

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fourth Session — Seventeenth Legislature
41st Day

Monday, April 1, 1974.

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

QUESTIONS

Weight Restrictions on Municipal Roads

Mr. T. M. Weatherald (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I should like to direct a question to the Acting Minister of Municipal Affairs.

It was recently announced, Mr. Speaker, that changes in policy regarding farm deliveries to elevators would allow farmers to deliver to the elevator point of their choice. It is obvious that this is of some concern to farmers meeting the weight restriction on municipal roads. I should like to ask the Minister whether the Minister intends to initiate discussions regarding weight restrictions, regarding a common policy for the municipal road system?

Hon. J. R. Messer (Acting Minister of Municipal Affairs): — Mr. Speaker, in response to the Member for Cannington's question, I know that there certainly is a good deal of concern in regard to whether the weight limitations on especially grid roads is going to restrict or inhibit in any way the movement of grain which is of primary concern not only to the farmers themselves but also the agencies responsible for moving the grain to the ports for shipment. I want to bring to the Members' attention that certainly the municipalities will have to have a good degree of input because a good deal of the damage, if damage is going to be done to roads by moving volumes of grain over them during the spring period, will be a responsibility of the municipality. I, therefore, think they have to initiate or instigate the discussions and give some recommendations or indication as to what role they would like to see the Government participate in. At this point in time I have not had any contact with any representative of individual municipalities with regard to waiving the limitations and then asking for some provincial participation in regard to whatever damages may occur to those roads.

Mr. Weatherald: — Just a supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I take it then that the Government does not intend to initiate a policy of its own but is in the position of waiting for the municipalities to contact you as to what may be done.

Mr. Messer: — I am not really saying that. What I am saying is that I should like to have some indication from the municipalities themselves in regard to what they may see as the problem if limitations are lifted. Certainly, it will be up to the individual municipality to waive the weight limits. I don't think that it would be right for the Provincial Government to establish in some arbitrary way the use of all municipal roads

Without regard for limitation of weight during the spring months. I think it is still the responsibility of the municipal councils for their respective RMs to waive those responsibilities and then indicate to the Government any problems that may occur.

Tightening of Abortion Laws

Mr. E. C. Malone (Regina Lakeview): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I have a question for the Attorney General.

I have had a news report brought to my attention in today's Leader-Post, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Justice for Canada, Mr. Lang, approximately a year ago asked all Attorney's General across Canada to do something about tightening up the application of present abortion laws. In view of this report I am asking the Attorney General, what, if anything, did he do as a result of this request from Mr. Lang?

Hon. R. Romanow (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, we considered the request very carefully and I believe I had some discussions with my colleague, the Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek) who in some ways is as directly involved in this, if not more so, than I am. As a result, at the time, it is some time now since I received the letter, certainly no further action was taken by myself or by my Department officials. That's the answer to the Member.

Mr. Malone: — By way of a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is your Department or the Department of Health studying the existing laws with a view to taking action at this time?

Mr. Romanow: — I can answer that sort of yes and no, in the sense that the Department people on the criminal side are examining the law — the criminal aspects of the law as it relates not only to abortion but there are two or three other items of concern. There is, I am advised, a meeting of Provincial Attorneys General lined up sometime in the month of May in which event several matters of this nature will be under discussion. As I say, that is the yes part of it.

The no part of it is that we don't have specifically any examination of the abortion laws.

SECOND READINGS

Hon. G. Snyder (Minister of Labour) moved second reading of **Bill No. 80 — An Act to provide for Compensation for Workers for injuries sustained in the course of their Employment.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, the Bill which I am asking the Legislature to consider in principle today, represents a major change in the benefit structure of Workmen's Compensation in the Province of Saskatchewan. It brings the level of benefits payable to beneficiaries to a more realistic figure keeping in mind rising living costs and acknowledging at the same time the neglect of years gone by.

Workers' Compensation, Mr. Speaker, since its inception has been regarded as a mutual form of insurance. Not only does it provide employees with the assurance of economic security for

them and for their families in the event of an industrial accident, but it also protects the employers from the possibility of financial ruin as a result of a damage claim.

Traditionally, Mr. Speaker, workers' compensation has removed the need for litigation. It is no longer necessary to show that the employer is negligent in any way or that his machinery is defective.

Since the introduction of Workmen's Compensation, costly legal proceedings have not been necessary. Today, under Workmen's Compensation, an injured worker is guaranteed consideration of his claim regardless of fault. In return, he has relinquished his right to sue his employer. Obviously, Mr. Speaker, benefits from the Workers' Compensation legislation flow both ways. The worker receives prompt handling of his claim without litigation and the employer is immune from individual liability suits.

Mr. Speaker, when I was appointed Minister of Labour in 1971, there were several major problems confronting the Department of Labour. Most of these problems stemmed from the fact that after seven years of neglect by a Liberal Government of that day, the Department's programs had become outdated or at the best were inadequately administered mainly due to lack of personnel and to lack of attention.

However, by far the most serious problem to deal with at that time was the Workmen's Compensation system. This system, had become over the last several years, particularly since 1964, not only outdated but distrusted and to a very large degree looked upon with anger by the very people that the system was designed to serve, the injured employees themselves.

The reputation of the Workmen's Compensation Board was in almost total disarray and disrepute. I was receiving literally hundreds of letters from injured workers who were convinced that they had not been given a fair deal by the system. The problem was a very large one, Mr. Speaker, and because it was, we wanted to make sure that our response to it was a planned and reasoned one.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Snyder: — In the late fall of 1971 we appointed a Task Force chaired by Judge Allister Muir, with members from both labor and the business community. We asked them to make recommendations to us with respect to improving the Workmen's Compensation system. We made it clear to the Task Force that their scope was not limited. That we wanted them to consider both the philosophy and the administration of the legislation. Upon receiving an interim report from the Task Force we did take certain steps which were not in any way intended to be a total solution to the problems facing the system but merely interim measures designed to remove some of the worst effects of existing problems.

We increased benefits at that time by an across the board increase of five per cent. We increased the income ceiling for the purpose of calculating compensation, raising the ceiling from \$6,600 to \$8,400 per annum. But most important, I believe, Mr. Speaker, at that time we appointed the Workmen's Advocate.

Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, when we established the position

April 1, 1974

of Workers' Advocate, we did not realize the full extent to which those services would be required. But we did know that there were a great number of injured workers and their families who obviously felt that they had in some way been mistreated by the Board.

We provided the Workmen's Advocate with the authority to receive complaints, to examine workers' compensation files and otherwise assist injured workers and their dependents with respect to compensation.

The response, Mr. Speaker, was both frightening and gratifying. Frightening in the sense that some injured workers had become so embittered after years of struggle with the Board that they had been permanently emotionally scarred. For others the experience was not so severe, although many had borne economic hardship as a result of what seems to have been an excessive "guarding of the gold approach" by the previous Board.

The Workmen's Advocate during the past year has been able to assist vast numbers of those persons and their families in successful appeals to the Board. Mr. Speaker, the office of the Workmen's Advocate has done an exemplary job and should be commended for the advice and the assistance that has been provided to countless hundreds of injured workers and their families.

The Board for its part has also been most responsive. They have taken a fresh look at many cases and often when making adjustments have borne in mind the unnecessary hardship resulting from the previous Board's attitude.

Mr. Speaker, as a result of that combination, I and I would venture to guess, all MLAs are receiving a minute fraction of the compensation complaints that they were receiving as late as two years ago.

The Task Force for its part continued the investigation primarily through the mechanism of public hearings held in various locations throughout the province in the spring of 1972. More than 80 employer groups and trade unions as well as other interested parties, professional associations, such as the Law Society of Saskatchewan and every individual worker who had contacted the Department of Labour to register complaints written to by us asking them to make their feelings known to the Task Force.

Advertisements were placed in all daily and weekly newspapers throughout the province to ensure that all interested parties would have an opportunity to express their thoughts to the Task Force. Originally, Mr. Speaker, a deadline of February 15, 1972, was established for the submission of briefs, but in no case was an individual or a group turned down by the Task Force simply because they had not complied with that deadline.

The Task Force, Mr. Speaker, received over 130 briefs, as well as large numbers of letters from individuals who wished to make the Task Force aware of their particular problems in dealing with Workmen's Compensation but for one reason or another did not wish to submit briefs or appear at the public hearing.

I think, Mr. Speaker, the Task Force deserves credit for

the fact that no individual, no group, no association that requested an attendance at the public hearings was denied the right to attend or make a presentation.

After careful consideration of all presentations, after thoroughly studying the administration of the Workmen's Compensation Board and after many hours of private deliberations the Task Force presented a report to the Government in March, 1973 which contained 73 separate recommendations with regard to the compensation system.

I think it is worthwhile to note, Mr. Speaker, that the Task Force did not only operate as a conduit of public ideas to the Government, it was an independent body in its own right, and while in a position to digest the ideas presented to it, used its own insight also and its foresight in drafting those 73 recommendations contained in the report.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, many of the recommendations were very farsighted and were not simply a repetition of ideas presented to the Task Force.

It was our intention to use the Task Force Report to develop departmental labor policy with regard to Workmen's Compensation, we then felt it was important that the public be aware of what the Task Force recommended to us, and that they be given an opportunity to respond on those recommendations. For that reason we distributed over 600 copies of the report to various groups and individuals throughout the province.

