

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Third Session — Seventeenth Legislature
33rd Day

Monday, March 12, 1973

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. Meakes (Touchwood): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to introduce to you, Sir, and through you to the Members of the House a group of seven Grade Twelve students from the school at Lipton. They are accompanied by their teacher Harvey Riffel. I haven't met them yet I hope to meet them later this day. We hope they have an educational afternoon, an enjoyable one and a safe journey home.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker (Regina Wascana): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to add a word of welcome to the Lipton students. That was my home town where I was born and raised, and had the privilege of attending public and high school there. So may I also sincerely welcome them here today. And I hope that our deliberations will be fruitful and they will gain much in watching the proceedings.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask you and other Members of the House to welcome two groups of students from the Milestone constituency. First there is a group of some 16 Grade Twelve students from the community of Yellow Grass. They are accompanied by their principal, Mr. Al Wagner and their driver Mr. Jack Winters. Also we have a group of Grade Nine students from the community of Gray. They are accompanied by their principal, Mrs. Doris Kelly and their driver Mr. Lawrence Bush. I should like to ask you to join with me in best wishes that they will enjoy the proceedings of the day and that their stay in the Legislature will be both educational and interesting.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank (Saskatoon-Mayfair): — Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Member from Nutana South, Mr. Rolfes, who is unavoidably detained today, I want to take this opportunity to introduce a group of students from John Lake School in Nutana South. I understand there are 67 of them. I gather they are located in the west gallery. It is my understanding that they are accompanied today by Miss Schultz and Mrs. Bock, their teachers. I am sure all Members will join with me in wishing them an interesting day in the Legislative Chamber and a safe trip back to Nutana South.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

ANNOUNCEMENT

Brier Championship Won By Saskatchewan Foursome

Mr. Tchorzewski (Minister of Culture and Youth): — Mr. Speaker, under Orders of the Day it is a great pleasure for me to take this opportunity to extend a very hearty and a heartfelt congratulation to the winner of the 1973 Canadian Curling Championship which was held in Edmonton last week.

The 44th Annual Canadian Men's Brier Curling Championship was won by the Saskatchewan foursome of skip, Harvey Mazinke and his team mates Bill Martin, George Achtymichuk and Dan Klippenstein. The Canadian champions and winners of the Brier tankard are members of the Regina Curling Club. I am sure that Regina residents are particularly proud of the Mazinke rink but all of Saskatchewan is proud and happy that the Canadian Curling Championship has come back to Saskatchewan after an absence of some nine years.

The Ernie Richardson Rink last won the championship honors in 1963. I think it is worth quoting a few lines out of a sports column of one of our dailies which describes the type of representation our province had in the Brier.

In addition to displaying top notch curling the Saskatchewan foursome easily won the most friends here (meaning Edmonton) with quiet sportsmanship and dedication.

It is especially exciting to have the Mazinke rink win the Brier because of the fact that the Silver Broom Competitions will be held right here in Regina this year. All of Saskatchewan as well, I am sure, as all the Members of this Assembly I know extend our congratulations to our Saskatchewan Canadian Champions. We are honored and pleased to have such able representation in the World Curling Championships. I know all of Saskatchewan as well as all the Members here wish the Saskatchewan rink every success in the Silver Broom Playdowns which are soon to begin here in Regina.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacLeod (Albert Park): — Mr. Speaker, we should like to add our congratulations to the Mazinke rink for its fine showing up in Edmonton. It is worth noting that the Mazinke rink is of course composed of Messrs. Martin, Achtymichuk and Klippenstein. We are little surprised that the Hon. Minister has difficulty in pronouncing the name of the second man on the team. A fellow like Tchorzewski would have a lot of difficulty with Achtymichuk.

Mr. Speaker, we believe that the demonstration of pressure curling is something which will lead the Mazinke rink on to the World Championship which fortunately will be held here in Regina where the citizens of Saskatchewan will have a close hand look at the way curling is really supposed to be played.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

CONDOLENCES

Mr. Coupland (Meadow Lake): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day it is with some regret that I advise the House of the passing of Mr. H.C. (Cliff) Dunfield. Mr. Dunfield represented the Meadow Lake constituency in this House from 1952 to 1956. I just heard of it before the sitting. I understand the funeral is on Wednesday. I am sure the House will join with me in extending our deepest sympathy to the bereaved family.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I know that all Members on this side of the Assembly would want to associate themselves with the remarks from the Member from Meadow Lake (Mr. Coupland). We will look for an opportunity more formally to convey our respects and condolences to the Dunfield family. But I would want at this time to join the Member for Meadow Lake in extending our sympathy to the Dunfield family. Many of us had an opportunity to know Cliff Dunfield. I knew him not when I was an elected Member of this Legislature but when I was a public servant working with legislative committees and when he was a Member here from 1952 until 1956.

He has had a distinguished public career in the field of not only provincial politics but local politics as well. He was a member of a number of lodges and he was very active in the life of his community of Meadow Lake. I believe he was mayor and he was certainly on the town council. He had been president of the Board of Trade. He was active in senior citizens' organizations and generally played a very, very active and vital part in the life of that community. I know that all Members will look for the opportunity in a more formal way to pay their respects. I join with the Member from Meadow Lake on behalf of the Members on this side of the House in conveying our sympathy to the Dunfield family.

QUESTIONS

Unemployment Level in Saskatchewan as of May 1, 1973

Mr. Lane (Lumsden): — Mr. Speaker, before Orders of the Day in the absence of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Cowley) I should like to direct a question to the Premier.

On the 2nd day of March the Minister of Finance advised this House that he first of all had estimates as to the employment or unemployment level in Saskatchewan. He also stated that given the state of the economy now and the prospects for the summer, I think that the employment prospects in Saskatchewan for this summer are encouraging. Now the Minister of Finance also advised at that time that, he said and I quote:

I hope that the Hon. Member (referring to myself) is not laboring under the delusion that the solutions to Saskatchewan's employment problems are solely in the field of fiscal measures.

So, for this reason I direct the question to the Premier. Now, using the words of the Minister of Finance, given the state of the economy today and the prospects for the summer, what as at this time does the Premier estimate the unemployment level will

be in Saskatchewan on May 1, 1973?

Hon. Mr. Blakeney (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, there is no way I think that anyone can estimate the unemployment level at any future time in this province or in this country. If one wished to have us estimate the number of jobs that would be available, that is something which very frequently can be estimated with some measure of accuracy. But what affects the unemployment rates is not only the number of jobs but the number of people who are seeking jobs, who are registering themselves for employment. All Members will know that during the year 1972 in Saskatchewan we saw a very, very dramatic change. It is reported by some that the population of Saskatchewan did not increase in 1972 and this is probably true. In fact, it probably slipped a little. Notwithstanding that, notwithstanding the fact that the population of Saskatchewan probably slipped a little and the population of Canada undoubtedly went up, the number of people offering for jobs went up more rapidly in Saskatchewan than elsewhere in Canada. That is a very interesting phenomenon. In the year 1972 the number of jobs available in Canada went up by 3.4 per cent. I want the Member for Lumsden to listen to these figures. The number of jobs in Canada went up 3.4 per cent with a rising population. And the number of jobs in Saskatchewan, the number of people offering for jobs, the labor force, went up 4.5 per cent, even with a smaller population. Now this can only mean that a very much larger number of people were offering themselves for employment. This meant spectacularly by a figure of 12,000 to 15,000 jobs last year the number of people who are apparently unemployed also went up. We have no way of knowing whether people who were discouraged in past years and who had given up looking for jobs are now going to continue to come out and offer themselves for employment as they did in record numbers in 1972. We hope they do. We hope this spirit of optimism continues.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — It will mean that many, many more people are working, as is true now compared with one year ago. But it also might mean that the unemployment rate appears to be high. Accordingly there is no way that we can estimate the unemployment rate. We are however, very optimistic that the number of jobs will continue to rise as it has very sharply in the last five or six months and that we shall see more and more people in Saskatchewan working at more and more jobs at higher and higher wages.

List of Grants for Schools

Mr. MacDonald: — Mr. Speaker, just a rather routine question and a very general one to the Minister of Education. Normally before Estimates for the Department of Education are commenced in the House, the Minister of Education (Mr. MacMurchy) through courtesy tables a list of grants for all schools in the Province of Saskatchewan. I should like to ask the Minister when this list of grants will be made available. Also there are two very important pieces of legislation coming up in the field of education. One relates to The Teachers Salary Negotiation Act and the second relates to the amendments to The University Act. Can the Minister give us any indication when these three very

important matters will be put before the Assembly.

Mr. MacMurchy (Minister of Education): — Mr. Speaker, in reply to the Member for Milestone with respect to grants and legislation. I have been busy since Saturday night deciding whether I should go to the New York Islanders or to the Vancouver Canucks. However, in all honesty with respect to grants the information is just going out to school boards at the present time. Since the Department is busy getting out the information to the boards, as soon as they complete that work it will be available to all Members. With respect to the legislation, I indicated a couple of weeks ago that I would hope to have it in the House within three weeks. I still have that hope although it is getting a bit crowded. But as soon as we possibly can we will have the two major pieces of legislation before the House. And as I have said many times it is important that we have them here in time for sufficient and adequate debate.

MOTIONS

Change of Member on Public Accounts Committee

Hon. Mr. Romanow (Attorney General): — Before the Orders of the Day I should like to move seconded by the Premier, by leave of the Assembly:

that the name of Mr. Owens be substituted for that of Mr. Hanson on the list of Members comprising the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts and Printing.

Office of Ombudsman

Hon. Mr. Blakeney (Premier) moved, seconded by Hon. R. Romanow (Attorney General):

That an humble Address be presented to His Honour the Lieutenant Governor recommending to His Honour Ernest Carl Boychuk of the city of Saskatoon in the Province of Saskatchewan, be appointed Ombudsman under Section 3 of The Ombudsman Act, 1972 being Chapter 87 of the Statutes of Saskatchewan, 1972.

