

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fourth Session — Seventeenth Legislature
44th Day

Thursday, April 4, 1974

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. R. Gross (Gravelbourg): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to introduce at this time 16 Grade Seven students from Gravelbourg Elementary School under the direction of Mr. Forest. The students are seated in the west gallery. I trust they will have an educational experience today and I look forward to meeting with them at around 3 o'clock.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

STATEMENT

Error in Leader Post Re SEDCO

Hon. K. Thorson (Minister of Industry and Commerce): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to correct an error which appeared in the Leader-Post for April 1st, 1974 and I understand may have appeared in other newspapers as well. It has to do with information that was tabled in the Crown Corporations' Committee with respect to investments made by SEDCO. The information as tabled indicated that SEDCO lost money on investments in two companies, Ad Fab Structures Ltd., and Rolloflex Ltd. Unfortunately when the information appeared in the Press it indicated that SEDCO had made a profit on those two investments and that was clearly an error and I should not like that to go uncorrected.

I may just say, Mr. Speaker, that with respect to those two companies the loss in Ad Fab Structures Ltd., was \$50,000 on a preferred share investment; and in the case of Rolloflex Ltd., \$1,750, again preferred shares were purchased.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Malting Facility in Saskatchewan

Mr. Thorson: — Mr. Speaker, while I am on my feet, may I take the moment to say to the House that Henninger International and the Government of Saskatchewan (through SEDCO) have organized a company whose object will be to develop a malting facility in the Province of Saskatchewan. This facility is to be located in the Biggar area and provided our application to the Department of Regional Economic Expansion for assistance is approved by that Department, we should see the development go forward fairly quickly.

It is estimated that the malting facility will use about 8 million bushels of barley from Saskatchewan annually and the total employment when the facility is fully operational should be in the neighborhood of 60 jobs.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

Local School Board at Ile-A-La-Crosse

Mr. A. R. Guy (Athabasca): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Education and also the Acting Minister of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan. The Government has argued many times during this Session that one of their major accomplishments to date has been the establishment of the Ile-a-la-Crosse local school board. The Government has been holding this school board up as an example of local autonomy, where the local people have been participating. The other day this local autonomous school board made a decision by the majority of the members of the board regarding school teachers for the coming year.

My question is, why is the Minister interfering in the affairs of this local autonomous board when the Government has made so much of the fact that they are running their own affairs, the Minister is now interfering in these affairs by setting up a mediator? The Minister has closed down the school for an indefinite period of time.

Hon. G. MacMurchy (Minister of Education): — Mr. Speaker, in reply to the Member for Athabasca, the Minister of Education and the Acting Minister of Northern Saskatchewan are not interfering with the affairs of that school board. There is obviously a really serious community problem as a result of the decision that that board made. So serious a problem that we have had a sit-in, we have had a sit-in in that school from last Thursday until Tuesday evening. On condition that the sit-in end and the parents return to their homes and the community become a much quieter community emotionally, we, in discussion with the Director of Education for northern Saskatchewan and the chairman of the school board at Ile-a-la-Crosse suggested to that chairman that the school be closed for yesterday and today. Holidays begin tomorrow and continue on into next week in northern Saskatchewan and at Ile-a-la-Crosse.

The purpose of sending in a mediator was to try and present to the community some vehicle by which they can settle their differences, still maintaining the school board and the autonomy of that board. And I have, as of this morning, appointed Mr. Hugh Thompson who is a Regional Superintendent to do that job. He is familiar with northern Saskatchewan having worked there and I hope he can help that community settle their differences.

Mr. Guy: — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. The Minister, of course, has not answered the question as to why he interfered in the affairs of an autonomous school board. And if what he says is true, if we are to support his argument my question is, is he going to shut down communities and schools every time there is a sit-in? Because if he is why doesn't he shut down the Department of Northern Saskatchewan because there have been several sit-ins against the Department of Northern Saskatchewan. The best thing that could happen would be to shut

it down for good.

Mr. MacMurchy: — Mr. Speaker, I have not interfered with the school board. I have made public statements in support of the autonomy of that particular duly elected school board. There is no question about that. I might also reply to this supplementary statement that it was not the Minister who closed the school, it was the chairman of the school board, Mr. Joe Favel.

Steel Development in Saskatchewan

Mr. J. G. Richards (Saskatoon University): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Hon. Mr. Thorson in his capacity as Minister of Industry and Commerce. There has been considerable discussion in the Press obviously about the impending steel development within Saskatchewan and western Canada. My question concerns, what will be the distribution of investment and jobs between Saskatchewan and Alberta in general terms? Given obviously that IPSCO has been very anxious that Alberta pick up options on a large number of shares, which would seem to indicate that IPSCO is anxious to become the steel company of western Canada and to assure itself some kind of state monopoly in western Canada, what guarantees do we have that there is not within IPSCO a desire and an intent to try and locate as much of any new investment in Alberta as opposed to Saskatchewan?

Mr. Thorson: — Mr. Speaker, I really think I cannot answer that question. The Government of Alberta up to this point has not invested in the IPSCO Company. Discussions are going on involving the Company, representatives of the Government of Alberta and certainly there are discussions going on between the Company and representatives of the Government of Saskatchewan. What they will lead to will eventually become known and I shall be able to answer such questions.

Mr. Richards: — A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, we have headlines in the Leader-Post talking explicitly about this project, some unofficial news release, and we try and raise the issue in the Legislature and we get no co-operation. There exists an option which the Alberta Government can take advantage of up until mid April. All the indications from unofficial sources are that they do intend to take up this option. What does it mean in terms of the role of the Alberta Government in IPSCO? I think it is highly legitimate that in this Legislature we ask questions about that and the Minister should be able to provide more information than he has to date. Can the Minister say, in general terms, what is going to be the relative impact of investment in iron and steel in Saskatchewan relative to Alberta? If he can't say definitely what will be final policy, how far has it gone to date? What are the options being discussed by the Provincial Government, the Alberta Government and the Federal Government and IPSCO?

Mr. Thorson: — Well, Mr. Speaker, as I said, the discussions are going on. What they will lead to eventually will be announced but clearly I can't lay out various proposals and counter proposals that are being discussed and still carry on the negotiations. It is quite obvious I am sure, Mr. Speaker, and I

think that is the point of the question of the Hon. Member, that the Government of Saskatchewan will not agree to an arrangement which would jeopardize the employment of people in the steel industry in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker: — The question just raised is a good example of asking questions on future policy. Members, the rule says, shouldn't be asking the Government to make statements on future policy but what is fait accompli and I think the Hon. Member is asking for a projection. I think we should try and stay away from that type of question.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. J. C. McIsaac (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, first of all I should like to direct a question to the Premier or in his absence, the deputy, or in his absence which ever one of the three frontbenchers may be Acting. I wonder, first of all, Mr. Speaker, if the Premier is aware that when he isn't here very few other Members of Cabinet seem to consider it worthy enough to take their time to come into this House for the question period.

On the question of Government announcements, whether they are future policy or present policy, Mr. Speaker, I want to know if it is the intention of the Government to continue making announcements outside of the Legislature at a time when the Legislature is in Session, which I suggest, Mr. Speaker, is acting in contempt of this House. I refer to the announcement on The University Act, several announcements by the Minister of Education — he called a Press Conference in Saskatoon. We have the announcement of the minimum wage by the Minister of Labour, it's a good one. I don't know why he wouldn't want to make it here in this House when the Legislature is in session. The steel mill, that's a little bit different, we understand that kind of a sleazy sneak preview, something like a stag movie, we understand why that was held outside of the House. But my question is, is the Government going to demonstrate its respect for this House and discontinue this practice of showing contempt as I say by staging announcements and so on outside of the Legislature when it is in session.

Hon. J. R. Messer (Minister of Agriculture): — Well, Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Premier and the Deputy Premier, I guess it becomes my turn to attempt to answer some of the questions that the Leader of the Opposition referred to last night. I hope perhaps I am more successful than the Deputy Premier. I don't know whether that is the reason for his absence today or not. But I do want to respond to the opening remarks that the Member for Wilkie made in regard to other Members of the Cabinet being absent. I want to let it be known to the House that the Premier is not here because of illness, the Attorney General is not here because of other Government business and is representing, I believe, the Premier. The Minister for Northern Saskatchewan (Mr. Bowerman) is hospitalized and the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Kowalchuk) is also away because of illness. These reasons are beyond the control of those individual Members and I know want the impression left that Members are off on a holiday or something like that as may have been read into the remarks of the Member for Wilkie.