In addition, officials of my Department and I, took two weeks during the summer of 1973 for the purpose of holding public hearings in a number of centres throughout the province so that all those persons who wished to discuss the report with us would have the opportunity to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I consider the Task Force Report to be an important forward looking document and I have no intention of allowing it to gather dust on some forgotten shelf.

The legislation which is before the House this afternoon marks a major step towards updating and upgrading Workmen's Compensation in Saskatchewan. I want to emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that it's only one step. There are other steps yet to be taken and much more remains to be done.

The Member for Moose Jaw North (Mr. MacDonald) has already noted that we have not legislated a future escalator which would protect pensions from the ongoing erosion suffered by fixed incomes because of inflation and increases in the cost of living. We haven't lost sight of that recommendation and we are continuing to give the matter most serious study in an attempt to find an appropriate mechanism by which this can be accomplished. We have not yet revised the schedule of industrial diseases under the Act but such a revision will certainly be made in the not too distant future. We have not yet implemented a dual heading system of pensions, which would treat physical disabilities separately from the pain and suffering occasioned by the injury. That Task Force recommendation has been given serious consideration and we are still endeavoring to find a suitable solution.

We have not at this time come forward with a universal

April 1, 1974

sick and accident programs but that recommendation, too, is receiving most careful scrutiny and attention.

I cite these examples, Mr. Speaker, to show that we are by no means finished with the report of the Task Force on Workmen's Compensation. We do not intend to sit back with the introduction of this legislation and rest on our laurels.

I am however, Mr. Speaker, proud of the legislation which is before you. It does, as I have said, go a long way towards improving workers' compensation in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Moose Jaw North was reported in the March 27th edition of the Leader-Post to have lamented that the Bill which is before the House does not contain a provision for lower assessment rates for employers with good safety records. I would only suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if the newspaper account was correct that the Hon. Member should re-read the Bill which is before the House and should take a look at the existing Workmen's Compensation Accident Fund Act. I invite the Member to look at Section 103 (3) of the old Act and Section 103 (8) of the Bill which is before the House today. Both the Act and the Bill, which is before the House, include provisions for a merit rating system. Both contain a provision for the creation of subclasses for assessment purposes where an industry is in a subclass that is less hazardous in nature than the class as a whole. Furthermore, both provide that the assessment rate in the class or subclass need not be the same for each industry that may be determined in relation to the hazards of each industry.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, the Bill which is before you provides that the Board may assess any employer within a class at a rate higher than the class assessment for the cost to the fund if that employer is consistently higher than the average cost of the fund of other employers in that particular industry. The additional money collected may be either applied to the Accident Fund or utilized to reduce the assessment rate for the other employers in that same industry.

But while theoretically it might seem logical to be able to assess each individual employer according to his historical safety record, in practice I believe, Mr. Speaker, it is neither feasible nor is it necessarily desirable. There are presently some 20,000 firms under compensation coverage and to assess each one individually would be a very onerous task. The administrative costs in doing so itself would result in significant increases in employer assessments.

I should point out that those jurisdictions in Canada that do utilize the merit system have found that in order to cope they have to limit that merit rating system to larger employers. Consequently smaller businesses were, in effect, discriminated against.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, it should be remembered that compensation assessments are based on the actual cost of compensation. If you cut rates via the reduction for good safety records you will have correspondingly to raise the penalty assessment rate in order to collect the necessary funds. But perhaps more important, Mr. Speaker, a merit system it has been shown, tends to discourage employers from reporting injuries and this is a practice which we do not condone and certainly do not wish to encourage.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the Bill which is before you does strike a proper balance between a fundamental principle of workers' compensation, that is to say collective liability and the idea of assessing employers according to their individual safety records.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have looked at what remains to be done. I should like to turn your attention to what has already been accomplished. First of all a number of the recommendations contained in the Task Force Report related to the administration of the Board and other matters within the administrative responsibility of the Workmen's Compensation Board. Since July 1st 1971 workmen's compensation coverage for farmers and their employers has been possible but on a voluntary basis. The Task Force found that few farmers had availed themselves of coverage and, therefore, recommended that the Board carry out an extensive advertising campaign to acquaint farmers with their obligations and the advantages of Workmen's Compensation to themselves and to their employees. This the Board has done although unfortunately the results at this point have been somewhat disappointing.

The Task Force further recommended that given the general principle of universal coverage for all salary and wage earners the Board should review the industries that were exempt from mandatory coverage under Workmen's Compensation. This, too, the Board has done. The present exemptions were carefully scrutinized and the Board did recommend to us that a number of these exemptions should be removed. Accordingly the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council in January of this year amended the regulations to rescind those exemptions and extend mandatory coverage to include such industries as commercial feedlots, stockyards, scrap metal dealers, swimming pools, just to mention a few. This extension will not take effect until January 1st, 1975 as we wish to give those employers sufficient time so that they may budget for their assessment.

I think it fair to say that those regulations, when they come into effect, provide coverage to a significant number of employers and their employees who should have been covered on the basis of prevailing standards throughout the province.

The Task Force felt that the present classification of industries had some inequities and recommended that the Board review the entire system of classification for assessment purposes. I am pleased to say that the Board has commenced such a review and we expect it will be completed either by the latter part of this year or by early 1975.

I think it is obvious from these few examples, Mr. Speaker, that the present Workmen's Compensation Board is most responsive to the suggestions designed to improve the functioning of workmen's compensation in our province. I think it can be said that the present Board has an enlightened approach to workers' compensation and I suggest that they are doing everything in their power to ensure that people are treated fairly, that workers' claims are handled promptly and are endeavoring to restore the confidence that working people in this province had in the Workmen's Compensation Board prior to 1964.

The legislation before this House provides substantial increases to workers and their dependents, Mr. Speaker. The increases range from 17.2 per cent in the benefits payable to the dependent surviving orphan to an increase of 105 per

cent to benefits payable to a surviving dependent spouse. The minimum pension payable to a permanently disabled worker will be increased by 87.8 per cent. All of the increases, Mr. Speaker, will be retroactive to the 1st of January of this year. These are, needless to say, Mr. Speaker, no small increases. Dependent surviving widows of a worker killed on the job will receive \$275 a month rather than the present \$133.90. Dependent surviving children will receive \$64 a month rather than \$52.50. Orphans will receive \$80 a month, an increase from \$68.25. The minimum total disability worker pension will be increased from \$173 to \$325 a month, also retroactive to the 1st of January of this year.

In addition, disability pensions presently payable will be increased, Mr. Speaker, by 2 per cent for every year that the pension has been in existence so that a person who began to receive a pension five years ago will receive an increase of some 10 per cent in his pension.

Now all of that, Mr. Speaker, represents a pretty expensive parcel. The total cost to pre-fund the above mentioned changes will be something in the order of \$16,150,000. After careful consideration we have decided that the additional costs of the benefits shall be pre-funded in the same manner presently utilized by the Board for all compensation pensions. That is to say the Board will put into the fund an amount which when amortized over the term of the pension will be sufficient to completely pay out the increased benefits for the entire period of the pension. While this ties up a considerable amount of money it is by far the most economical, much more economical than continually to pay pensions out of current funds.

The Workmen's Compensation Board can only afford, under its present rate structure, to contribute \$9 million to the pre-funding of the increases that I have mentioned. Therefore, we as a Government, are faced with a choice of not making sufficient increases or secondly, making those increases and charging it back to the Board which in turn would result in an increase of assessment rate, or thirdly, raising the benefits to the appropriate level and contributing to the raise in Benefits out of general revenue. We have chosen the third alternative, Mr. Speaker. The sum of \$6,560,000 will be allocated to the Workmen's Compensation Board from general revenue to assist in pre-funding.

The Task Force stated in its report, and I quote from the report on page 54:

Governments cannot legitimately deny their responsibilities in this regard. A large portion of the expenditure necessitated by some of the Task Force recommendations will essentially be a catching-up expense. The Government cannot lay all of the blame for the lag in Workmen's Compensation benefits at the feet of today's Saskatchewan employers, it is the Government that sets the standard in this regard and they have been content for too many years to make token changes more for the sake of appearance of action than to accomplish any legitimate improvements. The problems associated with compensation did not begin coincidentally with the reign of a particular government. Therefore, the viable changes are going to require Government financing and the Government has a moral responsibility to provide it.

I think, Mr. Speaker, we would be hard put to deny the validity of this statement by the Task Force. The cost of the increase in benefits contained in this legislation for existing pensions was not foreseen or anticipated and could not be accounted for in the existing rate structure. It would, therefore, be wrong to expect employers at this time to make up the entire difference. Therefore, we are contributing, as I said, over \$6 million in a one-time payment which in conjunction with the extra money made available by the Board will be sufficient completely to pre-fund the benefits for increases in pensions already in existence. However, the cost of improved benefits in pensions established subsequent to this legislation must be borne by employer assessment in the normal fashion.

