

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

Monday, March 4, 1974.

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. E. C. WHELAN:(Regina North West): — Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Hon. Member for Regina Wascana (Mr. Baker) through you I should like to introduce to all Hon. Members of the House, 45 Grade Eight students from the Douglas Park School in the Wascana Constituency. They are seated in the west gallery with their teacher, Mr. Kozak and three of the parents, Mrs. Wright, Mrs. Joorisity and Mrs. Wier. Also in the group is Kelly Smishek, daughter of the Minister of Health. Members join me, I am sure, in expressing the wish that their visit here will be pleasant and educational.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. R. ROMANOW:(Saskatoon Riversdale): — Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to introduce to you, Sir, and to Members of the Legislative Assembly approximately 55 students from King George School in Saskatoon. I think they are sitting in the Speaker's Gallery, if I am right, by some of the waving of hands. King George School is a very old and a very illustrious school in the city of Saskatoon, Mr. Speaker, and if my history is right I believe it is the school that Gordie Howe attended. We certainly all know the exploits of Gordie Howe. I should like to welcome to the Legislature the students that are here. I should also like to extend a welcome to the teachers who accompanied them, Messrs. Christianson, Sparks, Dobson and Coulthardt. I hope they find their visit informative and they have a safe trip back home to Saskatoon.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE FUND

MR. E. G. GARDNER: (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to ask a question of the Attorney General.

Late Saturday I heard several times on radio and television that he was transferring three pennies of the gasoline tax to the automobile insurance fund. Three pennies, of course, doesn't sound like very much to the average person but I should like to ask the Attorney General, is it true that this transfer to bail out the automobile insurance fund will amount to over \$9 million in the coming year?

HON. R. ROMANOW: (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I would answer as follows. I don't know the exact figure but my understanding is that it is in the

neighborhood of around \$9 million that is being transferred over. I would, however, dispute the Hon. Member's contention that it is to bail out The Automobile Accident Insurance Act. Indeed, it is not, I say to the Member that it is a principle of exposure rating which is recommended and advocated by many leading car insurance people. It is a very logical approach to insurance. The more miles you drive the more gasoline you pay, the more your risk is. It is directly tied to exposure rating. It is, in fact, bringing in fairness to The Automobile Accident Insurance Act.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — I believe that the public will realize it as building in some equity and will also accept the reductions that the proposal makes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

RENTING OF OFFICE SPACE BY GOVERNMENT

MR. D. G. STEUART: (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Public Works. But first I should just like to say in answer to that speech that it is a subsidy; there is no question about that.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order!

MR. STEUART: — Certainly, Mr. Speaker, I would be the last one to make a speech in answer to another speech.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. STEUART: — I might ordinarily be the first one but I will be the last one today. I thought I should answer that nonsense before it goes much further. We will answer that later on today.

I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Public Services or Government Services, whatever they call them now. We have been told that the Government is renting some space in the new Toronto-Dominion Bank Building and I also understand you are renting some space and making renovations or additions to the Ratner Building. Now will the Minister tell us how many floors in the Toronto-Dominion Bank, the new building, you are going to rent and how much you are going to pay and will he tell us if they are going to rent some space in the Ratner Building, how many floors and how much they are going to pay? Also how long a lease you are signing?

HON. J. E. BROCKELBANK: (Minister of Government Services): — Mr. Speaker, I don't understand the constant repetition about the Toronto-Dominion Bank Building? I would suggest to the Members opposite that they put a question on the Order Paper and we'll try to answer it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. STEUART: — Surely, Mr. Speaker, the Minister in charge of a Department, we are talking about a contract that could run anywhere from \$700,000 to \$1 million a year, that's what we are talking about, if it is a ten-year contract it would amount to \$7 to \$10 million. He stands in this House and tells us that he is not prepared at this time or he doesn't know at this time, the answer to those very simple questions. I can't understand it. If he doesn't know, he should say so, and then the Premier could take a look at his competency as a Minister. If he does know he doesn't need to put us through all the exercise of putting it on the Order Paper. I am asking three simple questions, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! I think the rules are clear. A Member can ask a question but cannot insist on an answer. If the answer isn't full enough there are other ways of getting the information.

MR. STEUART: — Obviously, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister doesn't know the answer I have to accept it.

FLOOD PREVENTION STEPS FOR REGINA

MR. E. C. MALONE: (Regina Lakeview): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I have a question for the Minister of the Environment.

He was good enough on Friday to tell this Assembly about certain steps that have been taken to prevent flooding in the Lumsden area in response to a question by the Member for Lumsden (Mr. Lane). I wonder if the Minister is prepared today to give this Assembly some advice as to flood prevention steps that have been taken in the city of Regina? When the Report was handed down by the Qu'Appelle Basin Study there was a press conference and I believe coming out of that press conference was the advice that the only steps being taken for Regina was to hand the residents of the city a copy of the report and to assure them that there was sand and sandbags available. I would hope that there would be more done than that, Mr. Minister, and would you give us some idea what that is?

HON. N. E. BYERS: (Minister of Environment) Mr. Speaker, the Department of the Environment is taking several advance steps to lessen the hazards to citizens and to property in the event of a flood because of the potential for a high runoff into the Wascana Creek this spring. The Department of the Environment is chairing a coordinating committee to work with the city officials and with a number of Government Departments and agencies so that the various agencies will know what their responsibilities are in the event of a flood. That is step number one.

Secondly, we have within the past two years stepped up our capacity adequately and hopefully accurately to forecast the potential for any flooding. We now have at our disposal a good deal of information that was previously not available because of less adequate flood forecasting machinery. In addition, we have installed additional water monitoring equipment along the river basin so that we hopefully will have much more advance information about flooding than was the case a couple of years

ago. I have scheduled a press conference for Wednesday at 9 o'clock of this week at which time we shall be revealing, in some detail, the Department's plans to deal with flooding, not only on the Qu'Appelle and on the Wascana where there is a high potential, but steps that we are taking to deal with floods over the entire province.

MR. MALONE: — Mr. Speaker, by way of a supplementary question, could the Minister tell me what notice, what minimum notice could be given to the residents of Regina if there is a flood?

MR. BYERS: — We hope to be able to give more advance notice. We shall be getting monitoring reports of runoff and this sort of thing on a 24-hour basis and we will be doing everything possible not only to keep the citizens advised of any potential flood but in addition to that we will be doing such things as carrying on an information program for citizens to advise them of measures to take to protect their property and that sort of thing.

SECOND READINGS

HON. A. TAYLOR (Minister of Social Services) moved second reading of Bill No. 54 — **An Act respecting the provision of Community Services to the Elderly, Infirm, Blind, or other Persons.**

He said: — Mr. Speaker, I am pleased at this time to be submitting for second reading The Community Services Act, 1974. It is legislation which I believe is a first for Saskatchewan and has no equivalent in any other province in this country.

The basic concern of any community services program is to enhance the quality of life for the citizens in need of such services. Such a program has to have two principal objectives. Its first major goal is to allow persons to continue living in their own homes as long as possible rather than be forced into institutional settings. The second major goal is to enable the Department to co-operate with agencies or organizations in the development and implementation of community services which will improve the life of such citizens. The Community Services Act is an expression of this concern and a serious attempt to achieve these goals.

This legislation is designed to complement The Housing and Special-care Homes Act, amendments which have already been presented at this sitting of the House. The report and recommendations of the Aged and Long-term Illness Survey Committee which were published in July of 1975 suggested two major recommendations. First, the development of additional institutional facilities and second, the development of an extensive community- services program.

Regarding the first recommendation the Committee proposed the formula of five special-care beds for every 1,000 population. This, Mr. Speaker, was in 1963. The Government, following that report, embarked on a program that would increase the number of beds, special-care beds or nursing home beds available, in the province. Unfortunately, however, the Government of that day ignored the community services aspect of the

March 4, 1974

recommendation. One can only assume that at that point they felt that priority had to be given to the construction of special-care homes. I feel this was unfortunate because we could have seen community services develop along with institutional care instead of having to be tacked on later.

It is also true, however, that in many instances an institutional facility once established can become the focal point for the development of community services in that particular area. I might say, Mr. Speaker, that in 1974 there are 6,771 beds ready for operation in senior citizens' homes of one type or another with another 546 presently under construction and soon to be opened. This combined total of 7,317 special-care beds far exceeds the prescribed formula that the Committee set down in 1963, a formula of five beds per 1,000 population. Now we have slightly over seven beds per thousand in Saskatchewan. It is the highest number of beds per thousand population of any jurisdiction in Canada and indeed the highest number that we know of in North America. In spite of this, construction will not cease just because we have surpassed the formula which was proposed by the Aged and Long-term Illness Survey Committee. Experience has demonstrated that there are still areas in the province which do require special-care facilities or which do not presently have sufficient facilities. The needs of these areas will continue to be accommodated on a selective basis.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that we have already, as a Government, taken steps to make available special-care homes to smaller population centres. It is our belief that wherever it practical people should remain as close to their own home area as possible. Formerly there was a population base established that required 5,000 population before a special-care home could be constructed. Our Government has reduced this to 3,500. We believe that this is an important step in providing services to people close to where they live. We have also followed the policy of ensuring that a hospital is available in an area where a Level III care home is established so that the needs of these citizens can more adequately be met.

The Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek) has proposed and is following a policy of encouraging small hospitals in rural areas to set aside some beds for Level IV care so that, again, senior citizens may remain close to their homes in years when they need such services. I would hope that smaller hospitals will take the Minister of Health up on this type of program and that they will develop such care for the elderly and others in need of Level IV in their area.

With the development of special-care facilities at least partially taken care of, the Government now turns towards the second recommendation of the Committee, the development of community services. Over the past few years a significant expansion of emphasis has occurred in this particular area. In 1970-71, for example, there were no funds set aside for community services. In 1971 the Government set aside funds totaling \$61,000 for the development of such services. In the next year that figure was increased by 50 per cent to \$94,000. The present fiscal year has seen this figure increase to \$286,000. The provincial Budget I am sure will indicate the funds available for the coming year in this same type of program. Obviously this area is no longer being neglected.

However, in order for the community service program to

achieve the fullest possible benefits for the citizens requiring these particular services it is necessary that the program receive formal clarification and guidance. We, in our Government, believe that The Community Services Act will provide the necessary impetus to enable community services to improve and expand the essential services it supplies to the public.

Before looking at the details of the Act itself, I should like to outline a few examples of the different types of community services that are now available.

Information and Referral Centres are central registries which provide information on services such as available assistance, room and board, counselling services and local activities, particularly as they pertain to the aged. We are supporting a number of such centres in the province at this time.

Senior Care Centres are located in special-care homes and provide supervisory, personal and nursing care to out-patients attending the centre on a regular basis, again assisting people who need some care to remain in their own homes for as long as possible.

Senior Activity Centres provide a central location where the senior citizens of the area can gather for social companionship, recreational and creative activities, seasonal parties, lunches and so on.

The Meals on Wheels program is used to ensure the provision of a hot nutritious meal to aged or handicapped persons in their homes on a regular basis. I might say this has become one of the most popular of the community services programs offered.

Transportation services enable persons in the community to attend the activity centres where they can enjoy the companionship of others, participate in recreational and creative activities and receive meal services in a central location.

Homemaker Services enable the provision of services that are necessary for the management and operation of a home by a homemaker as needed to restore or maintain independent living at home in times of stress. This can be the case of a senior citizen who is just unable to look after all the cooking that is necessary in a home or it might well be, as it is in some cases, the situation of a family where the mother has been taken ill and removed to hospital and in order to keep the home together the father needs some type of help. This is provided by the Homemaker and also at times by Meals on Wheels.

Aids to Independent Living are services designed to assist the aged and the handicapped maintain maximum mobility with reasonable safety. This includes such things as hand rails and other safety aids in private homes and in the community, minor home repairs and seasonal cleaning and installation of simple exercising aids on the advice of a physician.

The development of supervision of a foster home or boarding home program will enable aged persons who are not able to live independently to obtain accommodation in a family setting.

A coordinator of services may be employed by the community to initiate and develop local services by assisting government

March 4, 1974

and voluntary agencies in surveying their roles in the presentation of services to the aged and others and stimulate them to expand their programs where it is appropriate.

In order to properly establish these community services the Government is willing to supply financial assistance up to a maximum of 40 per cent of the total operating expenses. This monetary support is made on a continuing basis. The total grants to community services for the aged rose to \$162,755 for the period April to November 1973 as compared with \$94,370 for the entire fiscal year of 1972-73.

Well, there are many other kinds of community services. In fact the range of possible community services is as limitless as the scope of the imagination. Our Government is eager and willing to listen to any sensible and practical idea put forward by a community or service organization or interested citizens as to how the elderly, blind, infirm or other persons can be assisted to live happy and independent lives.

The Department intends to encourage communities and concerned individuals to establish and develop these services. Our Government has in the past few years made grants to agencies providing community services and has had a full time consultant to encourage communities in the development of the services. A second consultant was hired in September of 1973. I might say, Mr. Speaker, that is one of the additions to the establishment hiring figures that are often criticized by the Opposition, provide services mainly in this case to senior citizens.

The initial development stage of the program is now, however, passed. The Department, the communities and the individuals involved realize its value and this Bill is intended to formalize the program by giving it the proper legislative authority. Until now grants to agencies have had to be made under the authority of The Department of Social Services Act since there was no formal reference to community services as such. In addition, there was no mechanism by which grants could be made to individuals who use these various services, unless of course they met the means test under The Saskatchewan Assistance Plan.

The new Bill contains provisions for a grant program to assist agencies whose objectives include the provision of community services. It also provides for grants to individuals to enable them to purchase such services. If it is deemed advisable regulations may be passed establishing standards for the services provided. The Department of Social Services in conjunction with the Department of Public Health is presently studying the desirability of establishing standards for Homemaker Services. There are many persons who make use of Homemaker Services such as the ill, the elderly, the disabled and children. If as a result of this study it is considered advisable to establish standards for Homemaker Services our Department will do so. I might say to the House there has already been a request for such a setting of standards from a number of the Family Service Agencies or Bureaus in Saskatchewan who believe that there is a need to establish standards to make sure that when services are provided that they meet at least minimum requirements.

Our Department may also require persons who provide community services to be licensed. It is not our intention to require the many thousands of volunteers who do such tremendous

and beneficial work in assisting the elderly, infirm or blind to be licensed. However, where community services are provided by organizations and are such that standards ought to be imposed, licensing will be introduced as a mechanism of ensuring that the standards are met. The Bill proposes the establishment of a community services division within the Department of Social Services. The division will be responsible for the development co-ordination, licensing and administration of the various community services.

Many people in society are normally excluded from training programs leading to employment. The Bill stipulates that the Minister of Social Services may provide guidance and assistance to persons and organizations in designing and implementing programs providing for recreation or training for employment of the elderly, infirm, blind or other persons. The Bill also provides for the establishment of a system of awards; awards might go to individuals, organizations or corporations who make an outstanding contribution to the well-being of persons receiving community services. The Government believes that this is a tangible demonstration of the appreciation and recognition which these various concerned organizations or individuals deserve.

The Community Services Act is designed to establish a formalized and orderly summary of rules and regulations pertaining to the provision of community services. We believe that with the Act community services will improve immeasurably and consequently many Saskatchewan residents will be able to live a life of happiness and relative independence.

If I may briefly, Mr. Speaker, recap. Community services must complement institutional care. It doesn't mean that they will replace institutional care. There will always be those who need or who choose institutional living. There will be those who need institutional settings. But at the present time about 95 per cent, for example, of our senior citizens do not reside in institutions; they do not reside there mostly by choice because they prefer to continue living in their own homes. The same is true of many of our handicapped citizens, whether mentally or physically handicapped; they prefer not to be put in large institutions. The recent report of the Senior Citizens Commission has identified that most people prefer to remain independent. The argument frequently used is that they want to live in their own home, lock their own door and have in whom they wish, without staff bounding in and out at will. It seemed to us that the Government's responsibility is to provide a free choice so that the people can choose whether they wish institutional care or whether, indeed, they prefer to remain at home.

In the past with the construction grants and subsidies provided by the Government, our own included, to those living in institutions, we have, in fact, been placing institutions over and above the community services. This we believe has to be changed. We want to encourage the programs of Meals on Wheels, Homemakers, Transportation, the supplying of such things as telephones for the handicapped so that they will be able to use such a telephone, even though they may have physical disabilities.

Standards of service also have to be developed. I might say that we have been very pleased with the public acceptance of this program in the past. Originally it seemed restricted to the larger centres, the larger cities and many people in

March 4, 1974

smaller centres said it did not apply to them. I am happy to say now that we see smaller centres also developing community services and finding that it is just as applicable as it has been in the large cities.

There is, Mr. Speaker, great potential in this type of program. When I was in Swift Current recently, I was given what I consider to be an excellent example, where a couple was living at home. The man was what we normally consider Level III care, which is intensive nursing care, and his wife Level II care neither wanted to move into an institutional setting, and indeed, the doctor himself said that if this happened the man would likely die fairly quickly, because he would not be able to fit into the situation. By providing Homemaker Services, home nursing services and Meals on Wheels that couple have been able to remain living in their own home in their own community. Both have been receiving these services now for some six or seven months and both are finding them the kind of services they need to continue an independent life. This is the type of situation, Mr. Speaker, that this Bill is attempting to provide. I, therefore, move second reading of this Bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. C. P. MacDONALD: (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a few comments on this Bill which is not very controversial and certainly the Members of the Opposition will be most happy to support it. I should like to remind the Minister — he started off as if he invented community services in Saskatchewan — he started off as if he invented special-care facilities in the Province of Saskatchewan.

I should like to hope that this particular Bill is not window dressing because for two and one half years the Government has sat on its behind and done nothing about community services that were initiated in 1971 with the development grants by a Liberal government. I should also like to remind the Minister when he talks about special care facilities that in 1964 when the Government changed there were 2,400 beds in Saskatchewan, most of them old, dilapidated and shoddy. When we left the Government in 1971 there were almost 6,000 beds. Just look around the city of Regina, Pioneer Village, Santa Maria Home, Lutheran, Salvation Army, you can't find a community of any size in the Province of Saskatchewan that hasn't got a brand new special care facility. The Minister has probably travelled and visited them all. All of those facilities practically were built from 1964 to 1971 and required a tremendous amount of effort. In fact, Mr. Speaker, this Government has gone backwards, the amount of money in grants to build special care facilities in the last two and one half years, plus the grant for community services does not equal the total amount of grants in the majority of the years between 1964-71 and the Minister is well aware of this. The biggest disappointment to me is that after we had now achieved a breakthrough in the building of special care beds in the Province of Saskatchewan and where the program had begun to look, as the Minister has indicated, that now we have more beds per capita than any province in Canada and perhaps any state in North America, that now it was time to turn to community services.

In 1971 we initiated a program for the development of community services all the things that the Minister is talking about as if he invented them. Pilot projects and Homemaker

Services, Meals on wheels and so forth, these programs were to be experimented with by various communities. We got various community associations, various special care facilities to volunteer to put in these pilot projects to experiment over the year 1971 with the concept of expanding them throughout the whole province in 1972. Now we find the Minister is finally bringing in a community services Bill that doesn't spell out really what the Government intends. It is very general phraseology. I just hope that the Minister and the Government is sincere in developing the kind of services and putting the kind of emphasis on senior citizens in the Province of Saskatchewan and their needs, particularly in the special care field and the services field as they grow older.

The Minister has indicated and is well aware that the majority of the people in the Province of Saskatchewan, when they reach the age where they need assistance — and I am speaking about services in health, meals and so forth — don't want to enter an institutional setting. The institutional setting has a very small priority by the majority of people in Saskatchewan at that age. They want to keep their own independence, they want to keep their own home, they want to keep their own garden, they want to keep their own friends, they want to remain in their community and sometimes even on the farm or in the small rural setting. Therefore, the development of services to keep these people and make it possible for them to remain at home, to remain in their own independent setting, is of utmost priority. Now that the Province of Saskatchewan has reached that plateau in the development of special care facilities — I agree with the Minister — we now must continue to reduce the population criterion eligibility of small communities in relation to population. We put the 5,000 level on because there was such a fantastic demand all over the province, every community regardless of size, whether it was Assiniboia, Melville, Esterhazy, Saltcoats or Yorkton, all of them needed special care facilities. Therefore, we had to develop a plateau to give some priority to size where it was needed. Now that that particular plateau has been reached it is important to reduce the eligibility as far as population is concerned, and I agree with the principle of 3,500 that the Minister has indicated, it might even be desirable in the future to go down even lower. Because as the Minister knows there are many of these in order to get the 5,000 population figure very often rural municipalities went in with communities that were really not their trading centre or the centre of their activity whether it be recreational or economic.

