of the views contained by the Members from Assiniboia or Gravelbourg or any young or old person, I may not agree with. The fact of the matter is that they have demonstrated their competency and their ability and that they have the respect of the communities. I think that they have acted in this House responsibly in bringing forward another point in favor of the youth and that is what this Bill seeks to do.

I also want to comment, Mr. Speaker, on the comments by my colleagues from Shaunavon, Swift Current, Elrose, Saskatoon Nutana, who in various degrees have disagreed or agreed with the different sections of the Bill, have said in effect that this Bill is a Bill that stands for the confidence in and for our young people. If they have reservations about it and they seek to improve the Bill in principle in Committee of the Whole, for that I commend them. To that I can say the Government will seriously look at suggestions for improvement of this Bill as it will in any other Bill before this House. But the important thing is, Mr. Speaker, that they have realized what the main principle of the Bill is. And the main principle of this Bill, Mr. Speaker, in addition to lowering the age of majority to 18, I say is to give a vote of confidence in the young people of our province. With that position, Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members and the people of the Province of Saskatchewan to wholeheartedly agree.

It gives me a great deal of pleasure to move second reading of this Bill.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. D. Boldt (Rosthern): — Would the Hon. Member before he sits down permit a question. If the report had suggested in Items 1, 2 and 3 that the lowering of the age to 18, or keeping the age at 19 for entering liquor outlets and purchasing of liquor, would the Government then have gone along with this Bill or would they have gone on the recommendations of this report?

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, to my view the basis of the Bill is not liquor and 18. I would have still urged the Government in Cabinet and in caucus to have come in with this Act, as I did, because the first time I saw the interim report in any detail was when it was tabled yesterday. I should have still

recommended the lowering of the age to 18 as a responsible Minister of Cabinet. The principle of the Bill has nothing to do with liquor it has to do with lowering the age of majority.

Mr. Boldt: — It had no function whatsoever.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Romanow that Bill No. 14 — **An Act to amend The Fair Accommodation Practices Act** be now read a second time.

Mr. J.G. Lane (Lumsden): — Mr. Speaker, when we discussed the legislation last night about the Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission, the Opposition proposed an amendment to in effect make the question of age one of the criteria in determining what constitutes discrimination. As I stated last night it was the intention of the Opposition to propose amendments in that regard. This particular Bill, The Fair Accommodation Practices Act, is complementary legislation to The Human Rights Commission legislation. We are supporting that legislation in principle, we will be supporting this legislation in principle with the concomitant amendment.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Romanow that Bill No. 15 — **An Act to amend The Fair Employment Practices Act** be now read a second time.

Mr. Lane: — Mr. Speaker, again the same principle will apply in the question of Fair Employment Practices and this in reality is where most of the problems will come in. In light of the Government's position today it may be an academic question whether there are even going to be jobs for these people. However, we do intend to make some other consequential amendments setting out in particular detail what an employer or a person acting on his behalf can or cannot do. We intend to bring in amendments which prohibit an employer from using an employment agency that discriminates because of age. We intend to propose an amendment that trade unions shall not exclude any person from full membership because of age and no employer or trade union shall discharge anyone for that particular reason. These amendments as I say are consequential. We believe that the question of age discrimination is an increasingly important one. We feel it should be dealt with at this time. Again, the Opposition supports this legislation in principle.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Romanow that Bill No. 16 — **An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Bill of Rights Act** be now read a second time.

Mr. Lane: — Again the same considerations apply, Mr. Speaker. We will be proposing an amendment to prohibit discrimination on account of age but we support the legislation in principle.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. MacMurchy that Bill No. 1 — **An Act to establish the Department of Continuing Education** be now read a second time.

Mr. E.L. Cowley (Biggar): — Mr. Speaker, I don't propose to spend a lot of time in concluding the remarks which I had begun the other day. When I adjourned this debate I had suggested that the new Department of Continuing Education would enable a more co-ordinated approach to continuing education in this Province. I had expressed my concern that this aspect of education was, and had been, overshadowed in the present Department of Education by the K to 12 operation. I had also pointed out the difficulty this Government has had because of the lack of planning with respect to respective roles of the two university campuses. The debate over their roles is not restricted to this Legislature as is evidence by the continuing debate which goes on in both campuses, both amongst the students and the faculty. Mr. Speaker, it is extremely unfortunate I believe that the previous Government did not move forward more in planning, nor carry out more consultations with the university authorities, faculty and students.

Mr. Speaker, in speaking in support of the principle of the new Department, I believe it is necessary to review some of the tasks which the new Department will face. I think once we look at these they in themselves will serve to justify the creation of this Department. The biggest task that will face the Department is the development of community colleges and this will necessitate a very close liaison between the Colleges, the University and the Institutes of Applied Arts and Sciences. The new Department will be responsible for the necessary liaison. Some of the items to be negotiated are the recognition of credits obtained at one institution by the other; the method of arranging for one institution to offer classes in another and the question of the staff which will offer them and how the staff are to be retained. Because our concept of a community college is radically different from that of community colleges now in Canada, the Department will have a difficult role to play. It will have to foster the community development which we wish to build in and at the same time it will have to co-ordinate this unique type of community college with other existing institutions in Saskatchewan.

We do not envisage at this time that the community college will have entrance requirements. It will be an open school. In order that it can be an open school and yet offer courses for university credit, it is likely that courses and instructors will be contracted from the university. An added benefit from this method will be that it will diminish somewhat the pressure from staff and administration for junior college or university status. There will be a similar type of operation in the technical field, although here it is more likely that the staff will come from the high schools. Also more complex courses may need to be contracted from the Institutes. It is quite possible that some of these will require mobile facilities.

Mr. Speaker, there is a further reason why the new Department is a step in the right direction. For much too long the kindergarten to grade twelve operation in this Province has been built around courses which have been designed to satisfy the requirements for university entrance. When one

considers the relatively small percentage of students from amongst the total student body, the irrationality of this is apparent. The purpose of our public schools should be to develop the individual, not necessarily to prepare him for university. This separation of the two levels of education may in one small way allow for a more unique approach to public education in this Province. This is not to say that there will not be, nor need to be, continuing co-operation between the two Departments.

Mr. Speaker, for the reasons which I have outlined I will support the Bill.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. C.P. MacDonald (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, I just have a few comments to make on this Bill. First of all I want to warn the Government that I am not sure it is a good idea to lump together higher education in the Province of Saskatchewan and separate it from elementary and public or secondary education. The Province of Ontario has had a very unfortunate experience in the development of community colleges because they have been lumped together with the university and the university has had too much domination and control of curriculum development, and as a result what originally was designed in a community college to look after community needs and community interests, there is now the major race in Ontario to develop into a university. Small colleges where the curriculum was dominated by the university academic requirements in the Province of Ontario is finding that these are demanding to be made fully recognized universities and as a result there is a fantastic cost escalation in this area of continuing education.

