

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Second Session — Seventeenth Legislature**  
**30th Day**

**Thursday, April 6, 1972.**

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

**WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**Mr. A. Matsalla (Canora):** — I should like to present to you and to the members of this Legislature, a fine group of 47 young men and women in the Grade Twelve class of the Canora Composite High School. They are accompanied by their teachers, four in number, Miss Lorna Yont, Miss Laverne Wagner and gentlemen, Alex Strelieff and Steve Kobrynsky, and their very able and careful two bus drivers, Harry Wiwchar and Tony Demchuk. I say very able and careful because they have safely made the trip in spite of the treacherous icy road conditions.

On this occasion I should like to take the opportunity of commending the local organization of the Kiwanis Club for assisting by sponsoring this trip as one of their community projects. In this group representing the Club we have with us, Mrs. Lil Crotenko and Mr. Fred Petroff.

I hope the experience the students have of visiting this Legislature will prove informative and useful in their school studies, and impressive and memorable in the years to come. I hope too that their entire visit here and to the capital city is enjoyable and satisfying.

Mr. Speaker, may I express to the group our best wishes for a safe journey home.

**Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. W.E. Smishek (Regina North East):** — Mr. Speaker, I should like to introduce to you and to Members of the Legislature a group of 50 Grade Eight students from Arcola School. They are accompanied by their teachers, Mr. Zalinko and Mr. Mahilitz. They are seated in the east gallery. In welcoming them to the Legislature I express the hope of the Members from both sides of the House that their stay with us this afternoon will be educational and informative and a very pleasant day to remember.

**Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. E. Kaeding (Saltcoats):** — Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased today to be able to introduce to you and to the Members of this Assembly a group of 41 students seated in the west gallery from the towns of Saltcoats and Bredenbury. They are accompanied here today by their Principals, Mrs. Charlotte Thies from Bredenbury and Mr. Walter Farquharson from Saltcoats. Incidentally, Mr. Farquharson is not only the principal of the school but he is also the Minister of the United Church at Saltcoats and he is doing a good job of both.

We hope that they will have a very interesting and informative afternoon with us. As remarked by my friend from Canora, these people from the North had a treacherous trip in and they were half an hour late arriving, but we are glad they are here and congratulate their driver for the good job she did in getting them here in time. We hope their stay with us will be enjoyable and we wish them a safe journey home.

**Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. D.M. McPherson (Regina Lakeview):** — Mr. Speaker, I should like to introduce to you and to the Members of this House 40 Grade Eight students from St. Pius X Separate School in the constituency of Regina Lakeview. They are accompanied here by their teacher, Mr. Thompson. I know that you and all the Members of the Legislature hope that they have a very interesting day in the House.

**Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. J.G. Richards (Saskatoon University):** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you students from the Greystone School, accompanied by their teachers, Mr. Ralph Sherwin and Mr. Schmidt. These students are here on a day when we may be considering the question of fluoridation of provincial drinking waters and I should like to remind the House that these students, from my constituency, have had the advantage of fewer dental problems — thanks to the fluoridation of Saskatoon water since 1955.

**Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

## QUESTIONS

### PREVENTION OF LITTER

**Mr. J.G. Lane (Lumsden):** — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I should like to direct a question to the Hon. the Attorney General. In the first Session, 1971 Legislature a Bill was passed to prevent litter, which Bill was to come into effect on a date to be proclaimed. That legislation was designed to prevent the sale of beverages in non-returnable containers. Could the Attorney General tell us when that Bill will be proclaimed?

**Hon. R. Romanow (Attorney General):** — Proclamation depends on the question of getting regulations finalized. We are working on them, Mr. Speaker. Our offices are very busy now with preparation of legislation generally. I regret I can't give any definite information to the Member.

## CONDOLENCES

**Mr. D.G. Steuart (Leader of the Opposition):** — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I should like to just take a moment to pay tribute to a very outstanding citizen of Saskatchewan who passed away this morning. I refer to Jack Hamilton of Pense, who as we all know was the President of the SARM for five years. He was one of the original pioneers

in the Pense district and served as a reeve of the municipality in that area for a quarter of a century and certainly was a pioneer in the best sense of the word and a builder of Saskatchewan. He was an outstanding citizen and I know the Members on both sides of the House will want to pay Mr. Hamilton a tribute for the tremendous service and contributions that he made to our Province and pass on our condolences to the family.

**Hon. E.I. Wood (Minister of Municipal Affairs):** — Mr. Speaker, I should like to join with the Leader of the Opposition in expressing the same sentiments on this side of the House. Mr. Hamilton was the President of the SARM back in 1961, 1962, 1963 when I was Minister of Municipal Affairs before and we became quite closely associated. I would not say, Mr. Speaker, that we agreed on all points at that time. The matter of the county system was one that was before us and we were doing a good deal of discussion in those days, but I will say this, very frankly, that Mr. Hamilton and I, while we did not agree on quite a few points, our discussion was always frank and open and there was no hard feelings at any time.

Mr. Hamilton and I drove throughout the province together on different occasions attending meetings and held numerous meetings in my office and there was nothing but the best of relationship between Mr. Hamilton and myself.

I hadn't heard of his death earlier I am sorry to say, and I am very sorry to hear it now. I must express my deep regret, personally, on knowing that Mr. Hamilton has died, although I believe he had not been in good health for quite some time and in many ways it may not be other than a blessing. But I wish to record my own personal feelings on this and those of the Government on this side, if I may, Mr. Speaker.

## ADJOURNED DEBATES

### SECOND READINGS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Bowerman, that **Bill No. 81 – An Act to provide for the Division of the Province into Constituencies for the Election of Members of the Legislative Assembly** be now read a second time.

**Mr. D.W. Michayluk (Redberry):** — Mr. Speaker, when I adjourned debate on this Bill yesterday, I did not anticipate that the House Leader would be calling this Bill today and, of course, I may be speaking as fluently and not as logically as I would have had I taken some time last night to prepare my speech. However, I am very pleased, Mr. Speaker, that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) agreed with the proposal which is being put forth in this Bill. I think I understand his reasoning for taking that stand. Had I been a Member in the Government and the Party who had made the recent redistribution of constituency boundaries in Saskatchewan I would have wanted anyone to be very moderate in respect to the changes that were made in the constituency boundaries.

Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, has had a good number of redistributions since the province was formed, and of course in years gone by a long period of time had elapsed before a redistribution was undertaken by the Government. I want to go back to the redistribution of 1938. This is the time when the

then Government made the redistribution, it was the Government that stayed in office for six years. It was the same Government that was thrown out by the people of Saskatchewan in 1944 and it was not until 1951 that a CCF government found it necessary and desirable, due to population shifts in the rural areas of the province and the increase of population in our urban centres, that the CCF government of 1951 felt that it was necessary to have a redistribution. Now I have had an opportunity of reading some of the debates that took place in this Legislature in respect to the 1951 redistribution and, of course, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition only yesterday chastised some of the Members on this side who were probably in this Legislature when that redistribution was made. He said this was an iniquitous redistribution, that it was unfair, that it was loaded in favor of the CCF or the Government and that it was unfair to the Liberal Opposition. But I want to make mention of the several constituencies that were affected when the boundaries were changed in 1951. I want to make special reference to the Redberry constituency which I have the honor to represent.

Now there was quite an exchange at that time between The Battlefords and Redberry. The same constituencies have had several exchanges since then, Mr. Speaker. They took a good portion of The Battlefords and gave it to Redberry and they took a portion of Redberry and they gave it to The Battlefords. Well, the thought in this redistribution was that probably if they were to give the Liberals a good seat they would give them Rosthern – well, I don't see the Member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) in his seat – and, of course, they probably thought that they would give the Liberal Opposition a good safe seat in Redberry. And this is probably the reasoning that Mr. Fines and the Members of the Government used at that time. The same reasoning applied, the Members opposite were on this side of the House, the same rationale that they used when they carried out their redistribution of 1966 and 1970. They hoped that somewhere, somehow the people will forget that a Liberal is always a Liberal and an NDP is always an NDP. Well, of course, this was disproved in Redberry constituency when it was created in 1951, because it had given my friends opposite a majority of 1,249 votes, a safe Liberal seat, and in the election of 1952, Mr. Speaker, the CCF took that seat by 24 votes. This was a lesson that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and the Members opposite should have learned from the 1951 redistribution. This is what you should have learned, that there is no established pattern that the people will vote the same in every election. No. There is a hard core of Liberal supporters and NDP supporters but there is what we call the uncommitted vote. And this is exactly the vote that you, Mr. Hon. Leader of the Opposition and the Members of your Government offended by carrying out political hari-kari on that ruthless gerrymander. It was not intended to create equity and justice, it was merely a political gerrymander. I stated yesterday, Mr. Speaker, that I had had several boundary changes in Redberry when these gentlemen opposite were the Government. What did they do? Well they thought what belongs to Battlefords we'll give back to them, so they gave the Battleford part back to the Redberry that the CCF gave the Liberals in 1951. In the 1967 election Redberry became a larger constituency in numbers of voters. I was in this seat on the other side of the House and I asked the reason, what is the reason of taking away a portion of The Battlefords constituency and adding it on to Redberry? The answer given was very simple – your seat being a rural constituency there has been a rapid decline in the rural population, therefore, to make

Redberry a little larger in population we are giving you that part of The Battlefords, Borden, Radisson and the RM of Great Bend. Well, Mr. Speaker, in 1970 when the gentlemen now opposite performed a second political gerrymander on the Redberry constituency what did they do? They had found it necessary to take out about 12 townships from the Redberry constituency and add this area on to The Battlefords constituency. At the time between the period 1967 and 1970 there was a population decline of some 2,300 people in my constituency. Now where was the rationale? They gave me that portion in 1967 to bolster the voters in my constituency, in 1970 they take out 1,100 voters and they make mine the smallest rural constituency in population, next to the Hon. Minister of Education, Last Mountain, some 5,000 people. Where was the rationale, Mr. Speaker?

As I already mentioned a few moments ago this was mainly a political gerrymander to save their political hides.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Michayluk:** — They couldn't even draw a straight line. They couldn't see straight. They couldn't think straight and they couldn't draw a straight line. Then the Hon. Member from Wadena (Mr. Dewhurst), Mr. Speaker, this is your constituency. I think that for you to get around your constituency it is necessary to make some 29 turns. Then, of course, they took away 1,100 voters from Redberry but what did they do to the Hon. Member's seat for Melfort-Kinistino (Mr. Thibault)? You know, I think they were basing it on his ability, they gave the Hon. Member 14,000 people in Melfort-Kinistino, Redberry 5,000 voters, Last Mountain 5,000, Melfort-Kinistino 14,000. They justified addition and subtraction while at the same time completely dismantling Melfort-Tisdale, creating two. Mr. Speaker, the gentlemen opposite thought, well, we'll do away with one NDP constituency. There you are, you are right there and there your Party will stay for a long time because of your ruthlessness.

Now let's go to the cities. I said the other day, Mr. Speaker, that to find Last Mountain constituency on the map you practically have to use a reading glass or a telephoto lens to see it. Well, if you look at the city of Regina the situation is identical. It's identical, of course, they were so used to believing their own words, Mr. Speaker, in their own terms, "Saskatchewan is on the move", "Saskatchewan is growing", and, of course, "Albert Park is going to mushroom overnight or in a year under the New Deal". So what do they do in the city of Regina, they create an Albert Park, a new growth area and they give the Hon. Premier, the then Leader of the Opposition, Regina Centre, almost 17,000 votes. They give the Hon. Member for Regina North West, Mr. Whelan, 16,500, the Member for Regina North East, the present Hon. Minister of Health, about 16,000. But they create one for the Hon. Mr. Grant, their Minister of Health, 6,000 voters. Then the Liberal Boundaries Committee created this postage stamp constituency, Albert Park which my Hon. friend now represents (Mr. MacLeod) with 3,200 voters. Well, I bet you had to work hard, the Hon. Member for Albert Park to get nominated. Not only did you work hard to get a constituency created, you also worked hard to get nominated.

Well, you know if I had had my material I was prepared to use here today I would have pointed out a letter that the Hon. Member for Albert Park sent to his constituents — "Here is a

April 6, 1972

Liberal Membership with my compliments . . .”