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, this is a very satisfying day for me. This day represents the culmination of lengthy efforts to have appointed in Saskatchewan an Ombudsman or Legislative Commissioner who would provide ordinary people with direct and easy access to a type of appeal from administrative decisions which the citizen may think are arbitrary or unjust.

This story is a long one, Mr. Speaker. In 1964 the Speech from the Throne suggested that a special committee of the Legislature be asked to enquire into the best means of providing access to appeal along the lines of the measures in force in the Scandinavian countries and in New Zealand. In New Zealand they call their person the Legislative Commissioner.

Mr. Speaker, that was in 1964. In 1965 a resolution to the same effect was introduced by me and was debated at length in this Assembly. In 1966 I introduced a similar resolution.

March 12, 1973

In 1967 and 1968 similar resolutions were introduced by my colleagues; in 1967 by Mr. Willis the former Member for Melfort-Tisdale, and in 1968 my colleague Mr. Romanow the then Member for Riversdale and now Attorney General.

The arguments in favor of establishing the office of Ombudsman are as sound today as they were in 1964.

There has been a good deal of interest in recent years in the appointment of Legislative Commissioners or Ombudsmen to act on behalf of members of the public in following up complaints with respect to dealings which members of the public may have with various agencies of government.

This interest has not been confined to Canada but has been evidenced throughout most of the western world except those areas whose law is based upon Roman law. In those parts of the world where their law is based upon Roman law they have developed a system of administrative courts with a relatively elaborate system of appeals which has worked pretty well.

In countries where their law was based upon the English common law or basically the old Germanic law, these devices did not develop and interest has been high in establishing the office of Ombudsman or Legislative Commissioner. This has been particularly true in the Scandinavian countries, in Britain, in the United States and in certain countries of the Commonwealth.

There is no mystery about why there has been renewed interest in the office of Ombudsman in the last ten years. There has been in the last few decades, and particularly since World War II, a tremendous expansion in the functions which governments have been called upon to play in the lives of ordinary men and women.

Legislatures have enacted many laws which involved activity by government agencies on behalf of citizens and complex administrative agencies have been created to carry out these programs. Our executive and administrative arms of government have been given wide authority and power to carry on these new ventures. Not only has there been a great increase in the scope of these executive and administrative activities, there has as well, been a great increase in the authority exercised by these executive and administrative agencies on the lives of ordinary citizens. This authority is exercised by people in administrative capacities from Cabinet Minister almost down to file clerk and by a host of tribunals of a quasi-judicial nature which have been erected to make the many decisions necessary to carry out these programs. I think that in general terms these executive and administrative agencies have carried out their work with efficiency and to the general satisfaction of citizens.

We have had remarkably few complaints about how programs like the hospital plan or the medical care plan have been carried out insofar as they relate to giving to citizens their rights under these programs. However in the course of administering these programs there are many decisions to be made, decisions which are frequently of a discretionary nature. These decisions sometimes have a profound effect on the life of an individual citizen and accordingly it is not surprising, I think it is rather inevitable, that many of these decisions will be subject to complaints by citizens. But such is the complexity of modern government that a citizen who feels aggrieved, even when he may

have a very legitimate complaint, often finds himself in a position of not knowing to whom to complain and sometimes in the position of not having anybody to whom he can effectively complain.

The general situation which I have outlined has caused a number of students of our parliamentary institutions to propose that in these situations a Legislative Commissioner or Ombudsman could be a useful addition to our government. I don't mean to suggest that an Ombudsman will solve all the problems or most of the problems which confront citizens in dealing with the modern bureaucracy surrounding a 20th century government. We will need to be vigilant on all fronts and a Legislative Commissioner is one of the ways to be vigilant. I do not need to remind Members of this House that we have made some progress in Saskatchewan in the direction of protecting the citizen, probably more progress than in any other province of Canada.

I should like very briefly to remind the House of some of the steps that have been taken. I was amused when I was in Alberta a few months ago to see the large advertisements advertising a new Bill of Rights, the first Bill of Rights in a Canadian province according to the advertisement of the Alberta Government. I should like to remind them and this House, that the Saskatchewan Bill of Rights indeed Canada's first Bill of Rights, Federal or Provincial, was passed in this province in 1947.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — The Fair Accommodation Practices Act was passed in 1956; The fair Employment Practices Act was passed in 1956; The Regulations Act passed about 1963 or 1964, was passed to assist the Legislature in controlling delegated legislation; The Proceedings Against the Crown Act was passed many years ago — back in the 1940s — which permitted a citizen to sue the Crown without the permission of the Crown. It is interesting to know that at least until very recently that they didn't have such an Act in British Columbia. A relatively well developed system of magistrate's courts with well trained personnel provides some measure of protection for the citizen against arbitrary action in that area.

We have had other steps taken. I don't mean to suggest that the steps I have identified have been all of the ways in which citizens have been provided with methods of protecting themselves against arbitrary bureaucratic action. But in my view these safeguards are by no means enough. They are added to the list that I have given and I could have added more, Expropriation Procedures Acts and others. There is very good reason for believing that in a country with a British Parliamentary form of government and particularly in Canada, the need for protection of the citizen is perhaps greater than in most countries of the world.

In this connection, I should like to refer Hon. Members to a book entitled "The Ombudsman-Citizen's Defender", published in 1967 and edited by Professor Donald C. Rowat. He then was at Carlton University, He has since gone to Australia. The book consists of some 29 contributions on the general subject of Ombudsman. One of the articles deals with the Canadian position. At the outset it mentions some of the main features of our

parliamentary system, features which suggest that Canadians are very much in need of the services of an Ombudsman. Features referred to in some of these articles are as follows:

(1) The fact that there is a union of executive and legislative powers in a politically dominant Cabinet. This is true in any provincial cabinet whatever its political stripe.

(2) The fact that by reason of the single-member, single-vote electoral system governments frequently have very large parliamentary majorities supported by a powerful Cabinet. That is the situation here in Saskatchewan at this time. We have a large parliamentary majority supported by what we hope is a powerful Cabinet.

(3) The fact that we have a tradition of secrecy that permeates the whole administrative structure and makes it very difficult to obtain information about how and by whom governmental decisions are made. We call it ministerial responsibility, we call it the minister taking responsibility for the acts of his public servants and being responsible for them. That is true and that is good, but one of the effects is that there is a large amount of secrecy.

(4) The fact that there are severely limited opportunities for the appeal or judicial review of administrative decisions.

The above features are true in most parliamentary systems, but there are further features which underline the desirability of an Ombudsman in Canada.

Some of the special things which are true in Canada and may not be true elsewhere are:

(5) The fact that our constitution has no Bill of Rights in the United States sense; no provision whereby the liberties of the subject are enshrined in a written constitution. True, we have Bill of Rights that are statutes at the Federal level and the Provincial level, but these can be over-ridden by any Act of Parliament at Ottawa or of this Legislature.

(6) We have rather fewer administrative tribunals than some countries and there is no council of administrative tribunals or no general act whereby the administrative tribunals which operate in our jurisdiction are subject to some review or supervision.

(7) We have no general administrative rules which prescribe the area of operation of boards and commissions.

(8) We still in Canada (fortunately few in Saskatchewan) have some antiquated rules on Crown privileges and Crown liabilities. Indeed there are still some in Saskatchewan, although we have whittled away almost all of these antiquated rules.

(9) We have relatively poor arrangements for free legal aid to needy persons, so that courts are frequently not open to aggrieved citizens. I am not now speaking of the courts being open to citizens who are charged with crimes. I am talking about courts being opened to citizens who may feel that they have been aggrieved by a particular administrative decision.

(10) The fact that we have a federal system creates some additional administrative confusion with difficulty in pinning down just who is responsible for some decisions.

Mr. Speaker, I could spend more time outlining the many circumstances which create difficulty for the citizen in dealing with administrative agencies of government. However, I think that there will be general agreement that such difficulties exist and that the citizen, unaided, is relatively powerless

to overcome these difficulties.

When there is a dispute as to whether or not an Ombudsman would be a useful addition to our governmental structure, the dispute is usually not over whether citizens are encountering difficulty — not whether citizens somehow get wound up in the administrative coils and have difficulty dealing with government — but rather on whether or not our existing agencies can effectively deal with the problems of the citizen or on whether or not the Ombudsman would be a useful addition to the agencies which might assist the citizen.

One of the arguments used in opposition to the idea of an Ombudsman is that an Ombudsman could do little or nothing which an MLA can not now do. The argument runs that an MLA is elected to pursue complaints on behalf of his constituents and that if he does his job well and effectively no Ombudsman is necessary. I am not very impressed with that argument. As I see it, Members of the Legislature have neither the knowledge or the facilities to follow up in any detailed way on many complaints which a citizen might lodge with them. Certainly we all try to be diligent in following up complaints which are lodged with us, but it is simply not possible for an MLA who is frequently a part-time person and who in most cases does not live in or near the capital city to do a satisfactory job of follow-up on behalf of the constituent. The chief reason for this is that he must accept the view of the facts given to him by the administrative agency, or by the Minister in charge. He has no real access to the documents or other material which might challenge the approach taken by the senior official or the Minister. I have been on the Opposition side of this House for seven years, I have been on the Government side of the House for five or six years — indeed I may cross again —

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Maybe 20 years from now!

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — I have been in the relatively favorable position of Minister of the Crown and I have never felt that I could do a 100 per cent satisfactory job of investigating all complaints on behalf of constituents unless the complaint happened to fall into the area of administration where I was a Minister of the Crown. In the latter position, I could call for the file and review it and get to the root of the problem. And if there was a public servant who I felt was stonewalling me, I could soon have that put to rights. But there were some real problems in areas when I was a backbencher on the Opposition side — I never really was a backbencher, or at least was not sitting in a Cabinet seat. I don't feel that anyone who is looking at this problem realistically could say that an Opposition MLA or a Government MLA can get to the root of every problem unless he happens to be the Minister of the department concerned or unless he happens to be the Premier. Therefore I think that more needs to be done to protect the citizen's rights in respect of possible administrative abuse. I don't want to create the impression that there are a lot of administrative abuses. I don't mean to create the impression that under this Government or the previous Government there were a lot of them. But I feel this, that I have been a public servant and I have a great admiration for the public service, I feel there will be fewer administrative abuses if there is an Ombudsman looking over the shoulders.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Nor am I very impressed with the idea that the prerogatives of an MLA would be interfered with. Most MLAs I know would be only too glad to have an official to whom a complaint could be referred where the MLA had not got a satisfactory answer in the full knowledge that that official could call for the files, could question the public servants and could investigate the complaint fully and impartially.