As of July 1st of this year, Mr. Speaker, the income ceiling for compensation calculations will be increased from \$8,400 to \$10,000. Taking into account the income ceiling revision of 1971, the maximum benefit for totally disabled workers will have risen from \$4,950 to \$7,500 since we formed the Government in 1971. Mr. Speaker, this is a realistic increase for which this Government can be proud.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Snyder: — This legislation, Mr. Speaker, revises somewhat the method of determining an injured employee's average wage upon which compensation calculation for permanent total disability pensions are made. At present the employee's income is averaged over the previous 12 months which in some circumstances is not a fair approximation of his average weekly wage. For example, an employee who received a 10 per cent wage increase two months before the injury receives less compensation than he should considering his actual average income at the time of the injury. Therefore we have changed the determination so that the average wage shall be the greater of either the average wage as calculated before or the worker's current wage at the time of his injury.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, the income ceiling will be raised by increments of \$1,000 whenever 10 per cent or more of the workers injured in a given year have incomes exceeding that current ceiling. This provision, Mr. Speaker, will ensure in large measure that the ceiling does not lag behind the general wage increases in the future.

With this legislation we have also introduced equity for men and women under the compensation system. In the past only invalid widowers were entitled to survivor benefits. From now on dependent spouses whether widow or widower will be entitled to survivor benefits.

Mr. Speaker, the Bill before you now contains in Section 8 (d) a provision which would bring farm and ranch employees within the compulsory coverage of workmen's compensation as of January 1, 1976. Farm organizations have been consulted on this matter and we have recently received some indications of concern with the Section as it is presently worded. Some concern was advanced at leaving the implementation date until 1976 because it was too great a delay and the process should be speeded up. On the other hand concern was expressed that farmers already covered by some private plan would object to the compulsory inclusion under workers' compensation. For this reason we have

decided to remove the fixed inclusion date from the Act. A House amendment will be introduced so that the Section will simply exclude farm and ranch employees from compulsory coverage. This will allow us the opportunity to further consider and discuss this matter with the farm population with the option open to us of effecting whatever change is deemed necessary by regulation with no fixed time period involved.

Mr. Speaker, the other matters covered in this revised Workers' Compensation Bill are mainly administrative in nature and I need not touch upon them today. Our approach has not been to change the basic principle of worker's compensation which is fundamentally sound but rather to bring the Saskatchewan system in line with the realities of the 1970s. I have no hesitation in saying that the amendments in total will make Saskatchewan's legislation one of the best, if not the best, in the whole of Canada.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Snyder: — Mr. Speaker, in summary I should like to repeat that we have substantially increased benefits payable to injured workers and their dependents but with this legislation we have progressed a long way towards complying with the recommendations of the Task Force on Workmen's Compensation. Once again, we recognize that our job is not over and there are many things that remain to be done in the area of workmen's compensation. However, I wish to remind the House that in 1971 the New Democratic Party promised the people of this province that we would revamp the Workmen's Compensation administration; that we would establish a more meaningful appeal procedure; and that we would increase pensions and benefits. Mr. Speaker, the passage of this legislation means another NDP promise made and another NDP promise kept. It is with a great deal of pleasure that I move second reading of this Bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. D. F. MacDonald (Moose Jaw North): — Mr. Speaker, there has been some considerable fanfare accompanying the introduction of Bill 80. The Minister of Labour has alluded to the major changes and the Bill has been described in the Press and other places as proposing sweeping changes. I think Bill 80 should be viewed in its proper perspective.

First of all let me say that there is no argument that this Bill provides significant increases to existing pensions, it provides significant increases to compensation benefits, to surviving spouses and dependents, and it provides for a significant increase in the income ceiling for the purpose of calculating compensation. These increases are significant and in themselves can be considered major. They are overdue.

It should also be noted that pensions to a surviving spouse and minimum monthly pensions are still not up to the current minimum wage, so they can hardly be thought of as revolutionary. Secondly, there is a change incorporated in this Bill whereby men and women workers will be treated equally. This is a change that I endorse wholeheartedly. To me it is a change that simply recognizes the reality of our present day society. Men and

women must be treated equally with regard to pension benefits whether it be Workmen's Compensation or superannuation. This is another change that I think is overdue.

However, having conceded these two significant changes, and trying to put Bill 80 into its proper perspective, it seems to me that it can hardly be said to be proposing sweeping changes. In this respect the Bill might be considered a bit disappointing. I say this having regard to the much talked about Judge Muir's Task Force Report. This Task Force Report suggested an almost new concept in Workmen's Compensation. It is my understanding that the report was basically accepted quite enthusiastically by all parts of society. It is a report that is very forward thinking and yet only some of the minor recommendations from it were incorporated in Bill 80.

Bill 80 proposed a new Act and yet it is in every way the old Act with some amendments. There is very little new in concept in Bill 80. It is an updating of old provisions. It is therefore with some misgivings that I will be supporting the Bill. I am not opposed in any major way to the proposed amendments to the old Workmen's Compensation Act and yet I feel that there are some very important concepts that should be incorporated into what I would term a good Workers' Compensation Act.

May I first put on record some of the changes with which I do agree. As I have already stated the Workers' Compensation Act must apply equally to both men and women workers, and therefore, the change in name of the Act is a good change and I agree with raising the income ceiling on which compensation is calculated and also to further increasing this ceiling by \$1,000 whenever 10 per cent of workers injured have incomes in excess of the current ceiling.

I feel a claimant should have a right to the Board's decision in writing. The claimant should know what facts the decision was based on and adequate reasons for the decision made by the Board. This procedure will, besides providing the courtesy of proper communication, will help the claimant decide whether or not to file an appeal.

In cases where the injured worker was injured and there was a third party or a party other than the employer that might be liable, then the injured worker should be able to take benefits from the Compensation fund and then take civil suit against that third party and the proceeds from such a suit in excess of the pension benefits should then go to the injured worker.

Industrial disease should be compensated for on the same basis as for an injury disability. I agree with making the determination of a worker's income, for the purpose of compensation, more flexible. As I remarked before, I agree with the increases for benefits to spouses and dependents where the injury has resulted in death and to the increases in existing pensions and to the increases in minimum pensions. However, I do observe that recommendations were made to the effect that the minimum should be at least equal to the minimum wage.

At this time I have written in my notes and I see I must concur with the Minister. I have written in my notes – I have not as yet consolidated my feelings on the incorporation of farmers into the Act. I also note that the Task Force recommended that teachers be included and they are also excluded

April 1, 1974

from the new Act.

These are what I consider to be some of the more significant amendments in the Bill and I have placed my thoughts on these amendments in the record. As I said earlier, some very important matters are left unsaid in this Bill and these should be commented on.

By and large, the major recommendations of Judge Muir's Task Force Report have not been acted upon. The very fact that we have introduced a new Act instead of amending the old Act would indicate that this Government has no intentions of instituting some of these major reforms. I listened to the Minister as he said he was not going to allow dust to gather on the report and that he said that he was studying and would continue to study it. But I think the fact that this was a new Act rather than amendments to the old Act would indicate to me that this Government is not likely prepared to institute some of the reforms which are needed in this field of compensation to injured workers.

There has been public praise for the thinking in the report and yet I do not think the Government opposite has any intention of acting on it.

For the record and for the benefit of those who haven't read the report, I should like very briefly to outline the thrust of the 1973 Task Force Report chaired by Judge A. J. Muir of Moose Jaw.

Before outlining the major recommendations I would say that the report suggests several things regarding adjudication of claims and also compensation benefits. Some of these recommendations are in Bill 80 and many others are not. However, the report has recommended three very major changes. These as I said are not and likely will not be considered.

The first major recommendation was that a universal sickness and accident scheme be developed. The Task Force recognized the present concept, the same concept that will be continued in Bill 80 is arbitrary and illogical, and I use those words quoting from the Task Force Report. For example, if a worker was to fall and break his back when he was two or three feet from his place of business, from his place of work, he will receive no benefits. It is also recognized that benefits available from other schemes such as welfare, unemployment insurance, are not really sufficient nor are they co-ordinated. It should be made perfectly clear that there is no intention of having the employers fund the entire universal sickness or accident scheme. Under such a scheme employers could be expected to contribute on the same basis that they are contributing now.

The second main recommendation is that there should be a new theory of compensation. Briefly this theory suggests rather strongly that the goals of compensation should be two-fold. One, to compensate people for the permanent loss of bodily function that may accompany serious injury, and two, it should provide injured individuals with all the tools and assistance that may be necessary in order to return to productive employment.

Therefore, the Task Force feels that compensation should be awarded under two headings; one, loss of bodily function and two, maintenance of income. Task Force has also suggested the

mechanism by which the Board could achieve this.

The third major recommendation which falls into what I have just described, is that programs for rehabilitation and resettlement be drastically increased and improved. The report suggested over the long run this service would not be a cost to the fund but may actually help to relieve the fund of financial obligations as regards pension pay-outs. The tremendous human values of this program cannot be measured. These measures are the very important features that are left out in Bill 80.

One of the most significant features that was not included in this Bill is the provision for the escalation of pension benefits. The most important reason for bringing in this Bill today is to update existing pensions. Time and inflation have caused pensions to fall far behind and therefore it becomes necessary to bring in legislation to update benefits. With Bill 80 we accomplish this. We do not, however, make provision to offset the effects that will obviously occur even during the next year. Pensions that are increased today will be outdated a year from now. People who go on pensions tomorrow will see the real value of their benefits eroded during the next year. There is absolutely no question that we should provide for an escalation of pensions in this Act. This is already done in British Columbia and it is already done in Quebec. It is being asked of us in this province and we should be providing this. The Minister said that he and his officials held public hearings throughout this province and I am sure that he didn't go to one public meeting that employees did not ask for this provision.