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Michayluk:** — “that will give you the privilege to vote on a certain day in which I intend to stand for the Liberal nomination”. I haven’t it here but I’ll bring it tomorrow, and I’ll table it too.

Now, Mr. Speaker, going back as I said at the outset, that many redistributions have been made in the Province of Saskatchewan. But never in the history of Saskatchewan were two redistributions carried out in the period of six years.

**An Hon. Member:** — . . .

**Mr. Michayluk:** — Well yes, two in Redberry . . . I have gone back, Mr. Speaker, checked the records of when the redistributions were introduced in the past. What opportunities were Members of this House given to debate those redistribution Bills? The duration of the debates? It’s very interesting. The Hon. House Leader has brought in this Bill and probably our legislative session is about half way through. In the past redistribution Bills are brought in a day or two before prorogation. A Bill was brought in, moved, no time for debate. The House was then prorogued within two days sitting. That’s the longest. No public commission, no public hearings, except politicians, that’s right, politicians on the staff who were deciding on the constituency boundaries.

What are we doing, Mr. Speaker? The Hon. House Leader yesterday introduced a Bill for the creation of an Independent Boundaries Commission. This is a Saskatchewan first.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Michayluk:** — The Hon. Leader of the Opposition yesterday said we should have a politician on this committee. Past committees had politicians and look at the mess they’ve made. All you have to do is to look at the map of constituency boundaries in Saskatchewan and this is what politicians did when they were on Boundaries Commissions. I think once and for all that the decision to where the boundary lines are to be drawn should be taken out of the hands of politicians. Probably some retired politician could advise the committee whether they are doing a good job.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Like . . .?

**Mr. Michayluk:** — Well, like Dave Steuart will be after the next election. I mean the Hon. Dave Steuart.

Now I’m very pleased, Mr. Speaker, that this Bill provides for what will actually be known as an Independent Boundaries Commission. A chairman to be appointed by the Chief Justice of Saskatchewan, together with the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly, the third member will be appointed by the Speaker after consultation with the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Michayluk:** — This Government, Mr. Speaker, is not hiding the fact that we will be setting up a Commission that's not going to gerrymander in favor of the Government or in favor of the Opposition. The basis on which the boundary lines will be drawn will be decided on the basis of population from the last Federal census, 1971.

I want to agree, Mr. Speaker, some of our urban centres may have to increase their representation in this House, probably our rural areas will have to lose some of the Members. Hopefully not. But, Mr. Speaker, I think that this Government, through this Bill, wants to prove to the people of Saskatchewan, to the Members opposite, that we can hold up our heads and provide a Commission which is truly independent and when the final lines are drawn that there will be the principle that the representation in this House will be on the basis of population wherever possible. There is to be a 15 per cent tolerance as the Bill indicates. However, I can say that it will be for the first time since the formation of Saskatchewan in 1905 that the boundaries of the provincial constituencies and the representatives that will be fairly elected will be a true representation.

I will support the Bill.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. P. Mostoway (Hanley):** — Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to speak on this Bill and its refreshing implications. I also feel a duty to speak on it because of the very idea of change in this vast area. It's an area in which there was much discussion in Hanley constituency just prior to the last election.

What I am about to relate to you is in reality facts and a passing on of strong opinion on the part of the people of my constituency.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to inform this House that yesterday I tried to find an electoral map with the view of concentrating on Hanley constituency in the Chief Electoral Officer's office. Well, we looked high and low, but there was no map of Hanley constituency, and then all of a sudden it hit me — no wonder Hanley constituency was missing! The grotesque shape that they had so contorted Hanley constituency into was too much for human eyes to see.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Mostoway:** — Mr. Speaker, let me tell you what the Opposition did to that great constituency which I have the honor to represent. I think it can be said that it is the only constituency that went through four gerrymanders in three years, and here is how they did it.

After the 1964 election and right up to the last election, the day of the great backfire, South East Saskatoon City, urban jurisdictions such as Vanscoy, Vonda, Prudhomme, Sutherland and certain rural areas were added or subtracted at such a pace that before an electoral map of Hanley constituency came off the press it was hopelessly out of date. Why, at one time they had the boundary running right through the middle of the village of

April 6, 1972

Prudhomme. Now apparently they thought of it as being only half safe, as the old deodorant advertisement used to say. I don't know if there are any implications there or not. But the real climax to this absurd chain of events came in 1967 when they had an area of Saskatoon known as Montgomery Place in Hanley constituency, while at the same time Montgomery Place was still legally in Riversdale. Here was a large group of people in two constituencies. Well, then a group of people in Montgomery Place in Saskatoon petitioned the court to be placed in Hanley constituency only. Well, the court decision was if anyone was not satisfied with the ruling, after the election the whole case could then be brought to court, in which case the court would rule on whether or not the results could be upset. Now was there really a problem for the Government of that time? No, the Returning Officer simply refused to appoint Hanley constituency enumerators for Montgomery Place. They, therefore, had to vote in Riversdale. Well, had they voted in Hanley, there's no doubt that our candidate would surely have won.

Now out of this episode certain things can be clearly seen. In their frenzied efforts to juggle for political advantage and I might add that this had gone on prior to that, some constituents had special status, membership in two constituencies. And secondly, it put the courts in an extremely awkward position. In reality, a Liberal appointed Returning Officer really decided who would win Hanley constituency on the basis of saying you must vote in Riversdale. And last, it won them a constituency that they couldn't have won otherwise.

Then in 1968 they took out Montgomery Place, but – and listen to this – they made it retroactive to 1967 to safeguard their win in Hanley constituency. Now, four gerrymanders in three years. Obviously they were very concerned with their representation by population. In fact, they seem to have been obsessed by it. Well, who would dare accuse them of tampering for their own benefits.

Mr. Speaker, the people of my constituency welcome the establishment of an Independent Boundaries Commission. They are sick and tired of being used as a political football for the expediency of politicians. In fact, I interpret the results of the last election as a demand for it. I know the people of my constituency will look with favor on the appointment of an individual from the judiciary. And no one can sincerely argue on the inclusion of the Clerk of the Assembly on the Commission either. The only appointment that may be contentious is the third member, and here the politicians will have a grand opportunity to show their good faith in selecting a third capable member mutually acceptable to all.

Mr. Speaker, I most emphatically will support this motion.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. D. Faris (Arm River):** — Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak in support of this Bill to set up an Independent Boundaries Commission because I'm sure that a vast majority of the people in Saskatchewan want to see this matter of electoral boundaries taken out of the hands of politicians.

Now, it may be said as has been said on the other side, that



politicians aren't all that bad and that, "Really, fellows we shouldn't be political when we're discussing this Bill". But the decision whether or not this debate would be political at this time has not been made in this House this year. It was made last year, or when the last boundaries were drawn for that last provincial election. There is no question at all that it was the most viciously, politically-minded manoeuvring of electoral boundaries that's ever taken place in Saskatchewan and I think you'd find it hard to find boundaries drawn on that kind of basis in any other province in Canada. I believe that the Boundaries Commission must be out of the hands of politicians and that it has been demonstrated within the last year that this must be done. I think that the reason why the public felt so strongly about this matter was that they realized that very often politics can be looked at as a game. But they understood that it was a game that had rules and that it wasn't fair that when a government found itself in trouble they should all of a sudden change the rules and change the boundaries simply in an attempt to hold on to power. I believe the people of this Province, as perhaps no other province, understand that politics isn't just a matter of power but what you do with it. And they were very concerned that the former Government, though it had a large amount of power for seven years had not used it, not used it in a way to serve and to meet their needs.

Yes, I believe that we must take the matter of electoral boundaries out of the hands of the politicians and for that reason I believe this Bill is very largely a good Bill. I believe that first of all it's good in that the committee that it appoints is a good committee. There's not much question in my mind that the Chief Justice or his appointee is acceptable to both sides of this House. There's no question in my mind but that the Clerk of this Legislature, as with his predecessor, is an acceptable person to both sides of this House. There's no question in my mind that the Leaders of both the Parties in this House will get together and as reasonable men come to a fair-minded decision as to who the third member of that Committee should be. I believe that if there is any questioning as to whether the third member should be appointed by the Speaker after consultation, then one only has to look at the Federal Boundaries Commission where two out of four of the members of the Commission are appointed on the recommendation of the Speaker.

Now I think this is a good Committee and I think most of the Members on both sides of the House agree with this. I believe that the procedures that are set forward here are in the most part good procedures. Particularly I'm pleased with the suggestion of public hearings because I believe that this will give the politicians, as individual citizens who have rights, alongside other citizens, a chance to give their opinion on the interim report of the Boundaries Commission. More importantly, it also gives every citizen in this Province who feels he has something to say about this matter, a fair and open chance to do this. I believe that Members on both sides of the House will support this.

I am personally concerned about the final matter brought out in Section 22, the adoption of the report. Because it is recommended, as is recommended for the Federal House, that the final report then be sent to the Legislature and if the Legislature by resolution approves, or approves with alterations the proposals of the Commission, then they will be accepted. I believe that here is a provision that could be improved upon and

April 6, 1972

I intend to try to seek in third reading for some means to improve upon this suggestion because having taken the decision of boundaries out of the hands of the politicians in terms of the Committee that is established and in terms of the procedures which are to be followed, I don't think we want to find ourselves in a position where any citizen in this Province can say, "But look, then it comes back to the politicians. Then it comes back to the Legislature where the majority in the House can determine to alter those boundaries again".

Now I realize that this provision is found in most of the other pieces of similar legislation in Canada. I believe this provision is found in Manitoba legislation, I believe this is found in the Federal provisions. But I think there are good grounds to suggest that if we could alter this in some way perhaps to provide that a majority on both sides of the House would have to recommend any alteration in that final report, we would have a better Bill. Some measures such as that to guarantee that at no time do the boundaries of the electoral districts in this Province ever again become a political football.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to support this Bill in second reading and I'm sure that whether this amendment is brought in or not at third reading, I'll support it at that time. It's good legislation and the people of Saskatchewan will be pleased to see it.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. H. Rolfes (Saskatoon Nutana South):** — Mr. Speaker, I too should like to participate in this debate. In listening to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) yesterday, I want to say that in a way I agree with him. Maybe we shouldn't get partisan about it, but I think that those of us who went into politics for the first time have some real deep feelings about what happened in the last election and certainly what happened just before it.

When I decided that I was going to participate in this debate I felt that I would really go after the Opposition for what they had done and possibly not defend the accusations that are made against our Government when we were in power in the 1940s and 1950s. I don't agree with a gerrymander at any time regardless of which Party does it. But, Mr. Speaker, in the last election I think it was so obvious that even those people who had never supported the NDP, this time did support us for no other reason but the big gerrymander.

I can remember well, Mr. Speaker, in the election campaign when I sent out my leaflet, entitled 'The Liberal Gerrymander', I received a phone call from a well-known Liberal card-carrying member of Saskatoon. He identified himself and eh told me that, "I certainly agree with your leaflet". He said, "You and I are of a different Party but certainly you and I agree that the democratic process of the principle of representation by population must be maintained". He told me at that time that though he would find it very difficult to vote for our Party he would have to think about it very seriously because of this particular issue. He told me also that at this time he had tried to convince some of the members of his Party not to go ahead with this drastic gerrymander but to no avail.

Mr. Speaker, there are many reasons why the people voted for

our Party. Certainly there were the reasons of Bill 2, broken promises of the Liberal Party, deterrent fees, economic conditions, the Federal Government, but I think more than that they voted for the New Deal for People that we put before them. I think in the first Session in August and in this Session my Party has shown that we make promises and we carry out our promises. In our first Session in August we did away with deterrent fees, we abolished Bill 2, we said to people 65 and over that we will give them a break from the Medical Care Premiums and in this particular Session we are carrying out other legislation in consumer affairs, Northern Department, Land Bank which will be coming up, an Ombudsman, etc. . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — I hope the Hon. Member will stay closer to the Bill, we must not talk on other legislation at this time.

**Mr. Rolfes:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I will do so.

My point, Mr. Speaker, was that we had made these promises and we also made a promise to bring in an Independent Electoral Boundaries Commission and that is what we are doing at this particular time. During the campaign, Mr. Speaker, as I was doing some campaigning from door to door I met a young man. We sat down on his front door step and he told me, "Look, I am not a supporter of your Party, but you know I am very fearful if he, that man (and he was referring to the former Premier) can do this, what will he do next?" He didn't guarantee me at that time that he would support me, but I walked away from his home being fairly well assured that I had his support.