Nor should it be supposed that if an Ombudsman is created he would necessarily look after all or indeed most of the complaints which an MLA is called upon to deal with. Many of these complaints deal with not administrative decisions but government policy. The Ombudsman would not ordinarily have power to review government policies, that is our job, not his. The MLA would still have the job of urging changes in policy where the existing policy works a hardship on a particular group of people or class of people. I don't think that MLAs need to worry about being relegated to the ranks of the unemployed if an Ombudsman is created.

I turn now to another point which is sometimes disputed whether or not an Ombudsman would in fact be useful in dealing with the admitted difficulties which citizens encounter. I tried to show that I think there is a job to be done. The next questions to be asked: Can the Ombudsman do the job? Before discussing this it might be helpful to refresh our memories on the precise functions of an Ombudsman.

When I refer to an Ombudsman I am thinking of the office largely in terms of the New Zealand experience. Broadly speaking, an Ombudsman keeps watch over the way in which government officials apply the laws and regulations to the public. He investigates complaints of private citizens with respect to the action of these officials. He does not have power to overrule an official, but he is in a strong position to suggest that an injustice be corrected. His only power is to report to the Legislature where he thinks an injustice has been done. Ordinarily he will report to the Legislature annually in any case. He would be a person who would have security of tenure of office, a person of high personal reputation and considerable skills. He would be given powers to investigate matters similar to those powers given to a Commissioner under The Public Enquiries Act.

I will not take the time of the House to give a detailed review of the very interesting history of this office. I refer Hon. Members to the debates of the House in 1965, 1966, 1967 and 1968. Generally speaking the office evolved in Sweden in the 18th Century and found its way into the Swedish Constitution early in the 19th Century, in 1809. Finland introduced the office in 1919, Denmark in 1955, and Norway in 1962. New Zealand passed legislation providing for an Ombudsman in 1962 — I think the first time in a British Parliamentary country and the Ombudsman there has actually been carrying out his duties for about 10 years. I have had an opportunity to read the reports of the Ombudsman in New Zealand a number of times and have been impressed by the number of problems that he has tackled on behalf of citizens of New Zealand. I have been impressed by the very beneficial results which he has achieved. Since that time interest has grown in Canada and the United Kingdom. The office of Ombudsman has been created in the United Kingdom and now it has been created in the provinces of Alberta,

New Brunswick, Manitoba, Quebec and Newfoundland.

A reading of the record of the office in Alberta will lead to the conclusion that the office there has performed not in any spectacular way, but in a way most useful to the citizen and the protection of the citizen's freedom. I would anticipate that the office would perform equally well in Saskatchewan. We are not looking for miracles. We do not expect any dramatic change, but we do look for a solid contribution to protecting the property and rights of citizens through the creation of this legislative watch-dog position.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I believe that this House is particularly fortunate to find a person of the capabilities for Ombudsman of Judge Ernest Boychuk. Judge Boychuk is still a young and vigorous man. He has nevertheless had a distinguished career as a Judge of the Magistrates Court. He has been widely sought after as a conciliator, mediator and an arbitrator in labor disputes. This in itself is a tribute to his sagacity and sense of fair play. Since good judgement and fair play, sometimes in accordance and sometimes in spite of strict technical rules, are perhaps the greatest attributes which any Ombudsman could possess, we are fortunate in having Judge Boychuk available to us and willing to accept this appointment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — It is anticipated that Judge Boychuk will be able to take up his new appointment as soon as he has wound up matters relating to his present judicial appointment. The date now anticipated, pending the passage of this Motion through the House, is May 1st. Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, it is with a good deal of pleasure and pride that I now move, seconded by Mr. Romanow (Attorney General) — I would ask the Hon. Leader of the Opposition to second this Motion if he wished — would you rather Sir? — the Attorney General — this Motion.

Mr. Steuart (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, first I would like to make it very clear that as far as the individual is concerned, Judge Boychuk who has been chosen for this position, the Premier told me about this sometime ago and asked if we had any objection to the individual and I said No, he is a fine man and enjoys an excellent reputation. I certainly wish him well in this undertaking that he has agreed to do on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan. Again, I want to say very clearly that we will co-operate with Mr. Boychuk in every way that we can to allow him to make a success of this particular position.

I want to make it very clear as I did to the Premier then and as I did when this Bill was first introduced and any time that it has been introduced in the form of a resolution by the then Opposition some years ago, that I object to the position. I don't think it is necessary today in Saskatchewan. The exact duties of this individual and of this office have been outlined by the Premier and again I say that in a province of less than a million people, 60 Members of this Legislative Assembly and possibly more after the next redistribution, that

the relatively few complaints that we have from individuals complaining about the Government — not complaints about government policy — these will not come under the preview of the Ombudsman nor should they, but complaints from citizens who are aggrieved because they don't feel they either get to the right department, or they don't feel that they have had justice done to their case, or they don't feel that the civil service of the bureaucracy has listened to them and given them a fair hearing. There is a relatively few number of complaints. The vast majority can be dealt with by the MLA if he is doing his job. The Premier says he is not impressed. Well, I guess if I had some of the MLAs he's got behind him over there I wouldn't be that impressed either but with the MLAs I have on this side I am very impressed that they can do the job. They will do the job if given the opportunity.

I say this, Mr. Speaker, that the MLAs today are in a better position to do this job than they were a year or two ago. I think a great many of the MLAs today since the increase in salary are working more or less full time. I think there are some who are working full time. I am not talking about Cabinet Ministers now or Parliamentary Secretaries. I'm talking about ordinary MLAs on both sides who are dedicating all or most of their time now to their position as an MLA. That is bound to have made a difference. I am sure they don't spend all that time politicking, I am sure they spend a great deal of that time listening to complaints, taking complaints from their constituents and following them through. I am sure I can say this for every MLA on both sides of the House. I have never known of an MLA, if there have been, there may have been one or two but I can't recall them, whether NDP or Liberal, would get a complaint from some individual in the constituency and wouldn't be influenced a great deal as to how that individual voted. They would follow it through if for no other reason than it was good politics. If they happened to vote the wrong way the last time and if the MLA is able to cut through the red tape and get justice done, of course, they figure that they might see the light and vote the right way the next time. So it is just good politics to look after your constituents and most MLAs and in fact I think all MLAs do a good job.

Now, I think he could do a better job, I've said this before, and while I freely admit we didn't do it, I think that some steps have been taken by every government to give the MLAs more back up, more facilities to do the job that they are elected to do and I should like to see every MLA have a full time office the year around. I should still like to see us finish the job in this Legislative Assembly Building that was once dedicated I think in the beginning to the elected people. Over the years it was taken over by the civil servants and in this last number of years, 10 or 12 years and I am not talking about any particular government, the elected people have started to take it back again. I should like to see us finish the job and see every MLA have an office and have access to stenographical help the year around, so that when they come in here in between sessions they could write letters, they could bring delegations in. If they come in with delegations they would have a decent place for them to meet, get their case ready if they were seeing a Minister, to write letters on their behalf and so on. I think if we back them up with this kind of facilities, this kind of help, that all MLAs in this House will do a much better job and make the position of Ombudsman even more unnecessary.

Again I say with less than a million people and with the number of MLAs we have, and the availability or should be availability of the Cabinet Minister, the position of Ombudsman is unnecessary. If we let the bureaucrats build up so much hope that we are frustrating people in their quest to have justice done to them under the laws, then I think we had better take a look at what we are doing and not at the need of an Ombudsman but maybe at the need of what we are doing.

I recognize with this Government and the growth of this particular NDP Government and some of the powers they have taken unto themselves, that maybe an Ombudsman becomes a little more necessary as the years go by. They have taken a great deal of power and we are facing legislation in this Session that will give them a great many more powers. I am talking about things like The Consumers' Affairs Act, I'm talking about things like a Hog Commission, I'm talking about things like the amendments to The Natural Products Marketing Act. These and many other pieces of legislation put on the books by the NDP is certainly going to mean that the public at large are going to need more and more protection from the power of the Government. Whether an Ombudsman can do it or not I really don't know but I don't think so. I think the job still falls to the MLA in the final analysis, falls to the public themselves to make sure that no government, NDP or any other kind doesn't take too much power unto themselves.

Another thing I don't like about this Bill, and the Premier talked about this Bill and the development of this Bill when he spoke, is that they have exempted many of their own possible actions. They have exempted, they have set many of the things that they will be doing above the investigating powers of this office of the Ombudsman and I think that needs to be reviewed. I don't know how they compare with other provinces but I think if we are going to have an Ombudsman, if we have to have one and obviously we are going to have one, then let the chips fall where they may. There should not be discretion on the part of the Attorney General or anyone else to set certain operations of the Government up above and beyond the investigating powers and the recommendation powers of this man and of his office. There may be some jurisdictions in this province, some jurisdictions in this world that become so large, and so complex that the office of an Ombudsman is necessary and the work of an Ombudsman is called for. I don't think we have reached that point in Saskatchewan yet. I think that very act of appointing an Ombudsman is in effect an admission of failure on our part. It is to some extent at least an admission of failure on the part of the 60 MLAs of this Legislative Assembly who are elected by the people in this small province of less than a million people, a little over 900,000 people and 60 MLAs representing them here, if we can't order things in such a way and can't control the actions of the bureaucrats in such a way that this frustration will not exist or will not grow or will not in fact be there to such an extent that it calls for this office and all the spending and the additional civil servants that it will call for, I think to some extent it is an admission of our own failure.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to go on record very clearly that I still oppose very strongly the principle of an Ombudsman but I will support this resolution because I don't want — I hope no one on this side of the House and we haven't even caucused on this particular resolution — but I hope that no one on this side of the House will vote against the resolution because I don't

want to do anything that will impair this man and his office, his chances and the opportunity he will have to do some good to the people of the Province of Saskatchewan once that he is installed in office.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacLeod (Regina Albert Park): — Mr. Speaker, I have a few words of comment on the Ombudsman and the situation in Saskatchewan. I want to make it clear, Mr. Speaker, that the need for an Ombudsman is created because of poor governmental practice and the refusal of the Government in its many bills to require and institute procedures which guarantee natural justice. The Premier in introducing this resolution said that the executive and administrative agencies exercise authority over citizens to a greater extent today than before, and that is certainly true, but the Government has to a large extent created the problem and then seeks to pat itself on the back by creating a solution to the problem. He says that an appointment of an Ombudsman will not solve all the problems, to which I say, “hear, hear”! He certainly cannot solve all the problems, particularly with the kind of powers he has been given.