I should also like to point out that certainly one of the very important facets of education is the need and the requirement to have it from the beginning until the end. Or from the time that a child first starts to school until the end with a co-ordinated approach. To separate and divide new higher education outside of the secondary level into a new branch and a new Department which will be interested in its own affairs and its own interests has certainly many dangers which the Government must be prepared to look at. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, in some ways this doesn't really make sense.

I also want to say that as far as the new community college concept is concerned, when we were investigating the possibilities of community colleges we were very conscious of the problems of duplication, not only in courses and curriculum, but also in buildings and capital costs. And I notice that the Government has maintained that at this time they are not intending to get into a new capital program and I hope that this is correct. Saskatchewan has probably the best comprehensive high schools and some of the best educational plant in various urban centres in Saskatchewan of any province in Canada.

A real conscious need in Saskatchewan in all education circles is proper utilization of that education plant in those various communities. They are very expensive, it's probably in all probability the most expensive community project or the most expensive building in that area, in many cases they are only being used on a limited time basis and certainly there is an already golden opportunity for the Government to use the existing plant to expand the utilization of that plant so there will

be no duplication, not only in facilities but also in costs.

I would certainly urge, also, that a very conscious recognition of the fact that community colleges must be orientated towards the areas of Saskatchewan in which they are located. Certainly there is a need for agriculture. Certainly there is a need for forestry and I would hope, for example, that in the northern part of the province that the community college emphasize and concentrate on those areas which would most serve that area of the province.

Other than that, Mr. Speaker, the concept in itself because of the fact I am concerned about the division of education into two sections in Saskatchewan, I am concerned about the Bill, but I think in overall, the overall philosophy of establishing this particular Department to expand the concept of community colleges is a good one.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. D.L. Faris (Arm River): — Mr. Speaker, on this Bill I wish particularly to direct my remarks towards the system of community colleges.

The development of community colleges present a great challenge to Saskatchewan. It presents a great challenge because as it has been pointed out by the Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) in every other province in Canada, Ontario, Alberta, British Columbia, where people have attempted to build a system of community colleges they have, in a large degree, failed. They started off with what they called community colleges. These were soon seen to develop into junior colleges and then grow into universities. It seems almost to be a law of bureaucratic growth that in the heart of every community college president there lies the secret yearning to be the head of a great university.

It will not be an easy task to see that our community colleges are so structured as to insure that they really do serve the needs of the community. I am pleased to see that right at the heart of our Saskatchewan plans there is a commitment to a community development approach. That is, there is a commitment to start with the expressed needs of the community. Having started with these express needs there is a further commitment to re-examine continually the opportunities for learning that are being offered in view of the changing needs. In this regard I am pleased to see that there is the intention to see that the existing facilities are fully utilized. We have in Saskatchewan facilities adequate to meet most of our educational needs. With the imaginative use of presently existing facilities with the imaginative use of mobile facilities, with the imaginative use of modern techniques, such as video taping of core lectures, there should be no need for costly capital projects.

Mr. Speaker, there is one final reason why I am enthusiastic about community colleges. It is because they are an exciting attempt to bring more and more advanced learning opportunities to the people where they are.

There exists in our society a very real problem in regard to access to educational opportunities. I refer to an article in the Vancouver Sun of February 16, entitled "Education of well-to-do subsidized by have nots." It reports that a study of students in universities and community colleges in Ontario

indicated that a greater proportion of children from higher income families attended university than do those from low income homes. And they also tended to choose the costlier courses, such as medicine and law. Quoting from the article it said:

The study said that 34 per cent of students in universities and community colleges are from families earning \$10,000 or more, but that income group pays only 28 per cent of education costs. The \$7,000 to \$9,000 income group has 24 per cent of the students and pays 22 per cent of the cost. Contributing more than they get back are families in the \$5,000 to \$7,000 group with 12 per cent of the students and 16 per cent of the cost share.

This report went on to say that almost 50 per cent of the students in law courses are from the upper income groups which pay only 29 per cent of the cost. More than 40 per cent of those in medicine are from the upper income groups. I believe that in seeing that we have real equality of opportunity in regard to education, the community college system in Saskatchewan can do a great deal to overcome this.

In concluding I'd like to quote from the words of the chairman of the Advisory Committee on Community Colleges. He has said:

That no other system has attempted to relate so closely to the community as the one we will be developing here. No other system has a commitment to community development and community services which this system will have. No college system in Canada is committed to serve the rural needs in a way this system will be. No previous community college system in Canada has a commitment to assist the informal learning system as ours will have. We are looking at exciting models and unique principles in the development of these community colleges. Saskatchewan has a long and honorable history in the development of adult education. We are building upon this foundation. If community colleges cannot be truly community oriented in Saskatchewan they probably cannot be community oriented in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to support this motion.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. H.H. Rolfes (Saskatoon Nutana South): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to participate in this debate, much of what I wanted to say has already been said, therefore, my remarks will be rather brief.

I should like to say from the outset, Mr. Speaker, that I am very pleased that this particular Bill which is being presented to the House will follow the philosophy that this Government has accepted or adopted and that is to give back to the people in the various communities the autonomy that they once had.

When we established this Bill, or discussed this Bill, I think it was uppermost in our minds that we guarantee that there be local autonomy. That we, not here in Regina decide what the needs of the community be, but that the community, the people

in the community tell us what the needs are. And these needs of the community would become the curriculum of the community college. These various communities would become the campuses. I am very pleased, Mr. Speaker, that the emphasis is not on facilities, is not on establishing new campuses and on this I certainly agree with the Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald). We don't want what Alberta has, we don't want what Ontario has and we certainly don't want to hang a shingle on every technical institute or comprehensive high school and call them community colleges. This is not what we want. I think in Saskatchewan we are going to be developing something very unique. I don't think it exists really anywhere else. At least if it goes along the lines we are thinking of right now.

Mr. Boldt: — Do you know what they want?

Mr. Rolfes: — No, I really don't know what the community wants, Mr. Boldt, or excuse me, Mr. Member for Rosthern. But the people, I think should decide. That, I think, is the concept that several Members in this House simply can't understand as to why we place so much faith in the people back in the community.