Mr. Speaker, Bill 86 was passed in the 1970 Session for one reason and that reason was to assure a Liberal victory in the next election. Boundary changes were made, Mr. Speaker, with no regard to the number of voters, with no regard to geographic boundaries, with no regard to size, they were simply made to ensure a sufficient number of Liberal candidates to be elected. No attempt, Mr. Speaker, was made to equalize votes among various constituencies. All we have to do, Mr. Speaker, is go through the number of voters and we find a variance of up to 500 per cent from the smallest to the largest constituency. An attempt, Mr. Speaker, was made in Bill 86 to concentrate as much traditional NDP strength in as few constituencies as was possible.

Mr. Speaker, in the 1967 Saskatchewan election the Liberals and the New Democratic Party polled within one per cent of the same total vote, yet the Liberals elected 34 Members while the New Democrats elected only 25. That I contend, Mr. Speaker, was a far cry from representation by population. The Liberals, Mr. Speaker, realized that their popularity was dwindling immediately before the last election. They attempted to prolong their stay in office by introducing in 1970, I believe, the worst gerrymander that this country has ever experienced. Mr. Speaker, I am told that in the last election the Hon. Member from Prince Albert West was asked this question at Prince Philip School, which happens to be in my constituency. He was asked if the NDP claim was true that it was possible for the Liberals to be elected with only 33 per cent of the votes. I am told that he admitted that he hadn't examined it too closely but he thought the figures were fairly close. Now for this admission, Mr. Speaker, if it is true, the Hon. Member must be given credit for, I believe, that too many politicians faced with a similar situation would have waffled on

that particular question.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to relate to this House a humorous experience that we had in the last election. We had a public meeting at Aden Bowman Collegiate. Jim Weber, the Liberal candidate for Riversdale was there, Austin Forsyth my opponent, my colleague Wes Robbins from Nutana Centre and myself. When my colleague got up to speak he made this statement, "If I were a member of a government that imposed such a gerrymander on the people of Saskatchewan I would resign". Immediately up jumps Austin Forsyth and he said, "Now boys and girls you must remember that Mr. Robbins was a Member of this House in 1964 to 1967 and a gerrymander took place and he did not resign". Mr. Mr. Robbins pops up again and says, "But I was a Member of the Opposition, it certainly wouldn't have done any good for me to resign".

During the election, I had the privilege of having several public meetings with my opponent and he found it very, very difficult to explain the gerrymander. I remember him telling the high school students at Walter Murray Collegiate, "Don't listen to Mr. Rolfes, he said that he is going to do something about it; that his government is going to set up an Independent Electoral Boundary Commission". He said, "He won't do it, we didn't do it, no politician will do it". Mr. Speaker, I want to tell my opponent of the last election that we are doing it in this Session and I am speaking to it today.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Rolfes:** — Mr. Speaker, I should like to turn to my constituency in Nutana South where we do have some difficulties explaining to the people why part of the area between Melrose and the River, which is on the east side of the River, should belong to Riversdale on the west side. I had difficulties during the campaign, Mr. Speaker, to try and convince these people that they had to vote in Riversdale. But even today people still call me from that district and ask me, as their MLA, to do something for them. Their problems come up and time and time again I have told them that the Attorney General is their MLA but they simply cannot get it through their heads as to why, when you live on the east side of the River you should be represented by someone on the west side of the River. Mr. Speaker, I don't mind helping out my colleague, Mr. Romanow, after all you know, he only had a majority in 1967 of 2,561. It is getting a little bit ridiculous when he winds up in 1971 with a majority of 6,348. I should have thought, Mr. Speaker, that in 1967 when Austin Forsyth had a majority of over 1,700 votes that that would have been sufficient. No, that wasn't sufficient. Lorne Avenue at that time was the boundary . . .

**Mr. MacDonald (Milestone):** — On a Point of Order. Mr. Speaker, it is normally the rules and the common courtesy of this House not to attack and use a man's name in this Assembly who isn't here to defend himself. The Member has used the name of Austin Forsyth about 10 times. Mr. Forsyth isn't here to defend himself.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I believe if a Member uses the name of a former Member he can't call him an Hon. Member, as long as he is not using the name in a slighting manner and saying things which he wouldn't say outside the House. Then I should disagree if he was saying something in the House that he wasn't prepared to say outside the

House.

**Mr. Rolfes:** — Mr. Speaker, on that point, I simply want to say, I have no intention of insulting Mr. Forsyth. I have said this before, and it has been said again that he was the conscience of the Liberal Party. I have the highest regard for Austin Forsyth. All I am doing, you can quote me on it, the Hon. Member for Milestone, I have said nothing insulting against Austin Forsyth. I am simply quoting what Austin Forsyth has said and I was relating to this House the majority that Austin Forsyth had in 1967. If that is insulting, then I think we should get a Webster Dictionary and give it to the Member for Milestone.

Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, the Liberals enjoyed a majority of 1,700 in 1967. One would have thought that that would have been sufficient. If they wanted to do something to help the people of Nutana South they should have moved the boundary to the River which is a natural way to divide the constituencies, but they did not, they moved the boundary another two or three blocks further east. The reason for that, Mr. Speaker, is that the people between Melrose and the River vote anywhere from 65 to 80 per cent NDP. They knew they couldn't defeat the present Attorney General, so you might as well give him a few more votes to try and safeguard Nutana South for themselves. I want to say at this time, Mr. Speaker, that I am grateful in a way to the Hon. Member for Milestone and the Hon. Member for Prince Albert West and the others who sat on this gerrymander because, Mr. Speaker, I believe by doing what they did they made certain that I got elected in Nutana South. The people simply said we are fed up with this type of a government, we are fed up with the way politicians are abusing the principle of representation by population. Mr. Speaker, I want to suggest that this Assembly could go a long way in restoring the people's faith in the elected representatives and in the democratic process by unanimously supporting this Bill.

We, in the NDP promised electoral reform; we promised an Independent Boundaries Commission and I think that is what we have. I want to assure this House that as long as I am a Member of this House I will not stand for the slightest interference with the independence of this commission. I will oppose any attempt by any Member to interfere with the principle of representation by population. I made this statement, Mr. Speaker, during the campaign and I now want to congratulate the Attorney General and this Government for bringing in a Bill which I think all of us can support — a Bill that will assure once again that Members of this House are elected on the principle of representation by population. Mr. Speaker, I certainly support this Bill.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. H.E. Coupland (Meadow Lake)** — Mr. Speaker, after listening to a lot of this coming from the other side of the House, I was going to put a word to it, but I think maybe I will . . .

Being the one Member that is really gerrymandered out of his seat before it is even handed to the so-called independent commission, I just want to say a few words. I am wondering if maybe they cut Meadow Lake in half because the history of the Meadow Lake seat since 1938 changed Members every four years or every election, until I won it in 1964 and now I have won that seat three successive times. I want to tell the Members opposite

that I made the prediction in Meadow Lake right after the last election that there is no way that the Government in power now is going to leave the Meadow Lake constituency with the same boundaries it has. I want to point out to this House that the Meadow Lake seat as it now stands has a natural geographic boundary. Because 10 miles south of Meadow Lake we have a forest reserve and all the area northwest that is in the Meadow Lake constituency today is pretty well considered the general shopping centre of the whole area, right from LaLoche down. When you get north of LaLoche there is a 500-mile jump into Uranium City, so whoever has to represent that seat from Meadow Lake north or from where the proposed boundary is now will have to jump down from Uranium City 500 miles into that area. It is just not going to be as nice a boundary as what it is today. The boundaries of the Meadow Lake constituency today are just natural, it is a section of the northwest part of the province, I am not sure what the population is, but I am sure that it will come close to 15,000 which is what the Members opposite are saying is a fair amount of people to represent. I know there are over 8,000 voters so that even double that gives you 16,000. I can't see the justification in cutting off half of the Meadow Lake seat, I know they want to get rid of me and this is probably one of the ways they are going to do it, or try to do it.

**Mr. Messer:** — . . . independent.

**Mr. Coupland:** — It is not subject to the independent commission. You fellows made the South subject to the Independent Boundaries Commission but you have already stipulated the division in the North by cutting off half of Meadow Lake. Make all constituencies subject to the independent commission. I want to tell the people of Beauval, Ile-a-la-Crosse, Buffalo Narrows, Turner Lake, LaLoche that I will still look after their problems, in spite of what the NDP are trying to do to them. I am not against the Bill but all I am saying is that don't be so sanctimonious in saying, that we won't cut out anybody's seat. You did that to me, cut off half my voters and a lot of good people that I have represented since 1964 and I'll continue to represent them even if they are in another seat.

**Mr. K. MacLeod (Regina Albert Park):** — Mr. Speaker, I should like to speak in support of an Independent Electoral Boundaries Commission, and I should like to support the proposals contained in the Bill. I have never defended a political gerrymander as a political technique. The Hon. Member from Hanley (Mr. Mostoway) knows that. He knows that I was in his constituency during the election and, at the same time and at the same place where he had members of his Party out to listen to me and to question me, a question was raised about gerrymander, and I said then in the clearest of terms that I opposed it and that I didn't like it and that was before we knew we would not win the June 23rd election. I do not support a political gerrymander by any Party. Among the insidious affects of a political gerrymander is the fact that some Members who do not deserve to sit in this House are actually confirmed in office.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. MacLeod:** — There are some people who believe that the Member for Regina North West (Mr. Whelan) hardly merited re-election and

that with a good candidate, which we had, and a proper boundary, which was there formerly, he would have been defeated. But what happened was this – the additional numbers who were put into his constituency actually confirmed him in office. He is not the only one. What the gerrymander did among other things was guarantee that the Government opposite would have at least 15, not less than 15, Members simply by the hiving of their votes. It works in reverse two or three ways besides the bad thing that was done, and the bad political result, the publicity was adverse, and it guaranteed that some of them who ought not to be elected were elected.

Now I hope in making a division of our Province into new constituencies, the Commission will give some consideration to the following points.

To begin with, in constructing each constituency I think some consideration should be given to traditional boundaries. Secondly, regard should be had to growth or population decline. That is, growth to be anticipated or population decline to be anticipated in constituencies. And that with respect to our farm and our rural areas that some particular attention be given to the distances to be travelled. Now our rural areas, because of the low density in the areas, require generally a smaller population base than do the city constituencies. And, representing a city constituency, I think, in all fairness I can make that point.

The one thing I regret most sincerely has been the tone of the debate on this Bill. It has not been statesmanlike by Members of the NDP Government. I'm tired of hearing the Liberals argue about gerrymander and I'm tired of hearing the NDP argue about it and I'm tired of the Liberals doing it and I'm tired of the CCF-NDP doing it. All my life I have watched these people do these things. We have, at this time, an opportunity to do something worthwhile and the NDP Members have turned it into a narrow political manoeuvre. The Member for Redberry (Mr. Michayluk), (I see he makes his speech, which is his custom and then he leaves the House and he spends the rest of the time presumably accepting congratulations from Members in his lounge), having made his speech disappears from the Assembly. He does not wait to hear any comments made about his speech. I presume that he's out there busily looking after his giant constituency.

The one thing that he seems to be particularly proud about was a letter that he has talked about and which was brought into this House on a previous occasion. And it related to the nomination convention out at Albert Park. But you know, it was very interesting. Nobody out there of those who were involved (and I am talking about Liberals involved) ever accused me of not winning according to the rules. Now I don't tell the NDP how to run their convention and I presume they will do the courtesy of not telling us how to run ours, although courtesy is not something I've observed from those benches lately.