To begin with, Mr. Speaker, he has not been given any authority to deal with any agencies where there is a mixture of more than one authority. For example, if some old age pensioner is wrongly treated by the Regina Local Housing Authority, that body being composed of not only members of the Provincial Government but members of the City and Federal Government would be beyond the scope of investigation or the concern of the Ombudsman, despite the fact that Saskatchewan has or should have a real concern for the way its money is being spent and the way people are being treated.

At the time that this Bill was brought in, of course, Section 17 where the certificate of the Attorney General could block any view was withdrawn. But that is the only improvement that was made to the Bill. This Ombudsman will not have any powers to summon any person of any real authority under subsection (1) of 22 and subsection (2) of 22:

Persons who really exercise authority, and those executive and administrative agencies or people who exercise real authority, will be excluded from the purview and the examination of the Ombudsman.

Deputy Ministers are excluded, and almost no person in Government apart from the Minister himself exercises more authority than the Deputy Minister. People who are responsible to the Minister are all excluded. In addition he is limited to residents of Saskatchewan. This is another example of this Government treating people in Alberta and Manitoba and other parts of Canada differently from the way they would treat people in Saskatchewan. Under Section 13 (1) the limitation to residents clearly applies.

There is no adequate provision for counsel for people who come before the Ombudsman; no requirement that the Ombudsman or his staff assist people in framing their complaints despite the fact that the people who come to the Ombudsman are likely to be the very group who most need assistance in preparing and

framing their complaints. The premier said that among the reasons for an Ombudsman is the poor arrangements for legal aid. I say, "hear, hear" to that. There is no question about it that the province still inadequately provides for legal aid to people, particularly in the civil areas, who require assistance. This is, therefore, intended to cover for the failure of the Government to provide adequate legal assistance. I would remind the Members of this House that the program which was began in 1967 by the Liberal Government when the Hon. D.G. Heald was in power, has not been substantially improved since that time.

There is a limitation as to time. When we discussed this I pointed out that this was the only Bill in Canada which limited the length of time which the Ombudsman could cover to review a claim. The complaint must be started within 12 months of the date on which it arose or the complaint should not be examined by the Ombudsman. I refer to Section 13, subsection 2 of the Act. I said, Mr. Speaker, that this is the only Act in Canada which has that limitation at the time we discussed it last year.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Premier said in introducing this resolution that he was not looking for miracles. With the power that this Ombudsman is to have we too do not look for miracles. We wish him well, we believe that the appointee was well chosen and we will support the individual chosen as the Ombudsman. We want to make it abundantly clear that we regard the Government as having failed this Ombudsman right from the start in not arming him adequately with the kind of powers which he ought to have. If they really and truly trust their appointment they should give this man and the kind of powers which he needs to carry out the job properly and effectively. You can be sure, Mr. Speaker, that we will not undermine in anyway the efforts of the Ombudsman. We hope he does well and we shall look forward with eager anticipation to a job well done by him within the limits and the confinements which they have given him.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Romanow (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I must just say a few words on this Motion as a result of the comments made by the Member from Albert Park. In many ways this is a rehash of the debate of Second Reading and I don't want to get into that. I do feel that we must make two or three things clear.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, my point is that the powers of the Ombudsman in Saskatchewan are substantially the same as the powers of the Ombudsman as they exist in other jurisdictions. There is no uniformity with respect to the definition of power. Some include deputy ministers under the examination of the Ombudsman, some jurisdictions don't. Some include executive assistants and some don't.

Basically, Mr. Speaker, I believe the exception of the Minister and the Minister's support staff from the purview of the Ombudsman is above debate. The Minister must be responsible to one body only and that is this Assembly. The Minister being a Minister of the Crown and Minister of this House, must account for and give answers to questions on a day to day basis to the Members of this House. That is the theory of responsible government.

It is not the job of the Minister to be replying to the Ombudsman and I don't know of any jurisdiction, anywhere, that historically has allowed an Ombudsman to go right into the Cabinet room, or to go into the Minister's office, with respect to powers. I don't think it could be suggested, or has it ever been suggested by the Liberals opposite, that any Ombudsman anywhere has, in fact, that power.

And it is a natural extension therefore, Mr. Speaker, that an executive assistant or a special assistant in that category, a person who reports only to the Minister, a person who does not work within the line structure of the deputy minister and the Government. It also makes common sense that he, too, should be excluded because the Minister should be responsible for the actions of his executive assistant and special assistant, to this House as he is responsible for his own activities. I want to make that abundantly clear, Mr. Speaker. That as far as that exemption is concerned there is nothing untoward about it, in fact, to include the Minister and his assistants within the purview of the Ombudsman would be to thwart the theory of parliamentary democracy and certainly be adding a new concept, a new dimension to the Ombudsman that to my knowledge exists nowhere else where this office has been set up.

Now the question on the deputy minister. That is another issue. Mr. Speaker, my position was at the time of second reading that an argument – and I repeat it – that an argument can be advanced that the deputy minister's actions should be reviewed. When we made the policy decision to exclude the deputy we did so for basically two reasons. 1. We felt the deputy was the policy advisor – and I underline the word advisor – to the Minister. We felt that in that capacity he might be hindered in giving free, unencumbered advice, his opinion as to how government should be directed or how the department should be directed, if he knew that everything that he said, every step of his actions, could be reviewed by the Ombudsman.

And secondly, Mr. Speaker, from my short experience in government, it is true that deputy ministers have a great deal of general power, but the type of administrative decisions we are talking about, generally, aren't made by the deputy minister. They are generally made by a director of Labour Standards or some one out of the field with respect to meat inspection or health inspector. It doesn't require a deputy minister's final decision. So that in a majority of cases, we felt that this was not an appropriate office for consideration.

I acknowledge that my colleague from Regina Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod) has a good point and a good argument that the deputy perhaps should be included. It was my position at the time of second reading, and it is today, that if after a period of operation the Ombudsman should, in fact, recommend that his powers are too limited and the deputy should be properly included, we would certainly give very careful consideration to that approach.

I should like to make one other comment relating to legal aid. This Bill or Resolution is not designed as a substitute for legal aid. Members of this House will know that Dean Carter of the College of Law is now nearing the completion, almost a matter of days, before he tables a final report for us which recommends to the Government that legal aid should be set up in

the Province of Saskatchewan. It certainly will be one aspect of the entire process of protection of legal rights that we will be looking at.

And the other comment that I should like to make, Mr. Speaker, is on the business of the one-year limitation, one year back from the time of the institution of the Act and of the Ombudsman. My simple point is that there has to be a time to start something. We have to pick an arbitrary date for starting, and one year we felt was certainly not unreasonable.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to make the point in rebuttal to the Member for Albert Park, lest it be misinterpreted by Members or by the Press or by the public, that the powers of this Ombudsman are not of power or not of meaning. That is not the case. His powers are substantially the same as they exist, elsewhere. I think that message should be left.

In conclusion I support the Resolution by the Premier. I know Judge Ernie Boychuk very well. Ernie Boychuk is a person who knows Saskatchewan inside and outside. He was born in Saskatchewan, educated in this province. He knows people of all backgrounds. He has a good academic training. He has a good judicial temperament. He is a man of experience in conciliation and mediation. He will be a tremendous loss to the Magistrate's Court in the city of Saskatoon, but I think a benefit to all citizens of the Province of Saskatchewan. I also give my wholehearted support in concurring with this Motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to *nenine contradicente*.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. MacMurchy that Bill No. 66 – **An Act respecting Community Colleges**, be now read a second time.

Mr. Whelan (Regina North West): — Mr. Speaker, I am proud and pleased to endorse the community colleges legislation.

The introduction of this Bill represents a dream that began when the late Woodrow Lloyd proposed this kind of institution to the Province of Saskatchewan. The community colleges purpose, its particular structure and the reason for organization in this way was understood, appreciated and promoted by Woodrow Lloyd when he sat in this House, first as the Premier and then as Leader of the Opposition.

The present Member for Last Mountain, who is also the Minister of Education (Mr. MacMurchy) will go down in education history as a man of courage and foresight because he introduced this type of Bill, Mr. Speaker.

The people of this province will give him full credit for the approach taken as outlined in his introductory remarks regarding the legislation.

I agree with him when he says that local instructors should be used as much as possible; that the latest techniques for teaching such as audio-visual aids and television should be utilized. The assertion that we will not need new schools but meet in basements and churches, or wherever space is available, will be appreciated by those who have paid for schools that now stand empty in some areas in our province.

To organize this program, so that there is a specific program to meet a specific need, will require the complete co-operation of the students, whether they are Grade Twelve graduates or 45-year old male or female employees.

Consultation and assessment on a continuous and revolving basis will be a necessity.

I agree wholeheartedly with the provision whereby the board members will be residents in the area where the community college is located. In the initial stage it is also essential that they be chosen by the executive council on the basis that they understand the philosophy and the purpose of the community college.

The Minister said that the community colleges program . . .

Mr. Guy: — . . . hogwash.

Mr. Whelan: — You will have a chance to speak on this and I am looking forward to it.