Now I think in so many Bills, Mr. Speaker, that have been presented and certainly this one is no exception, we have put back, or we have placed more faith in the people at the community level. And this, I think, has long been overdue. Let me say that I feel that the establishment of community colleges will fill the gap between high schools and technical schools and between technical schools and university.

In my dealings with young people, especially in my position as a guidance counsellor in a high school, I find a real lack of opportunity for students who do not want to go to technical schools, for students who do not want to go to universities, but students who want to continue their education. And I am very pleased to say that this particular philosophy of our community schools fits in very nicely with the definition of education that I gave the other day — a learning process right from birth until death. That people, regardless of whether they are 50 years of age, or whether they are 16 or 17 years of age, people want to have the learning process continued, and I think that our concept of community colleges will do that. It will make money available to people who want to have this type of education.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I agree with my colleagues, I agree with the Member opposite, the Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) when they say the community colleges must fulfil the needs as recognized by the people in the community.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that the Minister announced that a committee will be going around this Province speaking to people, listening to people, finding out what the people really want and I hope that this Government give first priority to our rural communities. Many of our urban communities have a fair number of opportunities, and while I am speaking on urban communities and since it was brought into this particular debate, let me say that I for one am not very happy with the way comprehensive high schools were established in this Province. I am not condemning any particular person because I don't know who was really responsible for them, but in many, many instances these comprehensive high schools are

nothing but white elephants. They are not being used to maximum and I think that there is a genuine opportunity now with the establishment of community colleges where we can make more use of them.

Mr. Speaker, I think community colleges will serve the needs of the people as we intend that they should and will fulfil these needs. We must permit the people at the local level to determine what these needs are and make the finances available to fulfil them, if community colleges will do that. I will be very pleased to support this Bill.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Messer that Bill No. 34 — **An Act to amend The Diseases of Animals Act, 1966** be now read a second time.

Mr. J.D. McIsaac (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, I have a few comments on this particular piece of legislation. This is an Act to amend an Act that was brought into the House in 1966 providing, among other things, for the Provincial Government to make regulations regarding the inspection of livestock in stockyards and public suctions throughout the Province.

I must say that I for one was somewhat disappointed that while as the former Government we did not move earlier on the implementation of some of the principles of this Bill, including the one as far as livestock inspection is concerned.

But late year, however, Mr. Speaker, the former Government did initiate a policy of inspection of livestock at stockyards in the Province and that policy has been accepted by a small number of the stockyards in the Province so far this year. Now the terms of that policy are briefly as follows: That the operator of the market, or the stockyard facility, pay 50 per cent of the cost of inspection be paid for by the Province of from the provincial coffers.

Here, Mr. Speaker, we have an Act before us setting out in Section 3, and I will read the Section:

The inspection of animals exposed for sale in stockyards or other public places, the fees that shall be payable for inspection and the manner of collection by the Minister of such fees.

And I can only conclude from reading this Section — it is one that permits the Government to make regulations in this respect — I can only conclude here, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister must intend to levy a per head charge, if you like, on the cattle and the hogs going through the various markets if indeed they do move to make livestock inspection compulsory, as I believe the Minister has announced.

Mr. Speaker, this is one more example of the kind of policy we have seen from this Government with respect to agriculture. Some of us will remember, all of us here I am sure, the Premier in the Throne Speech, outside of the House and on

other occasions, emphasizing the importance that was going to be attached to agricultural policy. And here is one, something like the one we debated yesterday in this House, where the thrust is not coming from the Government at all but it is coming indeed from the livestock producer. I know of no other Canadian province, Mr. Speaker, where inspection policies, veterinary inspection of stockyards are in force, where the levy is tacked on to the livestock seller and the livestock owner. I am sure that stockmen would have no objection to perhaps paying a small part of the cost one way or another, but I suggest to you, Sir, this is a measure and this is a move of this Government that is not going to be accepted by the livestock men in general. It is a move, Mr. Speaker, that is not going to help the acceptability of veterinary inspection in stockyards and it is one I would certainly ask the Minister to reconsider before he implements it if the Government sees fit. In this I agree with them, there should be compulsory inspection in stockyards in the province. The province out of the Department of Agriculture grants should put up the money to cover the costs of that inspection. I suggest that the Minister should give consideration to the Government paying at least 75 per cent if not all of the cost of inspection. I ask the Minister not to use this particular section that we are passing in this Bill because it will be the first time and the only Canadian province where the stockmen are asked to support the inspection that the Government is demanding of them. Surely it is a small service, to an industry that has in the last two or three years particularly, Mr. Speaker, been the one bright light in the agricultural economy and the agricultural sector of the province.

Again in closing I ask the Minister to reconsider the implementation of any proposed policy he may have in this regard to levy per head fees with respect to making payment for veterinary inspection of the animals of the various stockyards of the province. One other small point in passing, Mr. Speaker, there may well be a number of yards in the province if the Minister intends to implement compulsory inspection where there may be some difficulty in securing veterinarians to handle the job. I am sure I can speak for the Member for Moose Jaw North (Mr. MacDonald) and indeed other colleagues in the profession that in this respect if he comes and his officials come to the Veterinary Association that every effort will be made to try and make arrangements to cover some of these yards where there is no resident veterinarian. Hopefully the time will come in a year or two when more veterinarians will graduate from the Western School of Veterinary Medicine, not only graduate but stay in practice in the province to do some of this work, and other work that is there for them.

Mr. Speaker, I will oppose the Bill on the grounds that I do not believe the stockmen should be called upon to pay for this service.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. J.R. Kowalchuk (Melville): — Mr. Speaker, I want to make a number of comments regarding this Bill, and my own opinion as a farmer is I think this is a good Bill.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Kowalchuk: — I think it is a good agricultural Bill, Mr. Speaker. I think that in answer to the Member for Wilkie when he says that the cost of this inspection should be borne by the Government, and I am sure the Government is going to pick up a great deal of that cost anyway. I think it is to the benefit of the producer to know that he is selling a good clean animal or animals on the auction mart, it is to his advantage. The fact, Mr. Speaker, that the Bill seems fairly simple and easily understood does not subtract from the fact that, as a farmer, I certainly appreciate the Minister of Agriculture's brief and encompassing explanation in introducing this Bill the other day. It is necessary that all people understand the implications of this Bill. I think the 15 or 20 minutes that he took up the other day were indeed worthwhile. I just can't help but marvel at the way some of the Opposition speakers to your left react and I recall very clearly the other day when the Member for Moose Jaw North (Mr. MacDonald) got up and put his foot in his mouth. They continually keep putting their mouth on their foot, or should I put it another way, putting their foot in their mouth. This is another good reason for this Bill, Mr. Speaker.