Secondly, it was quite obvious that I was going to win anyway. But I did something wrong. I'll tell you what I did wrong. I did not do the thing in an underhanded fashion. I am told by the political veterans, NDP-CCF, Liberals, that that isn't the way you do it. They tell me that what you do is that you get someone else to give out your memberships and then if somebody discovers it the candidate can say, "It wasn't me – he had no authority to do it, certainly it should have been done", don't

let the candidate ever be sullied by that type of thing, keep the candidate lily-white is what they tell you. Let someone else do it. And I said this, "It is not going to be done that way". I said that the one thing the Members across the way and maybe old time politicians don't understand is that things can be done out in the open and if it's wrong to do it, it's wrong to do it out in the open as well as in an underhanded fashion. But if I do it it is going to be done out in the open. Now you don't understand that. But I do and I'll tell you something – I was told by two or three people who came up afterwards and said, "Ken, you shouldn't have done that". One man said, when the Hon. Member who is now the Premier of the Province ran first in Regina Centre, they said he had other people doing it and I said, "Do you know anybody?" and the guy said, "Yes, it was me". "I helped him", he said, "I handed them out". And I said to myself, "Isn't that interesting. The Premier of the Province today would do something but if you ask him, would he admit it – No. Would he deny it – Yes". And that's the object of that exercise. To keep the candidate lily-white. Well, I'm telling you if it's worth doing and you're going to do it, you do it out in the open.

Now we discussed this. We discussed this at length – all the candidates at that time in Regina Albert Park – and we said that if anybody couldn't afford a membership and wanted one, or if he was a civil servant, that he should get one, because this Government has, more than any Government, made civil servants second-class citizens. I tell you we had a lot of civil servants out at that nominating convention in Albert Park and they came there freely and openly for people to see them. But I tell you they're scared today. They are frightened to death because they know that this Government is a very political Government and will not tolerate people having membership in another Party. So I said, "That's another good reason for sending a letter along with it". No, I'm not going to do it in an underhanded fashion – another reason for having a letter with it very simply is this – "If you are a civil servant, Sir, and we lose the election, you can produce a letter which said you had this thrust upon you", and I can tell you this very simply, that this Government has no respect for people, it has no respect for the other people's way of doing things and on top of it they have made second-class citizens out of our civil servants.

I don't suppose any of them were sitting in on any of our meetings at which we discussed these things. I didn't see any of them, but they certainly have got a lot to say about how other people do things.

Now you don't understand honesty or openness. But I'm telling you this, it's going to take more than a speech by the Member for Redberry (Mr. Michayluk) to get me to do things in an underhanded fashion. You people are giving politics a bad name. You are pandering to the Archie Bunker in us. That is the kind of conduct that you are bringing into this House and I'm ashamed of it.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. MacLeod:** — But you are better politicians in some ways. You're better at publicity. I'll admit this, that you exploited the postage-stamp gerrymander a lot better than the Liberal's exploited your bag or multiple gerrymander. Certainly you got more mileage out



of what the Liberal Party did, than the Liberal Party did out of all the nasty things that you did. In the same way, the same result was intended.

Now the purpose of this House is not to stand here arguing these things, but obviously that's why you created this Legislature. You have spent all the time in politics and very little time in legislating for the good of the people of Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. MacLeod:** — I want to talk to you just a moment about Albert Park. Its size. Obviously the Member for Redberry knew what he was saying when he said he wasn't prepared. He certainly wasn't. He said there were 3,200 voters in there. Well, I received a copy just a few minutes ago from the Electoral Officer, (who I assume is an NDP appointee and therefore would produce something that I can rely upon if he increases it beyond 3,200), which says that Albert Park had registered voters of 4,573. Surely when you've got a constituency the size of Albert Park you don't need to lie about the size. You don't have to run around the country telling people that it's 3,200 or aren't you satisfied? Isn't that interesting. You people can't even count right.

There are 4,573 voters in Regina Albert Park, and there aren't enough. I agree there are not enough and in the election I said there weren't enough, but I'll say this, that you could have doubled the size and you still wouldn't have won the seat.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. MacLeod:** — I'll tell you this, that other seats are similar. Athabasca has exactly 4,573 and I agree quite frankly that considering the sizes of the two, geographically, it isn't fair. I have never defended it, I don't defend it when the Liberals do it and I don't defend it when the NDP or the CCF do it, but I'll tell you this, I'm not going to be sanctimonious about one guy doing it and the other guy not doing it. And I think that you could have made better men of yourselves. You could have made a lot of mileage out of this.

**An Hon. Member:** — . . . ?

**Mr. MacLeod:** — That's the whole purpose of your bringing in the Bill to get political mileage. It isn't because you believe in the democratic process. It's because you want political mileage and I can tell you you'd have got a lot more mileage if you hadn't attempted to exploit it the way you're doing.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. MacLeod:** — I suppose what will happen is that you will try to chew up Albert Park as much as you can. Well, that's fine. Go ahead. And I'll tell you this, it's a constituency that has more apartments than any other constituency in the Province of Saskatchewan. And they are very difficult to deal with. In one poll alone which is entirely composed of apartment dwellers, 114 per cent of the enumerated voters came out and voted and cast ballots. It is

very difficulty to enumerate those people. I have no doubt that at the time of the election there were at least 5,000 voters, but not enough. Clearly not enough. All I can do is suggest this, that this House is here for the purpose of conducting the business of the people of Saskatchewan. We should like to see it used for that purpose. But you have not permitted it. The Government has made up its mind that it wants to use this as a publicity stand and unfortunately we're going to have to sit around and listen to all these nonsensical speeches over and over again when you could have been statesmanlike, when you might well have said, "We think all Parties have been wrong, we think we've got to undo this wrong", and you would have been better men and I can assure you you would have got a lot more mileage in the next election.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. J.E. Brockelbank (Minister of Public Works):** — Mr. Speaker, now that we've heard from whiter than white we can get back to the debate on Bill No. 81, An Act to provide for the Division of the Province into Constituencies for the Election of Members of the Legislative Assembly.

The whiter than white Member says that the reasons we brought this Bill in is because we want to make a little political mileage on it, Mr. Speaker. So, I should set the record straight right at this time.

The reason that we brought this Bill in, Mr. Speaker, is that for seven years, seven long, lean years we've been fighting for electoral reform in this Province and this Bill, at this time, Mr. Speaker, is the first step in seven years for electoral reform in this Province. It's not something we put on the Order Paper yesterday for political mileage, Mr. whiter than white. It was in our platform. It's in the program — "New Deal for People". It says:

To restore democratic representation in Saskatchewan a New Democratic Government will enact legislation to provide for an Independent Electoral Boundaries Commission to complete a fair redistribution before the next election and periodically thereafter.

And that's what this Bill does, Mr. Speaker, and Members of this House.

I said it's been a long, lean seven years waiting for the opportunity to take part in a meaningful debate whereby the Members of this House who have the interest of the democratic system in their mind can stand up and speak to the principle of a Bill which will bring the democratic process into good rapport with the people of Saskatchewan. That's what this Bill does, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — The other day, Mr. Speaker, I heard the Member from Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart), whom I just heard now applauding me, give his pathetic, hollow, transparent performance in this House. Pathetic, hollow, transparent performance. And that's exactly what it was, Mr. Speaker. Why did the Member from

Prince Albert West give that performance in this House? Everyone could see through it. He said, you know I'm in favor of an Independent Boundaries Commission. Mr. Speaker, you only have to go back to 1965 in this House where during the Committee stage of a Bill the Members of the New Democratic Party, while then in Opposition, suggested to the Members opposite, who were the Government, that they should use the Federal Independent Electoral Boundaries Commission in the Province of Saskatchewan. That was a Commission set up by the Federal Liberal Party. Mr. Speaker, we wanted electoral reform and we were quite willing to go with that three-man committee which was set up to do the Province of Saskatchewan. A known Liberal, Mr. Norman Ward, from Saskatoon, a bosom-buddy of the Member for Prince Albert West was on the Committee. We were quite prepared to say that we'd take the judgement of Mr. Norman Ward and other members of that Committee as being the Committee that would draw the boundaries in the Province of Saskatchewan. What did those members do, Mr. Speaker? Did they say – yes, we're in favor of an Independent Boundaries Commission back in '65? No, they didn't. They voted us down, Mr. Speaker.

Now the Member opposite says – I should caution the Members across the way. I would suggest that those Members in the back row not say too much on this debate. Keep out of it. Just let the fellows in the front row carry the load for you because they're the ones that were in here and brought in these electoral gerrymanders. Except for the Whip (Mr. McPherson) who sits behind the Leader (Mr. Steuart). He was one of the key men in those gerrymanders and he thought he did a fine job.

**An Hon. Member:** — Use the Whip . . .

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — Now the Member for Prince Albert West when he rose in the House the other day said to the Members that, you know, redistribution based on population is okay but, Mr. Speaker, when he had an opportunity to vote over those long, lean seven years for representation by population did he? No, Mr. Speaker, he did not vote for representation by population in any form whatsoever. They defeated motions of that kind that we brought before this House. Resolutions brought before the House.

**An Hon. Member:** — . . . Leader in 1960.

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — I would suggest if you have a question I will attempt to answer it afterwards.

**Mr. Weatherald:** — Where was the Leader of the Party in 1960?

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — I don't think that's relevant to the matter of population.

**Mr. Weatherald:** — I think it was relevant . . . of Government in 1966.

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — Oh, that's got nothing to do with what I'm talking about. I'm talking about the seven years when we were in Opposition. We offered you opportunities to change the electoral law of this Province. You didn't do it.

April 6, 1972

Now, Mr. Speaker, when the Member from Prince Albert West said that he's in favor of representation by population, is he trying to fool the people of Saskatchewan by saying that Saskatoon-Mayfair with 16,000 voters should be placed right beside Saskatoon City Park which has less than 5,000 voters? That hardly squares with what he said in the House the other day, Mr. Speaker. Over those seven years, Mr. Speaker, we brought in six resolutions dealing with electoral reform and two of those resolutions dealt specifically with electoral boundaries in the Province of Saskatchewan.

The Member for Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart), when he was speaking, said that we should pay some attention to natural geographical divisions. Well, Mr. Speaker, if there ever was a Party that paid less attention to natural geographic boundaries it is the Party that is represented by the Members opposite. In the city of Saskatoon it is quite evident, where they had two constituencies straddling a very prominent natural boundary, the Saskatchewan River, the constituency of Riversdale and the constituency of City Park University.

They didn't pay any heed to natural boundaries, now we should pay attention to natural boundaries. They were opposed to them then, Mr. Speaker. They stood up in this House and voted in opposition to them.

Now I wasn't surprised, during this debate, to hear the Member for Meadow Lake stand up and offer a few words in the debate because I understand that he has some problems up in his own constituency. I think it is well that he sharpen up his talents about voting because he may be back there soon looking for more votes.

I haven't heard from the Member from Rosthern (Mr. Boldt). I should be pleased to hear from him. In the last election his majority was cut back a little bit. The Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) barely skinned into this Legislative Chamber again after the election. The Member for the Regina constituency is another Member who came back with a shredded majority. The Member from Rosthern, of all people, had great chunks cut out of his majority because the people of Saskatchewan were dissatisfied with the electoral gerrymandering that that Party did when they were the Government.

I said something about the Member for Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) and I don't want to give him too much attention, so I will skip over him. But the Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) who spoke briefly in this debate on a supposed point of order, had his majority reduced considerably because he was one of the ones who sat on that so-called gerrymander boundary commission that the Liberal Party had when they were in power. He was one of those who helped set those boundaries, Mr. Speaker. The Member for Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac) just barely made it back into this House because the people up in the Wilkie constituency were dissatisfied with the stand that that Member had taken on a number of issues. I daresay they were completely dissatisfied with the stand that he took on the gerrymandering of constituency boundaries. The Members from Moosomin (Mr. Gardner) and Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) both returned but they were lucky as well. The Member for Regina Lakeview (Mr. McPherson) is back and, of course, we are glad to see him back. He is a very personable fellow, but in another election it may be a different story because I think that the people in that area are getting

the message.

I mentioned, Mr. Speaker, that the Member from Prince Albert West, when he was speaking the other day, was concerned about how this constituency boundaries were arranged. He said a few years ago, Mr. Speaker, that it was intolerable that part of Saskatoon City should be in the constituency of Hanley and he took it out. But then it became expedient for him, as one of the key people in the gerrymander to have part of Saskatoon City back in the constituency of Hanley, he expediently put it back in, Mr. Speaker, and consequently the city of Saskatoon has six Members representing the urban area and one Member representing part of Saskatoon and part of the area that was normally Hanley constituency.