Therefore, it is important to continue this development of special care facilities. Now that the plateau is reached the real emphasis should be turned to community services. I am glad to see this Bill. I'll be looking forward very anxiously to see the emphasis given in the Budget in 1974 to community services. I hope now the development stage should be over. Certainly Meals on Wheels have demonstrated their value, Homemakers Services have demonstrated their value. Now it is time for some concrete action and expansion around the province. We will certainly support the Minister and the Government in any expansion of this kind of service and we urge them to give it some kind of priority in the year 1974.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. TAYLOR: — Mr. Speaker, I don't know where the Member for

March 4, 1974

Milestone was when I made my remarks on this Bill. I had attempted to be as calm and reasonable as possible, to be as non-political with the senior citizens and handicapped people of the province as possible, in fact, I said in my notes and I am sure it will show up later that the previous administration, or the previous governments had decided that the needed priority at that time was special-care homes. I gave them the benefit of the doubt that this, indeed, was an honest decision arrived at honestly and deliberately.

But, Mr. Speaker, I can't help but make a few remarks after what the Member for Milestone has said. He said they initiated the program of community services. That's true. But they provided no funds in the Budget to carry it out.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. TAYLOR: — Not one cent in the 1970-71 Budget for community services.

Mr. Speaker, they talk about their subsidy to special-care homes. Let me tell you, Sir, that in May or maybe late April of 1971, that's a noticeable date, they froze the rates in special-care homes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. TAYLOR: — Just over a month before the election and they paid Mr. Speaker, one wonders if that was done \$60,000 in subsidies. Mr. Speaker, one wonders if that was done after reasonable and due consideration or because they knew June of 1971 was coming up.

That government, as I said, provided no funds in their Budget for community services. This year we have provided \$286,000 and I invite the Members to watch the coming Budget.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. TAYLOR: — Mr. Speaker, that administration spent some \$60,000.

MR. MacDONALD: (Milestone): — Would the Minister permit a question? Would he indicate what amount was in the Budget in the year 1971-72, which was a Liberal Budget?

MR. TAYLOR: — Yes, Mr. Speaker, the Budget of 1971-72 showed no funds for community services, sorry, let me check my notes. I had it written down here somewhere. My apologies, Mr. Speaker, \$61,000 1971-72 compared to \$286,000. \$60,000 for special-care homes subsidies compared to \$3 million this year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. TAYLOR: — I agree with the Member when he talks about the criterion, the population base. Certainly there had to be some sort of criterion established. A population of 5,000 was reasonable. We have dropped it to 3,500 and I don't know if it can be dropped much lower. There are certainly other community services that

must be available in order to provide proper nursing home care.

Mr. Speaker, this Government is committed to providing community services, not just for our senior citizens, but for all people who happen to need them. This Bill will enable us to carry out that task. I hope that the Members opposite will indeed support us in this endeavor.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

HON. R. ROMANOW (Attorney General) moved second reading of Bill No. 34 — **An Act to amend The Executions Act.**

He said: — Mr. Speaker, this Bill is a Bill to amend The Executions Act insofar as executions against land are involved.

Under the present Act, Section 20, an execution creditor who has recovered a judgment against an execution debtor, may issue a writ of execution against goods and also against lands where the amount unpaid under the judgment is \$50 or more. The writ is then filed with the sheriff named in the writ and to encumber the land of the execution debtor, the sheriff files a certified copy of the writ in the Land Titles Office and by virtue of Section 180 of The Land Titles Act, the writ becomes a charge on the lands of the execution debtor.

The same Section also provides that no lands may be sold under a writ of executions against land until after the lapse of one year from the date the writ was issued. Further, that where land is to be sold under a writ, it must be advertised for two months in a newspaper and three months notice is given to the debtor of intention to sell. Notice must also be given to all persons who according to the records of the Land Titles Office have an encumbrance against it.

These provisions have been enforced in this province for many years. The proposed amendments here will result in the following changes in the law:

1. The right to issue a writ of executions against lands will be increased from \$50 to \$200. The \$50 minimum was established more than 50 years ago and it is felt that it has ceased to be realistic these days, and that the minimum should be increased to \$200.
2. The right to sell land under a writ of execution against lands, will arise as formerly only after the expiration of one year from the date of the writ.

A question has, however, been raised as to when the one- year period starts to run. Under the Act, if a writ of execution is directed to the sheriff at Regina and he files a certified copy in the Regina Land Registration District, lands of the execution debtor in land registration districts other than Regina are not encumbered by it. The Act, however, provides that where it is found that an execution debtor has land in another land registration district, the sheriff may file a certified copy of the writ of execution with the sheriff nearest to the land who will then file a certified copy of the writ in the land registration district in which the land is situated.

March 4, 1974

The Benchers of the Law Society of Saskatchewan recently raised the question as to whether the land in the land registration district other than the Regina Land Registration District, could be sold after the lapse of one year from the date of the first writ issued to the sheriff in Regina, or within one year from the date the second sheriff received and registered the writ in his land registration district.

I am advised that legal opinion is that the period of one year starts to run from the date the writ is placed in the hands of the sheriff in Regina. The Bill will clarify this point to that effect.

3. The period of advertising land for two months as required by the present Act has been shortened to advertising once a week for four consecutive weeks.

I am advised that costs of publishing advertisements have increased somewhat substantially, and so reducing the period for advertising the debtor will be saved some substantial costs.

4. One of the most important aspects of this Bill is to require that no land may be sold under a writ of execution against lands except with the leave of the court.

What is being done here is to adopt the principle of The Land Contracts Actions Act passed in 1943 and still a law of this province. Under that Act no mortgagee or vendor of land may commence action to foreclose a mortgage or cancel an agreement for sale unless he has first obtained an order of the court granting leave to do so. Under that Act the court is required to inquire into all of the facts as to the assets of the debtor, his financial circumstances, debts and reasons for inability to pay the mortgage or agreement for sale. And the court may grant or refuse leave.

I venture to suggest that if a mortgagee or a vendor applied to the court for leave to foreclose or cancel an agreement for sale, under which only \$50 was owing, that the court could likely adjourn the application for eight months, as it is permitted to do and give the mortgagor, or purchaser, a chance to raise that amount of money, or perhaps even to dismiss the application right out of hand.

It is rather difficult to reconcile the position of a mortgagee or vendor who, as I have said, must first obtain leave to foreclose that or an execution creditor who can sell the debtor's land even for a \$50 debt without the intervention of the court in any way.

The purpose of this Bill, therefore, in that respect is to place execution creditors in the same position as mortgagees or vendors. In other words this Bill requires that before an execution creditor may sell an execution debtor's land or lands which he did own at one time and later sold subject to the execution, he must obtain an order of the court granting him leave to sell and the court will then make some enquiries as has to be made under The Land Contract Actions Act already mentioned and either grant or refuse the leave.

Mr. Speaker, with those few words of explanation, I move second reading of this Bill.

MR. J. C. LANE: (Lumsden): — Mr. Speaker, just a few comments.

Unfortunately the Attorney General is not accurate when he says that execution creditors are in a different position. I must remind the Attorney General that execution creditors have already been through court in order to get the judgment, in order to get the writ of execution. I am going to submit to the Attorney General that the effective results of this Bill is going to mean that anyone who obtains a judgment against an individual and a writ of execution, is going to have to take at least one more year before he can exercise his lawfully obtained remedies. Surely that has to be, frankly, quite stupid in order to put this proper court order, he is in effect delaying a court order for at least one more year. He will have the time required to get the writ of execution, whatever that may be, and the court is involved in every stage along those lines. Then he will add to that, the requirements of The Land Contracts Actions Act, which in accepted practice, take at least a year for an order for sale of the lands under that particular Act.

So now we have two procedures that an execution creditor must take. There is no doubt and there is ample evidence, that the additional costs of obtaining remedies are costs that are passed onto the consumer and an awful lot of this so-called 'debtor protection legislation' means higher costs for consumers. There is no doubt that this will mean higher costs for consumers and in the absence of our Mr. MacLeod who is out of the city, I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

MR. ROMANOW moved second reading of Bill No. 52 — **An Act to amend The Automobile Accident Insurance Act.**

He said: — Mr. Speaker, there are a number of amendments to Bill No. 52 which will update this legislation — The Automobile Accident Insurance Act.

In meeting the automobile insurance needs of the motoring public in Saskatchewan the Act must be continually reviewed to meet the changing conditions. And this is what we propose to do with respect to this particular Bill, Bill No. 52.

Mr. Speaker, a brief description of some of the amendments which are being contemplated.

The first amendment is the addition of subsection 5(a) to Section 22. Subsection (4) of Section 22 makes special provision for a housewife. Subsection (4) provides that if she is totally disabled she is entitled to \$60 per week for 12 weeks. Section 5 further provides that if she is partially disabled she is entitled to \$30 per week for 12 weeks. The proposed amendment will lengthen the period of time in which she may receive compensation. If, on a doctor's instruction, a housewife is confined to a hospital bed, or otherwise to bed, or wheelchair she is entitled to \$30 per week for up to one year.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment reflects the increasing importance attached by society to the work of a housewife. It is now recognized that she is, in a sense, employed in the same way as anyone else and this amendment seeks to recognize this

particular fact.

Now another amendment, Mr. Speaker, relates to Section 5, which amends subsection (3) of Section 31 of the Act. This subsection presently provides that where a person received unemployment insurance benefits, he is not entitled to weekly indemnity benefits. It was felt that this is unfair since in mostly all cases the accident victim's unemployment benefits were less than his income and he still sustained a loss by reason of the accident. The proposed amendment provides that to the extent that his unemployment insurance benefits are less than his income from his employment, he is entitled to the weekly indemnity. Thus, by way of example, let us suppose that a man was making \$100 a week and was disabled in an automobile accident which occurred in connection with his work. But let us further suppose his unemployment insurance benefits were \$75 a week. He would be entitled to receive, under The Automobile Accident Insurance Act fund, the difference between his regular income of \$100 per week and his unemployment insurance benefits of \$75 per week, the sum of \$25 per week. In effect he makes no more. He just gets what he would be entitled to get if he was not getting anything from unemployment insurance. The way the Act presently reads is that if he gets from unemployment insurance, that's what he gets — it may be less than what he is entitled to get under the ordinary payments — and if this is in fact the case this amendment will allow him to get the maximum up to the amount.

Now the amendment in Section 4 of the Bill. This one, subsection (i), is another example of our attempt to keep the Act contemporary.

Hon. Members will know that the Act has three parts — The Automobile Accident Insurance Act basically — one part provides compensation for personal injury; a second part provides compensation for damage to vehicles; and the third part provides for third party liability coverage. The Hon. Members will further be aware that compensation under each of these parts is only payable if certain conditions are met. Thus, for example, it is a condition of the insurance that the driver must be licensed, etc.

Section 4 deals with compensation payable for personal injuries. It proposes to delete some of the conditions which, if violated, would vitiate the right of compensation for personal injuries. Thus, insurance is not payable if the vehicle by which the victim was injured is towing an unlicensed trailer.

By these amendments it is proposed to repeal this condition because in our judgment it is not particularly logical. Why should a person's right to compensation depend upon the existence of an unlicensed trailer? The presence of an unlicensed trailer does not affect the risk of an accident or the severity of the injuries and accordingly it is proposed the condition should be repealed.

Further, it is a condition of an accident victim's right to compensation for personal injuries, that he must not be injured while being towed behind the vehicle. If he was injured while being towed behind a vehicle he is not entitled to personal injury compensation under the existing legislation.

Now, unlike an unlicensed trailer, being towed behind a

vehicle does affect the risk of an accident. In fact, it is quite dangerous to be towed behind a vehicle and The Vehicles Act makes this activity an offence. However, we felt that it was illogical and unjust to deny a person insurance because he was being towed behind a vehicle. Surely the proper way to deal with this kind of behaviour is through the criminal law. We should be vigilant in convicting and finding those who are guilty of this kind of activity, but to deny him insurance extracts a particularly harsh penalty. It may result in a loss of several thousands of dollars to him or to his family, a far harsher penalty than a judge would ever consider levying under all the circumstances. A proper means of deterring such activity is, in our judgment, through the criminal law.

The proper means for deterring such activity in terms of the operation is, as I have said, Mr. Speaker, through the criminal law, to confuse the role of criminal law and insurance can work very harsh results indeed.

For the reasons outlined above in Sections 5 and 7, we are repealing the conditions that deny a person compensation for a damaged vehicle and third party coverage, if he is engaged in any illegal trade or transportation, or if he is towing an unlicensed trailer.

Section 4, subsection (2) amends condition 6 of Section 52. Condition 6 presently provides that if a person who is entitled to personal injury benefits under the AAIA, also has a private contract for accident insurance, the amount of his benefit under The Automobile Accident Insurance Act may be reduced so that the total of his AAIA benefits and his private insurance benefits shall not exceed his regular income. This is so that he will not be unduly enriched by his accident. However, in ^ some rather unusual cases, this section had the effect of making the total amount he received from private insurance contracts and The Automobile Accident Insurance Act benefits, less than he would have received under The Automobile Accident Insurance Act if he had not had a private insurance contract and condition 6 had not been operative. This is obviously unjust and the section provides that in no case should a person receive less because of this condition than the benefits payable under The Automobile Accident Insurance Act.

Section 6 of Bill 32 amends Section 112 of the AAIA.

Section 42 provides that if a person has a claim against someone insured under the AAIA, he is entitled to be compensated out of the fund, even if the party against whom there is a claim has nullified his insurance by violating a condition of the Act. Anyone having a claim against him may receive compensation out of the AAIA fund by obtaining a judgment in court. When the insured has nullified his insurance he must then repay into the fund the amount paid out on the claim.

Since a person has to repay into the fund it has been thought necessary to require the party making the claim to get a judgment in court so there can be no doubt about his legal liability. In certain cases, however, it is clear beyond any doubt that the party is liable, but it is not possible to find them. On a small claim the cost of suing a person who cannot be located, might be prohibitive. This section gives the AAIA fund the discretion to pay such a claim, after giving due notice to the offending driver. It is the discretion that would only

March 4, 1974

be used where the claim is small and the liability is clear.

Section 8 amends Section 66 of the AAIA.

Section 64 to 67 provide that everyone in an accident, involving personal injuries or damages of over \$200, shall make a report to the police. Such a report has, up to now, been available only to the officials of the SGIO managing the fund and not to anyone else. It has become apparent that if other parties to the accident had access to this report, a good deal of litigation could be avoided, for access to this report would often clear up any dispute as to what actually took place.

This amendment, together with a companion amendment to The Vehicles Act, which follows, will make those accident reports available to others involved in the accident and so avoid a good deal of litigation.

Section 9, subsection (1) and (2) make grammatical improvements to the AAIA, without materially changing its substance.

Section 9 (3) is also minor in nature.

Section 77 of AAIA presently provides that the total amount for which a negligent motorist is liable is reduced by the amount of any weekly indemnity benefits and payments made under that Act. Unfortunately, there has hitherto been no way of adjusting an award to take into account the value of future weekly indemnity payments. This amendment will provide a manner whereby future weekly indemnity payments can be estimated and taken into account in reduction of the liability of an allegedly negligent motorist.

Mr. Speaker, I believe these amendments will serve to update AAIA and, accordingly, I move second reading of this Bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. D. G. STEUART:(Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I found this explanation, and I listened to it very closely, and I found it very interesting that the Attorney General, who shouted across here a little while ago to the Member for Lumsden (Mr. Lane) that he hadn't done his homework . . .

MR. ROMANOW: — No, I didn't do that.

MR. STEUART: — Yes, you shouted that. I guess you would like to take it back now.

I find it very interesting that in dealing with Section 32 to begin with as far as this Act -is concerned, this amendment to Section 32, the amendments that deal with compensation paid to housewives is good. Section 3 involving someone who is on unemployment insurance and making up the difference, I think is good. When we get into Section 4 of this Bill, now I find it amazing that the Minister never even referred to subsection (e). If you read subsection 32 amended, under clause 4 (1). Clause (d), he talked about that but (e), he missed altogether. Did the Minister even deal with it? No! Let's see what it says. They had a little conference over there and then passed it over.

What it says is this:

Under the present Act, as I read it, under Section 32, accident insurance provided by this part is subject to the following statutory conditions: (a) an insured person shall not operate a motor vehicle unless he is named in an unexpired operator's certificate; (b) an insured person shall not operate a motor vehicle of which he is the owner unless the vehicle, being a vehicle required to be registered with the Highway Traffic Board under The Vehicles Act is designated in an unexpired owner's certificate. You can't drive unless you have a license and if you do no insurance, if you drive a car that is unregistered and if you are in an accident, the way it is now — and there is no change suggested — you are not entitled to any insurance. Subsection (d) states that the insured shall not operate a motor vehicle which is attached to a trailer, semi-trailer being required to be registered with the Highway Traffic Board under The Highway Vehicles Act is not so registered. That s being eliminated, so if somebody is doing that and they are in an accident they can be paid compensation. I don't particularly disagree with that. But in the Act it says that clauses (d), (e) and (f) of the statutory conditions shall be repealed. Let s read Section (e) and see why the Minister didn't deal with that.

MR. ROMANOW: — It's an error, it shouldn't be in there.

MR. STEUART: — Oh, it's an error. It's like The Foreign Ownership Act, or a few others. Let me read it:

(e) an insured shall not use or operate a motor or other vehicle while under the influence of intoxicating liquor or drugs to such an extent as to be for the time being incapable of the proper control of the vehicle.

It is in the Act and it is printed — you talk about doing your homework — it is now March 1st, printed, and the Minister gets up and makes a speech on it in second reading outlining the principles, confers with his colleague, another member of the legal profession, and very deliberately ignores Section (e). Now why? Is it to be amended? I'll ask the question — is it to be taken out?

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I am sorry I made no reference to it. I note, as the Leader of the Opposition points out, that it is in the Bill. Taking it out is not the intention of the Government and, therefore, I made no reference to it. When I got half-way through the Bill it occurred to me that maybe that was the case — the printed operation — so I tell you now that any references to drinking and driving as a statutory condition is not intended to be deleted. That's what the printed Bill says, not our intention.

MR. STEUART: — How did it get here? You mean the Bill was printed and nobody checked it? I think you intended to do this, but you got some static from your caucus — as you should have got — and you decided at the last minute to pull it out and you tried to slip it in without saying it.

There is another little detail you missed. Under Section

March 4, 1974

36, amended, clause (5) of the Bill as printed and as handed to the Legislative Assembly, and we've had it for quite some time now, and again the Minister ignored this rather interesting Section. Section 5 says:

- (i) clauses (d) and (e) of subsection (1) of conditions
- (2) of statutory conditions set out in Section 36 are repealed.

Well, he talked about some of these that are to be repealed, but again he missed subsection (c). Let's take a look at it: How can you lose third party liability, or how can third party liability be destroyed or not be brought into play?

(c) for any illicit or prohibited trade or transportation.

Now, is that to be taken out too? I ask that question. I mean, if you are driving, bootlegging, if you are transporting illicit girls someplace . . .

MR. ROMANOW: — That's to come out.

MR. STEUART: — That's to come out eh! Oh, you didn't mention that though!

MR. ROMANOW: — I did mention that, you weren't listening very closely.

MR. STEUART: — I was listening very closely.

MR. ROMANOW: — I don't think you did your homework.

MR. STEUART: — I did my homework. You say that's to be taken out then? They can do what they want, they can be bootlegging, they can do anything else, as it stands now . . .

MR. ROMANOW: — (c) does not come out, it's not relevant.