The Minister said that the community colleges program would “shore up” rural Saskatchewan. Let me make a plea to him to “shore up” urban Saskatchewan where, for those who have been unemployed, the need for a community college is real.

1. Surveys in my constituency show conclusively that many Grade Twelve students either don't want to or can't afford to go to university.
2. They are unable to gain entrance to the Technical Institute at Moose Jaw.
3. They would like to take training to get them into occupations or types of work where training is not available in the city of Regina, for those types of occupations, at present.

Some of the kinds of training that they are interested in include, — management of hotels, restaurant work, service industries, hospital work, day care centres, and nursing homes, as examples. There is also the need for retraining and upgrading in an intensive manner. There is a need for training in journalism, certain types of secretarial work, specific training too in the field of electronics and television.

We have to consult the students whether they are 18 or 48, male or female, and organize a community college to help them. The city of Regina has within its boundaries people who are in desperate need of the community college — Grade Twelve graduates, native people, housewives, unemployed people, people whose occupation has disappeared.

I concur in the idea of “shoring up” the rural areas, but in the meantime some of the people who have moved into Regina come from rural areas. And whether they come from Humboldt or

Regina, from an educational point of view, all of us have to agree that they need “shoring up”. Per square mile there are more people in the city of Regina who need “shoring up” than in any other area. Over and over they have told us, in questionnaires and in conversation, that there is need for a community college type of program. They have told us in letters and pleaded for this type of assistance.

This is my plea to the Minister. I congratulate him on the idea. I wholeheartedly endorse the community college concept. I am sure that when it was considered by Woodrow Lloyd this was the sort of educational project that he had in mind for all the people of the Province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, that need still exists here and throughout Saskatchewan. I am glad that it has been recognized by the Minister and I will wholeheartedly support the Bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIsaac (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 66 is a bill that has been in the concept stage and in the discussion stage for a number of years. And while I can’t agree with all of the bouquets spelled out in the remarks of my hon. friend from Regina North West (Mr. Whelan) I am not sure of the early history of this Bill, but there are many people involved in the development of this concept and almost as many ideas as there have been people in the sense that depending on whom one was talking to, what kind of interpretation they gave this term, community colleges.

Some people viewed it and spoke of it as an institution whereby students across the province could gain the advantage, perhaps the first year or two, or a university closer to home than at Saskatoon or at Regina. Other people spoke of it more along the lines of the Member for Regina North West, as an opportunity for on-the-job training, job training, retraining, this kind of program.

This, as I say, has been one of the interesting aspects of the term and the phrase, community colleges, through the years. The entire topic has been the subject of many studies and many debates. It has been the subject of at least two studies when the Liberal Party was in the Government, six or seven years ago, or up to 1971. The present Government also conducted a study on the question and the role and so on, on community colleges. I might point out to the Member for Regina North West, and I am sure the Minister is aware, that legislation was indeed prepared on this question in the winter of 1971.

Some of the provisions in the present Bill are somewhat similar and there are some of the provisions of that Bill that are not in this particular legislation that is before us.

Mr. Speaker, I support the concept of community colleges. Everyone, I am sure, in this House supports the principle as such. There is no question that the colleges should be, if they are going to do what the Minister hopes to do, they should be controlled by locally appointed boards. They should be controlled to some extent. I question, again, how we are going to see the development program and the concept that the Minister outlined, how we are going to see that developed with the kind of stringent controls that are spelled out here for the

provincial authority, his Department of Continuing Education.

I don't quarrel with some controls. There has to be some budget control. This part is fine. The budget is to be submitted and approved and I hope in that process, that there is the kind of development the Minister hopes for. I hope we shall see, coming out of this community colleges legislation, the kind of education or training if you like, that the Minister spoke of.

I wish him well in this regard. I really do. When I say, Mr. Speaker, he is bucking, as he well knows, the organized structure at one end, being the university and that particular well organized segment of post-secondary education. At the other end he is bucking the Grade One to Twelve structure, which again, is fairly well organized. The organization thereof and the structure being kept there, if you like, by not only school boards and trustees but by the teachers and the Teachers' Federation. Again, where he is looking at, trying to carve a piece out in the middle, and if I have any quarrel with any of the omissions of the Bill before us than the Bill that I had prepared, Mr. Speaker, is that nowhere in there does he make any reference to either the Trustee Association or the Teachers' Federation, who after all, at the moment are perhaps one of the main — the two main groups really — responsible for a good deal of the kind of education, adult education and other programs that are ongoing in the rural areas.

Legislatively they are not involved at all in it, no, but they should be involved in quite a bit of it. I am sure that they will be involved in the fostering and the development and the creation of many of the programs the Minister hopes to see evolved.

Again, I would have thought that he would have had the groups somewhere tied into the Bill, tied into legislation. They will be in the process. On the other hand I can see his arguments that by leaving them out he hopes to create the kind of institution he speaks of. I question if he will be able to buck the establishment to the extent that he would like to and that he would like to see happen. I share his objectives in this regard. I just question if it will happen to the extent that the Minister hopes.

I think another point that should be borne in mind, Mr. Speaker, is through the years and beginning back, I am sure, when the CCF or the NDP were government years ago, there was a beginning made then with adult education, with adult training programs by the school boards of the province. That has grown, and it has grown tremendously, over the last 10 years. The Federal Government in the many Manpower Programs, short courses and "not-so-short" courses. That is an evolution in education and less than formal training, if you like, that has moved and moved a long way over the past few years.

The trades schools and the technical institutes at Moose Jaw and Saskatoon and Regina, are another example of programs that have developed and have expanded at a tremendous rate here and elsewhere. So that while we have not had community colleges as such, and in some respect I am not sure that we haven't when one looks at what happened in other provinces. I think the Minister would agree with this. We have seen too often — they came along as another institution and you get enough people put together and they go about building an empire for themselves

and the result, in my opinion, has been we haven't seen developed in other provinces the kind of thing that should really be a community college. So while we haven't been lacking the programs, the kind of training, the Minister is seeking here, that's been development in this province, it's been going on and I think on a fairly well-organized basis, even though on an unstructured basis, on an unstructured basis to a great degree.

I want to suggest that I hope the legislation and the regulations that will pertain to it will help formalize it, will help avoid some of the duplication of effort, some of the duplication of dollars and energy that has gone into this area, even though there have been good developments, and by and large pretty good correlation in this province. I think that the Minister will want to see even greater correlation, if you like, not only in a region but across the province with respect to programs that are available to people and I do hope, as I say, that the kind of things he speaks of will eventually come about. I don't look for them overnight, Mr. Speaker, I don't look for them overnight. I suggest that it will be some time before people will come to appreciate the opportunity that is theirs. They have been bucking the system for so long in so many cases, that I do hope he is able to bring about some of the very high-minded objectives he has spelled out in introducing this Bill.

Again, I would have some questions on a number of other points that are in the Bill and some that are not in the Bill, when we get to Committee, Mr. Speaker, but in principle, if I may again remind my hon. friend from Regina North West (Mr. Whelan) the idea isn't entirely new, that the field hasn't been left untilled during the former administration. That much work has been done and the mere fact that this legislation is before us today and is able to be put before us is an indication of the work, not only done by the former government, but done by teachers, by trustees, by many adult education people working throughout the province, manpower counsellors, and many, many others who have built and developed these programs that this community college legislation will hope to correlate and set up.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kwasnica (Cut Knife): — Mr. Speaker, I should just like to make a few comments regarding the previous speaker's remarks before I ask leave to adjourn debate.

The Hon. Member who previously spoke said that the previous Liberal Government did quite a bit of work too regarding community colleges. Well, they were in office for seven years and I think that all we got out of seven years was draft bills which might have been presented to the House at some later date, or may not have been. When we took office we had a look at the Bill, and the whole concept, in our opinion, was so far off base that we had to reshuffle and reorganize and come up with a truly community college idea, and this we have done. So we had seven years of looking and thinking and when we took office within twelve months we set up four pilot projects which are going full tilt now and we will have the benefits of what has been done in those regions, which we will explain further in our speeches on this Bill, Mr. Speaker. We set up four pilot projects which are now exploring the field and we have the basis for a sound community college program forthcoming.

The previous speaker also mentioned the concern as to how local control or local development of programs will evolve when we have such stringent control. Well, really, if you look at the Act closely we find that it only states budgetary control; as far as programming and staffing and the use of plants, that's all local control to a large extent. As a matter of fact, I'm sure that the people back home, the grass roots people in every community will be glad of the opportunity to examine what its needs are and put forth programs and plans for the future. And I don't think, Mr. Speaker, as the previous Member indicated we are trying to carve out a piece in the middle. We are really in effect, just trying to shore up an area that needs looking at.

Now Mr. Speaker, I rise with enthusiasm to support this Bill, which lays the foundation of one of the most innovative and comprehensive community college programs in Canada today. Well, why do I say that this program is innovative? Well this Act is unique in its approach to community colleges. Unlike colleges in other provinces it is geared to assist people in rural Saskatchewan to obtain training, up-grading, knowledge and techniques for self-betterment or job placement. Our program is innovative because it allows for our regional libraries across the province to be used as the bases for films, books and resource material in general. Our program for community colleges is innovative because it allows for use of local personnel, as much as possible, by a system of accreditation of local instructors.

We are all aware that in every community, every Saskatchewan community, there are many capable and able resource people. Our program has a fresh approach because programs, courses and instructors are never permanent. They are always in a state of flux, changing weekly, monthly or yearly to meet the varied and changing needs of our smaller communities and we are all aware, Mr. Speaker, of the dangers that exist when courses offered, and staff giving these courses, become too permanent. They become fixed and they become costly.