This is quite all right but the Member for Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) should not rise in this Chamber and attempt to pass himself off as a person who has always been in favor of electoral reform in the Province of Saskatchewan. He has demonstrated over and over again in the past, that he really has no concern for electoral reform in the Province of Saskatchewan. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, if those Members in the front row over there vote in favor of this Bill that they will be doing it, Mr. Speaker, for one reason – for political expediency. And that is the only reason.

They are not converted, they don't fool me, Mr. Speaker, and I don't think they fool the people of Saskatchewan. That is why I suggest that the Members – the new Members – on the other side in the back row stay out of this debate, because if they get in the debate with those fellows in the front row you will get smeared the same as they have smeared themselves over the years.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, I don't want to spend too long speaking today. I want to conclude my remarks by saying that it is indeed a pleasant day in my legislative career to be able to stand up and support a Bill of this type that offers this principle for the Legislature of Saskatchewan, saying that we shall have an Independent Electoral Boundaries Commission. I am very pleased to be part of this as I am sure are a number of Members of this House and I will gladly support it.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. J.G. Richards (Saskatoon University):** — Mr. Speaker, in rising in second reading of this Bill to speak in favor of it, I want to speak as much to the Commission which is about to be formed as to the Members of the House.

In proposing a Bill which retains the concept of the single seat constituency, we are supporting the philosophy of the significance of local representation by individual MLAs, which can be disputed given other bases on which representation is allotted such as proportional representation, etc. And by opting for the philosophy of the single seat constituency we also imply the obligation of the local MLA to his constituent to act as a representative of an area for a group of people or a community of people, on a small local basis and to have an independence relative to the government of the day.

Another obvious principle which the Bill is trying to

elucidate is the idea of justice in terms of equal population per constituency. However, justice is never an easy concept to define whether we are talking about jurisdiction, sizes of constituency or any other matter. And there are many other aspects which will be defining the justice, or the injustice of the acts which the Commission will perform. I trust that members of the Commission will read the transcript of the debate which goes on in this House when they come to make their deliberations – and I trust that other Members will repeat some of the things which I plan to say now – so that they will take very seriously in their deliberations some of the other less obvious kinds of concerns which I think should be enunciated quite specifically by Members here in the House.

For example, I could refer to the remarks made by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) when we were considering the Ombudsman and the role and the significance of the individual Member and the need for him to act, in effect, as an Ombudsman. Following on from that argument I trust that the Commission will realize the relative difficulty of rural, relative to urban MLAs, in performing that function and, therefore, they will in effect, adopt as a principle the idea of some rural urban differential within the boundaries laid down by the constraints – 15 per cent either side of the mean – which the Act permits.

I trust that the Commission will very seriously consider this and opt on the principle that urban seats should have a larger population than rural seats. And there is another aspect to this argument, the idea, which all stems from the importance of the MLA acting as a representative of local people, I refer to Section 13 which does not specify the specific number of constituencies that are to be created, but, and I read, that the number shall not exceed 63 plus the two northern constituencies. The Act merely proceeds to set an upper limit. I very much hope that the Commission will deem it just to set the maximum number to increase to 65 the number of Members sitting in this House, so that we can achieve the principle of equal representation by population by a process of increasing the absolute number of urban MLAs, the relative number of urban MLAs, but not have to decrease the absolute number of rural MLAs.

If we stay at the same number of seats that we now have, namely 60, given the rural urban shift in population which has gone on inevitably to conform to the principle of equal representation by population, there will have to be a decrease in the absolute number of rural constituencies which, by definition, means an increase in the absolute size of these constituencies which makes it all the more difficult for the rural MLA to perform his function, given the difficulties which are posed by our sparse rural population density.

Therefore, I trust that not only I when I speak on this Bill, but others will take up these points and that the Commission will be impressed by the debate which goes on in this House, that it will take as a principle the need to increase the number of seats in the House despite the argument that could be made because of the declining population in Saskatchewan that there should be no increase. Because I think it is highly important, as the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) said during his speech during the Ombudsman debate, it is highly important that MLAs do act as Ombudsmen with a degree of independence of the Government and that to make this job easy we should not be increasing the size of rural constituencies and making it

more difficult.

That concludes my remarks, I will vote in favor of the Bill.

**Mr. J.K. Comer (Nipawin):** — Mr. Speaker, as one of the Members who wasn't supposed to be here according to the last redistribution, it gives me some pleasure to rise and speak on this Bill.

As some of you may remember in 1967 the Liberals only won by eight votes, so they had to improve their situation in Nipawin. They cut a little bit off in one place and put a little bit on in four more places and they thought they had given themselves about 349 vote majority. It didn't work out.

**Mr. Cody:** — What was your majority?

**Mr. Comer:** — My majority was 270, it was about a 600 vote change.

I should like to go on and deal for a few minutes with some of the comments that have been made by Members who have spoken across the floor on this Bill.

First of all I am always very interested when the Member from Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod) gets up. He generally explores a question from all the angles and leaves you completely confused on just exactly what he thinks. But he mentioned the fact, first of all, that his constituency had 4,753 voters in the last election. Now I don't know whether the Liberals thought I was twice as good but I have about twice that many. Some people have three times that many. Some people have over four times that many. I don't think that you can claim there is any equality in that.

In talking about what needs to be done in this Bill he said that you have to recognize growth areas and you have to recognize the need for rural representation. On one point I agree with him. We have seen in this Province redistributions that represented growth areas. It is a pretty nebulous thing and it is pretty hard to figure out just exactly where the growth is going to occur. I think many of us would agree that substantially the growth has occurred in Saskatchewan in the cities. So if you recognize special representation for growth areas and special representation for rural areas we are going to have a large number of seats by the time we get finished.

I do think that he is right when he mentions that we need some special consideration for the rural areas. I think, also the Government was right, the Attorney General was right by not putting that into the Bill. I should just like to echo what the Member from Saskatoon University (Mr. Richards) said. That we hope that the Commission will take this into consideration. We hope that they will take that 15 per cent leeway and consider the fact of the rural Member has to serve a very large area, even though at times the population may not be particularly large. And that the rural seats, in terms of population, will be somewhat smaller than the urban seats.

I think that is a principle that is worthwhile following. I don't intend to say much more on this Bill. I should first of all like to deal with something that the Hon. Member from Meadow Lake (Mr. Coupland) said. He mentioned the fact that we were redistributing him out of his seat. Now I don't know but this

may be so. But at the same time I think it was essential that we did draw a certain area of the North that was given special consideration, that was not going to be given seats with the same population or even seats within the same range as seats in the rest of the province. Because I think we all recognize that a northern Member may have a small population but he has a fantastic area to cover. You know I could complain too, I am losing some area into this northern region. I am not losing my seat but I am losing a significant area. In terms of politics I am losing 100 vote majority and when you only have 270 it puts you in not the nicest position. But at the same time I think that it is a principle that is worthwhile following giving special consideration to the North.

You know we can't draw a line just to leave Meadow Lake and a line to leave Shellbrook and a line to leave Nipawin as it is. You have to draw a line roughly in – with the line for the northern department, and give that area special consideration because of the peculiar situation there.

I should like lastly to deal with the talk that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) gave yesterday when he got up on this Bill. He didn't want us to get political. He said that he almost threatened us – if you get political we might vote against this Bill. Well you go right ahead. If you want to vote against it you go right ahead and I will just dare you to go on television and say to the people of this Province, they used their big majority to squash us 15. I just dare you to.

**Mr. Steuart:** — You might get your wish.

**Mr. Comer:** — You know I was reading through the past debates. The Hon. Member from Saskatoon Mayfair on a number of occasions has introduced resolutions asking for the Government – the former Government – to set an Independent Boundaries Commission. There were times when the Hon. Member from Prince Albert West was pretty loud in those debates. But in 1971 he didn't have anything to say. You know, generally, when you are reading through the debates even though the Hon. Member from Prince Albert West might not say anything, you can always find little interjections. He didn't even have them, nothing was said. I think we know the reasons why the Hon. Member said nothing.

He knew that the people of this Province could smell an election in the wind. He knew that on that same wind they could smell a skunk in the chicken house. The Hon. Member from Prince Albert West wasn't about to show his stripes. Mr. Speaker, the silence of the Opposition is understandable . . .

**Mr. MacDonald (Milestone):** — Oh, we will have lots to say.

**Mr. Comer:** — If they want to vote against it let them go ahead. We are proud to introduce this Bill and we will be proud to vote for it and I think the people of Saskatchewan will be satisfied that we have introduced it and voted for it.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. F. Meakes (Touchwood):** — Mr. Speaker, I'm only going to speak for a very few minutes. I had no intention of taking part in this debate until



I listened to my friend the Member for Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod). I kind of wish he was in his seat. As usual he "MacLeoded" the issue. Really what I want to say was to answer just a few of his remarks. One of the things he said that we, the Members across the way, intend to chew up Albert Park. I really don't think he meant this. The Bill he has in front of him, the Bill that we are debating, Sir, is a Bill in which there will be no political chewing up of any constituency.

I can understand him accusing us of being political and he wished that we wouldn't get political in this debate, I can understand that. He is a new Member of the Legislature and as a new Member of the Legislature he didn't have to live through the debates of the last six or seven years on an Independent Boundaries Commission. He didn't have to listen to the arguments, in particular from the Member from Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart), in trying to define or give his reasons why an Independent Boundaries Commission was no good and then have to turn back and come into this House and hear the Hon. Leader of the Opposition say that he was going to support the Bill.

A moment ago during the speech of my Hon. colleague from Nipawin (Mr. Comer) there was a quip across the House, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition said, "We'll surprise you, we may oppose it yet". I inadvertently quipped back, "I hope so". I want to say, Mr. Speaker, I want to say to this House that I didn't really mean that. It came out in a sense of fun.

I think that this Bill is a Bill that needs support of all the Members of the House. I could go into a long dissertation which I have no intention of doing, of the gerrymandering in adding a large area to Touchwood and I could say it was political. But I would rather like to continue on a little bit further than what my colleague the Member from Saskatoon University (Mr. Richards) had to say.

As one who has represented a rural constituency and it was a constituency consisting of about 65 townships with about 14 villages and towns prior to the redistribution of two years ago, I can say that in endeavoring to serve that constituency I found it quite hard to get all the way around to meet with my constituents and for them to find me. I feel that this was a larger constituency than it is wise to have.

In the last few months since the election I have had added, because of the redistribution, another 28 townships, another six or seven villages and towns. I know, Mr. Speaker, as one Member for an area that reaches well over 100 miles one way from corner to corner and 60 miles wide in another way, that it is practically impossible adequately to serve that constituency and to serve my constituents the way they should be served. I too, along with my colleague from Saskatoon University, would hope that the Commission would take that into consideration.

Before I sit down I say this, Mr. Speaker, that I believe that each one of us as Members of the Legislature, once this Commission is set up I think it would be a good idea for each one of us to put our views on paper and present it to the Commission. I am sure they would be interested and accept – I shouldn't say accept our advice, but listen to the problems we find in the representing of our own constituency. We should comment on the lay out, the things that we believe that they should take into consideration to improve the capacity for a Member of the

April 6, 1972

Legislature adequately to represent his constituency.

Mr. Speaker, as one who has voted several times in the last few years in this House to set up an Independent Boundaries Commission, it is a great pleasure for me and not only a great pleasure but I feel it is a milestone in my public life that at last we are to bring forth a program where we can come closer to having true democracy and that true democracy I refer to is representation by population.

**Mr. A. Thibault (Melfort-Kinistino):** — Mr. Speaker, I have spoken on several occasions about the unfairness of the way boundaries have been drawn in the past and it is needless to rehash the whole thing over again. I am quite happy that this Bill is before the House and that we will have the Independent Commission to redistribute the boundaries. I hope that we can see representation by population much closer than we have seen it in the past. And I say in the past.