MR. STEUART: — Oh, it's not! There is no more bootlegging, there's no more. Well that's fine if it's not relevant. I don't object to it being taken out. I don't think that if I am driving along or if someone is walking along minding his own business and he is hit by someone who is driving a car illegally in this connection he should be entitled to receive third party liability. So I don't disagree. I am sorry, if you mentioned that, then I missed it. I don't think you did mention it. However, I'll bow. You are saying that it is staying in the Act and it is going to be taken out of the present Act as it exists? But you are telling us then that Section (e), which is a very interesting section, as it ties into the other things you have done, it ties into the general relaxation as far as drinking drivers are concerned. And, again, I am pleased that you are leaving it in, I am pleased that you are not going to take it out. I don't think it was an accident. Again, I think you got caught with your hand in the cookie jar.

The other important parts of the Bill, I see nothing wrong with them, they are updating the Bill and we will probably support the Bill and there may be one or two questions we have on some of the other sections when we have a chance to study it. But, I presume, when we get into Committee then the Minister will bring in an amendment taking out subsection (e) of Section 4.

Now as far as the AAIA is concerned you have now opened up the Bill and I want to say a word or two about the new policy which I think is a disgrace.

I find it very interesting that the Government opposite has allowed the price of gasoline to go up. We have a tax of 19 cents a gallon on gasoline. Now what the Government is saying in effect, as the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) said on television two or three times, 'three little pennies'. Well as long as the public knows that three pennies amount to \$10 million next year and how much as the years go by — it will be an increasing amount — and in fact they are going to subsidize this program for the first time. Up to this point in time the AAIA, Automobile Accident Insurance Fund has gone up and down. When there were a great many accidents some years the governments, both CCF and Liberal, and now it's the NDP's responsibility, although they haven't faced it and they are not facing it now obviously, have increased the rates, sometimes they have decreased the rates as the fund went up and down. The fund at times has been in a very serious deficit position. When we left the Government it had a very handsome surplus, we left the fund in good shape. Now I am not going to pretend that the amount of accidents depend on the Government today. This has been a very bad year and that is not the fault of the NDP. However, I do say, and I make this as a suggestion, I think it would have been probably money ahead had the Government sat down with the cities of Regina and Saskatoon, the towns, even the rural municipalities and offered them some financial assistance or better still some assistance with their heavy snowplowing equipment — if it could have been spared — or extra financial assistance to clear up the roads, clean up the snow and clean up the ice. This has been, without a doubt, the worst year that any of us have ever probably experienced and I have no doubt that the deficit condition of the fund is directly due to the very, very serious year we are having in regard to ice and snowfall. I think it would have been good business, it could still be good business, even in the major cities, if the Government allowed the insurance fund or the SGIO, through the AAIA, to talk to the cities about some assistance from the Government in snow removal, clearing up the city streets. I have a feeling that not only would the people be saved from accidents and the possible injury that is going along with them but we would probably make money as well, or the Government would make money in total. However, they have decided not to do that and they have decided to subsidize the fund.

If the Government finds that they don't need three cents of the gas tax then I think there are all kinds of things that they could have done with it. That tax, as the Government knows or should know, goes into general revenue and so what they are doing literally is taking money out of general revenue that should be spent on schools, hospitals, or on highways, or even cutting the tax. That's not beyond the realm of possibility, if the Government doesn't need a 19 cent gas tax, then let them have a 16 cent gas tax. Because what they are doing in effect

March 4, 1974

and the Attorney General made a rather startling statement when he said, 'this is very sound and a practice that you find in vogue in other insurance agencies'. I challenge him, when he closes debate, the name of those insurance companies that subsidize from some other revenue that has absolutely nothing to do with the AAIA. The gas tax has nothing to do with this Automobile Accident Insurance Fund.

MR. ROMANOW: — I didn't say that.

MR. STEUART: — You implied that, if you didn't say it. I don't blame you for denying most of the things you say. I would deny them if I were you too. However, the record is there and we heard you and we know what you said. If you don't need the tax then cut it back. Because, what you are doing in effect, and the Premier said it on the hot-line this morning and you said it in this House, you said, "We are going to charge those people who drive more miles, more money." And that is what you are doing. Don't say you are not charging because if you don't need the money, cut back the gas tax and people who drive the most miles will save.

Now it's a fact, that people who drive the most miles are professional drivers. They are truck drivers, they are bus drivers, they tend to be commercial travellers, and I am sure that if you check the records you will find that those people who drive for a living have far less accidents per mile than most other people. And that's a fact. So what you are saying to truck drivers, what you are saying to commercial travellers and other people who make a living driving, 'we are going to penalize you. We are not really going to get at the people with the bad record.' Oh, you are getting at them, just as we did but you are changing the emphasis by taking subsidies from general revenue that should be used for other purposes, or intended for other purposes, and you are now going to do something that has never been done before, you are going to subsidize this Automobile Accident Insurance Fund. I think it is a tragedy because up until this point, and the AAIA the compulsory part, has been the subject of heated debates. One of the statements that's always been used when defending this is, that we can prove here in Saskatchewan, that we have given our people basic insurance cheaper than the private companies used to do or cheaper than the private companies were prepared to do.

We know there have been several hidden subsidies through AAIA, but they have been of a relatively minor nature. Now the gloves are off and with an election year this year or next year, obviously the Government is prepared to toss \$10 million into the pot and subsidize this insurance fund rather than face the very difficult problem, I suppose politically, of saying more accidents occurred, therefore the insurance rates must go up.

It is very interesting. They raised the rates of the non-compulsory insurance, the package policies. I would have thought it might have been the other way around, they would keep that insurance competitive and they would raise the rates on the non-competitive or compulsory section of the insurance Act, which they have chosen to do.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we look forward now to hearing the amendments to this Act. I hope that we have got all of them — he says just one — but you can't tell because it is customary that they should be announced when the Minister gets up to . . .

MR. ROMANOW: — I didn't know that.

MR. STEUART: — You didn't know that. Well you haven't read the Bill. I am sorry. After this have your officials give you the Bill, or if Mr. Thorson is to bring it in let Mr. Thorson bring it in, but somebody in a responsible position obviously should read these Bills before they are brought into the House. But I regret, very much, that the Government has decided to launch a new course as far as the AAIA is concerned. I think it's a retrograde step. I think it is a bad step. I think it is one that governments down through the years will regret and I assure you, if we are the Government it will be changed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. C. P. MacDONALD: (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, I just want to add a word or two and I think this is too serious a matter to hurry this Bill through to completion today.

The thing that disturbs me is that traditionally, Saskatchewan Government Insurance and in particular the Automobile Accident Insurance Fund has been set up and established on the principle that it was an insurance program, that premiums would cover the costs. This has been traditional. We have been able to compare Saskatchewan rates with other rates for comparable costs in other parts of Canada. It's always been a source of pride, that this was an insurance program. The NDP went down the length and breadth of Saskatchewan, but this particular amendment, Mr. Speaker, makes the NDP admit, admit to failure of any Crown corporation to be set up independent of political interference in the Province of Saskatchewan. It is admitting that no Crown corporation, supposedly set up on a business basis, on an insurance basis, by the Government of Saskatchewan or for the people of Saskatchewan with an independent board, supposed to be separate from the government agency, that this would be able to be run on a business, insurance or an independent basis free of politics. Now the NDP, with an election coming within a year, now with the costs going up, with the Automobile Accident Insurance Fund in a great deficit, now reluctant to establish the principle of premiums looking after the cost, this NDP Government has destroyed the whole principle that this is an insurance program. It now becomes, they are able to cloak and hide the real costs of automobile accidents in the Province of Saskatchewan by subsidizing it from the general revenues of the Treasury.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very, very serious, very, very serious infringement of and move upon SGIO and particularly the Automobile Accident Insurance Fund.

Mr. Speaker, I want to point that out, that this completely destroys the principle of insurance in the AAIA. It patently admits that now politics can become a first and always, a first and very important consideration in the management of the SGIO and the Automobile Accident Insurance Fund.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. G. T. SNYDER: (Minister of Labour): — Mr. Speaker, I don't want to add any more than a word

or two, but it is pretty obvious, Mr. Speaker, that Liberals opposite have been sitting over there licking their lips knowing full well that the accident experience had increased very markedly over the past while. They were determined that there would at least be one single thing that they'd be able to get their teeth into during this Session and they have lost it and they are bitter and they are sour. That's what's troubling the Leader of the Opposition and other people opposite. They had another spoke lopped out of their wheel, Mr. Speaker, about the time they believed they would have something to work into a chink of the Government's armour, something to work around and cause some confusion in the ranks on this side of the House. Just let me tell you, this is the only problem with Members opposite. They've lost an argument, a political argument, there is nothing philosophical that's bothering Members opposite at all. They have lost another political argument. They are a ship without a rudder; they don't know where they are going, they haven't been able to get their teeth into anything in the Throne Speech. After the Budget on Friday next, they will have less to talk about. They are in complete and total disarray, Mr. Speaker, and the problem with Members opposite is the fact that they lost what they thought would be a point of argument and this is the problem with Members opposite, nothing else, Mr. Speaker.

The proposal is a good move. It puts the responsibility where it properly belongs, on those people who are travelling more miles and therefore more susceptible to accidents. The more miles you drive, the more the tendency to have accidents. Accordingly", Mr. Speaker, this is a good move and I am sure it will be heartily supported by the people of Saskatchewan. And that's what is wrong with Members opposite and that's why they object to it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. J. G. LANE: (Lumsden): — Mr. Speaker, I rise on this particular debate. I think there is another matter that has been raised or that has come to the floor this afternoon, aside from the actual Act itself and that is the deliberate intentions of the Attorney General to mislead this House. We came in, and I am quite prepared on a Question of Privilege, to raise this matter of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

We are entitled to assume that second reading speeches are going to be straight forward and are going to explain the Bill and the details of the Bill and we were accused of not doing our homework this afternoon, Mr. Speaker. Now I don't know whether the Attorney General did his homework or not, but this Bill was brought to this House some time ago and laid on the table before this House, and this Bill condones impaired driving in the Province of Saskatchewan and the Government opposite introduced this Bill into the House, condoning and allowing impaired drivers to get insurance.

Now what happened when we got into second reading? That particular clause*was ignored, sloughed over and covered up by the Attorney General. He didn't touch it, he didn't mention it and we know at the same time, Mr. Speaker, that he was going over that speech, Mr. Thorson (Minister of Industry and Commerce) a lawyer, one of the three on that side, was sitting beside him trying to explain to him what the Bill meant. He tried to gloss

over that section.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, we are entitled, in this House, to have a straight forward explanation in second reading. It was a deliberate intention to deceive this House. The Attorney General didn't do his homework. He brought before this House a despicable piece of legislation, with a despicable clause, that even Members on his own side of the House didn't support and forced to pull out or ignore and it was not until the Leader of the Opposition got up in this House and asked him whether he was going to proceed, did he finally admit that he was not going to proceed with that particular section. Now surely, Mr. Speaker, that procedure is subject to condemnation and you yourself should stand and condemn the Attorney General for his actions this afternoon. Nowhere again do we have to take a second reading speech of one of the Members of the Treasury benches or the disaster committee, as they call themselves, do we have to take their word as spoken in this House as being the truth or their meaning of the legislation or their explanation of the legislation as being the truth because of the actions this afternoon. He has brought into discredit every one of the other Members of the Treasury benches, by this deceitful action and the attempt to gloss over a part of the Bill that should have been explained and he should have stated at the outset if he wasn't going to proceed, that the Bill would be amended and that particular clause struck out. Again, it wasn't until he was questioned by the Opposition that he then decided to pull out this section. Again, his actions are subject to condemnation of the Chair and the Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn this debate.

Debate adjourned.

MR. ROMANOW moved second reading of Bill No. 55 — **An Act to amend The Vehicles Act.**

He said: — Mr. Speaker, this is Bill 33. The Leader of the Opposition said, let's have the whole truth. Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition wouldn't understand the truth if it was told to him and every one of the Members opposite. Not one iota. The Leader of the Opposition, the Liberal Party opposite, is pathologically resistant to the word truth. You boys don't know what it means.

You stood around in 1964 and 1971 and you ran the most untruthful government ever in the history of the province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. STEUART: — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Attorney General, he is up on second reading of a Bill. I wonder if he would care to talk about the Bill. I am sorry his conscience is bothering him, but I wonder if he can get back to order and talk about the Bill. I wonder if he would give us the whole situation.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition wants us to tell him all the truth and that's exactly what I propose to do. All the truth, but I was going to say in rebuttal to the Leader of the Opposition that he doesn't know how to spell the word truth. Neither does the Member opposite him.

March 4, 1974

MR. STEUART: — Troth.

MR. ROMANOW: — Wrong again, you see Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition and the Liberals opposite are, well I'll make no other comment other than to say that I think we know that they are really probably the weakest Opposition this province has known and I will simply say that with respect to Bill 33, The Vehicles Act, this is a companion Bill to the earlier one, Bill 32. Hon. Members will be familiar with Section 165 of The Vehicles Act which provides that where a person is involved in an accident, resulting in personal injuries or damages of \$200 or more, he must report the accident to the police. A complementary provision in The Automobile Accident Insurance Act provides that the reports shall be made available to officials of SGIO, managing the AAIA fund. Apart from the officials managing the fund, such a report is confidential and not available to just anyone.

It has become apparent in recent times that a good deal of litigation could be avoided if the reports were available to other persons involved in the accident. There is often dispute about the facts which could be resolved without court action if the person making the claim had access to the report. Thus Section 163 of The Vehicles Act is being amended accordingly. This will enable faster settlements to be made. In turn the quality of insurance protection in Saskatchewan would be upgraded.

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

MR. E. C. MALONE: (Regina Lakeview): — Mr. Speaker, unlike the Attorney General I'll try and keep my remarks to the Bill that's before this House.

The purpose of this Bill, Mr. Speaker, is really to take away a basic unfairness with the SGIO. At one time the SGIO were entitled to see these reports and now this Bill will allow the other parties to see them. I am not sure whether the Attorney General, my learned friend, has read the Bill, because as I read the section it would appear that these reports are now available to third parties or second parties, but these parties are not allowed to use these statements in court and it strikes me that it's rather odd if they are able to see them that it takes away the whole effect of the amendment if they can't follow through and use these statements in court. I am not sure whether the Attorney General has even read this point.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, if the Attorney General wishes to go and cure some of the errors of the past, I would suggest that he go a step further and allow that all reports received by SGIO be allowed to be looked at by other parties, and I refer to police reports.

In the absence, Mr. Speaker, of my colleague, Mr. MacLeod, I ask leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

HON. J. R. MESSER (Minister of Agriculture) moved second reading of Bill NO. 45 — **An Act to amend The Planning and Development Act, 1973.**

He said: — Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order!

MR. MESSER: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Member for Milestone seems to have a lot to say today, while he sits in his seat. I notice he has been absent from the House for a couple of days.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Home sick with the flu.

MR. MESSER: — Were you sicker than normal was it just . . .

Mr. Speaker, an Act to amend The Planning and Development Act, the principle of this Bill is to give to municipalities the powers to amend a community planning scheme with the approval of the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Wood). It also states that any such amendment cannot be interpreted by any court as affecting in any way any action that was before the court before the municipality gave notice of intention to pass such an amendment. If such an action was either by a plaintiff who claimed personal loss or damage or one to which the Attorney General gave his consent to permit the action to be carried on in his name upon the relation of the said plaintiff.

Mr. Speaker, the question has been raised as to whether or not present legislation gives a municipal council powers under interim development control to allow innovations that are not allowed by existing zoning laws or community planning schemes. Mr. Wood had discussed this question with the former Mayor of Regina, Mayor Walker, and he indicated that it was his, the Mayor's, understanding that under interim development control the city could restrict development but could not allow development that was not allowed by present zoning by-laws or by planning schemes.

This Bill, Mr. Speaker, will make it clear that this latter interpretation is correct. In the past the Crown has not been bound by The Community Planning Act. As a result some land transfers by the Department of Agriculture and possibly other departments have not complied with all of the Community Planning regulations.

The Act was passed last spring, in fact, and indeed binds the Crown, but this Bill contains an amendment which will continue to exempt the Crown where the agreement in question was entered into prior to the coming into force The Planning and Development Act, 1973, last May 4th.

Last spring, the House was told that they were breaking new ground with The Planning and Development Act and there could be omissions. There were some and we are thus asking that two sections of this Bill be made retroactive to May 4, 1973, the date of the coming into force of The Planning and Development Act, in order to ensure the validity of the city by-laws passed since that date.

Mr. Speaker, there are other matters contained in this Bill that can better be discussed in Committee. Having said these few brief remarks, I move second reading of this Bill.

March 4, 1974

MR. J. G. LANE: (Lumsden): — Mr. Speaker, just a few comments. There is no doubt that the remarks of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) are just another stamp on this particular Bill as one of the most mixed up pieces of legislation ever introduced in this House.

We note that the Bill, when it was originally brought in, I think had more House amendments than any other piece of legislation. It was brought in with such a rush, such a hurry, to try and take control of the cities away from the city governments and give them to the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Wood).

The amendments proposed today continue that direction of the Government opposite. It also, as a result of certain activities of some supporters of the Government opposite, has forced the Government to continually exempt a certain Regina action from the legislation. We noticed the exemptions right from the time the Bill was introduced. The Government didn't want to interfere, didn't want to get involved, in that particular piece of legislation, but certainly wanted to get involved and interfere in everything else that city governments have done. As I say, this Bill continues that direction. It has taken again some powers away, and I refer in particular to the powers to allow interim development, that has now been taken away and it is only the Minister who can allow it or has, in effect, taken it away directly from the city so that no interim development can take place.

With those few comments, as I say, the direction has been made clear, it has been made tighter, that the Government opposite intends to take control away from the city governments and it shows a lack of confidence in city power to make decisions. With those few remarks, I will beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

MR. MESSER moved second reading of Bill No. 51 — **An Act to amend The Tax Enforcement Act.**

He said: — Mr. Speaker, the Bill to amend The Tax Enforcement Act established procedure whereby a municipality files a tax lien on land when taxes are in arrears. Under this Act, but subject to the approval of the Mediation Board, a municipality can acquire title to property that is in arrears of taxes. The municipality can subsequently dispose of the property and distribute the proceeds of the sale among those taxing authorities that have an interest in the arrears. A time period of at least three years is presently required from the time the taxes become arrears until the municipality can acquire title to the said land. This period includes both the time required to process the application and the statutory waiting period.

The Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities and the Saskatchewan Urban Municipal Association have on more than one occasion requested that we shorten the period of time that is required to elapse before an application for title can be made. And, further, that we simplify procedures for obtaining title to lots and small parcels where the assessment of property does not exceed a fixed sum and the property is not occupied.

The amendments proposed by this Bill will satisfy, to a very large degree, the requests from the two municipal

associations. One amendment will provide for conformity with The Provincial Mediation Board Act.

Having said these few brief words, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of this Bill.

MR. LANE: — It is interesting to see the schizophrenic approach of the Government and the Members opposite when earlier this afternoon we had the Attorney General bringing in legislation to protect a debtor and make it much more difficult to recover the land and in this particular case we have now shortened the time.

MR. MESSER: — Mr. Speaker, just a few brief words in rebuttal to the Member's observation in regard to this particular piece of legislation in his attempt, I think, to confuse matters which seems to be the only resource the Members opposite have available to them when they talk about progressive moves that are made by the Government of the day. If he had listened to some of the very brief remarks that I made pertaining to the implementation of this Bill, he would know that it is on the recommendation of municipal associations, the rural municipal association and also the urban municipal association, that we bring in this legislation because, in fact, the long period of time — three years — has not only been cumbersome and a problem to themselves, it has created, I think, by the period of time that is involved, created a hardship for other parties as well. It is because of their recommendations, their requests and their understanding of the problems at the urban and municipal level that we are bringing in legislation which will give, I think, better satisfaction to not only their organization but individuals in the province as well.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

MR. MESSER moved second reading of Bill No. 52 — **An Act to amend The Rural Municipality Act, 1972.**

He said: — Mr. Speaker, The Rural Municipality Act and the amendments that are now before the House comprise mainly housekeeping type amendments which will clarify existing provisions or re-enact provisions that were overlooked during the consolidation of the Act in 1972.

Some provisions are included to maintain greater uniformity within The Urban Municipality Act. We are all concerned about pollution and devising effective measures for control of pollution and the removal where possible any apparent causes.

Recently the Department of Public Health approved waste disposal regulations which require a municipality to provide sanitary services under specific conditions. We are proposing an amendment which will allow a municipality to levy a special tax in respect of each building that is being serviced and to add any unpaid tax to the tax roll against the land on which the said building is situated.