Turning to the question that the Member for Wilkie made in regard to whether or not it is going to be Government practice to make all announcements outside of the Legislative Assembly rather than here, I should like for the benefit of the Members to your left, Mr. Speaker, to remind them of the policies of the Liberal Government when some of them were on the Treasury Benches, in regard to announcements. I can recall a good many announcements being made in the Press before and perhaps not even to be announced in the Legislature. I believe that it is a decision that the individual Minister has to make in regard to when and where he is going to make his announcements. Certainly a good many announcements are made by the Government when the session is not in process, they are made by calling a Press Conference. I think that this is a standard procedure and I don't think there is any real requirement that a Minister, if he so chooses to announce something that relates to the Government or his particular department, that he necessarily has to make the announcement here before the Orders of the Day, before he makes the announcement to the general populace of Saskatchewan.

Mr. McIsaac: — Mr. Speaker, just a short supplementary on that point. At least we now know from the Minister that it is up to the choice of the Minister whether he wants to announce it in here or outside. Obviously most of them have chosen to take the outside route and not come into the House. I can ask the Government and ask the Premier, and I hope it is conveyed to the Premier, that he reconsider that kind of a policy. It breaks from the tradition of the Liberal Party when we were in power and it breaks from the tradition of their party when they were in power before because the House was used and should be used for these announcements. I suggest very, very sincerely that they consider returning immediately to that practice.

SECOND READINGS

Hon. J. R. Messer (Acting Minister of Municipal Affairs) moved second reading of **Bill No. 84 – An Act to amend The Property Improvement Grant Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, the prime purpose of the Property Improvement Grant is to relieve the owner of a large portion of his property tax which is levied for the operation of our school system. This program to say the least has received wide public support and the Budget presented at this Session provides funds to greatly increase this grant and to further reduce the tax burden on property for education purposes within Saskatchewan.

This Bill, Mr. Speaker, will increase the maximum grant for a principal residence from \$144 in 1973 to \$160 in 1974.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — This Bill will increase the maximum grant for business property from \$180 in 1973 to \$200 in 1974. This Bill will increase the maximum grant for farm property from \$270 in 1973 to \$300 in 1974.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — Mr. Speaker, grants from the Department of Education should hold the average mill rate for school purposes in 1974 to 43 mills. One of our promises to the electorate was to effectively reduce the average property tax for education to 25 mills. This Bill, Mr. Speaker, provides for a Property Improvement Grant based on 20 mills which will reduce the average tax rate for school purposes to 23 mills for the majority of property taxpayers. A promise made and a promise kept, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — Mr. Speaker, a person who owns the residence in which he lives can qualify for a grant equal to one-half of the property taxes levied against his residence up to a maximum of \$160. Although the ratio for municipal taxes to school and hospital taxes varies between municipalities, the average ratio is 50-50 between municipal and school taxes. A refund of one-half the taxes to the property owner will mean the Government has completely removed the school taxes on his property.

A minor amendment is made in the Bill to clarify that where an eligible applicant dies the payment of the grant may be made for that year to his executor or other person entitled by law to apply for authority to administer the estate.

Services such as roads and streets, sidewalks, police and fire protection are services to property and this constitutes sufficient reason to charge the property for the cost of these services.

The benefits of education, however, Mr. Speaker, are not a benefit to property nor are they confined to any one municipality. Rarely does a person use the benefits of his education in the municipality in which he received his training. In many instances he practices his profession in a province other than the one in which he took his training. These reasons, I think, clearly indicate that the cost of education should be removed from property and transferred to a source at either the provincial or federal level or a combination of both which more accurately reflects the ability to pay by the general public.

Mr. Speaker, the last Liberal budget, provided 183,000 residents with homeowner grants totaling \$12.3 million. In 1972, our first year of office, we reviewed this grant program and made the grants available to a greater number of residents of this province. At the same time we increased the maximum grants that could be claimed by an applicant. In 1973 we again increased the amounts and over 233,000 residents, some 50,000 more than in 1971 received \$30.2 million in grants.

Let me just review a moment, Mr. Speaker. One hundred and eighty-three thousand eligible residents in 1971, were paid out \$12.3 million under a Liberal government. Two years later, 233,000 eligible residents, more than 50,000 more, received grants under a New Democratic government, \$30.2 million in 1973, an increase of \$18 million in a two year period of time to the residents of Saskatchewan, under a New Democratic government.

Mr. Speaker, we have added an additional \$2.4 million to this program for 1974. The increase in the 1974 Budget over the

April 4, 1974

1971 Liberal budget, three years ago constitutes an increase of 265 per cent in this grant program.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — I think, Mr. Speaker, that it is abundantly clear that our promise to effectively reduce the property taxes for schools is indeed being carried out.

Mr. Speaker, having said these brief few words, I take great pleasure in moving second reading of this Bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J. G. Lane (Lumsden): — Mr. Speaker, it is obviously a good Liberal idea and a good Liberal program that is being improved with the spending of more money.

Mr. Speaker, the Bill evidences a failure on the part of the Government opposite, however, to solve the gut problems of municipal financing. Municipality after municipality is announcing in the papers these days and on the media that they are forced to up their mill rates. They are upping their mill rates in some cases considerably more than the increased monies being given to them. And surely this papering over approach, although the money is welcome, this papering over approach is not solving any basic problems and is not helping the municipalities who are being forced into more and more municipal spending by the Government.

I mentioned in the Community Capital Fund debate that there are activities on the part of the Government which will force many municipalities to spend more money than perhaps they should. It forces them to take programs within a certain time period and forces them to assess their priorities and change their priorities to bring them in to line with a provincial government priority and not their own. Certainly the added money is welcome, but let's make no mistake that the increase in the Property Improvement Grant or the Homeowner Grant does not solve the basic problems of municipal financing. We will have more to say, Mr. Speaker, and I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

Hon. G. MacMurchy (Minister of Education) moved second reading of **Bill No. 90 – An Act to amend The School Act (No. 2)**

He said: Mr. Speaker, Bill 90 contains a number of minor housekeeping amendments to The School Act and one amendment which will be of major significance to the teachers of our province.

The major amendment is a change to Section 270 of The School Act dealing with the right of teachers to hold office as elected trustees. Prior to 1968 the teacher could stand for election to office of a trustee, providing that that teacher did not stand in the district in which he was employed. This makes sense, Mr. Speaker. It's natural, understood by most people, that when negotiations are involved, a teacher should not sit as a member of the board which employs him. Conflict of interest could well arise. Having to make decisions concerning the teaching staff of which he is a member, could be difficult for both the teacher

and the board. It is a common and an accepted labor practice that in any one organizational unit the same person cannot play the role of both employer and employee at the same time.

It would be ludicrous to suggest, however, that because such a practice does exist and because it's accepted, it also means that a person cannot function as an employer at the same time as he is an employee in another organization or in another business. Indeed to suggest the latter is true would be very undemocratic. How could democracy function if the normal citizen could not sit on a board which was the responsible employer of employees charged with a specific service to the public? The whole basis of democracy, it seems to me, is that the public elects representatives to make decisions on its behalf concerning the policies, concerning the personnel of the organizations which serve it. Such a practice operates from the humblest level of public office to the highest and it is difficult to imagine anyone seriously questioning that process. It is difficult enough to imagine anyone questioning the process, but it seems to me it's downright impossible to imagine anyone not honoring that process when there is a challenge.

Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what took place under the administration of the Members opposite after their election in 1968. Not only did the Liberals not honor the process, they enacted legislation which was, in effect, contrary to that process. Prior to 1968, Section 270 of The School Act permitted a teacher to hold office as an elected trustee in any district other than the district in which he was employed. In passing The Teachers Salary Agreements Act, 1968, the Liberals repealed Section 270 and enacted an amendment to say that a teacher could not be a school trustee in the negotiation area in which he was employed. Now there were 13 negotiation areas in the province under The Teachers Salary Agreements Act. The areas were large enough, but the problems of distance would make it virtually impossible for a teacher to serve as an elected trustee in another area.

If a teacher did want to serve, it's obviously difficult to get elected because it would be difficult to be well known that far away. And anyway why should a teacher want to serve? It's extremely doubtful that a teacher would have any of his children attending school in another area. So they had it pretty well figured out and were safe in assuming that their legislation would prevent any teachers from serving on school boards as elected trustees.

The present amendment, Mr. Speaker, restores teachers to the status they enjoyed prior to 1968. Their rightful status as citizens fully eligible for election to public office as school trustees in any district other than the one in which they are employed.

This amendment is important now and will increase in importance as more and more people live in communities other than those in which they work. Teachers who work elsewhere can now assume their full rights and responsibilities as citizens in the community where their children attend school.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Bill contains three other minor amendments and two housekeeping amendments.