The Review Committee chaired by Colin Murchison reported in 1968 and they at that time recommended the introduction of an escalator provision tying pensions to the cost of living index. It now is six years later and you still have the report in your hands.

They favored a plan where a base is established and adjustments are made of 2 per cent for each two full point increases in the cost of living index. They further recommended that the pension fund should be responsible for the base pension plus upward revisions for five years. After five years any additional money required for upward revision should be made up from consolidated revenue.

The Task Force Report of 1973 also suggests the same provision. While suggesting that it would be wise to implement this plan with the new theory of compensation. It further suggested for those people receiving permanent total disability pensions, in other words, for those workers injured to the point that they will be unable to supplement their income by some work, that these pensions should be increased by a percentage equal to the average percentage wage increase in Saskatchewan.

This escalation feature is vital in this era of rapidly increasing costs of living and inflation. The conditions of our day demand this provision. We have made it possible to automatically increase the income ceilings on which benefits are calculated. It seems to me that this will tend to make new pensions that will be granted, more in line with the cost of living. It will mean that new pensions will more accurately reflect the purchasing power of the dollar at the time that they are granted. This very feature may, however, tend to make us forget those pensions that will tend to be outdated. Under this

April 1, 1974

system there will tend to be a few less poor pensions being paid and therefore, there will be less pressure on this Legislature to bring pensions up-to-date. This is all the more reason to institute a method of providing for escalation to pensions. There is no doubt that the omission of this feature is the most glaring example of a deficiency in this Bill.

Mr. Speaker, I should like more time to consider the remarks of the Minister, I have other remarks concerning the merit rating system, remarks which the Minister very briefly alluded to, I have remarks concerning the review period and I have remarks to make on the method of financing the Workmen's Compensation fund, so at this time I would ask leave to adjourn the debate.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Debate adjourned.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Messer that **Bill No. 73 – An Act respecting the provision of Financial and Other Assistance to Urban Municipalities for Capital Works Projects** be now read a second time.

Mr. J. G. Lane (Lumsden): — Mr. Speaker, in my remarks the other day I brought to the attention of the House some of the criticisms of the Bill that we have. I notice the desperate attempts of the acting Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Messer) to try and recover some of the steam that he had lost when the criticisms became evident by his unjustifiable interruption before Orders of the Day, the other day. There is no way around it but that this Bill does discriminate against municipalities of a population of less than 500 and it does this by not giving them the opportunity to come up with a five-year program or package for themselves. They are forced to take their per capita grant on a year to year basis. It indicates an unfortunate lack of confidence in the communities of less than 500.

The Bill also indicates a lack of confidence by the NDP Government in the abilities of urban municipalities to deal with their own problems. Because to make sure that the municipalities spend the money the way the Government wants, the Government has to appoint a Commission to oversee the grant program and the capital fund. That's unfortunately unnecessary and again an indication of a lack of confidence. The most obvious indication, however, of a lack of confidence is the fact that if the municipality sits down and objectively assesses its needs and the needs of its people and come up with a capital program over five years, as I say, capital development program, the Minister can still turn around and say, no, you are not going to get it because they have given an overriding veto to the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

It is unfortunate that the Government opposite has seen fit to place all these terms and conditions and restrictions on what is basically a good idea. Other Members on this side of the House will be raising before the Legislature some of the programs that have been removed because of this particular fund

and certainly the fund is not the bed of roses as attempted to be shown by the acting Minister of Municipal Affairs.

We are going to have to ask the Government Members what other programs, other than those publicly stated have been removed and integrated into the Community Capital Fund so without a doubt the fund does not consist of \$47 million in new monies for the urban centres of the Province of Saskatchewan.

We on the opposition side fortunately feel that \$1 for a municipality is better than none. We have made our criticisms clear but we feel the municipalities, as I say, will be somewhat better off than one wish the terms and conditions than not having any and for that reason we will support the Bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. H. H. P. Baker (Regina Wascana): — Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat amazed to find that the speaker who just sat down criticizing this Bill, saying that people cannot get the grant in certain communities or even letting out one whimper against such a wonderful piece of legislation. This document will go down as the greatest unconditional grant ever given to our municipalities in this province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker: — Just imagine speaking against or letting out one whimper against such wonderful legislation. I don't understand that, they say they are going to support the Bill but in essence they have actually opposed it already, opposed it already in the Budget. So here they are coming forward ridiculing it from every direction. They know it is a devastating piece of legislation against them.

When the Manitoba Government brought in grants for municipalities and an excellent Budget, before their last election, all the Opposition Members supported it. Had they not supported grants and then good legislation, they would have been wiped out in that province. The reason why they held onto their Opposition is because they supported Premier Schreyer's good Budget.

Now we have the opposite in Saskatchewan, they are opposing all our good legislation, grants and moneys that we are giving to our local communities.

The election, if it is called, this June, June 1975 or June 1976, under Premier Blakeney, I forecast that there won't be more than two or four Members left on the other side.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker: — This is the kind of grant that is needed by local government. The previous speaker said that we are taking away from local governments through this Bill. For the first time in our lives as cities, towns and villages we getting some real money.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

April 1, 1974

Mr. Baker: — And to stand up here and oppose it, the way they are doing, striking at it from every direction. Just imagine them speaking against it and that Member who sat down lives in Regina, while his seat is outside of our city, he still lives here. He says that he is against the \$11 million that I am going to get for the city of Regina. He voted against it before in the Budget, now he says he is going to support it. People will not trust him or believe him because they know that he has already opposed it.

Yes, I said it is a devastating Bill; it is a real knock-out, Mr. Speaker. It should be named the bill that wiped out Liberal Opposition in Saskatchewan.

Over the years when they were in power they did give us bits and pieces of grants. It didn't amount to much. The Member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) when he was Minister of Highways, I recall we went to him and asked to give us \$5,000 to help to recap Albert Street. There wasn't one nickel for us from them as a grant. This is the way they treated the municipalities. I can see why the Member for Rosthern is quitting and I am sorry he is not in his seat. He always likes to take a swing at me.

He knew that he would never be back again in this House, just as most of them will not be back again after 1974 or 1975. The people have caught up with this man who carries the bible in one hand and preaches for the devil with the other. Yes, they have caught up with him. This is the man who helped others put taxes on the sick and sent many to their untimely death.

I don't know how the Member for Rosthern is going to retire with a clear conscience, having all these things on his mind, in doing this to the sick people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Steuart: — Now we are getting into the gutter.

Mr. Baker: — The Leader of the Opposition says we are getting into the gutter. They are the ones that destroyed many people and drove out 103,000 people during their seven years, by not giving grants; by not putting some money into the economy to keep our people here. All you heard them preach was austerity, but never prosperity. You only heard, tighten your belts, and that is the reason why the people kicked them out forever.

Now what will Regina do with this sort of money, \$11 million? They oppose the building of a new city hall in our community by voting against it at the outset of the Session. They oppose the building of a new arena for the city of Regina, hopefully the two senior governments in this city can get together to build a much needed arena in our community.

They are opposed to helping us hold down our taxes in the communities. This grant is going to help us so that we do not have to borrow as much money as we had in the past. We will not have to issue debentures that we have had to do annually. In other words, it is going to help hold the taxes or keep them in check and within reason. They are opposing this Bill which will effect our recreational areas. They are against us

building new rinks and new swimming pools. They are against us building new schools by opposing these sorts of grants, that the Government has so generously given under the direction and leadership of the Premier of this province and the fine colleagues that we have on this side.

I am amazed at the way they talk with tongue in cheek. This will help stabilize, as I already said, our tax base. It will develop a better quality of life for our communities, not only in the field of sport, but in the field of culture as well.

In our city estimates now we are planning programs that will fit our grant system over the next five years. Already with this sort of money we are going to build another closed-in rink. We are planning two more within the community over the next year or so. We are planning closed-in swimming pools. As I stated earlier that gigantic project we are now able to get underway, the City Hall, is going to create much work over the next two, three or four years.

This Bill will create work in this province, in every community. This Bill is going to bring back the people who were driven away over the years, and we should put out a call to bring them home. We are going to need a lot of workers to carry on with the projects that are going to take place because of this sort of money – some \$47 million being put into the urban centres, cities, towns and villages, over the next five years.

You recall, Mr. Speaker, the past two or three sessions we held, what did we do? We spent a lot of money to stabilize the primary industry namely, agriculture, and it is paying off today. When you think of the Land Bank, FarmStart, a floor price for hog marketing and so forth, a marketing plan for our livestock such as hogs, etc.

This is what is building Saskatchewan. We are already getting the fruits of what we have done in this province. Agriculture is on the move; the people in the towns and villages will be on the move and this is going to assist them to build the facilities that they need so that they can keep their people in their communities.

We need facilities to keep our people at home and our towns and villages will grow. Regina will grow. These facilities that I have talked about will bring more industry here. We will also be able to solidify our tax base or tax structure. This is one of the ingredients to bring industry into urban centres.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on and speak about this little leaflet which outlines the various things that can be done, the timing of it, the five-year program. You take out a larger grant sooner if you need it. You can use 60 per cent out of this fund for the project and up to 75 per cent if approved. I don't call that control. I call that working together and we should be working with our senior governments.