Provision is made in the Act for a penalty not exceeding \$100 for an infraction related to the sale of grain while the seller is indebted to the municipality for tax arrears. Under

March 4, 1974

the existing provisions no minimum fine is specified and we have been advised of at least one instance where a fine of \$1 was levied for an infraction of this nature.

The imposition of a fine of this magnitude has no deterrent effect and may serve to defeat the intent of the provisions of the Act dealing with the sale of grain. We received a request from the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities to provide for a substantial increase in both minimum and maximum fines. However, we are proposing, at this time, to increase only to the maximum fine.

Mr. Speaker, I indicated earlier that this is a housekeeping Bill and I feel that any questions that may be brought forward may best be answered more fully in Committee of the Whole.

With those few brief remarks I move second reading of this Bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LANE: — Just a couple of comments, Mr. Speaker. Basically we agree with the Bill as tabled in the House. I will have a couple of questions . . .

MR. ROMANOW: — Must be something wrong with the Bill.

MR. LANE: — No, there is nothing wrong with the Bill it was the manner in which it was presented by the Attorney General or rather the Minister of Agriculture and I am sure that the Attorney General can take a lesson or two of how to bring a Bill before the House.

Mr. Speaker, I will have a couple of questions that I would like to raise with the Minister responsible for the Saskatchewan Housing Authority and also for the Minister of Public Health with regard to the matter of tax and sanitation services. I don't think that the full taxation for the regulations as proposed by . . .

MR. ROMANOW: — Ask them in Estimates.

MR. LANE: — If the Attorney General would quit nattering while I am trying to make my comments, I am sure that his remarks this afternoon have already delayed the proceedings of the House, and we could get something done this afternoon, Mr. Speaker. If you wouldn't mind riding herd on him a little. We also have some questions that I think I could be satisfied with by discussing the matter with the Minister personally. The same thing with the Minister of Labour (Mr. Snyder) with regard to the proposals in adopting the national building code in the Province of Saskatchewan. There are several ramifications of that particular proposal. I agree with the idea that council should be allowed to do it but I have certain questions that I think can be answered by the Minister and I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

MR. MESSER moved second reading of Bill No. 55 — **An Act to amend The Department of Municipal Affairs Act.**

He said: — Mr. Speaker, The Department of Municipal Affairs Act presently authorizes the Minister to make grants to municipalities in accordance with regulations made by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council.

Situations have occurred where the Department of Municipal Affairs would have preferred to have made a loan or loans to the municipality rather than be restricted in the narrow sense to providing or making available moneys by grant only. Although some opinions hold that the authority to make a grant includes the authority to make a loan there is some uncertainty and this Bill will clarify that matter.

The Department has been required to use the Appropriation Act each year for its authority to administer the Winter Works Programs. This Bill will provide the necessary authority in The Department of Municipal Affairs Act for the administration of future winter employment and Winter Works Programs.

Mr. Speaker, we have received requests from officials of some of our villages and smaller cities requesting the board of examiners to issue a certificate of qualification to each clerk or treasurer of a village or city who meets the requirements established by the board. Urban certificates are now issued to town clerks only. We believe this request is based on a sincere desire of the officials to improve their efficiency and we are providing for this certification by the board of examiners.

The assessing of all properties and businesses in a municipality for the purpose of taxation is performed under the direction and supervision of the Minister except in those cities where the population exceeds 15,000 in number.

The Department has consulted with these cities and has received direct — and I emphasize direct requests — for the elimination of this exception and for the Minister to supervise or undertake reassessment of these cities to provide a greater uniformity in assessments throughout the province.

We are removing this exemption from the Act and the Minister will be working with the cities to develop a satisfactory reassessment program.

Mr. Speaker, all of the provisions of this Bill are for the purpose of assisting local municipal governments and are proposed, partly, in response to their request.

I move second reading of this Bill.

MR. LANE: — Mr. Speaker, would the Hon. Member permit a question prior to making the motion? I have no other comments.

You stated that there were examples where the municipalities or the Minister wished to make loans rather than make grants. Could you give me an example of where that situation arose?

MR. MESSER: — I am sorry I don't have a

March 4, 1974

specific example. As the Member knows I am only acting Minister of Municipal Affairs. It had been conveyed to me by officials within the Department of Municipal Affairs that there were, in fact, a great many occasions where municipalities were deserving of moneys under the present legislation and the only way the Department would be able to respond to them was to provide them with a grant.

The municipality would be more than happy to have the grant but because of it being only available in a grant, in some instances, the Department would have to turn down the provision of the money. The municipalities would have been most happy if they had been able to borrow the money by way of a loan rather than to have been confronted with the situation of a refusal because it was only available in a grant. The Department could not justify making the money available as a grant. They realized that it was a legitimate request of the municipality for a loan but they had to turn it down and this certainly inhibited the kind of activities that we want the municipalities to be involved in.

So I can't be specific, but I can assure you that there are a number of occasions that this was the case.

MR. LANE: — I just have a couple of comments on it. First of all . . .

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. LANE: — Mr. Speaker, I begged leave to ask the question of the Hon. Minister. He answered my question prior to making the motion and I should just like to make some comments on the Bill. And, again, Mr. Speaker, would you get the Attorney General or the House leader to keep his mind on what he is doing. If he spent his time studying his Bills before he came into this House, Mr. Speaker, he could make a contribution.

Just to comment on the Bill, that I should like to put . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! I think when a Member wishes to ask a question if the Minister is still on his feet, if he interrupts and asks whether he will answer a question then, but otherwise he should say this is a question he wants the Minister to answer when closing debate.

MR. ROMANOW: — You are finished, boy.

MR. SPEAKER: — If the Member will make his statement short I will tolerate him.

MR. LANE: — Mr. Speaker, I might in that regard advise Mr. Speaker that I did ask the Deputy Speaker, however he refused to recognize me.

What we should like in second reading is how the Government intends to solve the problem of the lack of assessors, the situation now is the lack of assessors and the assessments are running many years behind schedule at the present time and what

is intended to solve that problem in the future. Secondly, whether the lending provision, or the power that is now being given will it override the powers of review of the Local Government Board? And if we can have answers to that when we get into Committee of the Whole we would appreciate it.

MR. MESSER: — Mr. Speaker, I can assure the Member in regard to the second observation that he made that the loans will not override or in any way inhibit the activities of the Local Government Board so that it is not a situation of having an alternate avenue to provide moneys where a municipality has been turned down by the Local Government Board.

The observation in relation to the arrears of assessment within the province is one that certainly the Department is concerned about. All I can say is that we will be giving some very sincere attention to that in an attempt not only to catch up on the arrears of assessment, but try to keep them more current. I would suspect that one way of doing this would be to increase the assessing staff that is now available to the Department.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

MR. R. ROMANOW (Attorney General) moved second reading of Bill No. 57 — **An Act to amend The Provincial Mediation Board Act.**

He said: — Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 57 is an Act to amend The Provincial Mediation Board Act. Subsection (1) of Section (a) of The Provincial Mediation Board Act is being amended by adding a further clause to it, namely, clause B, which will enable the Provincial Mediation Board to require a municipality which takes land under The Tax Enforcement Act and sells the same, to pay to the previous registered owner the balance remaining after deducting expenses, arrears of taxes and the like.

The reason for the above amendment is that at the present time, by virtue of Section 33 of The Tax Enforcement Act, the balance remaining after acquisition and sale of land by a municipality under The Tax Enforcement Act, forms part of the general revenue of the municipality and the municipality is not accountable to the former owner for any sums thus realized.

It is considered more advisable and more equitable to make provision for the balance remaining upon order of the Board to be paid to the former registered owner rather than having it form part of the general revenue of the municipality.

As an example of how the amendment will operate, the Provincial Mediation Board may give a conditional consent to a municipality to take title to land where there are arrears of taxes. Where it does so and the municipality resells the property to a third person it is entitled first, to apply the proceeds on the arrears of taxes and the expense of acquiring title which might, for example, amount to \$2,000. If the land sells for \$3,000 the balance remaining of \$1,000 would be payable to the former registered owner.

I move second reading of this Bill.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

March 4, 1974

MR. ROMANOW moved second reading of Bill No. 58 — **An Act to amend The Administration of Estates of Mentally Disordered Persons Act.**

He said: — Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 58 is an amendment to the Administration of Estates of Mentally Disordered Persons Act.

The source of this legislation really comes from the Master of Titles for the Land Titles Office. He has advised the Department that difficulties are being experienced by the Land Titles Office in removing notices from their records pursuant to certain previous Acts respecting the administration of the estates of mentally disordered people.

Previous legislation in this regard set up procedures so that the notice was filed against the name. The present Act provides for filing the notice against the land. Because of previous notices being filed, sometimes, there are delays in registering documents as the name of the document to be registered may be the same as that of the patient and yet the patient has no real interest in the land.

The registration cannot be proceeded with until clarification is received from the administrator of the estate. In addition to the above problem, there is a certain amount of hostility from a competent person when he is confused with a person certified incompetent. This can occur when the name is the same or similar.

The present legislation protects the interests of a person certified incompetent. The old provisions need not be retained for reasons of protecting these interests. Therefore, these proposed amendments will enable registrars and court clerks to remove any notices filed under previous Acts that appear on their records. The amendment, also, statutorily removes such notices which were filed under previous Acts respecting the administration of estates of mentally disordered persons.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this amendment is essentially of a housekeeping nature. I think that it will make for better public relations between the Land Titles Office and the public and I think the acceptance of this amendment should be by and large favorable.

I move second reading of this Bill.

MR. E. C. MALONE: (Regina Lakeview): — Mr. Speaker, would the Minister answer a question in connection with the Bill?

This does not refer to any titles, just the registrar? I am sorry, this Bill does not refer to amendments or to endorsements on certificates to title?

MR. ROMANOW: — No.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

MR. ROMANOW moved first reading of Bill No. 59 — **An Act to amend The Snowmobile Act, 1973.**

He said: — Mr. Speaker, this is an amendment to The Snowmobile

Act, 1973.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, before I get into the description of the amendment which is, by itself, a fairly minor one, that from my experience The Snowmobile Act is a piece of legislation which has worked reasonably well since we introduced it about a year ago. You will recall that there were many concerns in some quarters about the potential effect on snowmobiles. But I think that by and large the administration of the Bill and the effect of the law has been very good indeed.

Snowmobiles are an important aspect of modern-day living. There is no doubt about that. But notwithstanding this particular Bill, my Department continues to receive reported complaints about accidents of some snowmobile operators, who will still flout the law and continue on in what may be described as a reckless manner. I think this is a very serious situation for snowmobile operators and for others, not only in terms of the danger that it presents to the operator and to others. The effect of repeated complaints really means that governments are continually under pressure to look at this and other types of legislation to see if it can be toughened up. What I am really saying, I guess, Mr. Speaker, is that I think that this Bill has worked very well indeed but I would ask all snowmobile operators to make sure that the letter of the law is upheld and I should also like to say the obvious. No matter how good a law is or how well it operates, in fact it really depends upon the individual who is operating the snowmobile, the person who really makes the Bill a meaningful Bill. It really depends on him if the legislation is to work. So we are looking forward to a continued improvement in the actions of the snowmobile operator in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Now to the amendment. The amendment of Section 2, Mr. Speaker, will add the definition of the words, 'privately owned land and private land' to mean land other than land registered in the name of the Crown, and affects provisions in the Act for posting private land, so-called, as contained in Section 25 of the Bill and for crossing of one parcel of privately owned land to another as contained in Section 15, subsection (7). The intent of this amendment is to make it clear that for the above purposes privately owned land, that is to say the posting provisions, does not include land owned by a municipality but not comprised within the boundaries of that municipality. In other words, public lands in the sense of being owned by a municipality but not contained within the boundaries of a municipality are deemed to be private land for the purpose of posting under Section 25 and for the regulation of crossing a highway between one parcel of land and another.

This amendment was proposed to us at the instance of the city of Saskatoon as it relates primarily to park areas owned by the city lying outside of the city boundaries. The same position would arise here in Regina with respect to King's Park. The effect of this amendment to subsection (7) of Section 15 is to make it clear that all the conditions contained in Clauses A, B, C and D have to be complied with. The amendment of subsection (7) of Section 21 is merely to correct the erroneous reference to a wrong section in The Vehicles Act. Thus in this type of a situation part of the land could be municipally owned land and if the municipality decides to post it for no snowmobiling then the provisions of the Bill would apply. That's the effect of this amendment.

March 4, 1974

Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 59.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. E. F. GARDNER: (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, I would agree with the Attorney General that The Snowmobile Act has been generally well accepted throughout the province. There is one aspect, I believe, relating to the use of snowmobiles that should be looked at and probably should be incorporated in this Act.

I am sure that most Members are aware that snowmobiles are being used quite extensively in this province for the hunting of foxes and coyotes. Now this is a provision that is very tough to enforce. Permission is supposed to be granted before anyone does this, but I think everyone would agree that it is almost an unenforceable provision. Someone might say, if you know of cases why don't you report them. But by the very nature of this type of offence it is very difficult to catch people doing this. There are Americans who have been coming up into my area bringing snowmobiles and high-powered rifles and shooting a large number of coyotes. As you are aware also, coyotes can bring you \$40 or \$50 apiece these days and it is a pretty lucrative proposition. It is good revenue for the people who are doing this. Now there may be a case for controlling coyotes in the province and I would perhaps agree with this but I feel that it should be done in some other manner. I think most people would feel that chasing these animals with a snowmobile is the wrong way to be controlling them. I feel that there should be, perhaps this refers also to The Game Act or primarily these provisions, but it seems to me there should be some provisions in The Snowmobile Act which definitely prevents any association of or combination of rifles and snowmobiles being used at the same time. The whole provision needs to be tightened up because it is being very badly abused at the present time and in particular the southern part of the province where many, many coyotes and fox are being hunted by people with snowmobiles. I am sure this is not the intent either of The Snowmobile Act or The Game Act.

I have some other comments I should like to make on this and at this time I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Smishek that Bill No. 49 — **An act relating to the premium levied under The Saskatchewan Medical Care Insurance Act, the tax levied under The Saskatchewan Hospitalization Act and the Personal tax levied in Health Region No. 1 (Swift Current) under The Health Services Act, and various matters related thereto** — be now read a second time.

MR. H. H. ROLFES: (Saskatoon Nutana South): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a few comments on Bill No. 49. I think Bill No. 49 certainly should be supported by everybody in this House and I would hope that people in this House would put their politics aside and will look at this Bill in light of what it will do for the children in this province and

especially, Mr. Speaker, for the children of low and middle income groups.

Mr. Speaker, there is no question that many of the programs which this Government is offering have set a trend to offset inflation due mainly to the activity of the Federal Government. When Premier Blakeney got on television last fall and indicated to the people of Saskatchewan that we were going to take steps to offset inflation, I think many people were wondering what steps this Government would take. When he said that the minimum wage would be increased to \$2 and also that hospital and medicare premiums were dropped, no doubt many people asked why.

Why increase the minimum wage? I can well understand why the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) criticized us by saying that we were one of the causes of inflation. Mr. Speaker, I don't think anybody today would say that \$2 an hour or \$2.25 or \$2.50 an hour causes inflation.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, anybody who would oppose or even suggest that taking off medicare fees of \$72 for old aged people, people who are on fixed incomes, people who simply are very, very hard done by by inflation, anybody that would even suggest that that is a step in the wrong direction certainly, Mr. Speaker, does not have the interest of the low income and the middle income groups at heart.

In the report submitted by the Senior Citizen's Commission they made it very clear, Mr. Speaker, that many of the senior citizens of this province need all the extra help that they can get to offset inflation. Inflation, Mr. Speaker, is caused mainly by inaction of the Federal Government. Certainly, I agree with people that we, in the Provincial Government, must do our share. I agree that people at the municipal level must do their share. Anyone who gets up and criticizes us for assisting senior citizens and helping the low income group by taking off the \$72, I think are not facing reality. All you have to do is go to the people that are in the \$6,000, \$7,000 or \$8,000 group and ask them what they think of this Government's steps in doing away with the premiums of medicare. Every time you ask them you get a positive response. \$72 to a man who earns \$4,000 or \$5,000 or \$6 000 is a lot of money. It might not mean anything to most of us in this House who earn \$12,000, \$15,000, \$20,000 or \$30,000.

This Government, Mr. Speaker, in 1971 promised that we would do something for the small person and this Government, I believe, has kept up that promise. I congratulate the Premier and the Minister for taking those steps that were absolutely necessary to offset inflation and helping those people who are the hardest done by, by inflation, those on fixed incomes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. P. P. MOSTOWAY: (Hanley): — Mr. Speaker, I hadn't really intended entering this debate because I was sure that no one in his right mind would oppose this Bill. How wrong I was to assume 'that Members opposite would not rant and rave as usual. I should have known that the skins of most Members opposite can not be pierced by any other nicety that you may wish to think of. I should have known that true to Liberal principles Liberals opposite oppose any piece of legislation introduced in this House which will give relief to the poor, the aged, the handicapped . . .

March 4, 1974

AN HON. MEMBER: — I'm sick.

MR. MOSTOWAY: — You say you are sick, well you certainly sound sick. . . . and scores of other people in this province. I should have known that they would oppose this Bill because of the equalization principle involved, and I should have known that what they are really agitated over is the fact that large companies, as was mentioned by one Hon. Member, may have to pay a wee bit more administration wise. I think that's what his hang-up really was.

Mr. Speaker, I admit I was wrong to believe that Members opposite would not use every trick in the book to come to the rescue of their true kin, large corporations and companies. Mr. Speaker, let Members opposite serve their masters, this Government will serve the people of this province.

Mr. Speaker, I think introducing this Bill in the Legislature is a good idea even though it is possible the same results could have been achieved by regulations. It is a good idea to openly present plans to democratically elected Members of this House for public discussion. Mr. Speaker, can you imagine the gibbon-like performance Members opposite would have put on if this House was bypassed. Secondly, the introduction of this Bill in this House allows the smoking out of all sorts of creatures who would otherwise be lurking in the shadows. It is plain to see that some of them are starting to crawl and slither out already.

Mr. Speaker, it is an accepted truth that the removal of medicare premiums is possible because of an improved economy in this province. For this the Provincial Government should be loudly commended along with that noble group of NDP Members of Parliament in Ottawa who are finally getting through to our eastern-oriented Federal Government. Because of this the net result is that the money needed to replace that amount which the premiums brought in can now be taken from an improved general revenue account and a legitimate increase in royalties on minerals which belong to the people of this province. But who contributes most to moneys accumulated in the general revenue account? Well, simply put, it is those who are the most able to contribute due to higher profits, wages and salaries. Now what could be fairer than asking those who earn more to contribute more? It is much like the concepts involved in income tax, whereby the more you make, the larger your contribution. Are Members opposite opposed to this principle of equalization? Mr. Speaker, I believe they are against it from what I can make out of the illogical and immoral gibberish as expounded by the Hon. Member for Moose Jaw North (Mr. MacDonald).

As for the increase in mineral royalties to help replace revenue lost by the removal of premiums, I don't look at it as any kind of a hardship to mineral companies; rather I look at it as a positive step in a series of efforts by this Government to give the people of this province a juster price for their minerals to reverse the mineral and resource giveaway plan started by the last Liberal regime to win favor of corporations, cartels and the excessively rich. Mr. Speaker, an Opposition Member claims that employers should not have to necessarily turn over to their employees the amount of the premium which might now be an obligation of an employer through a union contract. This Member's reasoning is feudalistic, anti-worker, but typically Liberal. Oh, I know that most employers would have turned this amount of money over to their workers, but I am not so sure

everyone would have. Those who would not do so without some governmental prodding are probably those who don't pay their workers too well anyway. Mr. Speaker, this Bill's assurance that this money will be turned over to workers will not be objected to by fair-minded employers be they big or small.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to make another point in regard to the removal of medicare premiums. Have Opposition Members ever allowed themselves to dare think of the large number of people who have trouble getting together \$36 or \$72 yearly? Have Members opposite ever asked collection clerks how payments were usually made, in instalments or a lump sum? Well, I'll tell them from what I can gather, most payments were made in instalments, a clear indication that many people could not afford a lump sum. If a family premium of \$72 is translated into terms of food or drugs or glasses one can very easily realize that the hardship to some was considerable. Mr. Speaker, it would appear that premium removal will save the people of this province roughly \$500,000 in administration costs. Who can argue against such a saving. Will Members opposite once again scoff at this amount as being mere change and not worthy of consideration in this Government's attempt to fight Federal Government induced inflation. Mr. Speaker, it would appear that Members opposite are not going to support this Bill, at least not at this time. It would appear that they will be demanding assurance that it will not cost a few large companies a few dollars extra or the well paid a few pennies extra. Mr. Minister of Health, I know you can't give them this assurance which would allay their fears, but I think it is safe to say that they can be given assurance that this Bill will provide extra security to numerous citizens who are not as fortunate, financially speaking, as most Members in this House.