Section 70 subsection 2 is an amendment to make it not mandatory to swear a religious oath as a condition of being a

April 4, 1974

candidate in school elections. This removes any possible charge of discrimination in the matter of who can attend as a candidate for school trustees.

Section 83 subsection 1 provides for any voter who is called upon to take an oath to identify whether he is a public school or a separate school supporter. This was formally done, formally done verbally by the Deputy Returning Officer and the amendment simply removes the possibility of error.

Section 264 is an amendment to include loiterers in the group of undesirables listed in the section which the school authorities may remove from the school premises if necessary.

Mr. Speaker, the other amendments are of minor housekeeping nature, designed to bring The School Act in line with other Acts presently passed.

The changes to The School Act No. 2 contained in this Bill are progressive changes, Mr. Speaker, and I am pleased to move that Bill 90 be now read a second time.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. C. P. MacDonald (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, just a few comments on the Minister's remarks.

First of all, after listening to the Minister I was sure now, that a school teacher living in Avonlea could now absolutely participate in any school board in the province. I suggest that this does very little for the school teachers in the Province of Saskatchewan. Let's take an example of a rural school unit. The rural school unit may be 75 miles square. All of a sudden a teacher is located in the middle of that, say the Milestone school unit, such as the town of Avonlea. Now this says he can't hold office as a school trustee on the board that employs him. The Minister says he could go to Moose Jaw or he could go to Regina and he could stand as a school trustee there and nobody debates that. And it was very little different than the area clause that was put in in 1968. It narrows it down, it opens it up and because now there has been a transference of negotiations and collective bargaining power from the local board to the provincial board this now broadens it so that a teacher doesn't have the same restrictions as he might have had in the 1968 Act.

Certainly we support the principle of this particular Bill. We will not oppose it, but let's make sure that we understand very clearly what the Minister is doing here. He is saying that really no school teacher, unless he happens to work for the public system in the city of Regina can then hold office on the separate school board in the city of Regina, Saskatoon, or wherever there are two boards and we certainly agree with that principle, but it's not broadening it. He's really got the same basic fundamental right as was contained in 1968.

Mr. J. C. McIsaac (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, just a very brief comment to reiterate the points made by the Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald). I listened with some interest for the Minister, as he began debate on this Bill 90 which is the second set of amendments to The School Act he has had to bring in this year. I'm not sure

whether this little section here has resulted from a little conference, or cocktail party or whatever he may have had with some of the Federation and decided to bring this back in, but it's a very small little move. It doesn't do any of the great things the Minister would lead the House to believe. It does, I'm sure, perhaps apply to maybe 10 per cent of the teachers employed in the province and there's nothing wrong with the move that the Minister is making, and we'll certainly support it, but I just wish to point out that he did get carried away somewhat in his introduction.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

Mr. MacMurchy moved second reading of **Bill No. 77 – An Act to amend The Teacher Collective Bargaining Act, 1973.**

He said: In moving second reading of the amendment to The Teacher Collective Bargaining Act, perhaps I might just bring the Members of the Legislature up-to-date on the reasons for bringing forward the amendment.

In an action initiated last year by the Board of Education for the Moose Jaw school district No. 1, the Board of Education for the Moose Jaw separate school district and the Board of Education for the Moose Jaw high school district and the Moose Jaw unit, against the Attorney General of Saskatchewan and the Saskatchewan Teachers Federation, the plaintiffs sought to declare Sections 3 to 34 inclusive and Section 37 of The Teacher Collective Bargaining Act, 1973 be declared ultra vires of the Legislature. The ground was that the Legislation is repugnant to Section 17 of The Saskatchewan Act which amends the BNA Act Section 93. Now Section 17 of The Saskatchewan Act states that nothing in any such law will prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to separate schools which any class of persons have to have at the date of the passing of this Act.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Roman Catholic faith expects that religion will permeate a Roman Catholic school system in all its relationships. The plaintiffs argued that the right and privilege to operate their systems in this fashion was transgressed by The Teacher Collective Bargaining Act, 1973.

It was submitted that province wide bargaining has caused the separate school boards representing the Roman Catholic minority to lose control of their budgeting. Secondly, the plaintiffs argued that province wide bargaining causes the separate school board to lose control of its teachers.

However, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Justice MacPherson did not accept either of these arguments. There was one section of The Teacher Collective Bargaining Act, 1973 which in his opinion constituted a means by which the Act may be employed to trespass upon the rights and privileges of a separate school board and that is Section 32.

It provides to each party to a grievance, a right to have it resolved by arbitration. It provides that Sections 19, 20, and 21 of the Act shall apply to the arbitration. Subsection 3 of subsection 19 provides that such arbitration is binding and it's final. The grievances defined in Section 2 (h) as including any disagreement between the parties to a collective bargaining agreement with respect to the meaning or application of the bargaining agreement, to any violation of it or any matter

April 4, 1974

involving disciplinary action by a school board against a teacher except dismissal. That last clause is the offending one, since a grievance could not get to binding arbitration without a board's consent, involving one of the rights and privileges of a separate school board. Namely, it is the regulation of the selection of teachers or the administrative and instructional duties of teachers, or the nature or quality of an instructional program including religious instruction.

Mr. Justice MacPherson stated that Section 32 is ultra vires because it permits interference with the school board's right to operate the system to such an extent as to affect it prejudicially.

The amendment as proposed removes from the definition of grievance, the words, or any matter involving disciplinary action by a school board against a teacher except dismissal. By making this amendment, the Legislature will be following Mr. Justice MacPherson's recommendation and the Act would henceforth operate without further litigation.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to move second reading of this Bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. C. P. MacDonald (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, just a brief comment. First of all I am not going to go into the suit filed by the Moose Jaw and District Area School Trustees or School Boards against the Attorney General. I, in principle, think they had a very valid argument, or a very good argument and certainly one that I think is now being considered for appeal. I am not sure whether they have made a final decision to proceed or not. I think it was a good idea to bring it before the courts and clarify it once and for all.

The argument for the rights of separate schools in the Province of Saskatchewan is a traditional one and a very important one that is held very sacred by many, many people of the province, particularly that minority group, Roman Catholics.

I am not going to get into that. Judge MacPherson has brought down his decision in that regard. As I say I think there was a valid reason for going to the courts and I am not sure what the final decision will be if the decision is appealed.

I think this amendment is a good one because if I have read the amendment correctly, and I understand the amendment properly, and taking from what the Minister has said, by removing that portion, that last clause or phrase from Section 32 or any other matter involving the disciplinary area action against a teacher, except dismissal, means at least, and the Minister can inform me when he closes debate, it means that this removes any question that the school board has the authority over the teachers whom it hires. And this was the point that Judge MacPherson was making, by making it a grievance, and the arbitration procedures that follow. It meant that in reality some of the decisions of a board in relation to the teachers it hires, could be brought to binding arbitration and therefore the school board did not have complete control over the people whom they hired in the areas as set out in the Act,

So I do support the amendment. I think it does clarify it; it removes once and for all any question of an agitation or an aggravation between teachers and school boards in the province. Clearly, once again it stipulates what is a grievance, those things that come within the collective bargaining agreement and all of the things the school board then has, the power and the responsibility in control of the teachers whom it hires.

I hope that the Minister can tell me if I have interpreted the Act or the amendment correctly.

Mr. J. C. McIsaac (Wilkie): — Just a brief comment, Mr. Speaker. Regardless of the legal action that may have resulted in this amendment, I think it is a good amendment. The Minister well knows that for many years the objective of the Federation by and large has been to get almost everything and anything considered as a grievance as such, whether or not it directly related to the collective bargaining agreement.

I think the amendment before us cleans up the definition of ‘grievance’ which previously was a very, very wide definition, which allowed almost anything to be considered as a grievance, even though there may have well been other channels for dealing with those matters. As I say, regardless of where it comes to us from, as a result of court action or elsewhere, I do think it is a definite improvement and should result in an improvement with respect to definition of grievances and so on with respect to collective agreements, be they provincial or otherwise.

Mr. MacMurchy: — Mr. Speaker, I think the statement of the Member for Milestone and the Member for Wilkie are accurate in terms of interpretation. Certainly as we stated in our speeches and was provided in the legislation that what is taught, how it is taught, and who is to teach it, should not be a negotiable item. This was obviously, as Judge MacPherson pointed out, contrary to that original position and obviously contrary to the rights and powers of the school board.