This Bill has given greater autonomy to local governments, because they are letting us plan our projects over a five-year period. Mr. Speaker, I am amazed the Opposition saying even one word against this, saying that we are spending too much. Surely to goodness you and I know that in order to make money you have to spend money. And in order to get facilities you

April 1, 1974

have to spend money to complete them. This Government has generously given it to us under Premier Blakeney and he will go back because of this, with the biggest majority you have ever seen, Mr. Leader of the Opposition.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker: — I wish that he would call the election next June because we will wipe you out completely. There won't be any more than two or four of you left no matter in what June the election is called, if it is called in 1975 or 1976. As far as I am concerned with the good things we passed, the people in Saskatchewan would like to see us stay there until 1976 without calling another election. I would be for it, I would be for it, because they appreciate what is being done. We are a government for all the people and not for just a few when you were on this side of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I can speak with authority on this subject because I know what I went through under the Thatcher Government as Mayor of this city, when you couldn't even get \$5,000 to recap Albert Street. A mere \$5,000! You thought the world was going to come to an end. The Member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) was the Minister of Highways then. You people did all you could, through the Local Government Board, to stop the projects that we wanted to build. You didn't allow a school to be built; you didn't allow a main arterial road to be built; you stopped many of them and that is why we had unemployment and our people had to leave. Instead of pumping some money into the economy, you drove them out of this fine province of ours by doing nothing. We need them today and we are going to need them over the next five or six years. This sort of Bill, these grants, are going to generate the economy in this province to the extent that we are going to be begging people to come back to Saskatchewan to do the construction work.

Mr. Speaker, I take real pleasure in supporting this Bill. I am amazed that the other Regina Members on the other side are not standing up endorsing what I am saying.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker: — Having voted against it in the Budget, you have voted against this Bill and you can't deny it. You stand up now and say that you are supporting the Bill but you were against it right along. It is a disgrace to your party. I am going to say you should have supported the Budget if you believe in this Bill. I know that it isn't Budget time and I, unfortunately, was not here to speak to it. I want to tell you that by you people opposing it with all these fine grants, with all these generous gifts to the urban municipalities, on a per capita basis, was a grave mistake. I advised you to take on the Homeowner Grant Plan, this was one good thing that you did. Since then we have done something with it and have given out some real money.

Yes, the Members over there are smiling to themselves but they know that the blueprint is on the wall, that you will never be back again whether the election is this June, next June or the following June.

Mr. Speaker, I support the Bill.

Mr. E. C. Whelan (Regina North West): — Mr. Speaker, this Bill is a tangible and reliable way to help citizens who need facilities, cannot afford to pay for them because of a shortage of funds. Mr. Speaker, this isn't an empty promise, it is the answer. It is financial assistance to help urban governments because they are in need.

The Hon. Member for Lumsden (Mr. Lane) says the procedure in this Bill indicates a lack of confidence in urban government. Well, Mr. Speaker, they sure illustrated a lack of confidence in urban municipalities when they gave them 35 cents per capita per year during the years that they were the Government. There was no need for a committee to spend their grants; no need for a vote to decide how, they needed a squad of detectives to find their grants.

Mr. Speaker, this Community Capital Fund answers a need that has existed in urban communities for many years. In this province, with the flow of population from rural areas to urban centres, there has been a continuous demand for capital spending by urban governments, in order to provide the basic essentials for modern living. This demand has been met in many instances by borrowing money. So much money has been borrowed by some urban municipalities that interest payments take up a large percentage of the tax dollar and this has become a burden on the local taxpayer.

Over many years, since the first day that I took my seat in this House, Members, particularly urban Members, have enunciated that there was an urgent need for assistance to supply capital in order to relieve the tax burden on the homeowner in the urban centres. No government in the past, in particular those who sit opposite, who were, indeed, Mr. Speaker, elected on a promise to help urban centres, no government did anything of a significant nature to provide relief for the hard-pressed urban dweller as far as capital funds are concerned. Even the Municipal Corporation, which they introduced, was of limited value for again it meant paying interest on borrowed money.

Mr. Speaker, for the first time there is an outright grant in the amount of 60 per cent that will be made available to the city of Regina, over a five-year period of approximately \$11 million. It could be larger, it could be a bigger sum, if the 1976 population census indicates a rapid growth in the city, as I am sure it will.

As the legislation sets out, a total of \$75 per capita, based on the 1971 census, will be paid out up to 60 per cent of the cost of a project. In addition, there is a possibility of further grants from the Department of Youth and Culture for recreation centres; from the Department of the Environment for sewer and water, perhaps from the Department of Social Services and the Department of Co-operation.

What is the situation that has arisen because of lack of capital? In Regina City, for instance, and I am sure that this sort of situation exists in other urban centres, but in Regina City for instance, there are not enough bridges across Wascana Creek; there is a need to build more; the inconvenience of living 100 yards across a strip of water and having to travel several miles to visit a neighbor, as is the case with those who live in Dieppe Place in my constituency, is well known to Regina

April 1, 1974

North West.

There is a need for underpasses or overpasses. Anyone who drives north or south on Pasqua Street, when the trains are switching, on occasion has seen automobiles lined up all the way to Dewdney Avenue from the railway intersection at McKinley. It is not difficult to imagine the hazard that exists when the train blocks all the crossings at Campbell, Pasqua, Elphinstone and Albert, preventing an ambulance or fire fighting equipment having immediate access to 20 per cent of the population living north of the CNR tracks. These underpasses or overpasses have not been built because of lack of capital.

Again, Mr. Speaker, another situation exists, because of lack of capital, there is a shortage of fire stations; there is no fire station north of the CNR tracks in the city of Regina. This huge portion of the city's population is denied fire protection particularly if they are cut off by a train blocking the street.

At the present time Wascana Centre is being developed; it is a beautiful park, there is no argument against submitting money for its upkeep, but the people who work during the day know there is such a shortage of equipment, such as barbecues and benches for picnics, that you have to arrive on the scene by 3:00 o'clock in the afternoon in order to reserve space. This means that anyone in the north half of the city is denied use of the limited facilities that are available to the people in Regina. Although the entire valley of the Wascana, from the RCMP Barracks north and west, has been set aside for development, little or no development has taken place because of a lack of capital to build playground facilities, barbecues, to do landscaping, to build such facilities as a heated swimming pool, and other buildings.

Finally, and probably noticeable to everyone of you, traffic arteries in the city are narrow and clogged. The need to draw new main traffic thoroughfares, in order to prevent accidents, to give immediate access across and through the city traffic, has not been met because of the need for capital assistance.

In the city of Regina some money has been set aside for a City Hall. Because of a lack of capital the City Hall quarters are temporary. The capital city of the Province of Saskatchewan has long been without a permanent City Hall.

True, we have in the city of Regina, a large, beautiful central library. The research facilities provided are adequate, extensive and recognized as modern in every respect. The outlying areas have a book trailer service. When a student, particularly in high school, is doing research, complete library facilities should be available in the north and south parts of the city, in the outlying sections of the city. Lack of capital funds has prevented the construction of these much needed community educational centres. It is true that university professors, and they have told me this on many occasions, can spot first year students who come from parts of the city not adjacent to and who do not have available to them research facilities, such as those located in the downtown library centre.

With the rapid growth of the city, and this takes in many parts of Regina, but particularly in the north, the west and in the east, there is a need for recreation centres to provide

a combination of, meeting place, perhaps day care centres if they need one or they want one, library, heated swimming pool, physical education equipment and park facilities. At stake is the health not only of the children but of adults as well. Because there have been no capital funds available, even the study of such projects has been meager, almost nil.

Recently replies to a questionnaire mailed to my constituents in Regina North West indicate clearly there is a demand for a recreation centre and meeting place – not a shopping centre or a commercial venture – but one belonging to the community that would assist in developing the physical and mental aptitudes of the people who live in the area.

More urgent and more pressing needs, such as extension of sewer and water and pavements, have used up every available nickel an urban centre has been able to acquire. Physical and mental health, recreation centres, libraries, traffic arteries – these have been delayed. This Capital Fund, Mr. Speaker, spells out the answer.

I have one criticism, it is this, Mr. Speaker. There is a need at the present time – and I appreciate the suggestion of the Minister, and I agree with the Minister when he introduced the Resolution that we should consult the public, that we consider a 5-year capital projects plan, that we constantly seek the advice of the urban municipalities – but there is a need to provide technical information in certain fields, because in certain fields there is limited or no experienced personnel available in some of the urban centres.

There is a need, Mr. Speaker, to provide estimates for the elected people in urban centres, regarding the cost of recreation centres, libraries, parks, etc., and to provide them with a complete background of information and facts, so that they can set out a realistic 5-year term of capital projects that will answer the needs that have long been denied and have long been necessary in the urban centres. Few aldermen, few elected officials, have this information at their fingertips, in this province to my knowledge. In the urban centres, and in the government departments, and I think this applies not only in Saskatchewan but across Canada, because the whole urban problem is just beginning to get attention, there is a shortage of people studying techniques and plans for alleviating urban problems. It seems to me that introducing a program of this kind needs a good backup team in the Department of Municipal Affairs: it is like beginning to build a new house, we need a good set of plans, or for baking a new kind of cake, we need a recipe.