So I say to Members opposite, if you are really concerned about the less fortunate in this province, do not oppose this Bill. If you wish to make this province a better place in which to live, do not oppose this Bill. Members opposite, if you have now seen the light, if you wish to step down into the real world of Saskatchewan, if you have trouble possibly sleeping at nights, if you have changed and now believe that the more fortunate have an obligation to the less fortunate, do not belittle this Bill of justice which is widely being hailed by hundreds of thousands of Saskatchewan people.

Mr. Speaker, I will be supporting this Bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. L. LARSON: (Pelly): — Mr. Speaker, I couldn't let this occasion pass without saying a word or two. I was hoping we would have some more comments from the gentlemen opposite but very obviously they are anxious to let this Bill pass without being on the record stating their true feelings about it.

I refer to this as a very historic occasion in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. We are now putting on the Statute Books the fact that hospitalization premiums will be wiped out. This to me fulfils a very long and cherished ambition of the CCF and the New Democratic Party. It was the original thought in the minds of those who set up the first hospitalization and medical care plan that the day would come when we would be doing this very thing. Now historically it is a fact, this legislation says so.

March 4, 1974

I agree with my former colleagues who have said that this is going to pose as a challenge to the rest of Canada and the other provinces. It will be the same challenge as hospitalization and medical care was a number of years ago. The same stories that were repeated then have, of course, been repeated again. The fact that the country couldn't afford this, where is the money going to come from, who is going to pay for it, and so on. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that these are all unworthy questions to ask when you recognize the fact that they are being paid for in any case. It is being paid for by the people of the province. Rather than doing it individually and doing it when you are sick and on your back and unable to pay and earn, you pay for it as you are working and as the province accumulates revenue to do so.

It reminds me, Mr. Speaker, of how far Saskatchewan has come by way of medical care and hospitalization. I am one of those who can recall prior to 1944 the hardships, the suffering, deprivations that people were subjected to when they happened to get sick. If you didn't have the bucks in your pocket you didn't see a doctor or you didn't get into a hospital. Some, and there were quite a few, very kind doctors had a ledger almost as thick as the national debt accounts of services to people and unable to collect. After medicare and hospitalization came into effect these ledgers were put away and are no longer necessary.

The premiums were, of course, a long step in the right direction. It made it possible for people to have access to the kind of medical care that was available and they showed very great appreciation for this. They also show appreciation for the abolition of the premiums as this Bill does. As my colleagues have pointed out when you are sick it is not a time to tax or to make anyone pay. When you are sick is when you need peace of mind and comfort and the assurance that you will have access to the best care that is available.

I can't help but remind myself, Mr. Speaker, of the treatment that the same people of Saskatchewan got under the former Liberal Government. I can't help but remind myself and the people of the province of deterrent fees. Oh, yes, it was being abused; you had to do something to stop people from seeing their doctors. It was an insult as far as I am concerned to the intelligence and to the general concept the people of Saskatchewan had towards their health. And utilization fees, we've got to keep them out of the hospitals, they are abusing it. This, Mr. Speaker, was the attitude of the former Government towards health care. The people of the province recognized this and they treated them accordingly in the last election. Certainly, they are going to be very happy that we now have on the Statute Books of the province a Bill that says premiums will be abolished.

I felt and heard many people say when the announcement was made by our Premier that it was a step to fight inflation. I am hard put to understand how the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) can say that this Government is not contributing to the fight against inflation. Certainly, by keeping this amount of money in the hands of the poor and needy, as my colleagues have pointed out, certainly goes some distance towards helping to do away with this cost and putting money in the pockets of those who need it. So I am very proud along with my colleagues that again Saskatchewan is showing the lead and challenging the other provinces, challenging Canada and challenging the world to

make medicare and hospitalization available to all citizens. It is one of the primary rights of every individual that he should have access to this kind of service and this kind of care. So, along with my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, I am very proud and look upon this as a red letter day for the citizens of Saskatchewan. I am very happy to support Bill No. 49.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. G. B. GRANT: (Regina Whitmore Park): — Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt in any Member's mind on this side of the House and I am sure the same holds on the other side to some extent, that this Bill is largely window dressing especially with regard to the abolition of the premiums. It is not required in that respect whatsoever. The Hon. Member for Saskatoon (Mr. Rolfes) who said this will give great relief to the old age pensioners, if he will recall, the premium was removed for the old age pensioners in 1972. We haven't had any premium since 1972 for those over 65 years of age and in 1973 we witnessed the removal of the premiums for everyone, so actually these poor suffering people that you have referred to have not been suffering for the last 1 1/2 years. You should, I think, appreciate the fact that this Bill is absolutely unnecessary and is only brought in for one purpose and that was to deal with the question of \$72 for employees where the premiums have been paid by the employers.

Now I think the Hon. Member for Saskatoon (Mr. Rolfes) and certainly the Member for Pelly (Mr. Larson) have said that this is really a wonderful thing, it's a first; in fact I think Mr. Larson said it's a first for the rest of the world to look at. Well, I would remind him that Manitoba doesn't have a premium. Quebec doesn't have a premium and most of the Atlantic provinces. I think there is some question whether Alberta has a premium, I am not sure. But whether it has or hasn't it is certainly not a first for Canada, Saskatchewan was scooped by the other provinces and this is an indication that these two Members certainly didn't do their homework very well.

The Member for Saskatoon said that he hoped that all Members of the House would support the Bill and I think the Members on this side of the House could have supported the Bill if it had been solely for the purpose of the removal of medical care premiums. That is your philosophy and I don't think we feel that strongly about it, if you have funds running out of your ears to pay for this from other sources, sources that I am sure will discourage investment in the province and discourage business. That's your privilege and we don't feel that strongly about it that we couldn't have supported the Bill if that was all it did. But Mr. Mostoway, the Member for Hanley, once more demonstrated the feelings of the Members on the other side of the House about business and investment and industry and employers by inferring that the employers wouldn't do right by the employees unless this provision was included in the Act. I can see no earthly reason why this should be legislated. The unions can certainly negotiate it again at the renewal of their contract without bringing it into this Legislature. The employers who have been paying it on their own have no chance of discontinuing it, it's going to be a way of life as a result of this, the ones that are not unionized.

I had occasion to speak to one of the leaders of the

Saskatchewan Federation of Labour this morning and I asked him his rationalization for this move because I said the employees haven't suffered, they are still getting the benefits of medicare and hospitalization scheme through the generosity of the taxpayers. His answer was that the employers were going to gain by it if the Government didn't do this. I can't just see the employers gaining particularly because they are going to help along with all the rest of us to pay taxes in this province to provide for the non-premium medical care and hospitalization scheme. So I don't know why, Mr. Speaker, the Members opposite and why the Minister of Labour (Mr. Snyder) didn't bring it in as a wage adjustment rather than bring it in under this particular Act. Because that is all that it is, simply and purely, for certain segments of our population, a wage boost. And, if you wish to give them a wage boost why don't you be honest about it and do it in the proper manner.

Mr. Speaker, because of the fact that this Bill was not required for the elimination of the medicare premium, because of the fact that it has been cluttered up with another matter that I think is unfair and unjust, I cannot support the Bill. I do this knowing that you Members opposite will, I am sure, go out on the hustings and say I am opposing the elimination of medicare premiums. If you do, I will be very careful to point out that you are wrong, we are not opposing this Bill because of that feature. We are opposing it because of this unfair inclusion of the compulsory feature of a \$72 adjustment to the employees so that the NDP can appeal to them to contribute it to their party.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. R. ROMANOW: (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few words on this Bill, prompted in particular by the Member who just finished taking his seat (Mr. Grant) by his comment about what the NDP will be telling the people of the Province of Saskatchewan. He is right. We are going to be telling the people of the Province of Saskatchewan that the Liberals did vote against the medicare and hospitalization premium removal. He is absolutely right that we are going to be telling that story because it has to be told over and over again, in terms of the attitude of the Liberal Party to medicare and to hospitalization.

Mr. Speaker, the Liberals' approach to this Bill, their approach to fight the \$72 removal of the fee is the same as their philosophy that led them to impose the deterrent fee. Absolutely the same, Mr. Speaker, in 1968 or thereabouts when the Liberal Party introduced the deterrent fees. It was really the manifestation of the Liberal attitude that somehow in the good old fashioned way every individual should pay as you go along with respect to medicare and hospitalization premiums. I recall, in particular, asking the then Minister of Public Health in the course of the debate what their rationale was behind the implementation of the deterrent fees. The answer was, I recall very forcefully, because the Government wants the people to know that they are participating in their own recovery. That was the reasoning behind the deterrent fees. That is the basic reason that is behind the Liberal Party now, in refusing to accept the abolition of the \$72 medicare and hospitalization premium. Somehow it doesn't sit well with their philosophy that you have got to know that you are participating in your own recovery, that somehow you have to fork something out of your pocket, particularly in the health field services. Mr. Speaker, I thought that

battle was won now in Saskatchewan 12 years ago or more. Certainly I thought that battle was won more than 12 years ago in other parts of the world. It makes only good economics, let alone any of your social philosophies and other attitudes, good economics to have the medicare and hospitalization scheme which does away with this old antediluvian approach that somehow you have to know that you are participating in your own recovery. The good old free enterprise, good old fashioned, individualistic rugged attitude that the Liberals opposite take.

You are right, Mr. Speaker, the Member opposite is dead right when he says the Liberal Party is going to be Painted for what it is by the removal of this premium. A party which never ever did believe in the basic philosophy and principle of medicare and hospitalization. They opposed it in 1962 with everything they had in them. They set up front organizations in 1962, keep our doctors and you can name them all because they don't believe that you can get away from this principle this individualistic principle somehow that you have got to pay for what you get and you are going to have to do it in this particular area.

They fought it. They lost. When they gained power, they implemented the deterrent. They fought it again by the deterrent fee. Make no mistake about it the implementation of the deterrent fee was an attack on the principle of medicare and hospitalization as set up in this province. It was an attack because it set up this business of paying personally out of your own pockets when the entire philosophy of the scheme in 1962 was to get away from that. But it has always been the stated objective of the NDP and before that the CCT that we would do away with the premium, because this was also the wrong way to go. Gentlemen opposite, I ask you to think what you are doing. You are asking this House to maintain a premium of \$72 for every person who pays that premium regardless of how much money they make. You are asking the man who makes \$5,000 or \$6,000 a year to pay that \$72 as much as you are asking the man who makes \$30,000 a year to pay that \$72. Mr. Speaker, this is a regressive form of taxation. \$72 for the man on \$6,000 is one thing, but \$72 for the man on \$30,000 is another thing. What the Leader of the Opposition and the party opposite wanted us to do, is they want that \$72 to apply throughout, regardless of ability to pay.

I recall inside this House and outside the House the Leader of the Opposition and others getting up in other areas. I read in a newspaper report, Mr. Speaker, the other day, of the comment of the Liberals opposite when we announced, for example, the transfer of three pennies in the AAIA and the allegation was that we are going to be penalizing the working man, the man who is driving his car. We have got to be working to ease the plight for him. Well, Mr. Speaker, how in the world can you rationalize that stated concern for the poor people of this province, supposedly, with the philosophy of the Liberal Party in maintaining the \$72 premium. I ask the Member for Lakeview (Mr. Malone) does that show any consistency in logic? Does it show any type of honesty or integrity in the political approach? Whatever you may say about the three pennies on AAIA, we are not arguing that, at least it has one virtue of logic, it is tied to ability to pay, because of the usages of the gasoline and the purchase and the driving are tied. But the \$72 to be applied throughout regardless of the man's economic position, regardless of the circumstances he is in, we are now being told, is logical with other Liberal stances, Mr. Speaker, that is out and out utter nonsense. It is nonsense of the worst order by the Liberals

opposite.

I had to really smile when I heard the Liberals react at the time this announcement was first made. The Premier said when he made the announcement that this was an attempt by the Province of Saskatchewan to fight inflation. It is a very difficult job for a provincial government to fight inflation, in Saskatchewan, in Ontario, wherever. It requires a national approach to the inflation problem. No one who honestly and logically would look at the situation would say otherwise. But we are trying. We said at the time of this announcement, of which this Bill is the subject matter, there would be three things we would do. 1. We would increase the minimum wage. 2. We would increase welfare allowances. 5. We would remove the Medicare and Hospitalization premium.

All of these, Mr. Speaker, have a certain consistency to them, because they are all geared to the person who is most hit by inflation. The person on the \$7,000 or \$8,000 a year income or lower or even a little bit above that now would try to put some extra money in his pocket. We are trying to get him to combat the increasing cost of living that he is fighting against. We are giving him a tool to try and fight this inflationary bug that you people are so hepped up about. That's what the medicare and hospitalization bug does, it gives somebody \$72 extra, a living bonus you might say, but \$72 that he didn't have up to now.

What did the Liberal Party do? The Leader of the Opposition said first of all on the increased minimum wage, he opposed the minimum wage. Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition opposed that inflation package and opposes this Bill. He would have the workingman back to a \$1.50 if he had his own way. Why the Liberals opposite believe that a decent minimum working wage is contrary to their good old fashioned free enterprise, rugged, "let's do it on your own" philosophy that they advocate. He doesn't want the man to go up from \$1.75 to \$2. I ask you gentlemen opposite to remember that. Your party is opposed to increasing the minimum wage from \$1.75 to \$2. The Member for Lakeview knows that very well. He was on a hotline show on the CBC at the time with his opponent Don Keith and a caller telephoned to ask where he stood on the \$1.75 to \$2 increase. The Member for Lakeview said he supported the minimum wage increase. The Leader of the Opposition said a week before that he is opposed to the minimum wage increase. The Leader of the Opposition's approach is, don't give that poor working man an extra 25 cents an hour. What you do, is one of two things, either give a grant, an outright grant or give the industry for whom he is working an outright grant. But don't give the worker that extra two bits an hour.

The Member for Lakeview (Mr. Malone) ran in the last election campaign on a strong anti-welfare flavor. He condemned the welfare practices of this Government. He tried to argue that welfare was being abused. He doesn't want more people on welfare. He does not want more people on welfare.

MR. MALONE: — Do you?

MR. ROMANOW: — No, I don't want more people on welfare. But what does your Leader of the Opposition recommend? He recommends that you make an outright grant to that person, in effect putting him on

welfare. Don't give him a decent working wage. Keep him at a \$1.75 and make up the difference by giving him a grant which amounts to welfare. The Member for Lakeview laughs. The Leader of the Opposition said that. That was the position on the minimum wage. I challenge the Member for Lakeview to get up in this House and correct me, if I am wrong, that the Leader of the Opposition opposed the increase for a minimum wage of \$1.75 to \$2. I challenge the Member for Lakeview to get up and to tell me if I am wrong that his proposal that the difference from \$1.75 to \$2 should be given in the form of a welfare grant. He didn't call it a welfare grant but that's what it amounted to, a grant to the individual. That's absolutely the case. That's the position they took with respect to this welfare package.

Now we come along with respect to the premium and the removal of the medicare and hospitalization. We said that we had to remove this particular part of the inflation package. We said that this was something we could assist the individual with. No, he was opposed to that as well. Good old fashioned free enterprise Liberal approach. He said, as my colleague from Regina indicates, that by giving the chap on \$8,000 to \$9,000 income an extra \$72 that that is inflationary. Now I suppose the Member for Lakeview would laugh and say that he didn't say that either. Somehow that the \$8,000 chap on income will get \$72 extra a year to help combat the cost of living. How in the world will anybody in the Liberal Party opposite tell me how that is inflationary? How is giving him \$72 inflationary, but giving the difference between \$1.75 to \$2 in minimum wage to the industry isn't inflationary? I can't understand that. Mr. Speaker, I can't understand the logic of such an outdated approach. I didn't believe it until I saw the Leader of the Opposition's response to this particular anti-inflation approach, as I see it now, the Liberal opposite approach to this particular Bill.

Mr. Speaker, they are against this business of helping small people and people on low income getting their \$72. They are opposed to that. They want to maintain this regressive tax. Mr. Speaker, this tells me a lot of what the Liberals would do if they ever should gain back the power in the Province of Saskatchewan. I believe that the first thing they would do is to impose the deterrent again, Mr. Speaker, because that is consistent with their philosophy. Oh, yes they would! That's their way of showing us that we are participating in our own recovery, when we are flat on our backs. That's their way of telling us when we are fighting a serious illness that we are participating in our own recovery. Their \$72, that's their way of telling us that we ought to be penalized and the right to good health is something that in democracy everyone is not entitled to. That's what they are telling us. They ask me, Mr. Speaker, whether or not I am going to go around the hustings telling the people of Saskatchewan that they oppose the \$72. Mr. Speaker, I am going to go on the hustings telling them they are opposed to removal of \$72. I am going to tell the people of Saskatchewan that that indicates part of the bigger basic approach of the Liberals opposite to medicare and hospitalization. They never liked it. They don't like it now and if they could ever do away with it, I tell the people of this province, they would do away with it. Their approach on this Bill tells us that much now.

They would like to have medicare put on the same basis as in the good old days, prior to 1962. That's really what is behind this party. I ask you now, Mr. Speaker, in 1974 is this a party that's keeping pace with the times? Is this a party who

March 4, 1974

is in 1974, I ask the Member for Lakeview? You think you are back in 1962. You think you are back in 1962 with your tax on welfare and your tax on the small workingman and your refusal to remove the \$72 premium. I would ask the Member for Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) but I am afraid he wouldn't be able to answer anyway, so I won't bother asking him. I won't ask the Leader of the Opposition because he is long ago gone down the road now. Let nobody in the Province of Saskatchewan be confused. This is the same old Liberal Party that was elected in 1964. It is the same old Liberal Party that was defeated in 1971. It is the same old Liberal Party with the same leaders and the same philosophy and the same approaches, the same reactionary attitude to everything. I tell the people of the Province of Saskatchewan that if they ever should elect a Liberal Government again, medicare, hospitalization and the social advances we have succeeded would always be in danger.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support this particular Bill. I think it is a step forward to improving the quality of opportunity for all men and women and children in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Hon. Mr. Smishek that Bill No. 15 — **An Act for the provision of certain Dental Services in Saskatchewan**, be now read a second time.

MR. J. G. RICHARDS: (Saskatoon University): — Mr. Speaker, I apologize if I bring the level of the debate back down from the flowing heights of medicare premiums. It has always been a tremendous subject of amusement and it has been a tremendous subject for political speeches for many a year, I am sure it will continue to go on. It is a great political war horse. I wonder what we should do without it sometimes.

Mr. Speaker, when I was so rudely interrupted by the clock last week we were discussing a piece of legislation concerning a dental health program. I believe it is an excellent piece of legislation. I give it my full-hearted support. I discussed the problem of parodontal workers and the fact that the Bill did make a beginning of involvement of parodontal workers and allowing for dental nurses, for dental assistants. I alluded to the problems which we have got to face about the monopoly control of the health professions and defining the scope of action, the scope of medicine, setting the fee schedules and that it was a definite step in the right direction to be beginning to limit these professional powers to define the scope of dentistry and what they alone in the past would like to dictate as to terms.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I took my seat at 5:30 o'clock the other day, the subject I was going to get onto was the question of fluoridation. Now the question of fluoridation has got a certain ring to medicare premiums, something which we are all again, in this case all for, but somehow with fluoridation nothing seems to happen. We go year after year in which we talk about it in vague generalities. The Member for Moose Jaw North (Mr. MacDonald) talked in glowing terms about fluoridation and how in this day and age, surely the opposition has been reduced to rubble and that most people recognize the scientific advantages of it, I will talk about economic ones as well in a minute.