Our community college program is unique in yet another area. There will be no multi-million dollar complexes or institutions to build, that will saddle our taxpayers with unnecessary and stupid taxes. We have learned well from the Alberta failure which tries to set junior colleges up as secondary universities and technical institutes. All that program did in Alberta was to set up another level of education between the university level and the high school level. This was unnecessary and has added heavy financial burdens on the taxpayers of Alberta. We, in Saskatchewan, are fully aware that to duplicate facilities and staff of universities at the local level would be ridiculous. Furthermore, our comprehensive high schools across the province already have all the necessary facilities for our community college program.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the Minister for doing an excellent job in planning the basis for our Saskatchewan community college system. I am certain this program will meet the needs of Saskatchewan people at the least possible expense, and this surely is the role of any government today.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I should like to take a few minutes to comment on the work done by the Minister's advisory committee, whose chairman was Doctor Ron Faris, whose secretary was Miss Marjorie Benson. This committee, of ten men and women, held

fifty meetings in southern and central Saskatchewan in June. Small group discussion was encouraged wherever possible at these meetings. Total attendance at these meetings was 1,897 persons, and it might be interesting to note that just under half of the participants in these meetings were women. Another 1,000 people joined in discussion of the college concept at meetings of other organizations at which the chairman or members of the advisory committee were asked to speak. In addition, 41 briefs were received on behalf of organizations and individuals. Some 30 letters were received following the meetings.

I mentioned earlier that just under one-half of the participants at the public meetings were women. The committee found that women in rural Saskatchewan appeared to be discontented with their learning opportunities. Lack of encouragement and opportunities to engage in Manpower programs was reported at several meetings. In a significant number of meetings women expressed concern about what they felt was a lack of opportunity for participation in a wide range of personal enrichment programs.

Mr. Speaker, our totally decentralized approach to community colleges will help solve this problem. If women in a community feel they want a particular program offered, they will be able to get that program. Thus, Mr. Speaker, we will see local control, local autonomy and input at its best in this community college program, set out by this Bill.

I should like to congratulate Dr. Ron Faris and his committee for the excellent job they did in the area of community colleges. Our Government has used the report as a basis for our new Community Colleges Act.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I support this Bill with enthusiasm because it will bring community college programs to many people in my constituency. It will bring about the first intra-provincial community college program in the western provinces.

I had the privilege of attending a joint meeting of Ministers of Education held in Lloydminster last December 11th. At a meeting of the Hon. Jim Foster and the Hon. Gordon MacMurchy and their assistants, a joint communique was issued pledging full co-operation between the two governments in a joint community college program in that area. Negotiations are currently under way which will resolve the basic issues of finances and administrative structure. It is my hope that the college program in the Lloydminster area, the Lloydminster, Maidstone, Vermillion area will soon become the fifth pilot program in our province.

Mr. Speaker, our community college program has been so well received in our area that we have already set up an action committee consisting of one member from every community within a forty mile radius of Lloydminster and one member each from the Lloydminster school unit board and the Lloydminster public school district board. My advisory committee is ready to swing into action as soon as administrative details are worked out.

Now, Mr. Speaker, our Minister, before proceeding on a large-scale program of community colleges, has set up four pilot projects to test the difference of programs needed in different kinds of areas. The four areas are as follows:

1. The Humboldt area — which is dense, concentrated rural population, with no large urban centre.

2. The Cypress Hills area — which has sparse population spread over a vast area;
3. The Parkland region — which is a twin city situation;
4. The Northern region in LaRonge.

Each of these areas have different situations, with different problems. For instance, we are finding that in the Cypress Hills community college area there is a need to make extensive use of our education media in order to meet the program needs and get them out to the people. Because of the sparse population, spread over a vast area, we will have to be sure our cable television, our education radio programs, audio and visual equipment, will all be available in the area in order to carry out a reasonable program in that area. In Humboldt, for instance, the emphasis is on informal programming, recreational and human resources such as family planning. In the northern region we are finding the need to have more technical, vocational programs.

Each of the pilot communities are establishing rural committees to observe the needs, community facilities and resources. The results of these surveys will form the basis of program planning and priority setting by the community boards. Each pilot project has a community college developer, with a regional advisory committee to assist him in early stages of planning. Community college boards will be appointed by late spring and programs will be operating by the fall of 1973, in these pilot projects. And I am pleased that the Minister of Education has set aside some \$675,000 in the 1973-74 Budget for new programming in the community college areas.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I want to commend our Minister for introducing this legislation which will fulfil a vital need in rural Saskatchewan. My only concern would be that the program will become so popular, so fast, with Saskatchewan people, that we, as the Government, will not be able to move fast enough because of lack of finances.

Mr. Speaker, there is not doubt that I will support the Bill and have a few comments to make at a later date and I would beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Debated adjourned.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Messer that Bill No. 50 — **An Act to amend The Natural Products Marketing Act, 1972** be now read a second time.

Mr. Meakes (Touchwood): — In rising to support the Bill No. 50, The Natural Products Marketing Act, I want to say this is a milestone for me. I have farmed all my life and I have seen the ups and downs and have raised livestock all those years. For too many years I saw the rise and fall of particularly pork from high levels to low levels. I was talking to one of my constituents on the weekend and he was telling me (a man who raises pigs) that two years ago he was getting 21 cents a pound and he said last week he sold pigs at 49 cents a pound. If something is not done to stabilize the price of pork we will, within a few months, see the same kind of a situation happen again when the price of pork will fall to another low.

Through all my farming years I was an active member in all of the farm organizations, active member of the old United Farmers of Canada, later the Saskatchewan Farmers' Union; member of the Pool, and as a member of these two organizations we went on year after year, each one of those organizations endeavoring to educate, to sell the idea of stabilized prices and a marketing board.

In 1964, April of 1964, I, as the Minister of Co-operation was involved in the vote that went on at that time for the hog marketing board. I remember the real interest that was taken in it, so to see this Bill coming before the House today which makes possible the formation of a hog marketing commission is indeed a highlight for me. I think there is a real need to stabilize agriculture. This is one of the things that we, in the New Democratic Party, promised that we would do. We would endeavor to find answers to stabilizing agriculture for the people who make their living in this profession. And I think that the real need in this regard is to stabilize production and I think that this is the only way that it can be done, through a hog marketing commission. It is interesting to note that in the last year the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer), consulting with all the provincial farm organizations, has worked toward this and they supported him in the action he has taken.

I have here a news report of the Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture, which I received on my desk last week. I think that this document is proof positive that the farming people of our province are wanting to see stabilization of their products and stabilization in particular of pork. I should like to quote from this document, news report from the Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture. This is what it says:

The Provincial Hog Marketing Commission will provide producers an opportunity to participate in both domestic and export markets for pork. The Federation and other provincial farm organizations support the idea of a commission and after two or three years producers will be given the opportunity to elect their own board.

The commission was formed last November by the Provincial Government with the agreement of the Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture, the Wheat Pool, National Farmers' Union and the Swine Breeders and the Hog Producers Organizations. The hog and swine organizations have been involved in the consultations since the spring of 1972 while the Federation was not involved until late summer and fall.

During 1970 the Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture developed a policy to assist and guide producers requesting the establishment of meat or livestock marketing boards or commissions. The policy also recognized commissions as a sound alternative to compulsory bargaining. The basic difference between the two is that boards control production through a quota system while a commission can only involve itself with marketing as stipulated by enacted legislation. A commission was also urgently needed to pursue with vigor the much needed promotion of hog products in the development of markets. For that reason the Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture also strongly supported commodity check-offs as a method of paying

March 12, 1973

for the services. The Government's view was that the market for Saskatchewan pork was being lost, and a structure was needed to co-operate with the other provinces in the prairie region in developing the hog industry.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot understand the position of the Members of the Opposition for opposing this Bill. They surely know too that through the years there has been an uncontrolled market with a great variation of the price of hogs. I can think of three years ago when everybody was in hogs. Everybody got into them and very soon the price was plummeting down.

This young friend of mine whom I was talking to on the weekend said he bought young pigs at \$24 per pig. At the time he sold them he got less than \$31. It has been a bust and a break ever since I was a young person. It has been no different. And I see in this Act the possibility of the farm people really getting places in the production of pork. There is a great possible market in the far east, Japan and other countries in the far east. The only way we are going to get that market is if we can guarantee them so many pounds of pork a year, not a year, but a week or a month. We are going to have to be able to guarantee them that we will produce the pork and they will take it. I think the Hog Marketing Commission is one answer toward getting into that kind of a market.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I support Bill No. 50.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt (Rosthern): — Mr. Speaker, we are talking about boards, Natural Products Marketing Act in this particular case. The Member who just sat down was telling us how hard up the farmer was a couple of years ago or even a couple of months ago. We have a Wheat Board and I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the farmers that were the hardest up in the last couple of years were the farmers that were straight grain growers and sold grain to the Wheat Board. The Wheat Board or the Hog Producers Marketing Board or the Milk Board, there is no way that they can guarantee that there is not going to be overproduction and there is no way that they can guarantee that there is going to be a price.

“Compulsory” is to me, being a real right wing free enterprise individual, compulsory is a very repulsive word to many of us in our society today. It is just always compulsory, compulsory, compulsory.

This Government talks about the Bill of Rights. And they say we want maximum freedom extended to all to the greatest extent. Yet this socialist Government in Saskatchewan brings in bill after bill which is designed to curtail freedom in one or another sector of our society and also to our economy.

The Natural Products Marketing Act is no exception. You are putting the hog producer in a strait jacket without giving him the opportunity to decide for himself if this is really what he wants.

The Association is upset about this Bill. They have requested a vote from the membership, but this Government has said

no. I just wonder why. I am sure that those older farmers to your right will realize and remember years ago the Wheat Board didn't make it compulsory for the farmer to sell wheat to the Wheat Board until a vote came to the farmers and they decided by vote that wheat, oats and barley be sold only to and by the Wheat Board. We had a vote there. And all the Opposition is saying now is let's have a vote. I personally am against the Hog Marketing Board although I don't produce any hogs. But if the farmers that raise hogs are against a marketing board that is their business not the Government's. It is not my business it is their business.