Veterinary inspectors provided by this Bill would protect the dreaded foot and mouth diseases. I think it is really important to have these inspections. The other day, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Moose Jaw North stated that the Minister of Agriculture talked for a great length of time, something like half an hour, that is what they said, where he thought that the Minister of Agriculture could have covered the simple Bill adequately in one minute. That's what he said. Now these were his words, this is what the Hon. Member said, and the, Mr. Speaker, he went on for five minutes rebutting the Minister's remarks. Not having covered it to his satisfaction he adjourned it, and I thought he would be back here today for another 10 or 15 minutes to talk on it.

It is quite obvious, Mr. Speaker, that the Opposition didn't want to hear the concise and to the point explanation offered by our Minister of Agriculture the other day. But on the other hand, they want a great deal of time to rebut some of these one minute Bills, Mr. Speaker. I, for one, appreciated a clear well delivered explanation by the Minister. I appreciated it very much. In fact that is his duty to do that, not skim over as we were accustomed in the last four years on many Bills introduced by the Liberals, Mr. Speaker.

The Member for Moose Jaw stated that the problem of stock inspection was well covered by former legislation and this new Bill adds nothing practical or needed to alleviate the problems of disease carrying feeder animals when sold at the market. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that the former Disease of Animals Act brought in by the Liberals in 1971, being voluntary, made it almost of no use at all. To protect the greatly expanding cattle and hog industry complete health inspection coverage of all sales points must be mandatory, not voluntary if real protection is to be the result. Just one case of the transfer of the disease by one head of cattle can and has in the past number of years contaminated and diseased whole herds of disease free stock. We understand that 50 per cent of the administration cost is going to be borne by the Government, I think that's fair and the farmer will be contributing his share.

This Bill safeguards buyers of feeder stock. It does not mean that it is absolutely foolproof but it will provide the

maximum of guarantee that most of the buyers will feel quite safe in buying feeder stock. In today's Act when considering the heavy feeder market this maximum protection is a must and this Bill gives clear evidence of such a protection. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that many Members of this Legislature have had the experience of visiting stockyards and auction marts and have actually seen sickly cattle marketed and therefore seen the need for this kind of protection. This Bill will deter people from bringing in sick stock to auction markets. There has been ample evidence even this last year that diseased stock has been brought into auction markets. I personally know of such diseases being brought in and transferred to other healthy herds by people who have brought them.

Mr. Speaker, the compulsory feature should have been brought in at the time that the Liberal Government made available the cattle loan program. People borrowing \$6,000 from a government loan program should have received that extra protection since many of them have had to compete on the open market to buy this stock. Mr. Speaker, quite a few found that they indeed had purchased disease contaminated stock and transferred this disease to their clean herds. Some lost a lot of money, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Speaker, is to be congratulated for bringing in this Disease of Animals Act; a Bill to protect not only the farmer's cattle industry, but to protect the equity of the millions of dollars that our Provincial Government has invested in the cattle business. I think this is an excellent Bill and deserves accurate and lengthy explanations and I certainly shall support it.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. T.M. Weatherald (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, I intend to be very brief on this Bill. It does seem to me though in listening to the remarks of the last speaker that he missed at least two major points in this Bill. The first one simply being that this is not going to stop any person bringing a diseased animal or sick animal or an animal that is in poor health of any kind to the stockyards, because they will not even see it as far as inspection is concerned once it is in the yards. For him to suggest that this is going to prevent sick animals being brought to the yards I think is completely wrong, as I understand the Act.

One point I should like to have the Minister tell us in closing the debate is what the charge will be that will be levied against farmers that market their animals through the livestock yards. My last comment is simply that as a farmer who does buy cattle in the yards I can assure the Minister that there will be many, many animals that are not healthy and will still pass through the yards undetected. This will be because there are many animals that come to the yards that have been bloated at home on the farm, they are put back in a little better condition, taken to the yards in the afternoon and sold and no veterinarian will ever detect this. There are many other diseases which will pass through and the old adage that has existed in the livestock business for a long time rightly or wrongly that the buyer should beware will still prevail regardless of all the protection we have in the world, because on some days there are several hundreds and indeed thousands of cattle. At least one of the yards in my area have up to 2,000 to 3,000 head sometimes in the fall, and to think that an adequate inspection by one veterinarian on 2,000 or 3,000 head of cattle in one day is going

to take place, I think is expecting far more than one individual will be able to do. I do hope the Minister will tell us approximately what the cost to the producer will be of this inspection.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. D.W. Cody (Watrous): — Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this Bill. In the constituency of Watrous we have a large number of hogs as you well know, possibly one of the heaviest concentration of any part of the Province of Saskatchewan. I was quite amused at some of the comments made by the Member from Cannington. I certainly do feel that there is little question that livestock coming into the market and inspected certainly will be in a better condition when they go out and that is one of the things we are trying to protect by this Bill. It isn't only a matter of a partial program, the program will be then complete.

Mr. Speaker, the hog industry, of course, has as we all know two distinct areas, that is, the farrow to finish operation and the weanling operation. The farrow to finish business, of course, is not greatly affected by auction markets as they usually have hogs going directly to an area where there is killing. This area of course will be inspected as well. However, I am mainly concerned about the areas of auction markets where there is trading going on between farmers.

It is a considerably different operation when we look at the weanling business. Particularly is this so in the last several years when we see a great fluctuation in our prices of weanlings and hogs, we note far more weanlings coming into the auction market for resale. The weanling operator has to rely to some degree then or to a large degree upon auction market selling.

We, of course, see a great problem in auction markets with selling weanlings and that problem, of course, I speak of is that of disease as has been pointed out. Mr. Speaker, I know of many, many farmers particularly in the area of Watrous and Humboldt who have purchased weanling hogs at auction markets and found themselves in great difficulty after making this purchase. They have taken a load of 30 or 40 hogs home only to find that several days later about half the hogs are diseased to such an extent that not even a good qualified veterinarian like we have in the Hon. Member from Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac) can bring them around to anything. Mr. Speaker, just two weeks ago I noted in the Humboldt Journal a case presently before the courts because of disease in an animal. I don't know the full ramifications of the case, however, there is little doubt that if the auction mart had been subject to this Bill there would have been no court case.

The two farmers whom I am sure have strong feelings in their respective cases are caught in the bind of legal action. Mr. Speaker, as we all know legal action is very expensive. I am confident the cost of this court case to these two farmers will be far in excess of any inspection fee they would have paid for livestock over many, many years of paying an inspection fee provided by this Bill.