It seems pertinent that we should help supply information and the background and a choice of recipes and a choice of plans, and the financial outlay on a 5-year basis in order that the elected officials can make the wisest use of the tax dollar. It seems to me this is an arrangement where we will be breaking new ground. This is an area where such problems as the removal of railways, development of urban transit, rebuilding of the downtown core in the cities, negotiations with Central Mortgage and Housing, perhaps with the Federal Government, to participate financially in such projects, will necessitate that elected officials have the best possible information – elected officials in the urban areas will need the best possible information at their disposal.

April 1, 1974

It is most commendable to put up the money. The idea of the Fund answers a problem that has long existed. The step we need to take, in addition, is to provide the right kind of assistance of a technical nature. The staff we have available should be available to every urban centre; it could save the urban municipalities money, prevent duplication and provide a clearing house for comparing capital expenditures throughout the province.

Let me repeat again, Mr. Speaker, the points I have made, in summary.

1. This Community Capital Fund answers a pressing need.
2. There are many examples of the sorts of capital expenditures that have been denied because there was no capital available.
3. There is a need for an administrative structure to provide technical assistance and administrative know-how to assist the urban centres in developing a 5-year capital program.

Mr. Speaker, this Bill represents a great milestone for urban assistance and I support the Motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. E. F. Gardner (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, I have been listening carefully to the previous two speakers in this regard and I don't doubt but what the Bill has some merit for the cities and that's fine. I hope it does, I realize that they have their problems too. It appears that the Provincial Government is the one which benefits most from inflation. And in this province it almost appears that they are encouraging inflation because this automatically raises consumer taxes, the E & H Tax is up substantially. They are the ones who benefit most directly from inflation and they are the ones who should be paying more to the municipalities at this time, because municipalities have a fixed tax base and their expenses are rising. I think it is quite logical that the Provincial Government should be accepting more of the responsibility.

We were interested in the speech by the Mayor of Regina. Apparently he has forgotten how the previous Liberal Government bailed him out during the 'monkey bar' fiasco that he got himself into a few years ago.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gardner: — At that particular time they saved his political skin. I don't know whether he was making his speech to try and butter up the Government to get an executive assistant. I don't know whether he has given up on the city or whether he feels that he can now get it from the Government, but at any rate, I hope the city of Regina does benefit from these grants and I hope that if they see fit they can use part of this money to provide an executive assistant for the Mayor. It might be a good idea because he waved this brochure around two or three times and told us about all the good things that are in it. But I wish he had read it a little closer, particularly as it applies to small communities. Because the Mayor obviously doesn't care what happens to the small communities, he is interested in the cities

and he should be interested in all of Saskatchewan.

It says quite clearly here, under the street improvement program:

The street improvement program initiated in 1972, under the Municipal Road Assistance Authority has been absorbed by the Community Capital Fund Program. Street improvement projects planned for construction under the previous program will be accepted as projects under the new program.

This means in our estimation – I am quite sure we are reading this correctly – that the street improvement program is no more and it is phased into this new Capital Grants program. This could be very detrimental to many of our rural communities.

I just checked one town, for example, of 600 people and in the last two years under the street improvement program they received \$67,002 under this street improvement program that we had, including \$49,999 last year. I said they are a town of about 600 people, so add \$15 per head, they would be eligible under this new program for \$9,000 per year. That sounds pretty great, in five years they would get \$45,000. But they already have got \$49,000 in one year alone, last year. So how are they going to gain by this new program. They got more money in one year than they are going to get in five. The worst aspect of this whole thing is that there are towns which for some reason or other didn't get the street improvement program under way last year, usually through no fault of their own. There was a shortage of equipment and this was put off until next year, and they are going to be in serious trouble. They are going to find out that not only are they likely to use up all of the money they are entitled to in the next five years under this program, they are going to have to put up some money besides. So, when you take a look at this, it just isn't that valuable for the small communities. And we are very concerned at this particular time about communities which have made plans for street improvements next year and very substantial improvements that are going to cost them a lot of money. Expecting very large grants, they are going to find out that they are now under this program and their grants are going to be very severely curtailed. These are the places that we should be concerned about, they have limited resources, a rather stable population, often their average income is lower than it is in the cities and they are just going to run into a great deal of problems because of this.

I think it is very important that we look at this brochure very carefully, because it does discriminate against the small communities and we should be taking a look at some of the other programs too. We don't know what it is going to do to some of these special programs. We should like to know, for example, about Winter Works. I just had put on my desk here some of the Winter Works grants, the late ones for the year. This was just delivered a few moments ago. I notice right near the top the town of Admiral, which is not a very big place, is receiving an estimated Winter Works Grant of \$10,000. Now if this is in addition to the grants, that's fine. If it is going to be part of this program, we should like to know, because we didn't realize at first that the street improvement program was going to come out of the capital grants. What about the other grants that they have been receiving through Winter Works, grants for sewage lagoons and this type of thing? So we find that in many cases the small

April 1, 1974

places are going to be much worse off as a result of this than they were before.

I am sure the Department of Municipal Affairs has all of these figures on file, they know of the towns of 400, 500, 600 or 800 people which did street improvements last year, which have them planned for next year and the year after, and very substantial grants that they should have received. We'll find that now they are either using up their complete allotment or they are going to have to cut back their program.

There are many questions in this regard that should be answered. We do support the fact that perhaps, as the Mayor said in some cases, it is going to help the larger centres. I am sure they need it, but it is obvious from reading this brochure and checking some of the information that this needs to be very carefully watched.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. L. Larson (Pelly): — Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words about this important Bill No. 73. Even though I don't represent a city the size that the Mayor of Regina does, or a town the size the Member for Moosomin is just lamenting about, I do represent and come from a community that is going to be able to make very good use of this kind of a program.

I agree with the Mayor of Regina in stating that this program is long overdue. It should have been on the road a long time ago. It is difficult to understand how we can hope to keep people in Saskatchewan, if we don't do something to improve service facilities, amenities, recreation and the like in our smaller towns and in our smaller centres.

I was interested in the comments of the Member for Moosomin. He again raises the old bogey that this causes inflation. Let me say to him that I have watched him and listened to him in this House on many occasions and heard him say, if you don't spend money it is inflationary because someone else has to dig it up. If you do spend money it is inflationary. I wish he would make up his mind as to what inflation to him really means. I am becoming thoroughly convinced that he doesn't have a clue what he is talking about when he talks of inflation.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Larson: — He wound up by attacking the Mayor of the city of Regina in the comments he made.

I think a very unfair attack, unfair in that he is bringing in personalities and things that happened a long time ago. Certainly the Mayor has proven himself very capable of looking after his monkey cages and everything else. Very capable. I am absolutely certain that the Mayor will prove himself equally capable in getting for the city of Regina the best dollar's worth for the money that is going to be available under this program. So to attack him is rather very nebulous and negative and a very weak approach.

He talked about street improvement programs being gone. And again he quoted as usual phony figures. He talks about a

community of 400, 500 to 600 population having street improvement programs that run to \$40,000, \$50,000 and \$60,000. I should like to see that kind of little town that has these kinds of programs that run into \$50,000 and \$60,000. So all in all it was the usual phony two-bit Liberal approach, whining and crying. You can't have it, yet we want it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Larson: — When you get it we don't want it, but we would like to have it. How really ridiculous and stupid can you get?

One of the things that is emerging in the comments and the statements from the Members opposite is the real scare and fright of the programs that are being brought in by this Government. They are really frightened and scared. Scared that we will go to the people in an election. Scared that they are not even going to come back with the lonely 15, it might be probably four, not even a corporal's guard.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Larson: — They are doing everything in their power to try to confuse the issue, to try to fool the people. They are trying to do everything to detract from what is going on in the province; trying to throw up smoke screens, trying to create all kinds of, as I said, phony issues.

The boost that this kind of a program will give to the cities and the towns and the villages of the Province of Saskatchewan is pretty hard at this stage to assess. If there is a weakness in the program, it is going to be in the ability to find people to do the kind of work that is going to be available, to find the kind of people who can take the jobs and do the work and do the developing. This may prove to be the weakness of the program.

Certainly cities and towns have been waiting a long time to get this kind of assistance. It is not impossible to continue — and I speak as a farmer — to keep on building an agricultural base without sustaining and improving the urban base. Our towns and villages won't survive unless we improve facilities and amenities. This is one, and a very good way of doing it.

It is going to give new life, new perspective and a new life to all these towns. The people will be able to enjoy the things that they now must go to the cities for. The cities in turn, will be able to improve where it counts the most. Where we are able to see the progress, a balanced progress, between urban and rural. Certainly this is long overdue.

The \$47 million is a substantial amount of money. The grant features of this program make it more attractive than any kind of a shared program that you could invent.

The strengthening of local government by having local decisions made on content and direction that the projects will take is a very important step. The Members opposite are trying to confuse people into believing that the Government is arrogant and that it is trying to grab and seize power. Here we have \$47 million that is being put into the hands of local governments to spend as they see fit.

April 1, 1974

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Larson: — I couldn't think of a better way to strengthen local government, I couldn't think of a better way to give them something to really get their teeth into. And yet, Members opposite are trying to drag out the red herring that we are trying to destroy local government.

An Hon. Member: — A Liberal dead fish.