The Government believes it has its support through the Canadian Federation of Agriculture and the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool. The Member from Touchwood (Mr. Meakes) just read and I have the report also from Mr. Boden and he read at length what Mr. Boden had to say. What do the hog producers have to say? Why this Federation of Agriculture who have been working their hearts out to try and get some uniformity of thinking about the farm organizations. They have gone to the rural municipalities and have tried to sell them on a certain idea that only one organization speaks for Western Canada or for the farmer. Right in the midst of their campaign you have the Hog Producers Association break away from the Canadian Federation of Agriculture. Why? Because Mr. Boden with his socialistic attitude, socialist mind and theory, he wants to shove a marketing board on every producer whether he wants it or not. It is none of Mr. Boden's business even though he does raise hogs. And if he raises hogs and there is a vote he can mark his ballot 'yes'. The same thing applies to the Wheat Pool. The Wheat Pool basically is a socialistic organization and they go ahead and say, the hierarchy of the Wheat Pool, they go and say to the hog producers, they should have a marketing commission.

Why should I make these kinds of statements about these two organizations and in particular the Canadian Federation of Agriculture? It is not because of what they are supporting recently, but time and again in the past. You would hardly notice their policies differ to any extent whatsoever from the NDP.

However, in a recent bulletin, and I want to read from this bulletin too. Mr. Boden says:

The Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture welcomes the 1973 Provincial Government's Budget as a step towards further recognizing the importance of agriculture to the total economy of the province.

He goes on to say:

The 1973 Saskatchewan Budget provides \$22 million for agriculture. That is 3.13 per cent of the total budget of \$722 million, which is a new record total for Saskatchewan.

I don't think that the farmers quite understand Mr. Boden whether he thinks 3.13 per cent is a record or whether \$722 million is a record. Surely the 3.13 per cent must be the lowest percentage for agriculture that any provincial budget has ever provided.

March 12, 1973

He goes on to say that these figures do not include the Land Bank — they do not include FarmStart, they don't include the grid roads and all other little sums which could in some way help some individual farmer.

But let us take a look at how he looks at the Liberal Government in Ottawa. Let us see what statement he makes about them. This is what makes me wonder whether the Canadian Federation of Agriculture in Saskatchewan, the Saskatchewan section, including its president whether he is promoting NDP policy, the present Provincial Government's policy. What does he say about the Federal Government?

The Federal Budget for Agriculture amounts to \$293.3 million. More than 10 times the amount of the Provincial Government although this is Federal. But most of the agriculture is in Western Canada. He goes on to say:

The Saskatchewan Federation feels this expressed a lack of concern for agriculture by the Federal Government, an industry which contributes many benefits, both directly and indirectly to the total Canadian economy.

He deliberately fails to mention the \$60 million so-called two-price system — most of which goes to Saskatchewan. He just casually admits that the \$26 million just recently announced by Mr. Turner in the Federal Budget coming to Saskatchewan for educational purposes from the Federal Government. It will provide some assistance he says.

Mr. Boden, praising the NDP as he does and belittling the Federal Government, which spends four to five times as much in agriculture in Saskatchewan than the Provincial Government does. I cannot help but conclude that Mr. Boden is riding the NDP horse.

He is rather outspoken against the Hog Breeders Association, so much in fact, that the Hog Breeders' Association have tabbed him and the president of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool as socialists and I believe they are absolutely right.

Yes, the Wheat Pool and the Canadian Federation of Agriculture have always argued for compulsory marketing of most farm products. They both argue that flax and rapeseed come under the jurisdiction of the Canadian Wheat Board. We see this in every Western Producer that has been printed in the last few years and months.

How come, and I want to ask the Federation and the Wheat Pool, how come that the flax and the rapeseed growers have not listened to their advice? There is only one reason for it. They have absolutely no confidence in these two leaders. I will tell this Government why. They know that if the Wheat Board sold rape and flax this year the price of rape would not be \$4 per bushel. And flax this year would not be \$5 per bushel. The farmers would be lucky if they would receive half this amount, if these grains were sold by the Wheat Board.

Mention has been made in this House and reported on radio and I believe the Attorney General was one of them and the newspapers have reported that some of the Members have stated how I oppose the Wheat Board. Well I tell you I certainly would

oppose the Wheat Board today if it hadn't changed its selling system of only a few weeks ago or months ago. If the Wheat Board had not smartened up and changed its selling policy of two years ago I would be all for dumping the Canadian Wheat Board. But I want to assure the House that if it had not been for the late Ross Thatcher and myself telling them the facts of life . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — . . . I am absolutely convinced that Otto Lang would still be in dreamland. They finally got rid of an old age pensioner who was meek in spirit and meek in heart and meek mentally — Mr. MacNamara, and embarked on an aggressive trade and selling policy. They reduced the price of wheat and barley and they were finally successful in moving grain off the Saskatchewan farm. Oh, the proponents like the Member for Touchwood would say, Oh, years ago he could remember, and I am sure he did, he sold some wheat for 30 cents a bushel, 40 cents a bushel under the free enterprise system, under the Grain Exchange. It is a fact that wheat was sold for as low as 30 cents a bushel during the dirty thirties but it also is a fact that wheat was sold for as low as 3 bushels for \$1 by our Saskatchewan farmers and a cent a pound was quite common only 12 months ago under our Wheat Board.

Today the Wheat Board price for wheat is \$1.76 per bushel. The initial price was announced only a few days ago that next year it will again be \$1.76 and yet the sale of wheat on the world trade today is \$2.60. I believe it is higher than that, I checked the papers here on the weekend. The Wheat Board thinks and the Minister apparently thinks that a farmer is only entitled to a certain amount of money, that the Wheat Board feels justified in retaining 83 cents less freight and without interest should be withheld from the farmer. Whereas the farmer who sells his rape and flax on the Grain Exchange he receives \$4 net. He gets it all. And he gets \$5 for his flax if he sells it. But the Wheat Board is retaining 83 cents less freight for every bushel that the farmer sells today.

The farmers can use this money. The initial price could be higher for next year. This Government wants to lay all the blame on Otto Lang for Operation LIFT. I want to tell the Members opposite that the responsibility of Operation LIFT lies with the Wheat Pool and the Wheat Board. These were the advisers to the Minister and therefore must share the full responsibility.

Compulsory and orderly marketing does not ensure the sale of a product nor does it guarantee a good price. There is no argument about it. The Wheat Board has proven this to me over and over again. That if you have overproduction and they don't want to sell, the price of wheat is going to go down as well as oats, barley and all the rest of it.

The Wheat Board and the Government of Canada are now concerned about production. You talk about stabilized price and the guarantee that there is going to be a certain number of hogs. How is a commission going to guarantee a certain number of hogs in the province when there will be no crop for two or three years? They can't guarantee it. The Wheat Board cannot guarantee Japan that we are going to sell so much rape to them if there wouldn't be a crop this year. There is no such thing

March 12, 1973

that the commission has power that is supernatural over and above the farmer. The Wheat Board and the Government of Canada are now concerned that sufficient supplies will be available to fulfil all commitments and the built up markets.

I am not convinced that the farmers of Saskatchewan will take their advice. Nor am I convinced that the hog producer will take the advice of a commission if it was set up.

As the Saskatchewan farmers find it more difficult to get hired help for their farms, or no help at all, I am convinced that the hog producers, the dairy men, beef cattlemen, a lot of them are going to sell out and sell out in a hurry because the price is good. If the Provincial and Federal Government are concerned about fulfilling all the commitments that they have made over the past years then certainly they should bear some responsibility and try and get some help available for the farmer who needs it.

As a matter of fact, most farmers are not going to take the advice of the governments, but they will do what they think is best for them financially.

Past experience would lead us to believe that government advice or Wheat Board advice is bad for the farmer.

I think most farmers will go back to straight grain farming, because of the difficulty in obtaining good farm help. If the Federal Government wants to pay the unemployed more insurance benefits than the farmer can pay for wages, and if this Provincial Government wants to pay those that are able to work more welfare payments, to welfare recipients more than the farmer can pay in wages, then these governments will have a hard time convincing the farmer to stay in hogs and in cattle.

Compulsory marketing boards have done very little in my opinion to stabilize farm income or assure good crops or good prices for products.

What is basically wrong with this Bill and I haven't attacked it by the clauses but I have attacked it in principle mainly, is the fact that it will not allow a producer a vote. Therefore, I certainly cannot support it. I beg leave to adjourn this debate.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Debate adjourned.

Hon. W.E. Smishek (Minister of Public Health) moved second reading of Bill No. 67 – **An Act to amend The Cancer Control Act.**

Hon. Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Speaker, one of the most serious health problems in Saskatchewan and indeed in the world at large continues to be the incidence in the toll of cancer among our people. After heart disease, cancer in its various forms remains the leading cause of death in this province. Regrettably the total number of people in Saskatchewan known to be suffering from some form of cancer will reach a figure of over 22,000 persons in 1973. In 1972 cancer patients spent over 162,000 days in active

treatment hospitals and very close to 1,400 people died from cancer during the year. Apart from the cost of human suffering and misery the treatment of cancer in our hospitals by the medical profession and the Cancer Commission costs close to \$10 million per year.

It is timely to remind this House that the medical profession, the government and the people of Saskatchewan were the great pioneers in the development of cancer treatment and the follow-up programs in Canada. In 1930 when The Saskatchewan Cancer Commission Act was passed, Saskatchewan became the first province to initiate a cancer control program. In 1931 two diagnostic and cancer treatment clinics were set up in Regina in the General Hospital and in Saskatoon at the City Hospital. In 1932 500 patients were admitted to these two clinics.

In 1944 the present Cancer Control Act replaced the original legislation and has remained substantially unchanged since then. That Act provided that all diagnostic services and treatment including drugs needed in the control of cancer would become a charge on the provincial revenue rather than on the individual patient. In partnership with the medical profession we developed a team approach towards cancer treatment. A team of highly qualified specialists assessed a patient's need and planned a treatment program for him. After treatment became free in 1944 there was a great increase in the number of patients referred to the clinics. By 1946 the number of patients admitted to the clinics had reached 3,000 and the cost had risen to just about \$400,000.

Since 1946 the number of new patients admitted to the clinics has risen steadily. About 4,400 new patients are admitted each year. Mr. Speaker, this year the Government will provide very close to \$3.5 million towards the operation of the work of the Cancer Commission and its program. This is exclusive of the cost of hospital care.