The Hon. Minister of Public Health when he introduced the legislation talked about fluoridation in glowing phrases as a preventive health mechanism.

MR. STEUART: — I put it in when I was mayor . . .

MR. RICHARDS: — Good for you! Davey put it in when he was mayor. Excellent precedent. I trust you will support me when I come to suggest we need to put fluoridation into this Bill.

Mr. Speaker, what I intend to do is to give notice here of a House amendment to reincorporate a provision of a Bill which failed and died on the Order Paper in 1972, which would allow the Minister to make grants to communities to finance the fluoridation of their water supply. Mr. Speaker, you may recall that back in 1972 this non-controversial piece of legislation was introduced, a small piece of legislation, and we had barrages of opposition. Some of it was rational. I also remember getting a letter from some chinchilla rancher in British Columbia who assured me that all his chinchillas got sterile because of fluoridated water. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that if the level of debate on dental matters is reduced to the subject of the sterility and the fertility of chinchillas we aren't taking our jobs seriously about preventive public health measures.

To go back to the Advisory Committee on Dental Care for children which the Minister drew up. Recommendation No. 5 explicitly said, in the interests of both dental health and economics, water supplies in all communities with a central water system should be fluoridated and a constant promotional educational campaign should be mounted to bring this about. In the text of the report they went on to say that for a program extending to the age of 12, this could mean a saving of \$600,000 a year; for a program extending through the age of 17 as the Committee recommended it would be a total saving of \$885,000 a year.

Mr. Speaker, before I, and perhaps this is the appropriate time to do it, before I go into any of the discussion of the health aspects, let me just drive home the economics by referring to a very simple study conducted over six years in two communities in the United States, in the State of New York. For the children involved in the study in these two towns, one named Newburg, one named Kingston, the average per child cost of providing health care — dental care — to the community with fluoridated water was \$47 per child. That was for a six-year period. The average cost of providing the same level of services to the child -in the unfluoridated water community was \$101. This was using the fee schedule which was applicable to the State of New York and providing regular checkups and providing for the dental care of the children in the two communities.

Mr. Speaker, that drives it home in simple dollars and cents. It costs twice as much without the fluoridated water as with. Mr. Speaker, how can we continue to ignore what is obviously a crucial preventive health mechanism? Let's bring it back home. Let's talk about Saskatoon and Regina. Saskatoon which has fluoridated water with one part per million, Regina without having in the order of .2 parts per million.

A survey conducted by the Department of Public Health in 1965 comparing children in both communities, both saw dentists

March 4, 1974

with about the same frequency and what was the result, Mr. Speaker? Of the children between the ages of seven and 15, according to this 1965 survey, only 3.6 per cent in Regina had teeth free of dental defects as compared to 17 per cent in Saskatoon. Of the percent having no cavities, there was 21 per cent in Regina with no cavities for this group, 37 per cent in Saskatoon. The average number of decayed, missing and filled teeth for the children in Regina — 7.8, in Saskatoon 6.3. In terms of the health of the teeth of the children in Saskatoon and Regina, the statistical conclusions are undeniable. Fluoridated water in Saskatoon has resulted in better health care.

If one takes a look at the sterling quality of MLAs around here I think we could also say that it hasn't done anything particularly harmful to the political inclinations of the people in Saskatoon relative to the people in Regina either. The combination of the financial savings 2 to 1 in that study in the States; the combination of the health statistics which are undeniable I think means that this Legislature should be prepared to give the sense of direction to the Government, that water should be fluoridated in communities which have not been to date.

I trust that when I introduce as a House amendment, when we consider this Bill clause by clause, we shall have the support of Members on both side of the House to amend this Act, to give the Minister the powers to provide funds to communities in order to fluoridate their water supply. If we aren't prepared to take this method, this step, if we insist upon being cowed by those who would talk about the sterility of chinchillas, that I think proves that it is a sham, our concern about preventive dental methods.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I give my strong support in principles of this Bill.

The Assembly recessed from 5:30 to 7:00 o'clock.

MR. A. W. ENGEL: (Notukeu-Willow Bunch): — Mr. Speaker, I intend to say a few words tonight on this Bill No. 15 to provide certain dental services.

I decided to speak on this Bill when I was listening to the former Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) talk about this and some of the problems that he felt.

MR. LAKE: — He hasn't spoken yet.

MR. ENGEL: — Yes, he has. I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I shall withdraw that. One of the Members over there raised the question that dentists would leave if we introduce this Bill. I remember in this House at one time when the Attorney General was speaking in this House and he made a wager and I intend to do that tonight. I will make a wager, and I am not a betting man as the Speaker surely knows, but I will make a wager of \$1,000 for every dentist who leaves my constituency. I am that sure that no dentist will leave Notukeu-Willow Bunch. The dentists will not leave Wood Mountain, Mankota, Kincaid or Rockglen because we haven't any dentists in Notukeu-Willow Bunch.

A survey was taken in 1971 on the condition of children's teeth. Three out of four children in the seven — year old age group required fillings. Two out of five needed some extractions; three out of four or three-quarters of the children needed some work done on temporary teeth. I will reword that so that we get the story correctly. On an average every child needs some work done on three temporary teeth. In the 11-year old age group each child had four decayed or missing or filled permanent teeth.

People on the other side are saying that we don't need a program to provide certain dental services. Forty per cent of the children surveyed had some form of gum disease and 20 percent needed straightening of their front teeth. Why, do you suppose, Mr. Speaker, did this problem occur? I think the key lies in the fact, and I mentioned it at the beginning, we just don't have enough dentists.

In our province we have approximately 214 dentists. That makes an average of one dentist for every 4,300 people. If half our dentists are in the cities, Mr. Speaker, that will bring the ratio to about 1 to 7,500. Our two major cities have half the dentists. If you take all the cities into account it would be more like one dentist serving about 11,000 or 12,000 people.

I am very disturbed about this, the need for dental care. This Bill No. 15 is going to be providing some changes and may- be this is why the Opposition is opposed to this Bill, they are afraid of change.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ENGEL: — If young people or children need dental care from the area of say Mankota, they have to drive 75 miles to their nearest dentist. The point that I am trying to raise is that there are no dentists available, let alone the aspect of the cost of the service. This program will bring the care to the children rather than having to take our children to the dentists. I really like this aspect of the Bill where the clinics will be established in the classrooms and the program will be available with little or no disruption to the classroom program.

If this takes care of about 15 or 16 per cent of the population, the age group that we are talking about now, that leaves that much more time for dentists who are serving that many people than they are anywhere else in the world. By the way, as far as one dentist for every 9,000 or 10,000 for people in rural Saskatchewan, in Sweden they have one dentist for every 1,200 people. If we can at least help 15 or 16 per cent of these people this would give our dentists a chance to do more efficient work on the balance of the population.

There is one more aspect of this Bill that I like and I_ have been talking to some of my friends who are dentists and in particular one dentist here in the city of Regina. He has been practising for a long time.

MR. LANE: — Name one.

MR. ENGEL: — I will name him if you care to have his name, Dr. Riffel. Dr. Riffel is on the Prayer Breakfast Committee. I

March 4, 1974

and Dr. Riffel serves on the Prayer Breakfast Committee and I am sure that he won't mind me using his name. We discussed some of the aspects of this program. The one area, a point that is really well taken, is that we introduced this program where we are training dental nurses. His argument is that we have these people taking a two-year course, and I don't think this dental nurse should refer just to ladies taking the course, I think some males should be involved in this course as well. And if these people show real promise and potential they should be able to go on and take another year and maybe they can — under the present direction they can only extract baby teeth, I am not sure of this, just what the terms will be as I haven't studied that course that closely. But they could maybe take another year's course and do something else and in time they could work at being a full-fledged dentist without having to lose any credits for the courses they have taken, or the time they spent.

I think these young people taking these courses, should be able to get full credit from the College of Dentists and they will get together when they see this program working. They will get together with this program and they will see what a good program it is and they will build that into a program where they can graduate as full-fledged dentists. I should like to see this develop out of this program.

Most of the dentists tell us that they have been used to practising with an aide or assistant. I was at the dentist the other day and the dentist did the drilling but his technician applied the filling and did the rest of the work. I think that they can work with assistants and this program helps provide labor at the rate that we can afford to pay. Why spend as much money on a highly trained person when he doesn't have to do that highly professional type of work. I think this is an area that this really covers and gets the cost down to where we can afford it.

This Bill, some of the highlights of this Bill that I think are tremendous, is that it gives the parents a freedom of where they can get their children's teeth fixed. The main emphasis is going to be on prevention and preventive care.

I am pleased that we have a Bill where we can get our teeth into and it is a good Bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. F. MEAKES: (Touchwood): — Mr. Speaker, as one who has no children and no teeth I hesitate to speak on this Bill. The other problem is that the Hon. Member for Notukeu-Willow Bunch took my punch away as I was going to make the same challenge that I would pay \$1,000 for every dentist who moved out of Touchwood. There aren't any, and there haven't been any for the last 20 some years. I think that it is over 20 years since we' have had a dentist who resided in the boundaries of Touchwood.

I said that I have no teeth, I have false teeth, of course, and I paid for them. But maybe if the Liberal Government of the '20s and '30s had brought in a program of this kind I might be able to stand here tonight and say that I still had my original teeth.

The main reason that I rose was because I took a few notes the other day when the Hon. Member for Moose Jaw North (Mr. MacDonald) was speaking and when he stated that he was going to oppose this Bill. A funny thing that I read the other day in the paper where there was a Liberal Member in the Manitoba Legislature who was bringing in a Bill and was proposing a Bill that would propose to do the same as Saskatchewan, only it was for up to 12 years, it was supposed to be up to 16 years. I kind of wish that you fellows would get together occasionally.

He was in his usual form of oppose, oppose, oppose and to just keep opposing. I have no intention, Mr. Speaker, speaking very long on this Bill. It is a good Bill. I am glad that it is being brought in. I think that it is a necessary Bill especially for the rural areas. I know that a great majority of the children of my constituency have to travel anywhere from 35, 70 to 100 miles to see a dentist. And if there could be some program brought in that will help these children get this kind of service rather than have to make this kind of a drive, I am all for it. So I will support the Bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. E. F. FLASCH: (Maple Creek): — Mr. Speaker, according to the guidelines set out by the Member for Touchwood (Mr. Meakes) I think I have some license to speak on this Bill. I still have my teeth and I have some children.

My constituency, as you know, is totally within the boundaries of the Swift Current Health Region and therefore, we have had a children's dental plan in operation for some years. I am sure that throughout most of the region the service has been satisfactory. I have had no complaints or any comments to the contrary from the Maple Creek constituency. However, we have had a continuing problem in Leader. We have, in the past, been able to recruit dentists who have worked, at least part time, under the region and who, as soon as they became established long enough to know that there were better positions available, suddenly left and went down East where, I suppose, business was more lucrative. I am sure that the people in our area would be very happy to have some dental services available near home and could avoid having to go to Medicine Hat, or Swift Current or to some other distant centres for service.

I think the Member for Moose Jaw North (Mr. MacDonald) was speaking totally from the dentists' point of view when he opposed this Bill the other day. I don't think that all work in any field of endeavor has to be left to the professionals. Nobody has ever convinced me that, for example, to be full-time principal of a school one must be a qualified teacher. I think that person must be an administrator, but not necessarily a teacher. I know that not everyone would agree with me. By the same reasoning, I don't think that some of the simpler tasks that are performed in the line of dentistry have to be done by a qualified dentist. I can think of a number of situations in which teeth were extracted when there was no dentist around. I remember two occasions when teeth were pulled in a beer parlor. Now Mr. Speaker, in one case the professional involved was a farmer and about all that the client paid for was the sedative. I think he paid for that in advance. Anyway, everybody concerned was satisfied. I am going to take the name of that gentleman and recommend that the Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek) see

that he gains entrance to a dental nursing school.

I remember in another area, Mr. Speaker, that we had a dentist who had his clinic set up in town but who also carried his services to the people. He came around to the various towns. I remember in our particular town, the pool room was his clinic and the barber's chair was the dental chair. He had no white coat; he carried his dental tools in his pocket, the pocket of his overcoat, and I have yet to hear anyone complain about the services he rendered. He was, mind you, a qualified dentist. There aren't enough with his dedication around any more.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. FLASCH: — Now, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all of us remember occasions when we have seen poor dental work done by qualified people — work that was unsatisfactory. I am sure all of us have seen fillings drop out of teeth, we have seen poor work by dentists and nobody complained too much about it. I suppose all that will change after this Bill is brought in. Any time a dental nurse makes a mistake, the Liberals will howl that it is the fault of the NDP for bringing in this Bill. I think, Mr. Speaker, that as time goes on and we get dental nurses established, the public will be very pleased with the job that they will do.

As far as Section 5, subsection (1) is concerned, which states that the Minister is not obligated to pay for dental work done for people who don't want to join this plan, I think it is a good section. People have opposed good things for too long for strictly political purposes. If they don't want to be a part of the program they shouldn't have their services covered by it.

Mr. Speaker, I am certainly going to support this Bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. H. OWENS: (Elrose): — Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek) during his remarks on second reading of Bill 15 and the other speakers who have spoken since have outlined very effectively the provisions of the plan. I do not intend to elaborate very much on those plans except to support them.

This service to Saskatchewan children and their parents will be another gigantic step forward in the provision of another very necessary and needed health service. Statistics prove the extreme lack and dire need of dental services by all people in Saskatchewan and especially by the very young. More especially by the very young who live in comparative isolation from a dental clinic. This includes a large number of rural communities where no dental service is available and where the dental service situation is aggravated by the need to make dental appointments in the city sometimes months ahead. I lay no blame on the acting dental profession. They are simply just burdened with work in whatever place they are located and although they may be interested in the needs of many more their capacity to a patient load is limited. On the other hand the extra cost of travelling long distances is also a burden on the parent. Under these circumstances many children have been deprived of the dental care needed. This in my mind is a disaster

of major proportions especially when the lack of proper dental care can be the forerunner of other health problems.

This proposed dental service plan will, when implemented, and personnel are available, overcome to a large degree this situation by its preventive service. Preventive to the extent that children enrolled in the plan will be examined at their school by a team of trained and qualified dentists, dental_ nurses, and certified dental assistants. Major services will not be provided under the plan, the plan will not be compulsory. The parents will decide whether their children may or may not participate.

The results of the pilot project in Oxbow area makes me feel that parents in Saskatchewan, generally, that is, are anxiously awaiting the implementation of this plan. The Oxbow program has already proven the acceptability of the plan and the quality of dental services provided. A shortage of dentists has, no doubt, stimulated the need for this program but the shortage will in no way distract from the quality of care to be provided under it. Present indications are that more than enough dentists are prepared to work under this plan to provide adequate supervision as required.

If it is found on examination by the dental team that the need for remedial work on the child's teeth is beyond their ability and training to correct, the parents will be advised of the need and urged to take their child to the dentist of their choice. There may be some fears in some particular areas that the dentists will be deprived of a fairly large source of lucrative income and in some few cases I hope this will be the case. However, I would dare to predict that the reverse will be true, mainly due to referrals. Referrals that would not have happened had it not been for the dental plan. Before, in many cases, only too late, would the child see the dentist for the purpose of pulling a tooth deteriorated beyond repair. I would hope, and sincerely so, that the dental source of income from provision of supplying dentures would practically disappear. I have personally no experience in the use of dentures but I have seen many young people suffer for considerable periods of time before they were in a position to purchase dentures and often suffered for years after because of a poor fit, aggravated by distance to services for adjustment and other problems such as unrealistic prices and unrealistic follow up provisions. Hopefully this program will change this situation very radically and more and more people will be able to enjoy their original teeth for their lifetime.

Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan has consistently led the field in the provision of health services for people. Once again Saskatchewan is leading the field in the provision of another health program that will be envied by and followed by other provinces and countries. I congratulate the Minister for introducing another piece of progressive legislation. I have every confidence the plan will be enthusiastically received by the people of Saskatchewan.

I will support Bill No. 15.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. G. B. GRANT: (Regina Whitmore Park): — Mr. Speaker, before the

question is put I should like to make a few comments in connection with this Bill.

It appears that the Members opposite haven't 'been paying too much attention to what has been said over here. One Member mistook something which someone else said and attributed it to me and I hadn't spoken yet. Two or three have misinterpreted the remarks of the health critic so I think it is about time that we straightened out some of these things.

Mr. Speaker, first of all I should like to congratulate the Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek) because I think he is entitled to one of the Oscars that they give out down in Hollywood because he has done a pretty good job of presenting this plan. You will recall when he introduced the Bill, he covered everything in the field of health right back to 19[^]. I don't think he missed very much, he went right through. He built a beautiful front like they build down in Hollywood, you know you really don't know what's behind it, but he was sure building a beautiful front. Metro Goldwyn Mayer had nothing on Mr. Smishek because he is a real promoter. Actually I think the Oscar would be awarded to him for setting up scenery, for the front -that he has put on because he has done a pretty good job. Actually the Government might do well and may save a little money by dispensing with the services of Dunskey Advertising and hiring Mr. Smishek because in putting on a good front for the Government I am sure he would outdo Dunskey and Company.

The Member for Maple Creek (Mr. Flasch) I think it was or maybe Netekeu-Willow Bunch (Mr. Engel), suggested that he would be willing to bet \$1,000 that no dentists will leave his area. He made reference to the Attorney General's wager and I don't know just how much money he had in mind, but I would remind him that the Attorney General lost the wager last November or in December when I bet him \$10 that the NDP wouldn't pull the plug on the Government in Ottawa and he took me up on it and delivered the \$10 in a couple of days. So his example is not a very good one to follow. I can tell you about a wager I had with the Minister of Health. I am going to give him a 60-day notice. He only has 60 days more to collect that \$100 for opening up one of those 11 hospitals that I closed. So 60 days from today, Mr. Minister of Health, that wager is off because you've had almost 2/2 years now and nothing has happened.

Now the Hon. Member from Touchwood (Mr. Meakes) says that he has false teeth. I don't know what he did in his younger days to bring this about because I still have all my teeth and I think I am as old as he is. I didn't have the advantages of fluoridation and I didn't have teeth pulled in a beer parlor because I had them pulled out in the blacksmith shop on the farm, some of my first teeth, but I managed to keep all the rest of them. So let's not condemn all the health conditions as far as teeth are concerned in Saskatchewan just because the Hon. Member has lost his teeth.

While we are on the subject of fluoridation, I don't think anybody in the portfolio of health can help but be a little confused about the pros and cons of fluoridation. I am sure even the present Minister might have some reservations although I know he favors fluoridation. But as everyone knows there are strong arguments pro and con. I think some persons say, and I believe the Hon. Member from Saskatoon University (Mr. Richards) used the comparison that it is like pasteurization, therefore,

it should be compulsory. I can't agree with him because if I hadn't taken advantage of pasteurized milk I might not be here today but the mere fact that I didn't have fluoridated water has had no effect on my teeth. I am quite happy with my teeth. I don't think it is in the same category as pasteurization at all and consequently if the majority of the people want water fluoridated, I certainly wouldn't mind, but I am opposed to making it compulsory on the basis of it being beneficial to some people and not necessarily other age groups.

At the outset just so that there will be no misunderstanding I am going to support this Bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. GRANT: — I am not enthused about the plan that the Minister has brought forth. He made reference to the medicare scheme back in 1947 in these words:

Now in 1947 the CCF Government gave birth to North America's first comprehensive, universal health care plan.

This seems to me to be the first birth that he was able to dig up because I am sure he would have gone back further but 1947 seems to be the time of the first birth. But as my colleague next to me indicated there has been the odd abortion and you don't have to go back that far. I have in mind the Foreign Ownership Bill, the Land Bank Bill and Bill 42, I think they could all be categorized as abortions and I sometimes wonder just what the next pregnancy will bring forth. I heard today that the Minister was suggesting that before the next election there would be a drug plan and he will bring in a Bill. I presume if we don't see a Bill very quickly we can assume there won't be any election this year.

I should like to suggest that this plan, not the Bill, but the plan and as a result the Bill has been conceived in haste, it had a short pregnancy and there are going to be problems when the delivery time arrives. I should like to point out that our main objection to the plan, not the Bill, to the plan proposed by the Minister is the same one that has been voiced by the president of the Canadian Dental Association. He says if the Saskatchewan plan includes proper supervision of assistants it would meet with the Canadian Dental Association's approval. I don't think the Minister or any others who have spoken in this House have convinced us that the plan does involve this type of supervision. I would hope that when he closes debate he would satisfy us that there is going to be the type of supervision that the Dental Association visualizes and the type that we should like to see.