I am surprised, Mr. Speaker, to note the earlier comments by the Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) where he is saying that he is still supporting the efforts of the school boards in Moose Jaw. That obviously he is still taking the position of opposition to The Teacher Collective Bargaining Act, even after a year’s trial, where we have seen settlements for three years – one for 1973 and a recent and very major one, for 1974 and 1975 and I will be bringing forward legislation with respect to the superannuation and group life insurance which were very much a part of that package.

We think it is going to work. We think that it has already shown that and I must say that I am surprised, but I am pleased that they support this amendment. I think that as we review both teachers, trustees and government review, the experiences, that we might have further amendments to bring forward for The Teacher Collective Bargaining Act, probably in the next session.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Messer that **Bill No. 79 – An Act to Regulate the Ownership and Control of Agricultural Land in Saskatchewan** be now read a second time.

Mr. E. F. Gardner (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, I think you will agree that it was fortunate that I looked over this Bill before I broke my glasses. I think this is the kind of a Bill where you are better off if you are not able to read the fine print. If you could just read the title of the Bill, then deal in generalities, as the Minister did in his second reading speech, perhaps you would not be too concerned. If you could listen to some mythical farms by the Arabs or some multinational corporation, perhaps you would be taken in. But not if you read the Bill carefully. I think if you look at the Bill carefully, certainly any Saskatchewan resident or any Canadian would be concerned when he actually sees what is in this Bill and realizes the true intent of the Bill.

I should just like to add that this Bill should have included some mention of recreational land. The Bill, in itself, is poorly drafted and we should like to see the Bill withdrawn, as it was in 1972. But any kind of a Bill that is looking at land use, in any province today, should certainly have some reference to recreation land. The Minister, in his speech, talked about Americans coming up and buying large tracts of land for hunting or something of this nature, and of course, nothing was done in the Bill about that.

He refers to land use Bills in Prince Edward Island or British Columbia or Nova Scotia or elsewhere and largely they are concerned with recreation use of land and perhaps rightly so. I don't think anyone wants to see someone from another country coming in and buying a great deal of land around the Okanagan lakes in British Columbia or around our lakes in northern Saskatchewan. There should be some control over this and this is completely left out of this Bill.

The Members, I believe, would all have no real objection to some restrictions on corporations, but we would like to make it clear that there is absolutely no statistical evidence to indicate this is an issue right now or is likely to be in the very near future. The Minister should not be using this as an excuse to bring in this Bill.

He mentioned how many millions of dollars that Exxon made in the last year and typically NDP scare tactics, where he indicates that these people may be interested in our agricultural land. Of course, there is no evidence of this. The evidence, in fact, is the other way around, the very few corporations who hold any agricultural land in this province are trying to divest themselves of this land, and I am sure the Minister knows this better than anybody because he has access to records which indicate that such companies as the CPR, Marathon Realty and one or two others – and this is about all there are that have any land, that they are selling this land as they get the opportunity because they have no intention, of course, to use it for agricultural purposes.

In looking at the Bill, Mr. Speaker, we realize quite readily that the intent of the Bill is the same as the Bill that was brought in on Foreign Ownership in 1972. In this case we are calling the people non-residents, who are under the regulations of the Bill instead of foreigners as this may sound more palatable. But the intent of this Bill is to place restrictions on other Canadians. This leads to the intent of the NDP Government for domination of our agricultural lands.

I want to say, again, that the Foreign Ownership of Land Committee, which was set up by this Legislature, did a very good job. I wasn't on the Committee but I read the report. I am sure they were conscientious; they studied the problem in depth; they had good consultation with the people of the province and even some people outside the province and it is very significant that no member of this Committee advocated, or apparently wanted any restrictions on Canadian ownership of land. It just wasn't suggested, it wasn't advocated by the Liberal members of the Committee nor the NDP members. Apparently this is what they found from consultations with people at the meetings that they had. The recommendations of the Committee were ignored in this regard, and of course, through them the recommendations of the public were ignored.

When you look at the Bill and see the very severe restrictions that are placed on Canadians, you wonder why the recommendations of the Foreign Ownership of Land Committee were ignored. Of course, the real reason is that the NDP want to control the land and place restrictions on other Canadians regardless of what the Committee indicated.

So this is the true intention then of the NDP Government, I mentioned in my remarks yesterday some of the discrepancies in the Bill, certainly the one which favors some Americans over Canadians in other parts of Canada, and the ridiculous situation where an American farmer living a few miles south of the border, at Bowbells or Crosby, North Dakota, can come up into Canada, come up into Saskatchewan and under the Bill as it stands here, could buy an unlimited amount of land 450 miles away, at Meadow Lake, and the Bill simply wouldn't apply to him because he is within 20 miles of the Saskatchewan border. Even though he is a foreigner, by our usual conception, he doesn't have to abide by our laws here, our income tax laws and other responsibilities, but he is free to buy all the land he wants, whereas a Canadian living near Virden, Manitoba, if he wants to have some holdings around Maryfield, Saskatchewan, 30 miles away, of course he is under the restrictions of this Bill because he may be just over 20 miles outside of the Province of Saskatchewan.

I suppose someone is going to suggest that perhaps regulations may be brought in to correct this inequality and this perhaps could be done, but it certainly won't make the Bill any more acceptable.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gardner: — The true intention of the Bill is to make Canadians foreigners as far as we are concerned, when they want to own land in Saskatchewan. They are foreigners in their own country as a result of this Bill.

April 4, 1974

We also indicated yesterday our concern over Section 19. I hope that everyone takes a good look at this section because it is the key as far as this Bill is concerned. I want to remind you that Section 19 is not referring to non-residents, as described in the Bill; it is not talking about someone living in the United States or even someone living in other parts of Canada. It is talking about any farmer who has farmed in this province and maybe has been here for two or three generations. Any farmer can be investigated. He has to prove that he has been here 183 days a year if they ask him. He has to indicate how much land he owns. They can ask for all of his records, books, papers, documents and so on and if he fails to provide them he is subject to a \$500 fine.

We are not talking here about non-residents, people outside of Canada or people outside the province, we are talking about farmers who live right in this province. It is further control and harassment of our own farmers by this NDP Government.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is obvious that we can't support a Bill, which promotes the shabby treatment for our friends and our neighbors elsewhere in Canada.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gardner: — It is a bad precedent for Canada; it is against the concept of our Canadian heritage and we will be very strongly against this particular Bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. F. Meakes (Touchwood): — Mr. Speaker, may I say to this House that it is with a great sense, deep sense of fulfillment and satisfaction that I rise in support of this Bill. I say that for two main reasons. First, as I stated one year ago when we were debating the report of that Committee and of which I was a member, and I say again that since I first came to this Legislature in 1956, I have talked of the necessity of doing something constructive to keep our rural communities alive; farmers on the farms, and business in our communities. For too long governments have neglected our rural communities and our farmers.

I say this by remembering what I said in 1957 when I made an address in this House in which I talked about how that winter that in my community there was quite a large number of farmers who, because of the economic conditions, were working and had found jobs in the city and that I was afraid that a number of them would not return to the farm because of having got jobs in the city.

Since 1956 when I came here and since that time, I have seen great changes, great changes in our rural communities. At that time in Touchwood constituency, a six quarter section farmer was a large farmer. And I might say that at that time I was a six quarter section farmer.

Today there are lots of three and four section farmers. In 1956 nearly every farmyard had its flock of turkeys, geese, chickens or all three of them. Each spring the housewife bought 100 turkeys, young turkeys, or young geese or a couple hundred chicks and raised them herself. She lovingly

tended those young fowl all summer and yes, I can remember my wife going out and the chickens jumping up onto her shoulders and on her head. She did it with love because she loved those chickens.

By November those chickens were sold, those turkeys or those geese, to the public. This money was used to get winter clothes for the children, for presents for the family at Christmas or indeed, to help pay farm debts. But suddenly and all at once, Mr. Speaker, all within about two or three years, there developed the eviscerating plants, local eviscerating plants, and in turn they silently got into partnership, and we saw 20,000 turkey farms, 20,000 egg laying plants, etc., and in no time this farm housewife was forced out of her little business. These super farms were able to force the price down to the level where she couldn't compete and I can think again in my home community of the women saying – well, let me put it to you this way that one of my friends who owned a 22,000 turkey plant, told me that he netted 45 cents a turkey, 45 cents a turkey on 22,000 turkeys was not a bad net income. But the woman with 50 turkeys she was unable to net 45 cents and that 45 cents wasn't a very worthwhile income for her work.

Since those days I have watched the change in the agricultural scene, in cattle and in pigs, to some degree the same thing has happened. I'm not saying in this House that it is all bad, but the advent of the worship of size has always made me shudder. Rather we should be thinking of maximum efficiency and productivity of the land each farmer does farm.