Mr. Speaker, it certainly would have made for better relations between the farmers of the area and also better relations between the farmers and the auction mart owner. Mr. Speaker, with those few words I feel that the amendment is a

good one and I feel that a big advance by this Bill in freeing the livestock industry of disease. I certainly and wholeheartedly support this Bill.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. J.R. Messer (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat dismayed and disappointed that especially the Member for Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac) has chosen to oppose the amendments to The Disease of Animal Act. I listened very carefully to the brief remarks that he made pertaining to it and he brought to light what I think we all know which is that the previous Act as it now stands is one that is voluntary and is shared 50 per cent by the Provincial Government and 50 per cent by the auction market involved. The problem with this kind of legislation, I think, is evident in that there are only two auction markets in the Province which are now taking advantage of this voluntary legislation. Therefore, I think it justifies the whole reasoning for this legislation, that is that throughout the Province of Saskatchewan we should try and provide disease free animals when they were sold in the ring of any auction market.

I listened carefully to the Member from Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) in regard to the remarks where he assumed that it would be impossible for the veterinarian or the veterinarians to check all animals. I remind him that where sales are large enough we have no reason to think that it should be limited to one veterinarian — that we will in fact miss some animals that go through but I am certain that the endeavors of the veterinarians will be to detect all diseased or sick animals before they get into the auction market. I agree with him that we still have to remember the adage that the buyer had better beware when he purchases. I want to remind him that it is better to light one candle than to curse the darkness forever. I think this is the kind of attempt that we are trying to make now. Certainly there are going to be animals that will get through the auction market that are diseased and are sick, but the fact that the compulsory aspect of the legislation will apply to all auction markets will be a barrier to those people who have diseased and/or sick animals to take them to the auction mart because they will, in fact, be detected and I think it will be common public knowledge that they are trying to sell an animal that should not have been sold in that auction market. This alone acts as a preventive and an advantage to the livestock producer in the Province of Saskatchewan.

I want to say further in regard to the Member for Wilkie's remarks where he made mention that the Government consider a cost-sharing of 75 per cent Government, 25 per cent auction market and/or farmer or livestock man selling animals through the ring. He said that this could be the least that we could offer to do and that it would only be a small service to the livestock industry. I fail to follow his logic here because it seems to me it was only yesterday, perhaps it was the day before, that we were debating the cattle check-off. If I can recall with any degree of accuracy he was saying that the cattlemen want to pay their own way. They want to pay their own way and they want to have members on the cattle check-off board that can make the decisions in regard to the money that is collected so that they could administer it to the best interest of the cattle industry in the Province of Saskatchewan.

I don't argue that, but I wish they would make up their minds as to whether they want the cattle industry to pay their own way or do they want the Government to pay the way of the cattle industry. There is a limit to what the livestock industry and the people that are involved in that industry can do in the Province of Saskatchewan to increase the potential expansion and potential increase of income from that industry.

Paying for compulsory check-offs at livestock markets is not one of those areas that they cannot participate in. With the greatest of ease, regulations and legislation can be passed so that they can, in fact, pay for that auction market inspection. And I think that is the way it should be so that the Government can get into areas of assistance to the livestock industry in this province, areas that I have mentioned in the past such as the encouragement of secondary industries in regard to not only the livestock industry but the total agricultural industry in the province, areas where we can further give incentives for further diversification.

Mr. Speaker: — I must remind the Minister that he cannot bring in new material. He can only answer the criticism of the Member who has been on this Bill.

Mr. Messer: — I appreciate your ruling, Mr. Speaker, and all I am simply trying to say is that by passing legislation that provides for compulsory livestock inspection and passing on either all the costs or a percentage of the costs to the people that are involved, gives the Government a much better opportunity to use the moneys that would have normally paid for that auction market check-off to be applied in areas where the livestock producer as an individual or an organization is limited in seeking the kinds of rewards that it would provide for him.

Having said those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I urge the Members on the left to reconsider their opposition to this Bill and support it in second reading so we can continue to give the kind of assistance to the livestock industry in the Province of Saskatchewan that we feel is deserving of them.

Mr. McIsaac: — Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Minister a question before he takes his seat? Is it the Minister's intention to bring in a levy per head as is spelled out in the Act?

Mr. Messer: — Mr. Speaker, I believe it does not clearly spell out in the Act how the costs of inspection may be transferred to the auction market be it in total or be it only a percentage of the cost and/or whether it will be levied directly on the seller of the animals in that market. I should want, as the legislation points out, it to be done by regulation. I hope to be able to have discussions with the auction market owners to work out a policy that I think will be most acceptable to all and one that will be versatile enough and simple enough that it will not create administrative problems. At this time, we have not really I think pursued the discussion with the auction market owners to the extent that I should have liked. In fact, Mr. Speaker, if I can include this in the answer to the question, I should like to make a proposal to the private auction market owners in the Province of Saskatchewan that they consider setting up an organization that can speak for them in

regard to problems such as this and give us recommendations as to how we may best carry it out. If they see fit to do that that may be the best way of formulating some sort of policy to pay for the costs and inspection.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Romanow that Bill No. 27 — **An Act to amend The Surface Rights Acquisition and Compensation Act, 1968** be now read a second time.

Mr. A. Taylor (Kerrobert-Kindersley): — This is a Bill that I feel is of vital importance to the Kerrobert-Kindersley constituency. I was interested in the remarks of the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) when he introduced the Bill. One of the first groups I came in contact with following the election last year was farmers interested in surface rights. The Attorney General said the same thing had happened to him. It is rather nice to know that you are following in such big, although well directed, footsteps.

I'd like to refer to something the Member from Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) said in his speech because I can't agree with one of the things he said. I wasn't going to mention this, but he said that farmers had confidence in the old Surface Rights Board. He hasn't been talking to the same farmers that have been contacting me. I also think he is guilty of making a prejudgment as to what the Attorney General wants for farmers in terms of rentals. He insinuated that the main reason for this Bill was to raise the cost of rentals and give individuals owning the land more money. It seems to me that what this Government wants and all that the farmers want are fair judgments from a fair board.

Now the Bill before us is badly needed and long overdue. Many farmers have been waiting a long time for this kind of relief and assistance. I'd like too, to commend the previous administration for making a start on this by introducing The Surface Right Acquisition and Compensation Act, 1968. There is no question that this was an important step forward. It was legislation badly needed in its day. For too long the advantage has been on the side of the oil companies.