The Minister went on to explain that significant steps have been taken to increase the number of dentists in Saskatchewan. He made reference to the Dental College enrolment and the injection of \$2 million by way of new facilities. I think this is good, I don't know that it is a guarantee of the retention of any more dentists in Saskatchewan, but at least we shall be training more and hopefully we shall be retaining more. But this is a long-range program and certainly it is not going to show too many results before about 1980.

March 4, 1974

The Minister also made mention of the Oxbow project and earlier in his remarks had stated that the Liberals had done nothing.

The provincial Liberal and Federal Governments have done nothing to bring about such a program.

I would point out that it was the Federal Government that financed the pilot project and the Minister made mention of this to the tune of, I believe, something like \$140,000 or thereabouts, maybe more. This Oxbow pilot research project was started when I was Minister of Health and I thought the Minister might have made mention of that. He did indirectly, by saying that it was now in its fifth year, but this operation is now fully financed by the province. That was our understanding that the Federal Government would finance it as a pilot project for two or three years.

I should like to tell the Minister of another thing that we accomplished. I can tell you in 1966 when I took over the Health Department, the dentists were certainly not as co-operative as they are today. We set up a committee to sit down with the dentists to discuss this type of a project and the committee finally threw up its hands because the dentists were so adverse to this type of program. Any mention of the Australian dental nurse made them immediately want to adjourn the meeting. So I think that credit has to be given where credit is due and if I did nothing else, I gather I was a little bit responsible during my term for softening up the dentists. Dentists were receptive to the pilot project which was a good project, the Oxbow project, and consequently there is better co-operation from the dentists as a result of that.

The Minister went on to quote some letters and I think he used poor judgment in picking out these letters. If he had a lot of letters, I am sure he could have picked out letters that would have made his point better than these, because the first one involved a reference to the exorbitant costs of dental care. And the first one was in reference to the removal of a wisdom tooth and it cost \$50. Well, some wisdom teeth are pretty difficult to remove and I don't know whether \$50 is exorbitant or not. If a wisdom tooth is bothering any of us enough, I am sure that we would feel that it was a pretty good investment to get rid of the thing.

The next one was \$70 for the removal of two teeth. Neither one of these letters had any reference to children under 12 years of age and that's all this Bill has reference to. I can tell you in my opinion, I am sure the Minister will agree, it's going to be some time before a government scheme is going to be paying for the removal of wisdom teeth or the removal of adults' teeth.

The last letter almost got down to the category that will be touched on by this plan. A 15 year old boy had work done to the tune of \$104, but likewise, he will not receive the benefit of this scheme. Not for a few years anyway.

There has been quite a bit said about the exclusion or at least about this scheme being voluntary and that there is no compulsion in it. Well, I think there is compulsion in it because when you tell people that if they don't join up, if they don't join the club, then they are not entitled to the benefits.

This is quite similar to the Trade Union Act in this province. If you don't belong to a Trade Union you don't have the benefit in the company you work for, you don't have the benefit of working for that company. I suppose it is carrying out their philosophy that unless people respond to their plans or to their compulsion, then they are not included in the plan. It certainly is misleading. People don't have a freedom of choice, their freedom of choice is either having a plan paid for or not paid for and the Minister says he can't understand the dentists' request, that those who wish to send their children directly to them be paid the same cost factor that the plan would incur. I think this is a reasonable request. I wonder if the Minister is afraid of a little competition outside the plan or just why is he refusing this? It looks to me as if he is going to drive people into this scheme, against their wishes in some cases, purely because of the dollar factor.

It seems to me that at the present time doctors can operate outside the scheme in Saskatchewan and yet the Medical Care Insurance Commission is picking up the bills, in many cases at a lesser figure, of course. If you are dealing with a specialist you certainly don't get the full repayment and the dentists are not asking for the full repayment. They are asking that they be paid on the same basis as the cost of the girls who are doing the work.

The Minister said that this scheme would cost in the neighborhood of \$1.8 million for the first year. Now I presume that's a full 12 months, not just 1974. There are some 15,000 patients to be treated and this to me looks like \$120 per patient.

All the dental nurses are not on staff, there'll be 35 on staff by August 1st so a good portion of that 12 months will have disappeared before the plan really gets under way, so that the \$120 cost per patient is really not for a full year, it is for a portion of a year.

Then he goes on to say that there will be besides this operating cost of \$1.8 million, capital costs of \$1.7 million. Of that latter figure a million and a half will be for dental equipment and pretty close to half of that first year cost will be non-recurring start-up costs. Even if none of it recurred you've got \$1.7 million at 8 per cent for the first year, that's \$136,000 divided by 15,000 patients, so you've got another \$9, so your total cost is now up to \$129. That's for the first year. In five years if all the children up to 12 are being treated, I believe there are something like 140,000. I don't think it's fair maybe to multiply by 129 but it may not be too unrealistic, because of inflation and added costs here and there. So sometime within five years when we get up to this 12-year old group, we could be spending anywhere from \$10 million to \$20 million, and I leave lots of leeway there because if it worked out to \$129 apiece, it would be \$18 million. So I think the public are entitled to know the type of scheme we are getting into.

First of all, it is not a dental scheme provided by dentists it's a dental scheme provided by lesser trained people under some type of supervision by dentists. Secondly, there is no freedom of choice, you are either in the scheme or you are out of the scheme. If you are out of the scheme you will pay the shot yourself. Thirdly, it is going to be quite a costly scheme.

If the people of Saskatchewan are prepared to foot the bill

March 4, 1974

to a tune of \$129 for every child, then I guess you've introduced the right type of plan. I think in all fairness to the voters of this province that they are entitled to know just what it is going to cost them.

I would hope that when the Minister closes debate that he will be able to enlighten us on some of these reservations that we have because I dare say that if we had remained the government, some form of a dental scheme for children under 12 would have been in the mill.

MR. ROMANOW: — Oh, come on; Gordon!

MR. GRANT: — You can oh and ah all you wish, but I can tell you that I am sure you fellows knew Mr. Thatcher well enough, and Mr. Steuart, that they would never have let me get involved with a pilot project unless they were receptive or fairly receptive to the other steps, because at the time that the pilot project was introduced, I can tell you gentlemen, that our Cabinet was fully aware of what this was leading to. That it wasn't just a three year federally funded project and that we were going to walk away from it if it looked like a good one. We were going to go ahead with it. So on the basis of that in all honesty, how could we oppose a dental plan of this nature when actually we were the ones that started it. You can't deny it, you can't deny it, not one single Member over there can deny it, because we were the ones that initiated it, with the help of the Federal Government, through that pilot project. We were the ones that got Doctor Currie from Calgary.

I was personally responsible for the hiring of Dr. Currie who was the father of this plan and was responsible for Dr. Currie and some dentists visiting various parts of this continent to ascertain the merit and value of dental nurses.

So you may try to mislead the public in that you have given birth to another brain child, but I would hope that the public will not be misled, that they will recognize that there are some people in this world who have the welfare of human beings at heart besides the NDPs and all you are doing really is launching a program that would have been launched in any event, whether you were in power or not.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. H. H. ROLFES: (Saskatoon Nutana South): — Mr. Speaker, just a few words on Bill No. 15. No, I didn't invent Bill 15, I have to give the Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek) credit for that, but I was absolutely certain that I heard the Member for Moose Jaw North say the other day that they were opposed to Bill 15 and would oppose it in second reading.

MR. MacDONALD: (Moose Jaw North): — Read my speech.

MR. ROLFES: — I must assume now, that the Member for Whitmore Park (Mr. Grant) is speaking for himself and not for the Members opposite. Didn't they also tell the Member for Whitmore Park, yes, we know Mr. Steuart, and I will say despite Mr. Steuart, you got the pilot project in Oxbow because if he had anything

to say about it, it would never have come to fruition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROLFES: — All you have to do is go through Hansard or go through the press to find what the Leader of the Opposition thinks. We know where he stands on anything that is progressive.

But, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Whitmore Park (Mr. Grant) said that we'll take credit for the birth of this particular plan. I'm not going to take credit for it and I'll give the credit for the pilot project to the Member for Whitmore Park. But let me also remind him that we know what often happens to births here in Saskatchewan and across Canada and thanks to Otto Lang and Trudeau they often end up in abortions.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROLFES: — I would say to the Member for Whitmore Park that that's what would have happened to his particular project in Oxbow, had they remained the Government.

Mr. Speaker, we often hear the phrase that doctors bury their mistakes. From personal experience I can say that mistakes of dentists often end-up in extractions. I have two extractions that certainly verify that statement. I want to relate to this House that when I was 18 years old I went to a dentist in Humboldt. I had a toothache and I asked him to fill it, but he said, no, no sense filling your teeth, your teeth are rotten and they have to be extracted. He said for \$5 I'll take an x-ray. I said all right, take an x-ray. He took an x-ray of my teeth and he said, yes, your teeth will have to come out. So he pulled my wisdom tooth, charged me a very nominal fee, I think it was \$6 at the time. Five years later, I went to another dentist in Saskatoon asking him also that I would like to have a tooth filled and he said, well, look you should take better care of your teeth. So I said, well there is no sense in taking better care of my teeth as a dentist took an x-ray and said that my teeth would have to come out. He said, look, I don't believe that. For another \$5 I will x-ray your teeth. He x-rayed my teeth, that happened to be in 1957. In 1957 he x-rayed my teeth and he said there's nothing wrong with your teeth. I still have my same teeth to this day. But thanks to a professional dentist, I have lost two of my molars.

I think it wouldn't have made any difference whether a hygienist or whether a dental nurse or whether the dentist that the Member for Maple Creek (Mr. Flasch) talked of, had pulled my molar teeth, they are gone.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that I think society has been too indoctrinated with this idea that unless you have a professional degree you are incompetent. I think that is absolute nonsense. If that were true, then without a doubt most of the Members on that side of the House and most of the Members on this side of the House would be incompetent and I am sure that that is not the case.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to say that I think that most of the people here are very, very kind to the professionals. I don't mind saying so that I think the costs of dentists today

March 4, 1974

are exorbitant. I believe they are "bloody well" too much and I think that 25 to 30 per cent of the people in this province simply cannot afford the present cost of dentists.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROLFES: — I want to say that I went into the dentist's office the other day and had my teeth cleaned and a dentist did not do the cleaning, a hygienist did it at a cost of \$16. All right, but the dentist was next door doing his supervision on another patient. Doing his extractions or fillings and I am sure making his \$60 or \$70 an hour on another patient.

I had a constituent phone me the other day. He said, "Look, when are you guys going to bring in low dental care, low cost dental care?" I said, what do you mean. "Well, he said, I just took my daughter to the dentist," — and I'll tell the Member for Whitmore Park (Mr. Grant) that that daughter would have qualified under our plan. The constituent said, "My daughter was just at the dentist and do you know what I had to pay for a filling?" I said, "Well, \$11 to \$15." He said, "You are pretty close, it was \$13." Thirteen dollars for 20 minutes of work.

Well, I am simply saying its fine for this gentleman, because he could afford it. And I can afford to pay the \$12 or \$13 and the Leader of the Opposition can well afford to pay \$20 for a filling, but there are 25 or 30 per cent who cannot afford to pay that amount.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROLFES: — Mr. Speaker, I want at this time, to congratulate the Member for Whitmore Park (Mr. Grant) for the stand he has taken on this Bill. I think he has let his conscience override his political affiliations. But I am also certain that the Member for Whitmore Park more than likely does not have the support of the other Members and I would expect the others to oppose this Bill as they have opposed the abolition of medicare premiums and so on.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the Member for Saskatoon University (Mr. Richards) that if there is a weakness in this Bill, it's that the Minister of Health did not again bring in the Fluoridation Bill. I supported it last year and I'll support it again this year or next year. Well, next year if he brings it in. I'll support it the year after, inside or outside of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROLFES: — Mr. Speaker, the Member for Whitmore Park indicated that he had three things against this Bill. One of them he said was that parents just don't have a choice. That's really not true. The parents do have a choice. They can either enrol their children in the plan or go to a regular dentist. And I can assure you that the 25 or 30 per cent of the low and middle income group will select this plan, because they had no choice before. They couldn't afford the high exorbitant costs under no plan.

Mr. Speaker, I think this Bill is just too important a Bill to let go for second reading and since I have further words to say I wish to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Snyder that Bill No. 44 — **An Act to amend The Labour Standards Act, 1969** be now read a second time.

MR. E. KAEDING: (Saltcoats): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few words in support of the amendments contained in Bill No. 44.

There are many people in the work force of our province who for reason of lack of training or a lack of opportunity or other reasons are required to move from one job to another much more frequently than the average. Many of these people, because of their short tenure on their jobs, seldom reach the present requirements of three years of service required before they can get three weeks holidays with pay.

The provisions of this Bill will finally give these people the same benefits as are enjoyed by the larger groups who are covered by union agreements in providing three weeks holidays after one year of service.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, no one will dispute the fact that in our modern technological society all employees should be entitled to that much free time.

In the potash industry, which is a dominant employer in our constituency, the turnover of labor force is very rapid, yet many of these employees work under rather adverse conditions, it is dusty, it is noisy and abrasive. Anyone who may have been down in the mine or in the mill or in the loadout would know the salty and dirty conditions these people work under. Surely three weeks of rest from such employment could not be considered excessive.

If these employees are required to work three years to be entitled to three weeks vacation many of them would never reach that stage. In spite of the provisions of The Occupational Health and Safety Act which was a major stride in bringing better and more healthful conditions to our industries, there still is a long way to go before workers can be said to be working in satisfactory conditions in the potash mining area.

I should also like to support the amendment that wages of an employee should be a trust on the part of the employers and should provide an absolute first charge on assets of an employer when bankruptcy action takes place. We all know of instances when employees have been left behind in their attempt to recover unpaid wages. Any improvement in their legal rights in this regard will be welcome.

I also support, Mr. Speaker, the provision being incorporated in this Act to prohibit the firing of an employee because a garnishee has been registered against him. Although it can be argued that this law applied against a delinquent employee has in some cases resulted in payment of accounts more often than not the result has been that the employee was discharged. This not only resulted in the employee being forced to find new

March 4, 1974

employment, causing further financial problems, but the debtor was frustrated and he would have to start the action all over again with the new employer if, indeed, the garnisheed worker was able to find another job in that area.

This new protection for employees would, therefore, give him additional security on his job and at the same time provide a method of debt collection in those cases where such action was warranted.

These amendments are another indication of the determination of this Government to provide greater security, better working conditions and more leisure time in conformity with the new requirements of today's society. It is increasingly difficult for employers to obtain sufficiently qualified help in this province since many of these benefits are now available in other areas. With the current strong demand for labor and a large variety of employment, it is incumbent on us to maintain a high standard in labour legislation.

Bill 44 goes a long way to up-dating our labor standards. I will, therefore, be supporting the Bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. G. T. SNYDER: (Minister of Labour): — Mr. Speaker, I want to add just a very few brief words with respect to the amendments to The Labour Standards Act that are under discussion at the moment.

I must say, first of all, Mr. Speaker, that I was somewhat encouraged by the tone of voice and the lack of hysteria that seemed to be evident when the Member for Moose Jaw North (Mr. MacDonald) spoke, because I can recall in years gone by the hysteria, the rancor, the venom, that was generated from Liberal benches, at any point of time when anything was brought forward to improve the working conditions, hours of work or labour standards generally, for Saskatchewan's working men and women in the province. I thought the Member for Moose Jaw North spoke with a very well modulated voice, with a lack of hysteria and without those cries of anguish that usually emanate from Liberal benches. I couldn't quite understand it, Mr. Speaker, except to come to the conclusion that perhaps Liberals opposite have somehow learned a lesson from the events of bygone days.

I recall very clearly, Mr. Speaker, in the days of the Thatcher Liberal administration, the war that was declared on the working people of Saskatchewan and Members opposite I know they recall the disastrous results of 1964 when a great deal of their rancor and the venom which they generated worked to their detriment in that particular general election. I think that a more recent example was one which could be seen in the general election in Great Britain when Prime Minister Heath called a general election almost on that precise topic, using the Trade Union movement, the working people of that country as a whipping boy for all of the national ills of that country.

Well Mr. Speaker, the principal provision of The Labour Standards amendment which is before you has to do with extended annual vacations. I said on second reading that these extended benefits would provide for a more reasonable degree of leisure time for Saskatchewan's working men and women. It would provide

the opportunity for study and for educational up-grading. But perhaps there is an even more important feature which should be considered, Mr. Speaker, and that is the phenomenon that we find in the Province of Saskatchewan where large numbers of skilled tradesmen, graduating from our vocational institutions, are only in Saskatchewan long enough to pack their bags after graduation and travel to points beyond our provincial boundaries to take a job in Alberta or Manitoba in light of the fact that the wages there are superior to ours. With the skills that they have, they can demand a greater degree of monetary return than is the case in the Province of Saskatchewan.

I think it is fitting to note, Mr. Speaker, that this phenomenon has been noted and a great deal of concern has been generated and the construction association themselves are indicating a concern that this summer, skilled tradesmen, graduating from our technical and vocational institutions will not be available to take care of the building needs in the construction industry.

I think, perhaps, Mr. Speaker, that the additional vacation benefits provided to Saskatchewan's workers after one year with one employer may just be a factor in keeping those skilled tradesmen in the Province of Saskatchewan where our vacation benefits are superior to our neighboring provinces. Certainly it won't be the wage scale in Saskatchewan, nor the balmy weather, that attracts them and causes them to remain in our province.

Just have a look at the wage scale, Mr. Speaker, and I think it is important that we should view the things that have happened since the year 1965. In 1965 Saskatchewan's average wage was \$3.12 greater than was the case in the Province of Manitoba. By 1972 Manitoba had overtaken us and the average weekly wage in the Province of Manitoba was in 1972, \$4.54 higher than was the case in the Province of Saskatchewan.

The Province of Alberta has always been out in front of Saskatchewan in terms of average weekly wages. In 1965 Alberta had an average weekly wage that was \$5.85 higher than Saskatchewan was. By 1972, after seven years of Liberal rule and Bill No. 2 and all the other component parts that Members opposite know all about, that spread had grown from \$5.85 to \$20.88.

I think that these are factors that need to be borne in mind in terms of providing labour standards in the Province of Saskatchewan that are attractive in terms of keeping skilled tradesmen and other people in the Province of Saskatchewan. We think that this is a good province in which to live and to raise a family. I think that it is a matter of giving the skilled tradesmen additional inducement to stay in our province. I think, without question, this may in some way raise our expectations in terms of keeping these people, who are highly transient in their nature of employment. Oftentimes a young person graduating from a vocational institution is single, without any family ties and able to move to neighboring provinces with relative ease.

I think these are some features to be considered when we are talking in terms of keeping Saskatchewan's labor standards at least in line, if not somewhat in advance, of the labor standards in the provinces to the east and west of us.

The other features other than the annual vacation

March 4, 1974

provisions I think are additional benefits, some additional security offered to working people in terms of the provisions which I talked about on second reading related to garnishee proceedings. I will not go into that again except to say, Mr. Speaker, that I believe the Bill to be a forward step, one that I believe will be recognized as a pace setter in Saskatchewan certainly and for the other provinces particularly to the east and west of us and I would hope that Members opposite would show their good judgement and good faith by supporting this Bill on second reading.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time on the following Recorded Division:

YEAS — 36

Messieurs

Dyck	Thorson	Steuart
Meakes	Carlson	Coupland
Romanow	Cody	Loken
Messer	Robbins	Guy
Snyder	Matsalla	Boldt
Bowerman	Owens	Grant
Larson	Mostoway	McIsaac
Brockelbank	Feduniak	Gardner
MacMurchy	Rolfes	Weatherald
Pepper	Hanson	Lane
Michayluk	Kaeding	Wiebe
Byers	Flasch	Malone

NAYS — Nil

Messieurs

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Messer that Bill No. 28 — **An Act respecting the Agricultural Machinery Institute** be now read a second time.

MR: M. FEDUNIAK: (Turtleford): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words in regard to Bill No. 28.