I should like to quote from the Final Report of the Special Committee on Ownership of Agricultural Lands which was filed a year ago, a quote about one of the livestock operations that we visited. I'll quote from that part which deals with the owner of this very large feedlot that we visited in Greeley, Colorado. Monfort was the owner and we saw 100,000 head of feeders in one feedlot. He owned another feedlot of the same size seven miles away. He owned also the slaughtering plant, he owned the trucks that delivered the meat from the slaughtering plant, they were refrigeration trucks, to his customers basically on the eastern seaboard where he said the processed meat was sold. He bought the alfalfa from the local farmers and I say that he was one of the better types. He was much better than one of the other companies that we visited, the Ceres Land Company where they were into everything from cow-calf operations, grew their own feed, owned their own packing lot, wholesaled the meat from the time the calf was born to the time the meat was sold on the retail market.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote just a little bit from the Report:

Warren Monfort began feeding cattle on a year round basis in the thirties near Greeley, Colorado. His son, Ken, now operates the company, Monfort of Colorado, which has six subsidiary companies and feedlots and slaughters and markets with 600,000 head of cattle per year. Monfort cattle buyers purchased stock weighing from 600 to 800 pounds throughout the western United States. Each of the two feedlots holds 100,000 head and the feeder is fed about four months. There are around 250,000 acres in Nebraska, Kansas and Colorado and Iowa that supplies the corn, the grain that's consumed. The Company owns its own elevators, owns its

April 4, 1974

own cattle, refrigerator cars and many kinds of trucks.

I want to say also that Mr. Monfort owned only 2,500 acres and in many ways I would say that he was better, much better than the other company we met, the Ceres Cattle Company. But I see these things and I know that some Member from the Opposition will rise and say, oh, yes, but there is nothing in the Bill. I'll be dealing with that a little further on in my remarks.

During our hearings and traveling across Saskatchewan, I became more and more convinced that action has to be taken. In the words of a number of people, both from Denver, particularly in the Denver, Colorado area said, "Lock the door before the horse is stolen." And we had also this same suggestion from numerous delegations who met before us in Saskatchewan. I admit I am not counting it as a majority. But on page 26, I should like to quote again and in a sense possibly answer my hon. friend from Moosomin (Mr. Gardner) who just sat down when he talked about the CPR or rather Marathon Realty which is a fully owned subsidiary of CPR, are trying to sell their land. This is certainly not true in some areas of Saskatchewan and I am now going to quote again from the Report on page 27, at a meeting held in Kerrobert and I am quoting again, Mr. Speaker, from the Committee Report:

Most people in Saskatchewan know that the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Hudson's Bay Company have in the past been owners of very considerable amounts of land in Saskatchewan. Examples of corporate farm operators are less known well across the province but their effect on the communities around them can be illustrated by several examples.

One example was cited as evidence at the Kerrobert meeting. The evidence was that Marathon Realty, a wholly owned subsidiary of CPR, owns approximately 40 sections in the RM of Rosemont, No. 378. Eight sections are operated by the Mesa Ranching Company which is reported to be from Minnesota.

Still quoting from the Report but I am quoting the words of the director of district 6 of the National Farmers' Union when he stated, and he was referring to the Marathon Realty land company:

All of this land was formerly used by local farmers who needed it as a pasture to provide themselves with a viable cattle operation. They were dependent on this land for income. It would appear that Marathon is leasing pasture land to Mesa in preference to renewing the leases to the farmers. For at least seven farmers the leases were not just renewed to them but they were subsequently granted to the Mesa Ranching Company. The major purchases of these eight sections are not done locally but are reported by businessmen to be done in Calgary. Lumber and treated posts and cattle are bought by semi-carloads from elsewhere. The farmers who formerly leased this land did their shopping locally, thus supporting their local community.

And I would like to add that as long as farmers rented land from Marathon, he was not allowed to take any of his neighbor's cattle into the pasture. But now Mesa Ranching Company is

actively soliciting cattle put on pasture.

I was sure that my hon. friends, the Liberal Members across the way would oppose this Bill with their laissez-faire attitudes. In a sense possibly I'm glad that they do. It will then be our Bill and we will take the credit for it. I see this Bill as the culmination of one of my great hopes over my many years in the farm movement acting as a local co-op board member, my activities in the Farm Union Movement, as a CCFer and later as a New Democrat. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the passage of this Bill will be an historic day for the farmers of this province.

There are one or two other things that are not included in this Bill which I would be happier to see in it. I believe that it should cover the size of intensive livestock operations. After seeing that 100,000 head of livestock in one feedlot in Colorado and knowing, as I say, that he owned another feedlot of the same size, and hearing that owner admit that such an operation might be better operated as a Co-op, it leaves with me a fear of what can happen here. Nevertheless this Bill can be amended at some other time if this danger becomes evident.

This Bill follows fairly closely the Report of the Special Committee on the Ownership of Agricultural Land. For this reason I congratulate the Minister of Agriculture who has introduced the Bill. It follows the suggestions of stopping the purchase of large tracts of land by large corporations either inside the province or out. It defines an acceptable agricultural corporation as one in which 60 per cent of all legal shares are owned by farmers who are resident persons and are primarily engaged in the business of farming.

Mr. Speaker, this is important to me. During our hearings we were told of the operation of large parcels of land being owned by a Florida based company which took some of the prime land in the Fillmore district. We were told of a farmer from the United States farming around 70 quarters of land south of Weyburn. He moved his machinery over the border, farmed the land, moved the machinery back. Along with it he took the revenue of the land. Such happenings cannot be anything but bad for our communities.

Within this Act such companies have 20 years to dispose of their properties. In my own personal opinion 20 years is too long a period. In 1932 in North Dakota, when they passed their legislation banning corporations from owning land, they gave the corporations only 10 years to dispose of their holdings. I should be much happier if ours were the same. I realize it was a compromise and I am prepared to go along with it.

The main thing is that we have this legislation which will stop any takeover of land by large corporations in the future. In other words the door is locked before the horse is stolen. There is only so much land, Mr. Speaker, on this earth and it is said that of all the total land mass only about seven per cent of it is arable. So in my opinion that land must remain in the hands of as many farmers as possible. Farmers should not be thinking so much of acquiring more land but rather of producing more food for a hungry world on the land that they do own.

I agree with the definition of a 'resident person' as one

April 4, 1974

who lives at least 183 days of a year in Saskatchewan. Many of our older farmers wish to spend some of the winter in warmer climates. In no way should they be stopped from being able to move to a warmer climate than we get in Saskatchewan during our winter months.

I am glad to see that any corporations which have in the past done their own farming have only five years to stop this practice and either rent the land to a bona fide farmer or sell their holdings. This is as it should be. In all fairness you have to give them the opportunity to get the most out of their machinery that they presently own but I think it should be stopped. Such companies have in the past contributed little or nothing to the local communities. We must return the farmers to the land and this will help our local communities.

Another think not studied by the Committee and not in the Bill is anything about farm size. We visited an area around Mott, North Dakota, where farm size had grown to the point where eight or ten farmers were farming nearly the whole community. Farms had reached up to the size of 125 quarter sections. We met with a dozen local businessmen and they didn't like it. Their town of Mott, once with a population of 3,000 had dropped to less than 2,000. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that in the future another Select Committee of this Legislature should be set up to study this problem. In my opinion this problem must be faced and solved in the near future.

I support the Bill that there be a limit to the amount of land of non-residents in Saskatchewan. I think the \$15,000 aggregate assessment is a reasonable one. Absentee ownership drains all the profits out of the province and out of the community. I also agree with the special exceptions for inheritors and relatives of one time farmers.

Above all the holding of non-agricultural corporations being restricted is what I had hoped for. That is to me the key of this Bill. This kind of ownership is the worst. We must keep Saskatchewan for Saskatchewan farmers.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to quote from a news report headed Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture, March 1974. I'll quote just two paragraphs:

The SFA agricultural policy proposals presented to the Government of Saskatchewan caucus and to the Liberal caucus March 6th and 8th, were well received. Those proposals covered a wide range of subjects including a recommendation of nationalizing the western rail network, a feed grains plan, and a grain stabilization plan.

The brief stressed a need for ownership controls on farm land owned by non-agricultural corporations and by persons not actively engaged in farming.

So I say again, Mr. Speaker, this Bill brings me a feeling of fulfillment. When I retire after the next election I will feel that I have had some small part in the work of seeing this Bill being enacted and becoming the law in the Province of Saskatchewan. I see the passing of this Bill the making of a better Saskatchewan and a better Canada.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. K. R. MacLeod (Regina Albert Park): — Mr. Speaker, I was one of the three Opposition Members who served on this Foreign Ownership Committee. The largest number of course were Government Members and the reservations of the three of us which differed substantially from the Government Members is printed in the Report. I cannot help but reflect at this time that it is unfortunate that the directions to the printer put the type face of the Opposition Members at a size far smaller than the body of the Report and the remarks of the Opposition Members are truly fine print.