On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, and I say this very sincerely, I can't help but wonder why two of the more important recommendations made by the Friesen Commission were not acted on at that time. There may have been good reasons which I am not aware of but it is difficult to understand what they might have been. One was the recommendation regarding tortious acts and the other concerned the review clause. Now it is true that a review clause was included in the Act respecting all new leases, that is leases that would be issued after 1968 after the passage of this previous legislation. This meant that any farmers dealing with the oil companies after this date did have the opportunity of having their leases reviewed on a regular basis. This did, however, ignore the problem faced by farmers holding older leases, leases issued prior to 1968. Some of these leases in our communities and areas at least go back to the early 1950s. As you will recognize, Sir, the amounts paid in the early '50s are far below the present rates. I should point out, Mr. Speaker, that some companies have voluntarily co-operated with the farmers in this regard. A few of the oil

companies have freely entered into negotiations with the land owners and have accepted new leases containing a review clause. Other companies, however, have steadfastly refused to change the old lease. They have maintained their legal right that a deal signed in 1955 is valid today and that the farmer must abide by the terms of the old lease. Consequently, some of these companies are paying rentals for battery sites of as low as \$58.16 and for well sites of around \$150, about a third or less of what is being paid by other companies with leases which now do contain the review clause. In terms of lease acres, some of these companies are paying \$50 an acre compared to \$130 in the same community and in the same area.

It seems to me, Sir, that this is something that could easily and ought to have been rectified by the original Act in 1968. We are pleased that this Government intends to rectify this situation now. We can also note, Sir, that renegotiated leases previously not covered by provincial legislation but covered by private contracts have in this period of time increased from 50 to 80 per cent in their rental. Now, all of this has caused considerable hardship for the owners of land where the old type lease is in effect. As all Members of this House are aware, costs of production for the farmer have increased substantially and yet some of these leases, remember, were signed before 1955. Without a review clause the market value of the land decreases; it is pretty difficult to sell it if the buyer knows he is going to be stuck with these old terms. Subsequent owners, including the family are compelled to accept the terms of a lease which they had no part in drafting and which they have no hope of changing.

The Coleville oil field was one of the first to be developed in Saskatchewan. Consequently, a number of leases do date back to the early 1950s and they don't contain this review clause. It also leads to major discontent among the farmers themselves. When one may be receiving \$58 or \$50 an acre and a neighbor is receiving maybe \$150 an acre, only because the neighbor was fortunate in having the review clause included in a later contract. The further refusal by some companies to discuss or bargain in good faith has led to total frustration and indeed, Mr. Speaker, to near violence. In fact, violence almost broke out last year because of this very frustration. Farmers in the district who could receive no satisfaction from the company with which they were dealing decided that if necessary they would use force to keep company men off their property. None of us condone violence, but we have to realize that this was the result of men who felt that the situation was hopeless and there was no other way. They had tried other means and then seemed to receive no assistance or satisfaction. And the threat was in fact issued that they would use shotguns to keep the operator off the premises. Fortunately, Sir, the situation was defused and the immediate explosion avoided.

When we speak of the relationship between oil companies or operators and the owner, we should note that one company has been particularly bad in this regard. They do not even have a local land representative with the power to settle claims. Their head office which seems to keep a tight control on all activities is in another country. And their only representative with even partial authority is in another province. Frequently, farmers felt that they had come to an agreement with the representative of this company only to find that the agreement was later rejected by the company itself. In many ways I suggest

March 23, 1972

this company has acted in bad faith and has been the cause of much of the discontent experienced and felt by our farmers. This company has even stooped to engage in blackmail. Some farmers owning both old and new leases were offered an across-the-board increase of 20 per cent in rentals; which doesn't really sound too bad. But they were warned that if they dared to go to the arbitration board with the new leases, which was their right, they would receive nothing at all for the old. This at a time when other companies were paying increases of up to 100 per cent when their leases came up for review.

I suggested that the other important amendment was the one regarding tortious claims. My understanding is that this means in fairly simple terms claims for trespass and damage related to it. Up until now many farmers have faced two legal obstacles in settling such claims. One was the simple difficulty of the legal process itself and the other was the fact that the operator of the wells would attempt to avoid responsibility by placing the blame on a contractor or a trucker or some other responsible party, or the difficulty of the owner in tracing the actual operator and proving responsibility. Under the amendments now proposed, the operator himself would be responsible, as he ought to be, for the acts performed by any of his agents or representatives. I think it's also important that the arbitration board should have the authority to deal with such claims and that it should not be necessary for them to go to court. In the first place the arbitration board does have greater understanding of the problems than might otherwise be the case in court. They are dealing with this sort of situation on a regular basis. They understand it both from the point of view of the oil company, I submit, and from the farmers. In many cases it was the board that gave the company the original right to enter the land. In the second place there is easier access to this board for the farmers themselves. The legal steps are not as complicated. The farmers feel that here they can represent themselves.

It should be remembered that grain loss or soil damage from trucks and equipment may affect the crop yield not this year but for a number of years to come. It is not necessarily just a one time occurrence or event.

I recognize that there are some who do not have much sympathy for the amendments being proposed. There are those who have claimed that the farmers should have been tougher negotiators in the first place. They should have made sure that the original leases were good and that maybe they ought to have included a review clause. Well, the farmers know that now! But hindsight is always easier than foresight. Remember that the farmers, in our area at least, had no precedent to go by. It was an entirely new venture. Maybe they could be faulted for being too trusting, for accepting the word of a land man who assured them it was a fair deal. Because of this they did sign some pretty tough and unfair documents. I'd like to quote from the writing of one farmer who was involved in this type of thing. This is what he says:

On July 3, 1952 a land man visited us with a lease to sign as they were going to drill a test hole in our quarter section. With this lease read to us and a cheque for \$275 with the understanding that there could be no oil or other wells that the contents of this lease "now in hand, well and truly paid to me by you, that you can

forthwith and from time to time hereafter enter upon and use such remaining portions of the surface of the said lands as may be required by you for any or all of your drilling and/or production operations on the understanding that you will present to me as soon as possible a sketch showing the area or areas so required by you from time to time whereupon I will promptly execute and deliver to you a lease of such area or areas in the form attached to this letter and initialled by me in exchange for payment to me of the first year's rental." This was signed by both myself and my wife and witnessed by the land man. You will find later in this letter where I think the oil companies were in error.

He continues:

Here is where I think the oil company erred in not honoring the general lease. But these nice land men could talk us into anything in those days.