Mr. Larson: — Yes, it is a Liberal dead fish, that is for sure.

If this program had not been brought in at this particular time, we could have seen and watched the disintegration of our villages and communities. We have made a good start as has been mentioned by the Open Roads Program and other programs that were geared to help some of the physical facts. But we still needed this program to get construction and to get amenities and to get facilities by way of recreation going. The local tax base certainly was not there, it certainly could not be expected to be carried totally by the local people. The whole province is going to benefit immensely and therefore it should be shared on this kind of basis. So I am very happy and very pleased to be a part of a government that brings in this kind of program.

I invite Members opposite to examine some of the things you are saying. To examine some of the stands you are taking on some of these issues. To look at your credibility either in the country or in this House. Do you really believe that the people of Saskatchewan are naïve enough or foolish enough to believe this kind of prattling nonsense that is being spread? Certainly, they are the first ones to judge whether or not local autonomy is being taken away from them. Certainly they know when they have power and when they have money to spend. Certainly they are the first ones that will come to the Government and say, okay, or hold on. Rather than have it become the theme, the total theme of the Members of the Opposition, surely if you want credibility in the country, you are going to have to change your tactics or my prophecy that you will go down to a corporal's guard is certainly going to prove correct.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Larson: — Mr. Speaker, I am very happy and very proud to support this Bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. K. R. MacLeod (Regina Albert Park): — Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to make any remarks on this Bill and I am not even sure that I can today, after the Hon. Member who just spoke because I almost choked when he condemned someone for raising a matter that happened a few years ago. It seems to me that half of every speech we hear in the House, particularly from the Government side of the House, deals with ancient history, and not very accurately at that.

This is a very intriguing thing we are going through right now and it is a very interesting lesson in political

psychology. I recall a year ago the Government spent a lot of time speaking on the tremendous good they were doing for the old folks by painting their front door and repairing a board on the side of the house. It seems to me the smaller the benefit, the longer the speeches of Members of the Government. I should mention that virtually the entire benefit of old age pensioners, for example, is borne by the Federal Government but the longest speeches are made by the Hon. Members opposite for the very tiny amount they do.

The Liberals get less credit for building a whole house than the NDP take for themselves for painting the front door.

I do support this Bill and the principle that more money should, in fact, be paid to the cities. But don't call it an elephant if it is only a horse. And that is really what is happening.

An Hon. Member: — A mouse.

Mr. MacLeod: — Or a mouse. First of all I wanted to know what was happening here.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacLeod: — I hear the Government talking over and over again about unconditional grants. And then they produce for us the instructions which are given to the cities, towns, villages and rural municipalities in making application for this grant. Step 5 says this, the heading is: "Provincial Approval and Grant Commitment". Attached to the letter are the numerous forms that have to be filled out by the cities and towns and villages before any of this money will be spent. Then it says in paragraph five:

Upon approval of a project application, the Department of Municipal Affairs will return one copy of the application with the Department's approval endorsed thereon. The approval will state the amount of the grant commitment to the project.

Later on it says:

However, you can still proceed with your project.

Apparently you can proceed with the project if you are prepared to pay for it but whether the Government pays or not depends upon Provincial Government approval. There is a lot of double talk in this whole thing. And what the Government is telling everybody is this, you can spend this money any way you like as long as you have the Provincial Government's approval of the way you spend the money. The fact of the matter is this, that there are numerous strings to the grants that are being laid out under this Bill.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot avoid the conclusion that the Government is using this also as an escape mechanism. The amount of money which may go to the city of Regina over a period of five years under this project, is something like \$10.5 million. That money is totally inadequate. The amount of money which the city of Regina ought properly to spend with respect to the improvements to its sewage system and is required by the Qu'Appelle

April 1, 1974

Basin system alone, comes to something like \$15 million. Now, the \$11 million which the Government of Saskatchewan will pay to the city of Regina over the next five years will not pay more than two-thirds of the total amount of money which the city of Regina should spend if its sewage treatment facilities were to be brought up to the proper standard as required by the Qu'Appelle Basin Study.

The fact is, therefore, that the Government is shouting about this Capital Grants program and is hoping thereby to avoid payment of proper amounts of money under other programs particularly the Qu'Appelle Basin Study.

More than that, every time that somebody comes to the Provincial Government in the future, it will be faced with the comment, "spend money under the Capital Works program, use this unconditional capital grant." And it will be spent 40 or 50 different ways by government speakers. The Government is therefore attempting to use this to escape its responsibilities for snow removal, responsibilities of recreation, its responsibilities under the Qu'Appelle Basin Study and in addition is making absolutely sure that if any other government grant is available, it will not get money under the unconditional Capital Grants program. I refer the Hon. Members to the form of application for the grant which is attached to this letter. Under item 6, it is made perfectly clear that the calculation must include any other government moneys available. I assume this means federal money because it says in paragraph 5, "Is this project eligible for any provincial or federal government grants or any other community capital fund grants, yes or no?" Paragraph 6 further says this:

That the grant payable is the lesser of the government grants, including federal government grants or the amount calculated under this particular Bill.

Therefore, the city of Regina will be deprived of Capital Grants from the Government of Saskatchewan in every case in which it is entitled to receive a federal grant.

You cannot possibly say that it is an unconditional grant to the city of Regina, if, in fact, it is a grant that is conditioned upon the following:

That there are no other moneys available to the city. More than that, every time the city of Regina takes money under this grant program, it must be prepared to spend 40 per cent of its own money. This is hardly an unconditional grant. It means if there is to be an unconditional grant for capital purposes, I suggest that the Government of Saskatchewan say to the city, "Here is money, spend it as you see fit. We do not impose the requirement that you burden your taxpayers with additional moneys to get this capital grant." The fact of the matter is this, that this horse is being ridden in every direction at one time and for a number of purposes.

I have tried to find in the Budget where this would be in the Estimates. I looked at the capital works part of the Budget Speech and I observe that the amount is to be \$45.75 million. Inflation is obviously growing at a faster rate than even I had imagined because by the time we receive this Bill in the House, Bill 73, the amount is now \$47 million. I looked in the Estimates to see where there might be payment of any one of these figures,

either \$47 million to the consolidated fund as proposed by Section 4 of the Bill or \$9.15 million as one-fifth of the amount spent under the capital works part of the Budget, or \$9.2 million being one-fifth of the amount of money being mentioned in Section 4. I don't see it in the Estimates. I don't see it. I would assume that the Province of Saskatchewan is intending to make a grant to this consolidated fund and if so, it should appear in the Estimates. I would hope that the Hon. Minister would kindly indicate where this amount of money is to come from as it doesn't appear in the Estimates, because frankly, I don't see it.

I do see, however, \$6 million on page 59 for unconditional operating grants but I don't see any offsetting legislation before us in the House, any enabling legislation. I, therefore, assume that the Government has changed its mind a bit from the time it printed the Estimates and the time it printed the Budget to the time it brought this Bill to the House, which indicates a rather haphazard approach to governmental operations. It is something we are becoming accustomed to and if we are going to continue with that kind of custom, I would suggest that the commencement of the Legislature in November of each year is virtually useless to us because by the time February or March rolls around the Government has changed its mind on almost everything.

Mr. Speaker, I support this Bill because it gives additional money to the cities, towns, villages and rural municipalities. I support it because of the increase in the amount of money but I want the Government to be perfectly aware that if they try to tell us that they are doing everything, we shall know differently. We know very well that we have got to spend 40 cents for every 60 cents we get from the Government. We know very well that we will lose other programs. We will lose every federal grant because it says so in the application form.

Mr. Messer: — It says nothing of the kind.

Mr. MacLeod: — It says that in the application form. More than that, we know very well that the Government will be pointing to the cities and will be telling the cities every time an application is made for recreational facilities, (and I must say that I was very pleased to see the Hon. Member for Regina Wascana (Mr. Baker) supporting the stand for additional recreational facilities for the city of Regina) but I was not pleased to hear about the delays that were obviously going to occur before we get additional community skating rinks in Regina. I have been asking for these things now for three or four years, and I am disappointed that we are unlikely to get them for another couple of years. I ask the Hon. Member for Regina Wascana to give top priority to this particular project and if he does, I can assure him that he will get my support.

Consequently, Mr. Speaker, this money which is being spent over and over by governmental speakers, will in the result be found to be totally inadequate for the job which it is intended to do.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. T. M. Weatherald (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a few words on this subject because I think that this program isn't quite all what it is claimed to be by the Government. For example, apparently capital grants are going to take the place of what were a substantial

April 1, 1974

number of grants under the previous Liberal Government.

For example, in the city of Regina, the amount of money I would think estimated must be at least around \$5 million into the Centre of the Arts, which I would presume would not be expected to be put up by the city of Regina as a capital works project.

In the city of Saskatoon, the Centre of the Arts received a substantial amount of money for that project which I would expect now would come out of the capital works projects.

I think my main concern has to be for a number of the smaller communities that apparently are going to get less money under this program than they did under the old one. It is very easily understood how this is going to come about.