It was very enlightening to be a member of this Committee. As we went around Saskatchewan at almost every place we stopped a member or a representative of the local New Democratic Party came forward and made a brief to the Committee. Those briefs probably gave us a greater insight into the thinking of the New Democratic Party than even this legislation before us today and it is frightening. In almost every case there were wails about the people leaving rural Saskatchewan and we subscribe to that concern but the solutions are enough to shock any person who listened to all of the debates and the presentations. There was a consistent pattern of attempting to keep people on the land by force and by legal restrictions. There were numerous requests to restrict the size of lands, the amount of farm land that any farmer in Saskatchewan could operate. I see that this is continued in the Bill.

I refer specifically to Sections 9 and 10, along with Section 7, but particularly 9 and 10. If a man should leave Saskatchewan and move to British Columbia for seven or eight years and if he should then die and pass his land on to anyone, that land falls within the restriction set forth in Section 7. Because it provides that there is only a five year limitation, if you do not farm land five years before it is transferred to your son even that is not exempt.

The effect of Sections 9 and 10 is the start of an effort to force people to stay in Saskatchewan. It is the beginning of an effort to freeze people into this area and I can assure you that I oppose every effort to drop an iron curtain around the Province of Saskatchewan which is what this Bill starts to do. An iron curtain is being cast around Saskatchewan. If you leave Saskatchewan obviously you leave your land behind, but more than that you are very limited in the people to whom you may transfer the land after you have gone.

I oppose this Bill because I think it is a bundle of nonsense and with respect to the remarks of the Hon. Member for Touchwood, genial nonsense. We all look back with some nostalgia on our younger days. I spent all my childhood and youth on the farm and we raised the chickens referred to by the Hon. Member for Touchwood and we took them to town and sold them. When I got to be a little older, we farmed south of Tisdale, with a dairy operation and we were obliged to discontinue it because we could not afford to install the pasteurization equipment, the very expensive equipment required, before we could continue.

And while we look back with some nostalgia the fact of the matter is the procession of events was natural and sensible. It's a dreamlike world that we are living in if we believe that we should go back in every case to the kind of days we had before. It cannot happen and it will not happen and it will not

April 4, 1974

happen because it doesn't make sense for it to happen. But if it could happen or should happen there is nothing in this Bill which in any way solves one of the problems raised by the Hon. Member for Touchwood. The speech of the Hon. Member for Touchwood did not in any way except by accident deal with the realities of Bill 79. The fact of the matter is that this Bill is ill conceived, to suggest that other Canadians should still be regarded as foreigners is totally anathema to us.

We oppose the concept that someone living in Virden or Portage La Prairie or Lethbridge should be regarded as a foreigner so far as Saskatchewan is concerned. But further we do not think it makes sense to give the person in Scobey, Montana or North Portal or Noonan or any of those places 20 miles south of the border unlimited rights to buy land in Saskatchewan. That kind of nonsense makes this whole exercise totally futile and ridiculous. Consequently, Mr. Speaker, while I have supported and will support a sensible foreign ownership Bill and for those who want to know the kind of a Bill, they need not look too far, we have laid our recommendations clearly in the fine print, to be sure, on page 48 of the Final Report of the Special Committee on the Ownership of Agricultural Land. That is the kind of foreign ownership Bill to which I subscribe, that is the kind of foreign ownership Bill that at least one or more others of the Liberal Members will subscribe to and support in this House. But I can assure you that I would be very disappointed if even one Liberal Member supported this Bill, in fact I would not be surprised if Members such as the Hon. Member for Weyburn (Mr. Pepper) and the Hon. Member for Elrose (Mr. Owens) didn't look at this Bill with a considerable amount of shock, particularly having regard to the remarks and their reservations in the Report.

For example, Mr. Speaker, and I quote – they are referring to the retroactive effect the recommended Bill would have had and the recommendations of the majority members would have:

We do not feel that there is sufficient agricultural land owned in our province by corporations to warrant such drastic measures.

Even two of the Government Members regard as nonsense some of the stuff that is being said in the House and is presented in this Report. They go on further to say:

These corporations purchased this land in good faith and under the rules, regulations and Government restriction in effect in the years in which the transactions were completed. They did nothing wrong or illegal.

Despite that, the Government prejudice against corporations continues to make itself apparent. As a matter of fact the whole report is filled with nonsense. They talk glowingly of the activities of Monfort of Colorado – the fact that it's a good corporate citizen, providing work for people, has carried on business with the best of ethics. Then it says with the greatest of gloom and suspicion, they say that just because it has done this in the past there is reason to expect that somebody else would take over that corporation and carry on differently. This kind of suspicion and gloom has no place in the Report and has no place in the Bill.

Mr. Speaker, the entire Bill and the remarks of the Hon. Member for Touchwood require further attention. I wish to

deal with some of the points raised by him in detail. I can assure you though that it is my intention to vote against this Bill and to fight here and outside the House as long as I can in an effort to get the Government to withdraw this piece of nonsense. If they can't bring in a Bill which follows the reasonable recommendations of the Opposition Members in the Foreign Ownership of Agricultural Lands Report then I have no choice but to oppose it. I will give further details at a later date and I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of 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.

Hon. A. Taylor (Minister of Social Services): — Mr. Speaker, there are just a few comments I should like to make on this Bill at this time. I think Members on this side of the House, and I would certainly hope Members on the other side, will agree that this is a rather exciting new concept in capital funding for the communities of Saskatchewan. For too long the communities have been waiting to find out what will be available next year before they can make their plans. This may have been a next year country in many ways, but municipalities find it extremely difficult to make their own long-range plans without some idea of what will be available from the senior governments. This Bill provides them with that knowledge in the field of capital financing. It will be well accepted by most communities in the province, if not all.

May I give you some examples, Mr. Speaker, of what this will mean in some of the communities which I represent. The town of Kindersley, under the Community Capital Fund, will have \$258,000 over a five-year period. The town of Kerrobert, around \$88,000 in a five-year period or \$17,000 a year. The town of Eston \$106,000 over a five-year period or \$21,000 yearly, over a five-year period or \$9,000 per year. So we could list a good number of others, Mr. Speaker.

The communities in this way will be able to develop their plans for new town halls or city halls, as the case may be; streets and road improvements, rinks, swimming pools and other recreational facilities. They will be able to know what is available to them not just this year but in the next four to five year period.

One of the Members opposite, Mr. Speaker, indicated that somehow or another we don't trust the towns under 500 because of the indication we had given that these towns would not have to submit five-year plans. Well, Mr. Speaker, this, of course, is a total misrepresentation of the facts. But then I suppose the Members opposite don't really want to be confused with the facts anyway. The facts of the matter are that the small communities under 500 can, in fact, submit five-year plans and can, in fact, receive the full benefits from this. Indeed, the Department will assist them in developing five-year plans if this is their wish. It has been the feeling of the Government, however, that we should not bind these smaller communities to

April 4, 1974

having to submit such five-year plans. Some will not wish to do so, and some will not feel capable of doing so. This we feel should be the freedom of choice for these towns and communities. We think this is a legitimate argument. The larger centers certainly should have no problems in preparing and submitting five-year plans since they themselves usually have planning staff available.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few more words about this particular Bill, I, therefore, ask leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Snyder that **Bill No. 80 – An Act to provide for Workers for injuries sustained in the course of their Employment** be now read a second time.

Hon. E. L. Tchorzewski (Department of Consumer Affairs): — Mr. Speaker, this Bill is certainly a very substantial one and I know that one could say a great deal about many of the amendments that are being incorporated within the old legislation. I want to spend some time on two areas which are of particular interest to me.

I want first of all to say that the Bill presented to the House by the Minister of Labour is a progressive one in that it takes account of contemporary changes and circumstances. Traditionally it has been the man in the household who has gone outside the home to earn an income for the family and in that setting the role of the wife was that of homemaker whose place was in the home with the growing family. To a large extent that situation still exists with the father away from the home during the day, earning the family income. For many couples that is a desired and mutually agreed upon method of raising a family. In the last number of years greater numbers of women and many of them married women have secured employment in the nation and in the province. I am sure that figures in Saskatchewan would bear this out and in view of our excellent economic conditions in the province I am certain that there are more female employees than there were two years ago.