In 1961 the CCF Government at that time introduced and implemented a Bill known as The Saskatchewan Agricultural Machinery Administration. This Bill was designed to conduct tests on farm machinery, wide in variety, of Saskatchewan's crop soil and climatic conditions as was possible. The results were factual details, free of bias and based on scientific measurements. The conclusions and the recommendations of these tests were based on laboratory tests, control use tests, expert opinion on experience but mostly on extended operations under actual farm conditions in Saskatchewan. These tests fell into two categories, functional and durability.

Functional tests were used to determine how the implement worked. Durability tests were to determine how long will the implement work. Typical measurements were made as part of the functional tests in various conditions, draft horsepower, capacities, weed kill, grain losses, etc. In addition, ease of handling, adjustment and safety were evaluated. Durability was based on the mechanical failures of the machine while being

operated in the field for a total time approximately from four to five years of normal Saskatchewan use.

The test report provided information which the purchaser could use in making a selection of the machines that best suited his particular farm where the purchase cost was to be considered as well in order to arrive at the best buy. The retail price F.O.B. Regina was also included in these reports.

Of the many factors measured in testing of any individual machine some proved to be insignificant while others were important considerations in machine selection. In these reports information concerning the significant factors of performance were shown. Where these factors were insignificant only a statement in this regard was shown. Many recommendations were also made to correct the performance and durability of all machines.

Mr. Speaker, this Bill gave many advantages to manufacturers. They obtained an evaluation and performance report on this machine for Saskatchewan conditions by an unbiased scientific service which was useful in marketing his machine. They obtained the capacity and power requirements of his machine in various Saskatchewan conditions and this avoided overselling with subsequent difficulties.

They obtained engineering service to assist them in offering a more suitable machine for Saskatchewan farming conditions. This was the result of extensive normal field work on this machine during one season and provided the opportunity to correct, by redesigning and improvement, any weaknesses which became apparent during the test period.

Mr. Speaker, most major machine manufacturers welcomed this service. To the purchasers it was most helpful. Mr. Speaker, because this was a good Bill, the Liberal Government during their term cancelled it.

Mr. Speaker, Bill 28 an Act respecting the Agricultural Machinery Institute will do everything that the AMA Bill did and I am happy to support it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. E. KAEDING: (Saltcoats): — Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to say how pleased I was to hear that the Prairie Agricultural Machinery Institute was going to become a reality this year, and that the Minister of Agriculture has been able to get the headquarters of this institute in this province. I would have preferred, of course, to have him put the headquarters in my constituency but I was very glad indeed, to see him recognize that it should be outside one of the major cities and I believe Humboldt was a good choice.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. KAEDING: — At a time when the cost of farm machinery constitutes a very major share of the capital cost of owning a farm enterprise I am convinced we need an institute such as outlined in Bill 28, to test and evaluate the host of new machines being offered on the market today.

March 4, 1974

Because many of the machines being offered are designed and built in parts of the world where operating conditions are totally different from those experienced on the prairies, the possibility of machines coming on the market which are, in their present form, totally unsuited to our conditions, is very real. Our farmers, mechanically minded as they are, cannot afford the luxury of experimenting with these kinds of equipment, without danger of considerable financial loss. With power equipment selling in the neighborhood of \$10,000 to \$25,000 and other equipment at proportionately higher cost, he needs some facility which can evaluate their machines and give an unbiased opinion of their suitability. Many high quality machines are being produced by overseas manufacturers, which may be highly acceptable in their home market, but fail to meet our requirements here. By putting them through a series of tests based on our conditions many of these machines can be adapted to our own needs, and I see this as a very valuable part of the work of this institute.

We also have an increasing number of small machinery companies springing up on the prairies, which do not have the facilities or the capital to test and evaluate their new inventions and as a result, may fail to get into production simply for lack of proper engineering guidance and testing procedures.

Governments have talked a lot over the years of establishing a farm machinery industry in Western Canada. I see this institute as a first and very necessary step to making such development possible.

Many of us here today remember the first agriculture machinery administration set up by the previous CCF Government in the 1950s and which was so ruthlessly and unceremoniously destroyed by the Liberal Government in 1965 to please some of their corporate friends in the machine companies. This was one of the first punitive actions taken by that government, which led to their ultimate decimation in 1971. Farmers appreciated and valued the service being performed by that test station and never really forgave the Liberals for that uncalled for action. Many of us still have the results of the tests made by that station during those years and still refer to some of their findings.

The new institute will hopefully operate in conjunction with the University of Saskatchewan and in co-operation with the other western provinces and hopefully – maybe in the distant future – but hopefully, with the Federal Government. With this broad financial base we should be able to establish a testing facility second to none on this continent, and in fact, except for the tractor test station in Nebraska, it should be the only really independent test facility on the continent for farm related machinery.

Machines tested at the station and found deficient could be redesigned by their parent companies to meet our standards and returned for re-evaluation. Through this process many of the weaknesses now showing up in farmers' fields would be intercepted and corrected before machines left the assembly lines. With test reports and pamphlets being issued to the public on performance, most companies would hesitate to introduce a new line until proper testing had been done. Too often in the past, Mr. Speaker, the testing was done at the expense of unsuspecting farmers who bought machines in good faith only to find them

unsatisfactory, but having little recourse but to take their beating and try to get on as best they could.

In order to be of the greatest value it should be mandatory that test reports made on all machines should be publicly displayed by the dealer selling the equipment. In this way, a prospective customer could inform himself of the kind of performance he could reasonably expect to get from any specific machine.

I am extremely enthusiastic about the impact that this institute could have on the development of new machines on the prairies. There are a host of inventors on our farms who have developed improvements on existing machines and designed new items of value to the agricultural industry. Because they have not had any facility to help them, many of these new designs have ended up in the wastepaper baskets. With the introduction of this program, Mr. Speaker, I can see many of these coming forward to the benefit of the industry.

Hopefully the institute can act quickly to attain standardization of parts on much of our locally produced equipment. The long-standing complaint of all western farmers has been the multiplicity of bearings, wheels, tire sizes, hydraulic couplers and so on, which they have had to contend with in the past. Any improvement in cross-referencing would be appreciated by all farmers and servicemen.

Although some of the Members opposite were instrumental in destroying the original concept of agricultural machinery testing, I am confident that they will have learned and will support this new and better proposal and will vote for this Bill.

Mr. Speaker, I will be supporting Bill 28, a Bill to set up an agricultural machinery institute.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. P. P. MOSTOWAY: (Hanley): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to mention a few points, naturally, in support of this Bill.

First of all, I wanted to mention that I believe that one Member opposite had mentioned that it was the intention of the former administration to have a lot of the work that the old Agricultural Machinery Act had done to be done by the Research Council. Well, I had occasion to talk to an official in the Research Council today, and he informs me that in no way were they ever asked at that time — or I might even add within the last few years — to do any sort of testing of agricultural machinery, although they had involved themselves in the management aspect of machinery, small companies, etc., but no actual testing. I must have got the wrong impression, deliberately or otherwise, from the Hon. Member. I forget who he was.

AN HON. MEMBER: — The Member for Moose Hill!

MR. MOSTOWAY: — The Member for Moose Hill, okay! Mr. Speaker, I believe that this Agricultural Machinery Institute that will be set up in conjunction with the three provinces, will literally save millions — hundreds of millions of dollars — to the farmers of this province. It will save in the form of parts, which

often break down. Sometimes people wonder whether these parts aren't made to deliberately break down very, very quickly. It will save millions of dollars in parts and also in labor, because when these parts break down it involves the farmer having to knock off two or three days either to do the job himself or to go to the dealer and have it done by him, or some central authority and they usually can't do it for two or three weeks. It will help to standardize parts. Farmers find it ridiculous that there should be a host of parts and none of them exactly the same in measurements. Maybe one is one thousandths of an inch bigger or smaller than the other. Farmers sometimes suspect that this is deliberate.

I would suggest, Mr. Minister, that when this AMI is set up, that the equipment of all companies will be tested thoroughly, not like the old AMA where I believe they tried to seek the permission of the companies involved before they would come out with their report. Naturally, some of the companies weren't prone to give an approval for having this report circulated to the farmers. It is my hope that anything they come up with, any testing, whether it be good, bad, whether they have the permission of the company or not, that this information be given to the farmers of Saskatchewan. I also hope that the findings will be broadcast to all the people. They could use the agricultural representatives, and also mailing lists. I've had numerous farmers in my area say that they were very pleased receiving information via mailing lists from the old AMA.

The old AMA, I believe most people would grant, did persuade many companies to change their machinery, adapt the machinery to the conditions found in Saskatchewan, and I naturally assume that this will be carried on under the new Act.

Mr. Speaker, I know that many farmers in my area are going to be supporting the institution of this AMI. Many dealers will as well, and I wholeheartedly support this Bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. D. BOLDT: (Rosthern): — Mr. Speaker, may I just say a few words.

I was a Member of the Government at the time when the former Bill — or the former institution for testing machinery was thrown out and . . .

MR. ROMANOW: — Dave, what did you do that for?

MR. BOLDT: — Well, I'll tell you, I am a farmer, you're not, you are a lawyer. You don't know anything about farming.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BOLDT: — Because I want to tell you, I want to compare the former testing agency to the Ombudsman that we have today. It ran very much along a similar line. I am going to read from the first annual report and on page 31, item 7332001 it says, the Ombudsman Mr. Boychuk writes the following:

On July 26, 1973, an employee informed the office that

since commencing work with the Department of Northern Saskatchewan, he had only received one pay cheque. A search indicated that in addition to the cheque he had received as payment for his training period, two other cheques had been forwarded to him, one of which had already cleared the bank, bearing his signature, and the second was sent the day of the complaint — bringing his wages up-to-date.

Now, do we really need an office that pays about \$30,000 or more to find this kind of information? And I want to go to page 35 and here again we have a very similar incident.

MR. ROMANOW: — Get on with the Bill.

MR. BOLDT: — I will, I will, we've got lots of time.

MR. ROMANOW: — Are you objecting to the Ombudsman then?

MR. BOLDT: — Oh, I've not got much use for the office. Because you know, these things, if they were taken up with a civil servant or with the director, or with all the open lines that you have the Minister (Mr. Brockelbank) sitting in Saskatoon. All you had to do was to phone and Mr. Brockelbank's office would have taken about three months to look after it, and after six months he would have got the cheque . . .

MR. MESSER: — . . . paid.

MR. BOLDT: — Now I got this literature from the . . .

MR. MESSER: — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order. I was wondering if Mr. Boldt is debating the right Bill. We are talking about the Machinery Testing Institute and I have listened to him very carefully for a couple of minutes now and he is talking about the office of the Ombudsman. He may not agree with that office, but it does not have any direct relationship to the Machinery Testing Institute which we are discussing in the Legislature this evening. I wonder if you could bring that to his attention, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Don't give me the gears.

MR. SPEAKER: — I was thinking that the Member was attempting to tie it in, and I would hope that he will do so.

MR. BOLDT: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I know that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) doesn't want me to criticize any part of the Government. What I fail to see, and the Agricultural Machinery Institute will be receiving machinery that is already in production, it's being sold by the dealers, by my friend who just spoke a few minutes ago, and I think personally, the farmer is by far the better tester than any agency of government because the agency will be testing it in certain areas — in this case mainly around the Humboldt area. The land, stony conditions, soil in particular, has a great deal to do with the type

March 4, 1974

of testing and I also believe that if the farmer registers these complaints the dealer will certainly look after it and there is nothing that the dealer hates more than to have a bunch of angry farmers come in and tell him that either the belt doesn't work or the bearing goes out, or this or that, within a year, that this will be fixed.

These reports that came from the former machinery testing agency, and I am sure that my farm friends on the other side of the House will agree, that they looked at a Case combine and^ they said, 'well, there was something wrong with the sickle. This was mentioned to the company and this already has been rectified. Even before the complaint was made.

So we are duplicating. I am not going to be opposed to it because there are friends in the farming industry that like that kind of literature, they want to read it. I don't know how much value it really contributes. I would far sooner see, if there is a need to protect the public, I would far sooner see that you go into the automobile business. Why not check the Chrysler cars? Why not check the General Motors cars and trucks? I hear more complaints about cars, more complaints about the heavy-duty trucks. Many, many complaints about the automobile aviation, or the manufacturers than I do about, farm implements. The dealers and the farm implement companies are very interested, and my teacher friend from Rosthern — he lives in Rosthern constituency now — says that the machine copies deliberately make some parts so that they will break. That's a very foolish statement coming from a foolish teacher. Coming from a teacher, I think it's a very foolish statement because after all this machine is guaranteed for one year. If the company wants to give me 15 bearings that break continuously well that's fine, it's their cost. The dealer is going to be mad at the company.

It depends so much upon the dealer. I have driven in certain areas. When I started farming you couldn't see anything but a Massey combine and a Massey tractor, then the dealer sold out and we got the John Deere in for a while. A real good dealer he was, he gave good service. People were buying John Deere machinery as if the Case and others had gone out of style. Then you go to another area and you see just Case machinery, solid Case. I know exactly why they are there, because you have got a real good dealer. In another area you will find International, that's a top notch machine. I can tell you that I basically believe in the Massey Ferguson equipment for one reason. If the dealer in Dalmeny would have had John Deere, I would have had John Deere equipment, and if he would have had Case, I would have had Case, because that man gave service. All I am interested in is service. I think most of the farmers are interested in service. But this is one of the dangers that I see — not the dangers, but one of the problems — that the testing institute will have is that before you have found what is wrong with that machine, you might have sold 100 combines for \$25,000 or \$30,000 each and they are in the farmers' hands. The farmers will find some complaints — you can't test a combine in spring, you can't test in summer, you test it when you harvest, when all the other combines and farmers are testing. As soon as a breakdown occurs, it goes to the dealer and dealer to the company and they know exactly where the weak spot is. By next year — I always advise my farmer friends if there is a new combine coming out, let it be the Massey Ferguson 750 or the 760. I wouldn't buy that

machine the first year it came out. There is always trouble with the first machine and for that reason I think that this testing, the institute has a strike against it before it gets in motion. The machines are in the farmers' hands, they are not being tested before the harvest season — I am talking about harvest equipment. Tractors, of course, you can test all year round or at least six months of the year.

I am not convinced that we need a great big institute for testing farm machinery because I am convinced that my farmer friends will agree that 'the machine companies have their engineers out visiting from farm to farm. If you are a big John Deere implement farmer, you have the field men coming from the factory. They will put some testing equipment on your machine if you will permit them to do so. I think your real concern should be what you promised in the New Deal for People and that is to try to keep the cost of machinery down. They have just sky-rocketed way out of line, some machines must be at least 75 per cent higher in cost today than they were two or three years ago. Let's hear something from the farmers, I just hear some yapping from the school teachers. I'd like to hear the farmers.

Morris-Rod Weeder, which is one of the better implement manufacturers in the province, the dealer in Saskatoon told me that the repairs on a rod weeder from last spring to this spring were up 35 per cent and they were expecting another 30 per cent increase this year. That is the concern that we should be really worried about, where these costs go out of line. As I say there are farmers who liked the former testing done by the provincial government or by the agency. I have no quarrel with them if they want to read these, I thought they were outdated just like the Ombudsman. He is doing an awful lot of work; he is a real fine sharp lawyer, who looks after silly little things. Where is the cheque, the cheque is in the mail. A complaint you should direct to social workers — that's what we got the civil service for. We pay him \$30,000 for that.

I read through this book. In many of the complaints that were here, there is no need to have a \$30,000 salaried office to look after these small complaints. I can look after some and the MLAs can look after the others, you have the people in the various departments that will look after them as well. It is another bureaucracy that you are setting up to employ a group of people running around at government expense. I would question very seriously whether we shall have full value, it will have some value.

I will not vote against the Bill, I am not enthusiastic about supporting it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. H. OWENS: (Elrose): — Mr. Speaker, I think we should congratulate our Minister of Agriculture for the job that he has done in setting up the Agriculture Machinery Institute.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. OWENS: — We talk about it replacing the old AMA (Agriculture Machinery Act) which it certainly does. The work our Minister

March 4, 1974

has done has broadened the scope of this institute to such an extent that it is hardly even a cousin to the old AMA.

I hope that I can keep myself from being a bit biased because sometimes when you deal with a certain line of machinery for a number of years you can't even look at another line without finding fault with it. Maybe this is one of the reasons I should like to say a few words about this particular institute.

The former administration saw fit to cancel the Agriculture Machinery Administration. Thanks to our Minister and the co-operation of the other two Ministers from Manitoba and Alberta this type of a deal can be perpetuated. The base that this machinery institute is set up on cannot be cancelled out by the stroke of the pen of one man anymore.

I really believe that the Opposition feel that they made a mistake when they cancelled the former administration. Farmers looked with enthusiasm, in fact, they asked for the reports made by the machinery administration, not just to know what kind of machine that they might have, but they want to compare it with other machines on the market. This is the only place you could get this kind of information.

I believe the Member for Moosomin (Mr. Gardner) speaking a couple of days ago on this Bill, tried to make us believe that the AMA was transferred to the University of Saskatchewan, complete with staff. This is kind of odd to me because I know of some people who worked in that administration who never did get to the University as far as testing machines were concerned. So I don't know what happened to some of these fellows, they certainly didn't get up there. I have nothing against the University Administration Research Department. I think they do a good job. But as we all know they are an independent university and they cannot make comparison. They can research, they can give you the data, but they cannot compare. This is one place where the University of Saskatchewan is very loath to do, is to compare one machine with another, this is beyond their terms of reference.

Therefore, it is extremely valuable that this great service is being reinstated. Most manufacturers are anxious to know the weak spots so that adjustment can be made and it can be accomplished quickly and satisfactorily, especially when it is made when the weak spot is found out in the field. As it has been said so often before, the machine that is made for one part of the world may not work satisfactorily in another. With ever-increasing capital costs farmers are becoming ever increasingly sophisticated in their buying habits. Machinery manufacturers are learning this very rapidly, they do not want machines to come to the field that are not satisfactory and they will be happy, I am sure, to have this means of finding out how their machine stacks up against machines of a similar type out in the field.

With the ever diminishing numbers of dealerships it is imperative that the viable dealerships still remaining in business provide an ever widening service. In this regard a cross reference system on standard or interchangeable parts is an absolute essential. May I suggest that the institute accept a leading role in this very valuable service for the dealers and the farmers and western Canada as a whole.

With the millions of dollars invested on farm machinery in western Canada it is an unforgivable lack of oversight by our Governments to ask and expect the farmers to accept the sales pitch by the salesmen and the brochures from the manufacturers to be the sole source of information as to the making of a decision on the purchase of a major piece of equipment which could cost them, as the Member from Saltcoats (Mr. Kaeding) mentioned, anywhere from \$10,000 to \$25,000 or even to \$30,000.

I might add that servicewise the major pieces of equipment are much more satisfactory and much more satisfactorily serviced than a minor piece of equipment, which is sometimes extremely essential to the operator but these pieces of machinery receive very minor consideration as far as the manufacturer or the distributor are concerned leaving the dealer in an almost impossible position.

I realize that all the i's cannot be dotted and all the t's cannot be crossed immediately. However, considering the broad base upon which the institute is based I firmly believe the three western provinces are embarking on a program of honest benefit to the farming population. Let us not forget that whatever is good for the farming community of the West is good for everyone in the West, in fact in all of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, this Government is fulfilling another promise made to the Saskatchewan farmers and now with the co-operation of Manitoba and Alberta will be providing unprecedented service to Canada. Once again Saskatchewan is leading the way in a very needed and necessary service.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: — I wish Members would rise before the question is posed.

MR. GUY: — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order, I think you have already called the question, they had plenty of time to make their remarks known whether they were going to adjourn the debate. I think the question has been called, I think it should be carried through. It is a procedure of the House, and it should be carried out as such.

MR. ROMANOW: — I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

MR. GUY: — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order. I think you had called the question and I wish you would carry through with your intention as you had showed.

MR. SPEAKER: — I agree, I was in the process of putting the motion when the Attorney General rose. I say that if Members wish to adjourn the debate they should rise before I ask the question.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I apologize to the House for not having risen earlier. I know this has happened on two or three

March 4, 1974

occasions in the past from our side and from their side. I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 8:48 o'clock p.m.