In the last 40 years the Saskatchewan Cancer Control program has become known world wide and has made a significant contribution to cancer knowledge. As an example, the first cobalt unit was developed in Saskatchewan and now we have installed the most modern betatron equipment, the most modern in the world. Speaking in the North American context, the only other betatron unit that exists in North America is in Boston. Ours is located at our University Hospital in Saskatoon. The betatron unit was opened last fall.

The amendments being introduced today are aimed at providing the Commission with new impetus and new sense of purpose and direction. Program and operational changes are needed at this time so that we can continue to provide the best in cancer diagnostic treatment services to the people of Saskatchewan. Early in 1970, the previous Government, the former Minister of Health, the Hon. Member from Whitmore Park (Mr. Grant) set up a committee under the chairmanship of Mr. Justice F.W. Johnson to undertake a comprehensive study of the cancer program in Saskatchewan. The study was jointly sponsored by the Provincial Government and the Saskatchewan Division of the Canadian Cancer Society. When the committee was established it was asked to examine and comment upon more than 20 specific issues affecting the provision of cancer services in our province. These ranged from an analysis of the medical aspects of the present cancer program; enquiry into the relationship between the

Commission and the College of Medicine and the medical practitioners of Saskatchewan; to an examination of the management and administration of the cancer program.

The final report of the Johnson Study which lasted close to two and one-half years was handed to the Department of Public Health last summer. This report has drawn attention to the fact that our cancer control program requires some major changes. It particularly pointed out the need to strengthen and update its management and administrative policies. It also recommended that payment for cancer services be taken over by the Medical Care Insurance Commission on behalf of the Cancer Commission. The report recommends that the Saskatchewan Cancer Commission concentrate more on the quality and effectiveness of cancer diagnostic and treatment services.

I should also like to highlight some further findings of the Committee. There is praise in the report for the quality of cancer services to patients and the thoroughness of our cancer registration and follow-up program. However, the Committee identified major problems in the gaps which exist between the cancer program and the activities of the University College of Medicine. There is a need for a closer relationship between those staff members who practise at the cancer clinics and those who teach at the University.

The Johnson Report specifically pointed out shortcomings in the Cancer Commission's research long-range planning and administrative organization. To rectify these problems the recommendations of the Johnson Report focused on the need to restructure the Saskatchewan Cancer Commission, to redefine its role and direction and to strengthen its administrative procedures.

Mr. Speaker, before introducing the recommendations of the Johnson Committee, I discussed the report with professional groups, with the Saskatchewan Medical Association, the College of Physicians and Surgeons, with the College of Medicine and with the Cancer Society as well as the Cancer Commission. They have all had their input into the amendments that we are introducing in Bill No. 67.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to say that my Cabinet colleagues and I favor the majority of the cancer assessment committee's recommendations on the future role of the Commission. The amendments being proposed this afternoon will serve to strengthen and streamline the Commission's operation. Let us examine some of the amendments in detail.

The membership of the Commission will be reconstituted to permit fixed terms of office and allow for the inclusion of new members on a regular basis. This was a specific recommendation made by the Johnson Committee. The Committee recommended that there is need for a more regular turn over in Commission members. The proposed legislation provides for a Commission of six to ten members appointed for three-year terms with the maximum of two consecutive terms. This is similar to what is provided for membership on the Medical Care and the Alcohol Commissions. The Deputy Minister of Health, or Associate Deputy of Public Health will be an ex-officio member of the Commission. We have provided for the appointment of one of the members by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council to act as chairman. In addition to the chairman and the deputy minister two other members are

specified in the legislation. One physician agreed upon by the Minister and the College of Physicians and Surgeons and one full-time staff member of the College of Medicine. The appointment of a member of the College of Medicine will allow both the Commission and the College to keep their watchful eye on the training of cancer specialists in our province.

In summary the reconstituted Commission provides for the appointment of three health professionals and up to six members of the general public plus the chairman, emphasizing one of the prime functions of the Commission.

The amendments, Mr. Speaker, to Section 5 and 6 of The Cancer Control Act will ensure that meetings of the Commission are held on a more regular basis to encourage greater participation and leadership in the development of cancer program planning. Up 'til now this was a matter for the Commission to decide. They were not required by statute to meet a specific number of times a year.

Further the authority of the chairman has been re-stated to ensure continuity in the administration of the Commission business. While the existing Act includes a comprehensive list of powers and duties of the Commission the Johnson Committee recommended a clear definition of the objectives of the Commission. We have therefore amended the duties and powers of the Commission in Section 11(a) to broaden the terms of reference of the Commission's functions which will now be concerned with program development and improvement.

The Commission will serve as a policy-making and planning body. It will become more closely integrated with other health programs. It will also maintain a continuing contact with both the providers of service and the general public in respect to the adequacy of the cancer program. It will be useful to cite the objectives of the Commission. The Commission will administer the program aimed at the prevention, diagnosis, control and treatment of cancer. The Commission will solicit public opinion on the adequacy and quality of cancer programs. They will allow for an exchange of views on the operation of the cancer program with members of the medical profession. The Commission will appoint advisory committees for review of those areas of the program requiring assessment.

Mr. Speaker, the Commissioners will take steps to maintain an adequate standard of professional education in connection with the diagnosis and treatment of cancer. They will lastly develop longer ranged plans and evaluate program development.

I believe that these objectives should allow the Commission to pay particular attention to the present and future needs of the cancer program in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, in the past the Cancer Commission has only periodically provided the general public with the review of its on-going activities. A very important amendment provides for the tabling of an annual report in the Legislature. This change is in line with the need to improve the public accountability of the Cancer Commission. The annual report will be transmitted to the Minister of Public Health who will table the report in the Legislative Assembly similar to the requirements and provisions in the case of the Medical Care Insurance Commission and Alcohol Commission. I am sure my friend opposite, the Hon.

Member for Whitmore Park (Mr. Grant) will agree with this amendment. I am aware of his desire to have the Commission table an annual report with him — the last time we have had a report from the Commission was in 1964. It is difficult for the Members of the Legislature as well as for the Government to assess programs, and how effective they are, when the Commission does not table an annual report. The amendments that we are making will require that the Commission prepare an annual report so that we can assess its effectiveness.

I believe that we will find that these organizational amendments will place greater emphasis on improving public involvement, encouraging more activity and providing more direction in the operation of the Saskatchewan Cancer Commission.

It is my belief that sound management requires workable objectives being placed before the Commission. The Commission should concern itself with long-range planning, operating policy and overall administrative guidance. I am confident that now these goals have been spelled out and the new organization will work hopefully, more effectively. As I indicated earlier these organizational changes are only the first steps in the implementation of some of the recommendations of the Johnson Commission Report. It is not possible to spell out by legislation many of the other recommendations but with setting out the new objectives, with the review of the Commission, plus other requirements that we are making we are hoping that new impetus and a new direction will be given by the new Commission. A reconstituted Commission will have the manpower skills and the appropriate authority to deal with the other recommendations contained in the Johnson Commission Report.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to tabling the next annual report on the Cancer Commission in this House early next year. I am hopeful that the first report will give evidence of steps that the new Commission will be taking to improve our cancer control program. Cancer will be one of the major health concerns of the Saskatchewan people in the future as it has in the past. The medical profession and the Government of Saskatchewan cannot afford to rest on past achievements. We must strengthen the organizational structure of the Commission and these amendments will achieve these goals.

Mr. Speaker, I might add that the proposed amendments have been discussed with the Cancer Commission and with the College of Physicians and Surgeons as well as the Saskatchewan Medical Association. There is substantial agreement on the amendments, in fact when the draft was first prepared, we discussed these with the groups I have mentioned and a number of suggestions were made by them and were incorporated into the Bill that is before us. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 67 — An Act to amend the Cancer Control Act.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald (Moose Jaw North): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few words. First of all cancer is likely the major health concern in Saskatchewan today and the incidence is increasing. The nature of cancer is still far from known. We know that some of the causes are chemicals and viruses and radiation and other irritants. We don't know how these agents affect the cause of cancer. A

great deal is still to be learned.

I think that, we as a Legislature, we as a public, owe a great debt to the Cancer Society for the tremendous contributions they have made to our society. I should just like to comment on the formation of the Canadian Cancer Society. I think it goes back in Saskatchewan, back to 1929 when the Saskatchewan Medical Association formed a cancer committee which was a voluntary committee at that time, and this led in turn to the formation of the Canadian Cancer Society. I think the Saskatchewan Medical Association deserves some credit for this.

I think that the cancer program that was established in Canada is also unique because it combined the forces of government and the medical profession and lay people and this is what made it unique. This led to the Canadian Cancer Control Act being passed in 1930.

What we are discussing today are the amendments to The Cancer Control Act, and really the amendments come to this House as a result of the Johnson Report which was commissioned by the Member from Whitmore Park (Mr. Grant). Certainly I agree with the recommendations of the Johnson Report. One of the strong recommendations of the Johnson Report is that a separate cancer program should be carried on rather than including cancer into the generalities of medicine and I strongly agree with this and I will certainly support the Bill.

One of the things that may give me some concern is the formation of the Commission. I don't think that it is really spelled out that interested people – truly interested people – should be able to devote as much time to cancer as is possible. I have second thoughts about limiting their time on this Commission to two terms.

Secondly, I think the chairman of the Commission should be a doctor and I think that he should have, not only the desire, but should be emotionally involved in the cancer problems. But I think, first of all, that he should be a doctor and I would hope that he can be.

The power and the duties of the Commission as outlined in this Bill, are powers and duties that the Commission has actually had in practice and been doing largely in practice and this amendment gives the legislation so that they can act properly under it.

The only other question that I would have is that there are other recommendations made in the Johnson Report and I would hope that these amendments won't preclude the implementing of further recommendations which were made by the Johnson Report.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I should like to adjourn debate so that other Members of our party can have a chance to look at this. I know that the Member for Whitmore Park will have more to say about this.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:33 o'clock p.m.