What was not understood very often in the early days of this oil business in our district was that there was much more involved than the simple matter of a well. This particular farmer found that besides the wells the oil companies also needed power. So he ended up with 13 poles, 9 anchor poles and 10 anchors on the lease area itself, plus 8 poles and an anchor that did require an easement for which he received \$80. No rental, just a one time payment of \$80 for the privilege of the oil company having power. Of course, besides the nuisance value itself, this certainly increases the farmer's cost of production as he has to go around every installation in his field. I think it has to be realized, Mr. Speaker, that farmers are receiving some income whether they have an old or a new lease, but in many cases the amount they are receiving is just not worth the trouble. Indeed there are many who would gladly give up their rentals if they had clear fields to farm.

Now this has been the situation, Mr. Speaker, in the period when the Financial Post reports that most oil companies have been showing a substantial increase in profits as is reflected in the value of their stock. I want to repeat again that some of the oil companies have at least gone part way in attempting to be fair. Some have voluntarily replaced the old type lease with a new lease. Maybe we ought to mention that this also provides an unfair advantage to those companies that maintain the old lease. They get their oil cheaper in this way. The costs of production are much lower than they are for the other company which is paying a fair price. I believe that this legislation will go a long way toward providing the remedy for which our farmers are looking.

I am pleased to see the legislation includes the mediation officers because I think that this can save time and money. Arbitration can be an expensive procedure for everyone involved. It also depends on the adversary system. It depends on people fighting, and surely if the mediation officers can get them to negotiate in good faith and come to a mutual agreement, it is much better for everyone. I think that the step that is being taken by this Bill is a long step forward. It will bring much relief to the farmers and I am sure that any oil company that is operating in good faith and sincerely will have nothing to fear from it. I support this Bill.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. A. Oliver (Shaunavon): — Mr. Speaker, in regard to the Member from Kerrobert-Kindersley, I didn't think that his constituency and mine were anything similar but I can see that the minerals are very similar in the two constituencies and we do have the same problems. I didn't think that people in my constituency had as many problems as you do but I can see that we do now. So that he has really outlined most of the problems that I have in my constituency in regard to surface rights.

I think that a lot of this stems back to the early '50s when oil was discovered and sort of an oil frenzy and oil fever was quite prevalent over the entire district. The farmers are a really quiet, peace-loving and modest type and to be suddenly thrust into the spotlight of oil on their land had sort of an anaesthetic effect on their ability to negotiate a sound agreement between oil companies and themselves. I think oil companies took advantage of this and some farmers signed away rights that they really had no intention of signing away. The injustices that the Hon. Member outlined are really prevalent, especially about the salt spills that affect the crop yield for years to come. This was never taken into consideration; it was just payment on the crop of that year or damage that year and that was it. You could either take it or leave. There is really no prestige now to have an oil well or battery or whatever may be on your land and it has become a standing joke in regard to the wealth of the property owner down there. It's a real laugh.

Some farmers are entering into agreements that do have the review clause in it. Some of the older ones are really stuck on this and I think the mandatory review clause is long overdue. I should just like to mention the fact that the Hon. Member from Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) claims that the mediation board will have a strong tendency to adjudicate in favor of the farmer. Mr. Speaker, I think this is far overdue and it is about time.

Mr. Weatherald: — Mr. Speaker, since my name has now come up twice and since I did have a copy of what I said, I should like to just clear it up. I said that in order to work satisfactorily, and I have a copy of what I said right in front of me, you would require the co-operation of both the oil industry and the landowners and that both farmers and landowners will be watching very closely as to what the new awards given by the board contain. Because if the awards, higher awards to the farmer, if they are away out of line then the oil industry will severely protest. That is what I actually said, I have the copy in front of me.

Mr. M. Kwasnica (Cut Knife): — Mr. Speaker, first of all I should like to congratulate the Minister for bringing in this legislation and using the Friesen Commission Report as the main basis for his amendments.

I have a major oil development in my constituency and therefore it has a great interest in what goes on in the oil business. In my constituency there is a fairly good co-operation between the farmers and the oil company, but there were small minor areas of concern which needed to be corrected and this will be done now by this Bill. I am glad to see that reasonable costs incurred by the farmer relating to hearings of the

Arbitration Board will be paid for and acknowledged by the board because many farmers do indeed have to hire lawyers to plead their cases for them and this involves cost. I am also glad to see that there will be some account taken of the damage to land in the form of tortious acts and in my area the major complaint seemed to have been the debris left all over, trees that had been cut down, metal scraps and so on. They were never really cleaned up and the farmer was left with this mess. Now the operator will have to clean up.

The review of the annual rates is an excellent feature too. This Act will allow review every five years. Many farmers in my constituency complain about the locked-in agreements for years ahead in their old leases. I should like to point out, in opposition to the Member from Cannington, and say that I feel now that the farmers have total confidence in the newly appointed Arbitration Board and I am glad to say that there is a member on that board from the Lloydminster area which has fairly substantial oil development.

At this time I should like to make one suggestion to our Government for the future perhaps. It may be beneficial, Mr. Speaker, for us to consider that surface rights should be under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Agriculture instead of the Attorney General. Not that I have anything against the Attorney General, he is doing an excellent job, but Attorney Generals being legally minded tend to concern themselves with the legal aspects of any Act, and I think that perhaps a Minister of Agriculture would be more concerned with land and what is being done to it. I think that it is closely related to agriculture and it may be well suited to be under the Minister. I haven't asked the Minister if he would consider it but I think it might be worth considering.

Well, I approve of all the items in this Bill, the mediation officer, and so and I am confident that this Act will go a long way to create a more harmonious atmosphere between the farmers of Saskatchewan and the operating oil companies in our province.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. J.A. Pepper (Weyburn): — Mr. Speaker, after having listened to the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) the other evening, the Member from Riversdale, also the Minister in Charge of the Surface Rights Department who introduced this very important Bill and now having listened to my colleagues from this side of the House, I think that all Members will realize the importance of it. I find that I have very little new material that I can add at this time. I do feel that as one who has been very interested in this piece of legislation since its implementation by the former Government, now sitting to your left, Mr. Speaker, and also as one who has a farm situated in the heart of the oil development within the constituency of Weyburn, I think I can speak from practical experience and with a reasonable amount of knowledge as to the desires of the surface rights owners within our province.

The reason that this Government, the New Democratic Party has introduced this Bill to bring about some of these changes, Mr. Speaker, or amendments to the original Act, is because they are justifiable changes and realistic amendments that should have been included in the original Surface Rights Bill, when it

was introduced by the former Liberal Government. Let me give the Members sitting to your left, Mr. Speaker, full marks for what changes they brought about by first introducing this Bill back in 1968. But we find that they did not make sufficient changes and this, Mr. Speaker, is the reason for having to deal with it again.