There is another area that I should like to suggest, something that is not in the Bill and perhaps we should bring in another Bill pertaining to the same subject. That is a set date for elections. We have this sort of sickness that has developed to a point where the politicians are not looking to serve their country as well as they could. It is an off and on deal. They are fighting elections every time there is a rumor of an election when they should be sitting in the House perhaps here or in Ottawa. We are worried about the date of the election and that's what I say perhaps should be in this Bill or perhaps should be brought in in another Bill. So that we know that in four years time on a certain date that the provincial election will be held. Just like your municipal elections and so on. The game that we are playing today is unfair to our people. To tell you the truth we behave like juveniles and worse than that. Because it is not giving good government to our people. We are not doing the job at the time we should be doing it. Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to heap abuse on anyone. Everybody in this Province knows what the score is. I am glad that we are approaching this far and before I leave this Legislature when my last term comes up, I hope we will have a date for the election.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. J. McIsaac (Wilkie):** — Mr. Speaker, this particular Bill before us is one that I was pleased to see the Government bring in. It was one of their campaign promises. We listened yesterday with great interest as the Attorney General launched the debate on this Bill as he indicated the fairness which he hoped this Commission would deal with the question of redistribution. But as I listened this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, to all of the Members opposite jump up one after another I question how fair this three-man Commission can now be when we learn more of the motives of the Members opposite and the feelings as expressed this afternoon. I very seriously question the intended fairness and the position that the judge, that you Sir, that the other members of this Committee will be placed in after listening to this debate and reading the transcript as was mentioned by one of the Members opposite. I will have more comments to make on this Bill, Mr. Speaker, at a later time and I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Messer that **Bill No. 75 – An Act to amend The Veterinary Services Act** be now read a second time.

**Mr. McIsaac:** — Mr. Speaker, the Bill before us is one that provides for the payment of larger annual provincial grants to veterinary service districts. I should like to point out at the beginning of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, that I may wander somewhat from the principle of the Bill that is right before us and cover some aspects that cover the broader picture of providing veterinary service.

I want to first point out to Members that this Act was amended last year in 1970 to allow veterinary service districts to help construct clinics for veterinarians in practice. Amendments were made to Section 6 and Section 11 of the Act to provide for this development and secondly to provide for a government matching capital grant to those municipalities which decided to go ahead and construct a veterinary clinic. In short, Mr. Speaker, the Bill before us does not represent new policy in the sense the municipalities were last year given power to go ahead and proceed with the construction of a clinic. Provision was made for that last year.

The Bill before us does however, Mr. Speaker, provide for the provincial share of the clinic cost to be made in one lump payment rather than over a period of several years. So in that sense it is an extension of the 1970 amendments. I will be supporting the legislation, Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the Government for bringing it in. But I do want to take the opportunity to urge the Minister to review the entire principle of The Veterinary Services Act. Last year I made similar comments to what I'm now going to advance, to the former Minister of Agriculture. I made them in private, not only last year but previous years. I've made some of these remarks to the former Minister of Agriculture, the Hon. former Member (Mr. McFarlane). So I can assure the Minister that they are intended in a partisan view nor are they intended in a personal view, as, of course, I am not back in active practice the last few months.

I think a bit of historical background for this legislation might be in order, Mr. Speaker. The present Veterinary Services District Act was enacted in Saskatchewan in 1945. And at that time it was largely a copy of legislation that was in effect and in operation in the Province of Nova Scotia. Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick a year or two later adopted similar schemes and as a matter of fact no other Canadian province has followed a similar plan as we have here and in the three Maritime provinces. Northern Ontario have somewhat similar provisions but not really identical to the coverage here in Saskatchewan. The scheme very simply stated, provide for a provincial grant or a provincial-municipal grant as is the case in Saskatchewan, a grant or a contribution toward the travel costs of veterinarians in rural areas. And, in turn, of course the veterinarian agrees to provide service to the farmers and producers in that district at uniform fees throughout the district. That's the essence of the present legislation. Now through the years the schemes in the other provinces have changed quite considerably. As a matter of fact in New Brunswick today the veterinarians are employed there directly by the Provincial Government and in practice throughout the province. But I won't take the time of the House to elaborate on these and other changes.

In Saskatchewan as a matter of fact, through the years there have been some changes but nothing really too major. Some increase in the size of the grant, some variation in the size of the area that one man can service, provision for a larger grant where a second man was hired and so on. Last year and this year again the changes were made to allow municipal service districts to construct veterinary clinics. I think the Member for Moose Jaw North (Mr. MacDonald) earlier in this debate, Mr. Speaker, pointed out some of the problems of the present Act. It did not encourage, as a matter of fact, it discouraged the development of the use of clinics as a means of providing better service to the producers. The legislation in the long haul has not resulted in extending veterinary service to the rural areas of Saskatchewan. I think in support of that statement, Mr. Speaker, a very quick review of Department of Agriculture annual reports throughout the years will certainly support that particular contention. The number of districts that were formed and awaiting the services of veterinarians, some of them have been set up for years and years and have disbanded, reorganized again and so on. So it certainly has not resulted in the establishment of very many good strong practices in Saskatchewan. And I believe as was pointed out by the Member for Moose Jaw North that it has in fact worked against the development of improved service and stronger veterinary practices throughout the province.

And I raise this point at this time, Mr. Speaker, for several reasons and I will mention two or three of them briefly. First of all since 1945 there have been great changes in the livestock industry of this Province. I am sure they are well known to all Members. We have seen fewer numbers of farmers and yet we have seen generally speaking, a maintenance of the livestock population but it is now concentrated in fewer hands. This has brought about greater specialization. I'm sure we are all aware of the specialization in the poultry industry. The farm flock is pretty well a thing of the past and the large egg producer and broiler factories have been with us for some time. The same is developing to some extent in the hog industry and to a lesser extent in the feeder cattle industry. At the same time that we have seen these developments, Mr. Speaker, the losses in the livestock industry are just as high as ever if not higher than ever, from disease as such, and from nutritional and management disorders that go along with disease. Not only is there an actual death loss that is a factor in contributing to the loss due to disease, but it is a loss suffered from the inefficiency in dealing with those animals that should have died and the industry would have been better off if they had died. So that we have two kinds of losses that have been going on and really those figures when added up, the experts who estimate those figures at the university and elsewhere across the country, put them well in the millions in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Now at the same time that the livestock industry itself has changed, Mr. Speaker, veterinary practice has changed as well. Today it is also like most other professions, a bit more specialized. We are gradually acquiring a more definite and definitive knowledge of certain conditions peculiar to Saskatchewan. We are gradually getting more knowledge and more practical control policies that apply to the method of handling the raising of livestock in Saskatchewan, so we have seen this kind of change as well. Now what about the livestock producer over the years, Mr. Speaker? Well I think everyone is well aware that he has lots of sources of help and advice. Feed companies supply advice,

some of it good, most of it good as a matter of fact, and they are making good efforts to do so. We have seen the Wheat Pool producers organization itself, grow into a major force in this respect. We have advice from experts there with respect to management, disease control, marketing and nutrition and all other aspects of raising livestock. We've seen our provincial Department of Agriculture expand and grow in this regard and I am sure it will continue to grow further with respect to advice and direction as far as the livestock industry is concerned. We have seen the Federal Department of Agriculture grow and expand services with respect to producers in the livestock industry, the private veterinarian as well as the Provincial and Federal people in the field.

The private veterinarian is still handling two aspects of practice if you like as applied to the livestock producer. Number one could be described as the fire-engine type of practice. I think here of treating the individual animal, whether it is a cow with foot-rot or whether it is a steer with pneumonia or what have you. At the opposite end of the pole is the straight hard health type of program where the practitioner is employed to oversee the general health or efficiency or well-being of the herd or the operation of the dairy herd whether it is a dairy practice, swine or beef cattle. So these are the two extremes and, of course, the facts are that the great majority of practices are a mixture of these. So I say we have had these two developments, we have seen changing patterns in livestock production, we have seen expansion in the veterinary service itself and in the knowledge of veterinary science as it relates to Saskatchewan conditions.

This brings me to one other development, Mr. Speaker, which is a significant and a relatively recent development as far as Saskatchewan is concerned and I refer here to the founding and the establishment of the Western College of Veterinary Medicine. The College has done a number of things, Mr. Speaker, and I suppose generally we could say two things: first of all, it has initiated and begun graduating veterinarians as such for the last two or three years. It is training students in other words not only for Saskatchewan but for Western Canada. But secondly, I think it has created a much greater awareness of disease problems and management problems as they relate to Saskatchewan. It has already stimulated a good deal of research in areas that have been of benefit to Saskatchewan producers and as time goes on will be of even greater benefit to livestock producers in Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, we are spending a good deal of provincial money, we have already spent a good deal of provincial money in establishing and operating the Western College of Veterinary Medicine. We do get operational support from three other Western Provinces, for this is one of the first schools of its kind in the Prairies that operated under the principle of joint provincial support. But we still put up a good deal of the money initially and we still put up a good portion of the operating costs of that College. What is happening to the graduating class up there, Mr. Speaker, very simply stated is this: we are not getting very many of those graduates going out into the rural areas of the province. Last year there were four or five, this year my unofficial reports vary from zero to two graduates that may establish in rural Saskatchewan. My reason for raising these points at this time, Mr. Speaker, is very briefly this; we are spending a good deal of money to graduate these people, we are already spending some money in the form of veterinary service support grants to try and initiate and establish veterinary service throughout the province. I suggest, Sir,

that that effort has not brought about the desired results. I want to ask the Minister this afternoon to give serious thought and study to a completely new approach to the provision of veterinary services in rural Saskatchewan. I don't have the answers, if I did I would take a good deal longer than I should at this point to give him the answers, or to give him some suggestions. I think first of all if the Minister looks at this problem he will find that it will mean a scrapping of the present Veterinary Service District Act. I think, secondly, he will need to bring together veterinarians in active practice in the province, representatives of the various livestock groups of the province and others that are active in the livestock industry, and hope that they can sit down and develop a plan of assistance if you like so that all livestock owners throughout the province will be in a better position to take advantage of the work that is going on in Saskatoon, in the University that we support provincially and of the graduates that will be coming out of that school in greater numbers next year. Mr. Speaker, I realize a move of this kind and a study of this kind won't take place overnight. I appreciate the fact that the Minister in personal and private conversations is aware of some of the problems in this regard.

I just want to take this opportunity to say we need more than some patchwork on the present legislation to meet the needs of providing the kind of veterinary service that the livestock industry as it is developing today in Saskatchewan will need, if we are going to stay as a good healthy livestock industry, one that is competitive and one that will continue to be the high quality of industry that it has been in the province.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. J.R. Messer (Minister of Agriculture):** — Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a few brief remarks before we pass second reading of this Bill.

I can certainly appreciate and respect the remarks that the Hon. Member from Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac) has made in regard to The Veterinary Services Act. I can agree with a great deal, if not all of what he has said. We recognize some of the deficiencies that he has brought to our attention today, I have had some discussion and consultation with him in the past in regard to further improvements that we could incorporate into The Veterinary Services Act. I think his suggestion is good that perhaps the answer is a total new Act. I believe he realizes that at this point in time we have not had the opportunity to put together the kind of solutions that are needed in order to provide the services to the livestock industry in Saskatchewan that we see they are deserving of.

I have had discussions with veterinarians in the Province of Saskatchewan and in fact I met for the first time with their association a month or so ago to discuss some of the improvements that they thought we could incorporate into The Veterinary Services Act. They unfortunately have not in their own minds thought out a concise and precise policy in regard to the improvements that we are considering. Certainly we will take the opportunity over the next year and before a session in 1973 to consult, not only with the veterinarians in the Province of Saskatchewan, but also with the livestock people and any other groups or individuals that may be related to this industry, so

that we could work towards the drafting of a new Act, one that I think would recognize and amend the shortcomings of the present Act and deficiency of services in regard to veterinary services in the province.

We also recognize that most of the graduates from the Veterinary College in Saskatchewan leave for services outside of the province. It is unfortunate, I think, that one of the main reasons that they are attracted to do this is that there are opportunities for the establishment of smaller veterinary districts, if I may use that terminology, in larger cities and provinces other than Saskatchewan. This is more attractive to them for a number of reasons, one being that the return may well be higher and they certainly don't have the kinds of problems that are encountered within the Province of Saskatchewan trying to service a large area. Sometimes a large area is needed in order to give them the volume of livestock, the kind of practice that he needs in order to make the kind of living he is deserving of. I think there has to be some real thinking done in regard to restructuring those districts so that we in fact can make it more attractive for these graduates so that we can, I think, get better return on the dollars that we invest in training and educating these people who ultimately become veterinarians who have in fact been residents of the Province of Saskatchewan until graduating day and then leave for what we may call "greener pastures" in some other province.