I wish the Member for Pelly (Mr. Larson) was here because I could quite easily tell him as the Member for Moosomin did, that there was a community last year of 600 people who received the amount of money mentioned for street improvements. It isn't too hard to calculate. Even under a lesser amount of money under the old program of street improvements, for example, in my constituency, the town of Carlyle, under the Liberal Government's program of paying 56 per cent of the cost of paving a main street received \$35,000. Their total amount of money they will receive over 5 years, will be \$75,000. Now, the Government raised it to 70 per cent. The 70 per cent they were willing to pay previously on paving main streets the capital grants projects that they have brought in will barely cover the amount of money they were receiving before. It will be slightly larger.

If you go into many other communities, this program, I think, by the Government — while generally it is a step in the right direction — has not been thought out well enough. I would think that this is pretty obvious by their brochure: "Street Improvement Programs":

Street improvement projects planned for construction under the previous program will be accepted as projects under the new program.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it goes on to say that communities will be expected to pay for this out of their own capital grants project. Obviously the communities that did it last year are in a much better position than those which have not done it yet. The ones that did it last year and in some cases received \$35,000 to \$40,000 will still qualify for the full \$75 per capita which is good, Mr. Speaker. But the Government should not be discriminating against those communities that were unable to carry out their street improvement program last year.

In essence, I would suggest to them that the street improvement program that was in operation last year should still be continued and shouldn't have anything to do with the \$75 per capita amount that the Government is talking about whatsoever.

It is obvious if you look through the Estimates, that what the Government has done, is they have taken some of the money from the rural areas and they have put it into larger cities of Regina and Saskatoon.

Let's take a look here, for example, at the community of Fairlight in my constituency. This year they received from the Provincial Government \$37,500. It is to build renovations to the skating and curling rink and the community hall for 30 jobs. The Government here is estimating their grant at \$37,500. Mr. Speaker, the total \$75 per capita, over 5 years, won't amount to \$7,500 to the village of Fairlight because there are less than 100 people there. In other words, under the new program it would get approximately \$7,500 or less. Under the current program they got \$37,500 this year. I don't think that the town of Fairlight can figure that this was a step in the right direction. It is obvious that this is what is happening. If we look on page 59 of our Estimates book, we have last year appropriated \$5 million for the Provincial Local Initiatives project for authorized grants for the purpose of fostering winter employment in local school units, hospitals, etc. This year that budgetary figure has dropped from \$5 million to \$3 million because the Government has replaced this program of helping the very small community they have replaced that program with a program of paying the \$75. So Fairlight, Saskatchewan, is fortunate they got the Winter Works project this year because next year they wouldn't be able to come up with anything like that amount of money.

Now, I want to make another case, Mr. Speaker. On page 62, for example, which bears out precisely what I said about the Government's program that they certainly advertised pretty widely. It was Open Roads and it was pay 70 per cent of the streets, now this year in the Estimates grants for street improvements in towns, villages and hamlets — zero. Estimated last year it was \$1,650,000, so it is obvious in the Estimate book that those towns that were previously getting, under last year's program, 70 per cent of the costs of their streets and this year they are not getting that kind of a payment for them and they are going to be expected to pay them out of the \$75 per capita. Now my point simply is this, that there are many smaller communities in Saskatchewan that are paving their streets and fixing up their streets and would have got more money under the old program than they will under the \$75 per capita grant system. It is quite easy because we can find examples all over.

I would suggest the Member for Pelly (Mr. Larson) phone over to the Department of Municipal Affairs and he will find quite a few towns last year that got \$35-\$40,000 and under this new program of \$75 per capita they won't get that much over the next five years.

Now obviously the Government has taken this money out of some of the rural small communities of Saskatchewan and they have put it into the city of Regina and they have put it into Saskatoon. Well I think that Regina and Saskatoon need unconditional grants and I am 100 per cent in favor of it but I don't think that the program of improving streets and so forth that was put into place beginning under a Liberal Government and improved under the present NDP administration, that that program should have been scrapped in order to save money to supply an unconditional grant of \$75. Basically, Mr. Speaker, I think that this is of considerable importance and I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Smishek that **Bill No. 67 — An Act respecting The Department of Health** be now read a second time.

Mr. G. B. Grant (Regina Whitmore Park): — Mr. Speaker, I am sorry the Minister is not in the House when this Bill is being discussed because it is an important Bill even though it was referred to the non-Controversial Bills Committee initially. I am sure the Minister did so with all sincerity but there are a couple of features of it that makes it very difficult to support.

First of all I should like to point out if this Bill is adopted and approved that in the future the Deputy Minister of Health need not be a doctor and while I can appreciate the thinking back of this I wonder what the Attorney General's reaction would be if the Deputy Minister of his Department were not a lawyer or if the Deputy Minister of Agriculture had no background whatsoever in agriculture. I think we could go right down through most of the departments and find this. Under the present conditions in the Department of Health the Deputy Minister of Health is doing very little of the day to day administrative work of the Department. It is being carried out by the associate Minister who is not a doctor and this to me is a good combination and one that should be continued. I think it would be most regrettable if this Bill was approved and resulted in the Deputy Minister, the second rating individual in the Department after the Minister, was not a doctor. Now if the Bill suggested that the Minister should not necessarily or probably should not be a doctor then I would approve it because I don't think the Minister of the Department of Health need be or necessarily should be a doctor.

Let's look at what is happening in the field of health in Saskatchewan. It really demands more and more the presence of a doctor in this very important portfolio. First of all the Government is now the owner and operator of the four major hospitals in Regina, all the hospitals you might say. In Saskatoon the Government is operating the biggest hospital and probably the most important hospital in Saskatchewan at the present time, the University Hospital. The Department is also operating the Palliser Hospital down in Swift Current. More and more every day in every way the Department of Health is getting involved in the direct delivery of health services and consequently being involved with the medical profession and the paramedical groups. So this, to me, dictates the necessity of the Deputy Minister of Health being a medical man if at all possible. I think that this should be one of the first requirements and only in situations where it is absolutely impossible to get a doctor should a Deputy be a layman and then I think he should be appointed in an acting capacity only.

I think that is all I wanted to say on that point and it is most difficult for me to support the Bill with that omission. It is covered in Section 3 where it makes reference to the Deputy Minister of Health. In the previous Bill it said, "and he will be a medical doctor."

Now the rest of the Bill, until you get to the Oath of Secrecy part, is quite acceptable because it pretty well repeats what was covered in the previous Bill of the Department of Public Health. But let's look at the Oath of Secrecy. I think this must and should cause concern to a lot of people in Saskatchewan who have lent their services and their abilities to various governmental departments and in the Department of Health. The ones that quickly come to my mind are the Alcoholism Commission, the University Hospital Board, the South Saskatchewan Hospital Board,

the General Hospital Board, the Palliser Board, the Cancer Commission, Medical Care Insurance Commission, the Advisory Boards on the dental program and such committees as the Judge Johnson Cancer Inquiry Committee that was set up while I was Minister of Health. If I read Clause 12 correctly, this would put the Minister in a position where he had the privilege of requiring any person constituting those boards to take the Oath of Secrecy. Now I don't think that there is any reservation on anybody's mind about the necessity of an Oath of Secrecy among a staff of a department such as the Health Department, the Attorney General's Department, almost any department. I think the Civil Service recognizes and accepts the necessity of secrecy in many, many areas. But it is a bit of a departure when a government is going to give the Minister the power to require any person appointed to a board, commission, committee or council to take an oath before entering upon his duties at any time.

Now it doesn't just say that the Minister can require this Oath of Secrecy from those he is responsible directly for appointing, but he can also require the Oath of Secrecy from those who are recommended by professional bodies and associations etc. Taking the Medical Care Insurance Commission as an example, the Governor-in-Council, but their names are submitted by the College of Physicians and Surgeons and by the medical school and this Bill would have the affect of enabling the Minister to require anyone or all of those individuals to take the Oath. I think it is placing quite a bit of responsibility on the Minister and the Act says he may require, he doesn't have to do it, but he may require it. He doesn't have to require all the people on the commission to take the Oath of Secrecy or just any person, I just wonder how he would pick and choose as to the individuals he would ask to take the Oath of Secrecy and the ones he would miss? To me it is placing the public who serve on these boards in a position where I would imagine in quire a number of cases they would be tempted to say, no, I don't wish to serve on that board if I have to take such an Oath of Secrecy as required by the Minister. Because I could imagine members of the Alcoholism Commission or the Medical Care Insurance Commission or almost any other, the Cancer Commission, any of these commissions or boards, to be bound not to express their disagreement without the permission of the Minister. It says, "Except as authorized by the Minister, they won't divulge any information in the course of his duties." So that would mean that if during the course of this committee's sittings that if something comes up that he violently disagreed with, his one choice would be to resign from the commission. I just wonder which department is next. I can see the Attorney General feeling the same way that there may be committees or commissions or agencies working for his Department that he might want to muzzle a little bit and make sure that they don't speak out of turn.

Mr. Speaker, other than those two Sections the Bill really just consolidates and clarifies the old Department of Public Health Act and makes reference to the repeal of Section 84 of The Public Health Act which is covered in here, so there is no change there. It is sort of an overriding Bill to enable the Department to administer all the other Acts that they have. So while it is a tidying up Bill to that extent I think the Oath of Secrecy and the provision for the Deputy Minister of Public Health not being a doctor are the two serious clauses and I personally cannot support the Bill because of those features.

April 1, 1974

Debate adjourned on the motion of Mr. Romanow.

The Assembly adjourned at 9:31 o'clock p.m.