Now the income of the wife and the husband may complement each other or in some cases it may be the wife and the mother who is the sole income earner in the family. The previous Act ensured that the wife of a deceased worker is entitled to benefits regardless of her ability to be self-supporting, whereas the husband of a deceased worker would be eligible for benefits only if he were an invalid. Under the present Act, if the wife dies while on the job her financial contributions to her family will not be recognized unless she has an invalid husband even though she may have assumed part of the family's financial responsibilities.

The Royal Commission Report on the Status of Women commented on this situation as part of Recommendation No. 13 and it said:

We recommend that the provinces and the territories amend their Workmen's Compensation legislation so that the provisions applicable to the wife of a person deceased will also be applicable to the husband of the person deceased.

The new Act, Mr. Speaker, meets the concerns of the Royal Commissioners and the concerns of people in the province many of whom are working wives. Now the Act recognizes the financial contributions of working women to their families. It acknowledges the right of working women to provide the same benefit to their families as do working men in regard to pensions. The Act also recognizes the situation of the married woman being employed outside the home for an increasing number of families today which may be economically necessary and desirable for married persons.

Mr. Speaker, in the last three years many changes have been made in the area of providing equal opportunity for women in today's society. And some of the other actions that have been taken in this area have been amendments to the Labour Standards Act in 1973 which provides for equal pay for male and female employees performing similar work and also providing maternity leave of up to 18 weeks for female employees. Another significant action taken by the province was the establishment in 1972 of the Human Rights Commission, just to mention some of them. So I consider this area affected by this legislation, Mr. Speaker, to be very significant and very important.

I want to also briefly comment on the raising of disability pensions. As a Member of the Legislative Assembly I have become aware of many individuals in the province and particularly in my constituency who have received for long periods of time benefits which were outdated, and outdated because they were based on economic factors of another day. The raising of the full disability allowance to \$325 per month is a step in the right direction and a move that will be welcomed by disabled workers, many of whom have begun to lose faith in government and particularly during the seven lean Liberal years when inaction seemed to be the keynote of the day. The raising of the maximum limit will raise the benefits substantially to such people and it is a welcome move that gives the injured worker a better income than that which he or she has been receiving.

These people have given themselves in service to the people of this province and for many years many injured workers and their families have had to turn to alternate forms of employment, if one is able to obtain such work, in a field which often is unrelated to the job where the injury occurred, even though medically and physically that worker may have found it almost impossible to carry on employment. The provisions in the new Act indicate this Government's concern for these workers and their families who have suffered because of mishap and tragedy.

Now with these few words, Mr. Speaker, I want to indicate that I will be more than pleased to support this legislation. I want to have some more to say on it and I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Romanow that **Bill No. 1 – An Act respecting the Protection of Privacy** be now read a second time.

Mr. J. G. Lane (Lumsden): — Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that the Government saw fit to bring in this window dressing piece of legislation. It is also unfortunate that the Government would not give the public

April 4, 1974

and the Opposition its stand on what effect this legislation will have on the Press of the Province of Saskatchewan. There was some considerable debate in the past as to the necessity of press councils in the Province of Saskatchewan and of course the Government opposite turned tail after flying a kite and backed off on the matter of press councils. So the Attorney General can not say that he did not have enough time in which to consider that very important aspect. But the Attorney General insists on bringing in a Privacy Bill and then not mentioning the effect of the Bill on the Press and says that will be a matter of a House amendment.

I say that is rather an unfortunate way of proceeding on this very vital issue. And it certainly indicates, I think, the real stand of the Government opposite on the matter of privacy.

We are concerned not only with the rather devious approach of the Members opposite when it comes to the matter of Press Councils but the Bill also conceals the failure of the Government to deal with the matter of individual information or private or privileged information.

We have some examples – computer information now can be fed anywhere in North America. These records – information on individuals is no longer private once it has been put into a computer. Surely there is a role in this particular aspect for the Government of Canada and I am advised that the Department of Justice is taking an aggressive approach in this field and is attempting to come up with legislation that will protect the information which has been computer stored – information about Canadians and which will prohibit the information about Canadians from going outside the country without their permission.

The matter of private information was completely excluded from the Act, again more evidence that the Bill is simply window dressing. We have for example no concern in the Bill about the growing – ever growing problem of government information about individuals. As governments get bigger and especially the Government opposite they are demanding more and more information about individuals. Practically every program that has been introduced requires an application form. In some cases a means test – the Day Care Centres. And of course some very, very personal information is requested. There is information required for Senior Citizen Home Repair, whether or not the individual who applies for this program is prepared to permit inspection of the home before work is carried out. Really I don't think that is a matter of government information because I don't think that the question of whether they are prepared to allow an inspection or not should be an influencing factor. And yet obviously if the Government has gone to the trouble of printing up forms with that request it could be an influencing factor. Frankly, I don't think it is any of the Government's business whether or not the individual is prepared to permit inspection. If you insist on it, let it be done after.

We have also the Saskatchewan Farm Ownership, certainly a strong interference in individual's privileged information. No doubt the questions will range from citizenship, residence and every other factor, income and that is an unfortunate approach. It is unfortunate that the Government in its Privacy

Bill did not take into account the matter of individual information or private information.

There are other examples of Government questioning. FarmStart has such questions as what household furnishings do you have. Surely that is an unnecessary question and an unwarranted question. And it is something that the Government opposite should be encouraged to avoid. It is unfortunate that the Bill before this House does not take into account such picky questioning by the Government opposite. You want in FarmStart applications present debt summary, loan purpose, a person now has to give the creditor's name and address, the balance owing, the years left to pay, annual payment, security taken, amount in arrears and that includes personal loans.

As I say, the Government in a Bill before this House is completely ignoring its own faults and its own wrong-doing when it comes to the matter of protecting individual privacy.

I have another example, Mr. Speaker, Return No. 94 – the 1973 session, and I use it for example. I asked the Government the names of all government departments etc., which supplied the names of all government departments etc., which supplied mailing lists to any individuals or corporations in the year 1972. I got a reply, the Department of Public Health, the Department of Industry and Commerce, Finance, Provincial Library, Department of Continuing Education and the Department of Education all supplied mailing lists of names of Saskatchewan citizens to other companies or corporations or governments about individuals.

Now surely, Mr. Speaker, when the Government of Saskatchewan supplies a list of the citizens' names, addresses, occupations, we don't know what information to Ogawa Seike Company Limited of Tokyo, Japan, there has got to be something wrong. Kramer Tractor Limited got a list of names of all the citizens of Saskatchewan. So did the Edmonton Journal and lo and behold, Miss Sandra Cook and unfortunately I haven't had a letter from Miss Sandra Cook, I don't know if anybody else has. The Department of Finance has sent a list of information about Saskatchewan citizens to R. L. Polk in Toronto. The Department of Saskatchewan citizens to MacLean Hunter Limited. I don't know whether that has got anything to do with door to door sales results from the mailing list, I don't know. It certainly is something that a Privacy Bill – a proper Privacy Bill should take into account. Premier Sports of Calgary Limited got lists of Saskatchewan citizens. What did that include? Did that include age, income? I don't know. But surely it is a practice that should be strenuously restricted by the Government and again I find it very unfortunate that this legislation ignored this very pressing problem.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lane: — Sometime I think the Government are going to have to tell us why they sent all sorts of information about Saskatchewan citizens to Athletes Wear Company Limited. Why they would want the list of Saskatchewan citizens, age, occupation, salary, income, whatever it may be, I don't know. But the Government opposite supplied it. They supplied the same information to Betty Anderson Associates Company, Alberta Ceramic Supplies Limited, and one Adam Thomson, to pick just a few. The Augi Bus Company Limited also got a list.

April 4, 1974

This may seem facetious but I think there is a valid criticism of the Bill, it doesn't take into account the fact that so much of the personal information about an individual is no longer private. The Bill doesn't solve that problem, it avoids that problem. And for that reason I feel I must oppose the Bill and also of course for the reasons stated by the Member for Albert Park.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. R. Romanow (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I must first of all say that to a large extent, I think many of the comments made by the Member for Lumsden were, in my judgment, well taken. I thought the comments with respect to governments and how government protects privacy of the information that it has were very relevant indeed. I am concerned about the increasing computerization, information that government has and places on the computer record. And then seemingly indiscriminately gives out lists. For whatever it is worth, I, as one Member of the Government, have opposed giving out the names of operators' lists to such companies as R. L. Polk and the like.

I think one of the difficulties has been that as legislators — I say this now in defence of the Bill — we don't give enough consideration to the role that government has and the nature of government activity vis-à-vis privacy. Up until now we have thought that government and information that the government gets is public, by and large. We have felt that under these circumstances, subject to traditional rules of privilege, government information was in a category different than in a category say of personal relationships of individuals who meet or deal on a social or personal or business basis.