Having made these remarks I assure the Member from Wilkie and the Members opposite that we will endeavor to do all that is possible to redraft a Bill that I think will provide much better services to the livestock people in the Province of Saskatchewan.

I move second reading of this Bill.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Blakeney that **Bill No. 68 – An Act respecting the termination of the Athabasca Pulp Mill Project** be now read a second time.

**Mr. J.G. Richards (Saskatoon University):** — Mr. Speaker, with regret I rise to oppose the Government on this Bill. I should like to congratulate the Government for having cancelled the contract for Meadow Lake, however, I do not think it appropriate to pass legislation in this House allowing for the compensation to be spelled out.

My personal opinion I will elaborate as I proceed, I will not make at the moment, but there are a number of things or reasons why it is inappropriate to allow any compensation to Karl Landegger for the contracts into which the previous government entered for Athabasca Forest Industries Limited. In my opinion, Mr. Landegger has no economic, no political, no moral claim on the people of Saskatchewan for any compensation. I should like also to make people in Saskatchewan begin to enter the debate in a more substantive way, as what shall be the resource development policy of our Province. It is also for that reason that I should like to oppose this Bill because I want to dramatize, to make public, to help people think, as to what should be resource development policies. It is very difficult here in the Legislature to try and get people to think given the

kinds of debates which we often degenerate into, but I hope in some small way my vote and the words which I say will influence the people of Saskatchewan to think as to how we can develop our Province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition made reference to an alleged moral obligation of the Government to pay compensation because it decided to cancel the mill. I should like, although this is a repetition of arguments which we have had many times before in the House and on the election platforms throughout the province, I should like just once again to go through some of the relationships into which the Government of the Province of Saskatchewan and Mr. Landegger have entered. I think that the conclusion from this discussion is the inevitable one that Mr. Landegger has no moral claim for any compensation whatsoever.

Let us go back to the Prince Albert Pulp Company and again I emphasize the obvious point that Mr. Landegger assumed no risk whatsoever. There was the \$50 million provincial guaranteed loan, there was the \$1.5 million in equity put up by the provincial government, there was the \$5 million grant through the Department of Regional Economic Expansion federally. There is approximately \$9 million invested in Saskatchewan Pulpwood, the Crown corporation set up to operate at a loss and to take the risk out of all the lumbering operation in the forests. What do we have as the nominal contribution of capital risk to the Prince Albert Pulp Company by Parsons and Whittemore? We have \$7 million out of a total of \$72.5 million. But that is just the tip of the iceberg. We all know that Parsons and Whittemore through various sub-contractors built the mill, they earned the profit on the construction of the mill and assuming profit rates on construction they earned \$7 million in profits by the time that the mill was built and accordingly they had no capital to recover, they were not in any sense uncovered by the time that mill was finished. Then there are other aspects which the Hon. Member from Whitmore Park, who is so incensed about monopolies would be obviously loath to see, there is the monopoly which Parsons and Whittemore had as the sole sales agent for the product of the Prince Albert Pulp Company, 3 per cent commission, Mr. Speaker, which adds up to \$1 million a year.

Now we come to look at things again in more detail and we add up the direct subsidies. We have got the \$3.8 million loss to August 31, 1971, in Saskatchewan Pulpwood, we have got \$5 million direct subsidy from the Canadian taxpayers to that mill, and then – I take these figures from information from the Deputy Minister of Highways as to the portion of highways built by the Department of Highways which should be attributed solely to the pulp mill – the figures which he gives are \$5.3 million. If we add together these three elements of subsidy the Saskatchewan Pulpwood losses of \$3.8 million, the DREE grant of \$5 million, the roads of \$5.3 million, we have a \$14.1 million subsidy, divide that by six, the number of years since construction of the Prince Albert Pulp Mill and we have a \$2.35 million annual subsidy . . .

**Mr. Kramer:** — . . . \$6 million invested . . .

**Mr. Richards:** — I am sorry if I have missed something out, add it in afterwards.



At least on this simple kind of analysis there is a \$2.35 million annual subsidy which works out to \$3,000 for every man who has worked in the woods or in the pulp mill. I would argue, Mr. Speaker, that that kind of subsidy which Mr. Landegger managed to wrench out of the previous Government does not mean that he has any moral claim to be compensated.

Now to come onto what are some of the general conclusions. Again, I don't want totally to challenge the sincerity of the previous Government as to what they were doing. I do believe that there was a degree of sincerity in their resource development policies, that they did believe that you could entrust resource development to private entrepreneurs and provide through the Provincial Government the infrastructure and the backup. My argument is that although that was their principle, that was not their practice. In practice they allowed for the very thing that they so abhorred from the previous CCF administration. We had private profits, private control but we had public risk and public subsidy, and the whole operation was to be blown up three times over in the Athabasca Forest Industries.

This was a highly capital intensive project which involved \$150,000 of capital investment for every job to be created. When we realized the atrocious situation of the markets and I quote from the 1972 Pulp and Paper Report:

A smaller world demand and continuing unfavorable relationship between prices and costs produce an unsatisfactory year for the Canadian Pulp and Paper industry in 1971. Both shipments and earnings declined from 1970, which itself had been the least successful period recorded by the industry in many years.

And yet the previous Government and Mr. Landegger was pushing them and champing at the bit to create another \$177 million pulp mill in Saskatchewan. Just last month we have had 17 people laid off from the pulp mill in Prince Albert. This kind of irrationality must stop.

I have not even touched on the lack of adequate planning into the pollution effect upon the Beaver River and the Churchill River system by the previous Government. There is a whole story to be told about varied reports, the scandals of consultants not listened to, the last minute environmental patch-up work which was attempted to cover up what would have been ecological disaster. All of these are the indications of the power which Mr. Landegger wielded over the previous Government. A Government which was intent upon having as an issue for the election the fait accompli of the signed agreements for that pulp mill. I submit that it is a very significant precedent that the people of Saskatchewan saw through that kind of election tactic and they were willing to take a sophisticated position and concern themselves with the ecology, and to concern themselves with the financial details and vote against the Government, which with such lack of foresight and with such obeisance to a foreign corporation was prepared to subsidize as had the previous Government.

What are some of the indications of the power with which Mr. Landegger wielded over the previous Government? I could return to the June 14th agreements which have been time and again talked about in the House, and how these closed off loopholes at the very last minute as Mr. Landegger was fearful of

the contract being cancelled. Mr. Landegger knew what was the position that had been stated by the now Premier, then Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Blakeney, who on February 19th said that an NDP Government will reserve full freedom of action in dealing with the new Saskatchewan pulp mill. I repeat that phrase, "full freedom of action". Mr. Landegger knew that, the people of Saskatchewan knew that, the Liberal Party knew that and I submit, Mr. Speaker, that it would be morally just to use that full freedom of action to send Mr. Landegger packing without a penny. Why, Mr. Speaker, did the contracts for the Athabasca Forest Industries for this new pulp mill allow for \$17 million in advances on the day of signing of the agreement? Is it coincidental the fact that the \$17 million figure happens to be within \$200,000 of the equity commitment which Parsons and Whittemore had to put into a new pulp mill. I am sure it was purely coincidental that 70 per cent of \$24 million, Parsons and Whittemore's equity commitment to this mill, was \$16.8 million and the advances were for \$17 million. Pure coincidence, pure coincidence, nothing else.

What, Mr. Speaker, do I personally think is the most appropriate position for us to take? As I stated before there are two aspects of this argument: the one is what right, if any, Mr. Landegger has to claim compensation? I would argue from the way and the practices which he entered with the previous Government, that he does not have any.

The second aspect, however, is the beginning of the debate which Saskatchewan people must undertake as to how can we develop our Province to the best interests of Saskatchewan people. I admit that I don't have all the answers and I'm just initiating a debate, but I think that small as it is, the decision that this House makes with respect to compensation to Mr. Landegger is significant. The Premier referred to three alternatives which were open to the Government: (i) Let nature take its course. (ii) To legislation termination. (iii) To undertake an arbitration procedure. Now the option which I think was the most appropriate and I am sure the Premier considered it at length is the question of legislating termination. I think that what we should have done in this case is we should have brought legislation before the House declaring the contracts to be null and void and setting what compensation, if any, is deemed advisable.

I think there should be some qualifications about no compensation here. I think it is a separate issue as to whether or not we honor the interest payments on the \$35 million borrowed via Athabasca Forest Industries. At the moment I am making the point about the lack of claim of Mr. Landegger, not of other creditors. That is a separate argument. Therefore, the case could be made that compensation should be made to the extent of \$1.8 million due to the financial obligations of the moneys borrowed. Although in a good populist Saskatchewan tradition one could ask why should we be paying money to these financiers. I also think that a case could be made if there are local contractors who have been damaged by this decision to cancel the mill, there should be some board set up to allow for compensation to local contractors. When we come to the \$4.1 million to Parsons and Whittemore Equipment and the \$.3 million to Parsons and Whittemore Contractors I think there is no need to pay those sums at all.

Now, there are implications of taking such a position. It

is a high risk position but there are great things to be gained as well as lost. There are credit implications I agree. It's not the kind of thing which Eastern financiers are going to like us to do. But then a New Democratic Party was not elected in Saskatchewan to do the kinds of things which Eastern financiers necessarily like us to do. We were elected as socialists to bring social change to the North American economy and these are the kinds of risks which I think we have to be prepared to make.

**Mr. Boldt:** — You were not elected . . .

**Mr. Richards:** — Secondly are legal implications. The Premier made allusions to the fact that there are legal problems and that it might be constitutionally beyond the power of a Provincial Legislature, but from the legal opinions which I have got, and I have taken the trouble to consult a number of legal people on this question, that although the courts might protest, although Liberal lawyers might rant, I think that it is legally constitutional from a Provincial point of view. There are no extra-provincial rights involved. If we come to talk about the British Columbia Electric cases as an example in point, that was a rotten decision which was never appealed by the British Columbia Government and it should have been. There is a great deal of legal opinion which is of that opinion.

It would be a significant precedent if the Saskatchewan Government were prepared to bring legislation to this House to declare the contracts null and void, declare no compensation for Mr. Landegger and then should Mr. Landegger, and he certainly will, given his pattern of legal affairs which trips across three continents, bring us to the courts I think we are within our constitutional bounds to put forth such legislation even if Mr. Landegger would challenge it. It would be a significant precedent in Provincial autonomy and we need Provincial autonomy if we are going to set for ourselves an autonomous socialist policy with respect to resource development. Given the colleagues of the Members opposite who occupy the Treasury Benches in Ottawa we can never expect any alternative to the resource sell-out which characterizes Federal policy, Mr. Speaker. If there are going to be in the near future constructive alternatives which develop resources for Canadian people and not for the interests of the United States economy, these alternatives are going primarily to have to be developed at a regional level.

I come back to a point which I have made at other times in other context that one should not solely interpret what is going on in the Quebec Separatist Movement merely as a phenomenon of cultural separatism, it is also an expression of frustration at the lack of economic independence in Ottawa. The frustration which is felt by people such as Mr. Levesque, who left the Party of the Members opposite because that Party was unwilling to pursue an independent Canadian economic policy. It is a very unfortunate state of affairs in which we find ourselves here in Canada now that the creative politics which are attempting to find constructive Canadian alternatives are being primarily found at the Provincial level. At the Federal level we have the eloquent, swinging Trudeau who will lead us gaily down the path into integration with the United States in that we are being forced, albeit that this is at an unfortunate level in terms of the market size, in terms of the limited powers of Provincial Legislatures, that we are being forced at a Provincial level to engage in the struggle to define alternatives.

Finally, after having considered credit implications and legal implications, there are political implications. This would be a significant struggle, it would be a significant political precedent in the willingness of a Provincial Government to stand up for the interests of Saskatchewan people independently of the interests of a large corporation. And that is no light political precedent to take, it is the kind of precedent which would require the united support of Saskatchewan people behind the NDP Government. I am of the opinion that Saskatchewan people are willing to take these risks. I am of the opinion that Saskatchewan people realize the bankruptcy of the policies of the previous Government and that they very much want, they desperately want socialist leadership in some kind of constructive alternative. Therefore, it is with regret, as I return to the beginning, that we did not on this occasion use it to give the kind of leadership which I think was needed on this issue and it is with profound regret that on second reading of this Bill I will oppose the Government.