I also believe that if one looks back to our records in Hansard in 1968 when this Act was being dealt with in Committee of the Whole you would find, Mr. Speaker, that the Hon. Member from Swift Current (Mr. Wood) and myself suggested or recommended amendments to the Bill at that time. But the former Government now sitting to your left did not and would not agree to our recommendations. Had they at that time seen the wisdom of those amendments our Attorney General today would not have found it necessary to introduce them now. Might I also add, Mr. Speaker, that Judge Friesen in his report to the Government, and in all fairness to the farmers, recommended the majority of these amendments we are dealing with now. So I say there was really no excuse that we should be waiting until now to see this added consideration given to our rural Saskatchewan and maybe our farm people.

For many years, Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan was known and is still known as the bread basket of the West, where agriculture reigns supreme and our whole economy is based on our agricultural industry. Our fathers pioneered this Province and spent many years in clearing, breaking and cultivating the rich soil so that this industry could flourish. Little did they realize what other industry might be embedded many feet below that area which is now known as the top surface of our farm, the only area which our farmer actually owns or has control over. It was not until seismographing crews came in and through their findings discovered the minerals that are now located in many areas of our province. Arrangements were made, contracts were signed between the farmer and the land man representing the various oil companies allowing them to enter, to build roadways and to drill and to discover these minerals. Our rural farm people, Mr. Speaker, have always been known as a very co-operative group of people and always realized that in order for our province to flourish in all segments of society that we must work together and try and promote and build a better Saskatchewan. The operators of oil fields in most cases also worked with this in mind. Having served for some 12 consecutive years on a rural municipal council where every quarter section in a division which I was in charge of had been drilled out by oil companies, where 27 companies had holdings in there at one time, where 17 oil rigs were also drilling at one time, I had the occasion to try and keep harmony among both groups of people, the farmer and the oil personnel in that division. This, Mr. Speaker, was when oil development was at its height. May I remind you, Mr. Speaker, this was during the years of the former CCF Government when it was in office, in the period of time from 1956 to 1964. Since those early stages many follow-ups have occurred that we do not realize will enter into the picture following the initial stages of any industrial development. It is for that reason that a Bill came in in 1968 and that now today more amendments to this Bill are being introduced at this time. When this Bill is passed it will give our surface rights owners an opportunity to renegotiate their contracts. Some of the contracts were signed which have no clause allowing this and the farmer was at the mercy of the oil company whether he be given any consideration or not. And when you, Mr. Speaker, oil spills, salt water

seeping out into your good agricultural farm land in areas off the original well site, where the companies are not paying yearly rentals, or where pressure builds up and well heads burst blowing this mixture of oil and water over your grain fields which are swathed or even otherwise for many rods surrounding this well site, one cannot but help be unhappy with these conditions. Great inconvenience is caused when loaded trucks of grain or tractor wheels drop into pipe line trenches which cave in because of insufficient care being given towards the filling in and the packing of these trenches, or where yellow sub-soil is left on top of the rich top soil, the farmer has to take a great loss before he gets this soil once again into production. Here, Mr. Speaker, you can see quite easily the needs of the amendment brought in by this Bill.

Might I also remind you that when battery sites are located near a farm dwelling, the sulphur and the gas that is pouring out into the air at all times corrodes the galvanized wire fences, weakening them, pitting them to the extent that they break and have to be replaced at any early date. Where aluminium siding on houses and steel granaries also deteriorate very quickly causing much added expense to the farmer. These are only a few of the many reasons that a Bill of this nature has to be introduced and these amendments made to provide him the opportunity and facilities used to compensate the surface rights owner or farmer for the great loss he finds compelled to endure.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think it is only fair that agriculture and our rural farm people be given an equal opportunity for progress and to share in the benefits of the industry to our province, particularly when these people have to endure losses and inconveniences that arrive in order that industry does progress. I believe that when many of our minerals have been developed and many perhaps have come and gone, our Saskatchewan rich and fertile agricultural land will still be here and will be very productive, providing that we take the measures to keep it that way.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have more that I should like to add at a later time. May I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. MacMurchy that Bill No. 46 — **An Act respecting the Education and Certification of Teachers** be now read a second time.

Mr. J.C. McIsaac (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 46 is one that amalgamates the present Teacher Education Act, the present board of Teacher Education with another board set up and operated the last few years, the Teachers' Certification Board. Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, I should have expected something a good deal more extensive from the Government opposite in the whole broad field of teacher education than a Bill that merely reshuffles an existing board and in effect, as near as I can see in reading it, does practically nothing at all to change the present situation. Because it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that I am sure there are many Members opposite, particularly the teacher Members, that if there is one area of education that is in need of a critical re-evaluation and that is the question of teacher training, or if you like the teaching of teachers. Perhaps I should say that the situation in Saskatchewan is no different

March 23, 1972

I am sure from my knowledge than that of any other Canadian province.

Here as an example we have two new large and beautiful buildings, colleges of education, both in the Regina Campus and the Saskatoon Campus, put there at a time when the former Government was carrying on an expansionary capital policy for the university. We have these two institutions. We have large staffs. We have well equipped facilities and large student bodies. But I must say, Mr. Speaker, it has been my impression and it hasn't changed much since that time, that if there is one area, as I say, in need of critical re-evaluation it is this whole question of teacher education.

I only hope and say to the Minister, and in his absence to some of his colleagues, and his legislative secretaries, that the new board that he is proposing here will be able to make more progress in these areas certainly than was the case with both boards over the past few years.

I wish the Government well in this regard. I hope the Bill isn't just a reshuffling of names and numbers and people and positions as it appears to be. I hope it will result in a sincere effort being made to re-examine this area. I only regret, Mr. Speaker, that this Act which this Government has brought in, an Act of this kind especially when it has made such an issue of education prior to the June 23rd election and since that time. It appears that the only reform that we are going to see in this very important area of education, the only reform that we can see coming at least, is this kind of weak legislation as before.

I could comments on some of the other window-dressing type of pieces of legislation that are coming in with respect to education and this certainly has to be typical of them. I will support the Bill, of course, but as I say I just had only hoped that we would have seen a much more comprehensive piece of legislation, a much more comprehensive declaration of policy in this regard. An indication that the Government is going to live up to some of their promises to reform education as they said so often, and still continue to say, to a much lesser extent today than before June 23rd.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

The Assembly adjourned at 9:30 o'clock p.m.