**Mr. T.M. Weatherald (Cannington):** — Mr. Speaker, I regret that I have not had the time that I would have liked to have had to prepare a fairly lengthy speech on this particular subject . . .

**Mr. Romanow:** — From the heart . . .

**Mr. Weatherald:** — Well that's where it will have to come from. But, Mr. Speaker, I do appreciate the comments from the Member opposite who unlike so many other speakers on that side, and I must confess at times we are also guilty, of stripping his speech of the political aspect and giving us a fairly clear-cut statement of what he actually believes. I must confess that I would be most delighted to debate with him but I'm afraid it would be on the opposite side on a particularly resource development policy such as he mentioned. But what is drastically needed at this particular time in our Province is a clear-cut statement from the Government opposite as to precisely what its policies are regarding resource development. We are wandering around in a political wilderness that is known by just about everyone apparently except the Premier and his Cabinet that the Government does not have a policy of any kind as far as developing the resources of Saskatchewan. On the left side they have the Hon. Member from Saskatoon who suggests an outright nationalization policy to develop our resources. A complete nationalization policy, I respect him for his views, I don't share them but he does know what he is speaking for.

On the other side we have the right side of the Government claiming that we should have some little bit of Government money in and as much free enterprise money as we can get, as long as they don't make a profit, and we'll try and attract some capital in that regard. In the middle I think we have total confusion and that is generally the policy of the Government opposite, total confusion. And so what is needed by the Government opposite is a clear-cut statement of policy so that the people of Saskatchewan, whether it will be outright nationalization, or whether it will be a fuzzy type of free enterprise which has existed for some time under the Government, what the rules will be for people to invest in Saskatchewan in business and in resource development which is most important as far as our people are concerned and which is most important if we are to attract any kind of investment capital whatsoever. I want to make it

very clear, Mr. Speaker, if the Government continues in its course there is no person in Saskatchewan with any amount of money who is going to invest any amount of money here. It is becoming more and more obvious that the Government will find itself, if they haven't already reached it, of going on very many wide experimental situations in which they themselves will be the chief backers. So I want to suggest that the Government of Saskatchewan develop a policy and let the people of Saskatchewan know what it is. It is the most important thing at this particular time.

Now as for the Athabasca pulp mill the suggestion most recently put forward, of course, is simply the contracts made with Parsons and Whittemore should not be honored; that in fact Saskatchewan should basically act like some Latin American republic states and send the Company, regardless of the contracts made with them, packing. Well, Mr. Speaker, what this really basically is, is a straight policy of outright nationalization. It is obvious that once this is done, it is equally obvious that we would attract no more outside investment of any kind. We simply would close the borders of Saskatchewan once this had been done once in our Province and it is equally obvious that no other investment would come from outside the province and the Government would actually be embarked on a total nationalization policy, which I presume is what the Member from Saskatoon is really advocating.

As for the profits he talks about Parsons and Whittemore making, I would remind him at the Prince Albert mill that a turnkey contract was left which was very competitive with any other contractors throughout the country. It was made as far as other contractors throughout the country was concerned and, therefore, it would be hard to see how the Government of Saskatchewan itself could have hired the work for any less cost.

**Mr. Richards:** — Mr. Speaker, would the Hon. Member permit a question?

**Mr. Weatherald:** — I'll permit a question when I'm finished my speech. As for the other aspects of Parsons and Whittemore, the Members opposite are very quick to condemn policies which apparently have outside capital invested in them but at the same time Members opposite stand up day after day in this Assembly and they cry out long and loud that we should develop our resources so that we maintain population throughout the whole province. This we agree with. Really it is the basis of the regional expansion policy of the Federal Government, the reason the Federal Government puts grants into various projects around the country so that we can decentralize our population, so that we can create jobs outside the big cities and that we don't have everyone hived up into 15 or 20 cities in the country. But the very same Members today get up and condemn the Federal Government for putting money into a project such as the Prince Albert pulp mill. They condemn it and yet tomorrow they will likely give a speech saying that it is a terrible thing how the people are coming to the cities, it is a terrible thing how they are leaving the countryside. Yet today they make a speech and say it is a terrible thing that the Federal Government should put some money in to develop a pulp mill at Prince Albert to keep the people working in the countryside and keep them there.

Mr. Speaker, I simply suggest that they are inconsistent

and they should make up their minds whether they want decentralization with public support in it, or else they don't want decentralization because we can't have it both ways. I suggest that many of the costs while they are real, are more than recovered through many of the customary taxes which many of my colleagues have outlined dozens of times throughout the province – corporation taxes, income taxes, the multiplier affect that is normal economic occurrence when money is spent. I want to suggest to the Member opposite in this regard that often what is greatly overlooked, the talk always by economists, is how much money is flowing out of the province or out of the country, in effect the dividends and in effect the capital, and I want to suggest to the Member opposite that there was a study done not long ago by a professor I am sure he would know of, Professor Safarian, that showed very, very clearly that in many export industries such as potash that if the money that came into the province had not been invested by an outsider that there would be no flow of money back into the province through the export. In other words, Mr. Speaker, while it is true that money maybe comes from United States into Saskatchewan to develop the potash industry it is equally apparent that every time potash is sold outside of Saskatchewan at \$18 a ton or whatever it is selling for is coming back into our Province. Without that outside investment that \$18 a ton would simply not be coming to Saskatchewan. Many studies today show that in export industries, particularly, that a direct investment into resource industries brings a lot of money into the province that would not otherwise be there. So it isn't always a one-way street. As the Member opposite suggests, the way the argument usually goes is that if the Province of Saskatchewan borrows money from the Americans, Germans or someone who invests money in Saskatchewan, then there is a big flow of money out. But I suggest to the Member opposite, in particularly export industries like we, in Saskatchewan, are frequently talking about, that there is a big flow of money in from those exports coming into our Province and this does a great deal of good here. But unfortunately those particular aspects are usually lost sight of because of political convenience.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Weatherald:** — Mr. Speaker, I don't share any feeling of the Members opposite for nationalizing industry on a wholesale basis. I do think that if our Province was to embark on the nationalization policy that it would be a disaster. We simply don't have the technology to build pulp mills or operate pulp mills. And it is one of the things that we must face in Saskatchewan that there are a lot of other places that are a lot better and more economical to build pulp mills than there are here. That is why we have been forced into making some concessions and making some changes that we don't particularly like, but which we are forced into making if we want that type of industry to come into Saskatchewan. Then we sometimes have to make an arrangement that we may not like, but which is still much better than having no industry whatsoever.

You take, for example, the prospect of us building a pulp mill, the Government of Saskatchewan. We have no technology, we have no market organization, we have no research organization. We simply don't have all of that knowledge and technique and expertise that is required to carry on such an operation. We don't have any of it, Mr. Speaker. For Saskatchewan to go it

alone and try and nationalize and build this type of organization on our own it would be very obvious that it would likely be a financial disaster and any increased costs that have gone through trying to bring in outside capital with other companies, that it would likely cost the Province of Saskatchewan far in excess of any loss of money that we have by bringing in outsiders as we have been trying to do.

It is pretty obvious that the Government of Saskatchewan some time ago, in the Government insurance field, attempted to expand beyond our borders and I think they ended up with only one subsidiary able to do business outside of the Province of Saskatchewan and that was in Montana. The Guarantee and Fidelity Life Company was able to do business in Montana. Every other province in Canada would not allow the Saskatchewan Government insurance business to operate outside their own provincial borders. This is the kind of problem, which if we go a nationalistic way in our own Province, we should run into constantly.

So, Mr. Speaker, basically what I suggest is not to argue or belabor the point that the Member for Saskatoon brought up and he does bring up the case for total nationalization which I suggest if we were not to pay any compensation that this is what we would be embarking on as a total nationalization of the provincial economy. But I do say to the Government that now is the time to make a clear statement on what your intentions are.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Weatherald:** — Now is the time! Mr. Speaker, we are going on and on and on and not one word do we find from the Government benches as to what their intentions are.

At least the Member for Saskatoon knows what his are. The people of Saskatchewan know and we admire them for it. But the Province, the Cabinet, the Treasury benches, they don't know what they are doing, Mr. Speaker. They haven't any idea. Like the Member for Maple Creek used to say, they are like a chicken in cold weather, one day they are on one leg and the next day they are on the other leg.

I suggest to them that the best thing that they can do is to get the Premier in his seat and stand up someday and tell us what the Government's intention is as far as business in Saskatchewan is concerned. Get up on both feet and tell us what the development of the resources are going to be for the Province of Saskatchewan. Let's lay down the rules so that we know.

You know we got a tax increase for the potash industry in minerals — \$6 million. I hope that the industry can afford that type of money. I don't know whether they can or cant, but I do know one thing, Mr. Speaker, that the industry doesn't know anything about it. They don't know how the taxes are going to be raised or anything. They just know that one day, the day of the Budget, they looked up in this book and they found \$6 million more coming from there. Now if you expect any business to invest money with ground rules like that, Mr. Speaker, it simply cannot be expected. That is what the potash industry did. On Budget day they got the Estimate book and they found out that the Government of Saskatchewan is going to get another \$6 million from them.

April 6, 1972

Now that type of business is investing millions of dollars and it is not good enough that that is the type of rules they live under, because they have a lot of other places they can go and a lot of other places they are going.

So I just want to sum up, Mr. Speaker, that as far as resource industries are concerned, the Government should lay down a policy whether the people agree with it or disagree with it, but lay it down and let us know what the rules are and let's get on with the job so that we know what those rules are and do something in Saskatchewan right now. No one knows what the rules are and we are all sitting around. We don't know, the Government doesn't know, businessmen don't know, the public doesn't know. They don't know whether we are going to do it the way the Member for Saskatoon said, we don't know if we are going to do it the way I think the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) says, he is supposed to be the right winger over there . . .

**Mr. Steuart:** — He's a middle winger.

**Mr. Weatherald:** — . . . and there are more on the Treasury benches that nobody knows whether they have a policy or not, and maybe haven't even thought about it, which is probably more the truth.

So, Mr. Speaker, with those few words I will conclude my remarks and make way for another colleague on my side of the House.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Richards:** — Mr. Speaker, at this time may I ask a question of the Hon. Member for Cannington?

Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member made reference to the competitive turnkey contract with the Government let to Parson and Whittemore for the construction of the Prince Albert mill. The question is: by what criterion does the Member know that this was a highly competitive contract since there was no tendering for the construction of the mill?

**Mr. Weatherald:** — Well, the cost of building the mill was about the average cost of other similar types built across the country.

**Mr. H.E. Coupland (Meadow Lake):** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words on this.

I was a little interested in the remarks from the Member from Saskatoon. You know it is very easy to sit in an ivory tower and say that it is wrong to supply jobs for people. You know the former Premier of this Province, the late Ross Thatcher, had a great concern for the people of this Province and especially the people of Indian and Metis ancestry.

When you hear a Member get up and condemn someone for coming in and building a pulp mill and say that he has come in here to exploit our resources and this and that, it is nothing but just ridiculous remarks. The Premier, with his concern for the people of Saskatchewan, and especially for the people of the North, went out looking for somebody to come here and he asked people to come in and develop our resources.



**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Coupland:** — We have these renewable resources here in Saskatchewan and we wanted somebody in here to develop these and provide jobs for these people. I am sure that if the Member for Saskatoon had as much on the ball as Karl Landegger, that he could have had all the same guarantees and gone out there and provided jobs for those people. But he is not interested in that. He is interested in his teaching profession. He has a beautiful job. But all the people in northern Saskatchewan haven't been lucky enough to go to university or get enough education to go out and get good jobs. So we want to bring those jobs to them.

Mr. Speaker, when they talk about kicking this fellow out after he was asked to come here, without any compensation or anything, I think this is pure unadulterated — it is ridiculous and I better not say what I think or I might have to retract it.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Coupland:** — But, Mr. Speaker, I have quite a bit more that I should like to say on this so I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

**Mr. Richards:** — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Privilege. I should just like to tell the Member opposite that when my contract was cancelled last year I received no compensation from the University of Saskatchewan.

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