I get annoyed myself when I see many of what I think are frustrating and bureaucratic questions that are asked. I am not sure that The Privacy Bill, however, such as we have before the House, is the proper avenue to come to grips with this.

My judgment is, and that of my department officials is, that, it should really be dealt with in a special type of legislation which is forthcoming indeed from the Federal Government and by the provinces as they consider the question of their role vis-à-vis privacy. So I think that the questions that were raised by the Hon. Member were valid questions. I think misplaced in terms of the context of this Bill which deals with private individuals and their relationships, I think they can be properly dealt with and should be properly dealt with by governments in another form in another type of legislation, such as computer control legislation, data bank information legislation and so forth which is being actively reviewed by federal and provincial authorities.

The comments of the Hon. Member for Lumsden with respect to Press Councils were in my judgment totally misplaced. It is correct to say that I believe in Press Councils. I believed in them three years ago when I started giving some thought to this matter and I believe in them as strongly, if not stronger, today.

When you stop to think of a situation in Saskatchewan where, for example, the two daily newspapers are essentially controlled by the one company, registered, owned and operated

by outside interests outside Saskatchewan. When you look at the tremendous influence that in the city of Regina one radio station has, also linked through a subsidiary to the same eastern company, I think that it is incumbent upon all of us to ask whether or not under these circumstances we can be assured of accurate, fair reporting. That is not to say that reporters go out willfully to distort information, not at all. But I do say that it raises some valid questions about the role of the Press in a democratic society. I am not sure that a Press Council is the answer. I am not sure that a voluntary organization where publishers, working journalists and the public together on a Press Council are represented, whether that in fact is the answer to breaking what might be in the minds of many people, an unhealthy Press situation that exists in this province. But I tell you, I think that it is one approach which is certainly much deserving of consideration. My regret has been that the suggestion which I made, which was a purely personal suggestion, and not a Government suggestion, was dismissed strongly by the two dailies to which I have made earlier reference; dismissed without any public comment or criticism. I think the day will come when we as legislators and when we as members of the public will in fact begin to look at the role of the Press in Saskatchewan just as the Press looks at our role as legislators. We should look at their role, and I submit to the Member for Lumsden that Press Councils is an idea, a concept that is worthy of further consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make just one or two comments, in closing, about the statements made by the Member for Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod), when he spoke to the Bill.

The Member for Albert Park really missed the boat on two counts. He missed the boat firstly, in saying that the Bill would result in anti-social behavior. I think his exact words were that the Bill could lead to anti-social attitudes. He went on to give examples of people who are on a bus being subject to the provisions of the Bill because they have overheard the conversations which might take place in the bus. He advocated this point of view publicly outside the Chamber when he was asked by the Press.

The Bill may be frivolous and vexatious, but in my judgment, Mr. Speaker, the comments from the Member who would describe the Bill as leading to anti-social attitudes are certainly frivolous and vexatious. No one can reasonably portray that this Bill would lead to the type of consequences that the Member for Albert Park talks of.

First of all the Bill talks of circumstances which are reasonable. A judge has a great deal of latitude in the sum of all of the circumstances to determine what is an invasion of privacy and what isn't an invasion of privacy. I just don't believe that there is a Judge of the Queen's Bench Court who would under those examples say that overhearing a conversation at a cocktail party or on a bus is an invasion of privacy, and that the result would be anti-social attitudes on the part of the people of the Province of Saskatchewan. I really believe that the Member's criticisms in that regard were totally misplaced.

I want also in this area to point out to the Hon. Member for Albert Park that the Bill talks about willful violation of the privacy of another person. So that if one does overhear a

April 4, 1974

conversation, the key words in the Bill in Section 2 is that it is a tort for the person to willfully and without claim of right, willfully, violate the privacy of another person.

Surely any of the examples that have been stated by the Hon. Member would be exempt from the provisions of the Act because it could not be reasonably portrayed as being a willful attempt to violate the privacy of any individual.

Mr. MacDonald: — How do you . . .

Mr. Romanow: — That in fact is the law. That is what the provisions say. It would be willful. I can point out also to the Hon. Member that in British Columbia for seven years and in Manitoba for four years that not one action of that type was raised. No lawyer would advise anyone to raise an action of this nature and it could never be sustained in a court of law. I can tell you that if it did come to that type of situation we'd be the first to come back with this Bill either to amend it further if needed or to rescind it if that was the actual end result. So I say to the Hon. Member for Albert Park he was totally in error there and I thought that his comments were frivolous when he talked about anti-social attitudes in the end result of this Bill.

Mr. Speaker, one other comment which I should like to make with respect to the role of the Press and the proposed amendment. This is an area that leaves a politician like myself totally confused. Frankly, I don't know as a Government whether we are to listen to the Opposition or whether we are not to listen to the Opposition. Up to now I thought that it was smart politics to listen to them, maybe not to acknowledge it publicly very often but at least listen to them to see what the criticisms are about. When this Bill was first tabled in December, the comments by the Leader of the Opposition and by all the Opposition Members who spoke on the Bill at that time was that generally they weren't opposed to the Bill but that the one big worry they had was the potential threat it had to the freedom of the Press. That this was really an attempt by the Attorney General to come back around what he couldn't get by way of Press Councils, namely, to muzzle the Press with the Privacy Act. But that if we could overlook and overcome this worry about muzzling and freedom of the Press, it was implied by the Leader of the Opposition that the Bill would be acceptable.

Well, in any event, the position was by the Liberals opposite . . .

Mr. Steuart: — . . . said that . . .

Mr. Romanow: — No, the Leader of the Opposition did not say that. I have a newspaper clipping, but I can't put my finger on it immediately, but I could dig it up in a matter of minutes, where the Leader of the Opposition is quoted on this. In fact I might be able to put on my finger on it while I am making my remarks exactly on the Bill.

But in any event, Mr. Speaker, the point that I make is that

the position of the Opposition basically was that the threat to freedom of the Press is the biggest opposition that they had to this Bill; that it was an attempt or could be an attempt to muzzle the Press so-called.

This also was the concern of the Saskatchewan Weekly Newspaper Association — “Privacy Bill Concerns the Weeklies.” And I might say it was also the concern of the newspaper types whom I spoke to, both privately and publicly. This was the big concern of the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix, freedom of the Press. That somehow if we could correct this business of restricting freedom of the Press, then the Bill would be all right. So we listened to the Opposition, I feel as if I have been had. We listened to the Leader of the Opposition and we listened to the Press and we said, well maybe they have a point. Maybe we should clarify this position. So we proposed the amendment.

Now the Opposition says, we don’t want to make the Press into a special category. Now they say they oppose the Bill because we are singling out the Press from the public.

Mr. Speaker, I have been saying to the people of Saskatchewan everywhere that I travel, and I repeat to the House in this Bill, that it is precisely that type of stance taken by the Liberal Party in Saskatchewan having any belief in the credibility of the Liberal Party any longer. It is precisely the position that the Liberal Party took on this Bill in December when they said that the freedom of the Press was the main danger to it and now say that they are not going to support the Bill because we gave the freedom of the Press protection. The contradictions leave the people of Saskatchewan totally incredulous of anything that the Leader of the Opposition and the Liberal Party opposite says.

I tell the Leader of the Opposition and the Liberals of this province that the credibility of the Liberal Party is zero, because they continually flip-flop on public positions. One day they say that they are against the Bill because it affects freedom of the Press, but if we can correct that they say they will vote for the Bill. The next day we correct and they say they are still against it because we corrected it.

I could name you example after example, Mr. Speaker. Their position on Bill 42. Their position with respect to agricultural policies. Mr. Speaker, I want to tell the people of Saskatchewan and tell this House again, that one of the very serious difficulties for a government is to face an Opposition which is like trying to poke at a balloon. It is very difficult to do this. It is an Opposition which changes its color and its hue and its attitudes. It is an Opposition who doesn’t have any solidified positions. I say to the people of Saskatchewan that the people do not have any confidence and don’t believe in any of the positions taken by the Liberal Party in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — It is precisely because of the position such as they take on The Privacy Act.

April 4, 1974

Mr. Speaker, I want to say this. There is one gross misconception which the Member for Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod), on this business of the amendment, has made. He said that this amendment singles out the Press and puts them into a special category. False! It does not! We could do without the amendment and it wouldn't matter one iota to the way the Bill is presently worded and the role of the Press. We can do with the amendment and it wouldn't add or detract one iota from the way the Bill is worded.

Section 4 of the Bill says it is a defence in this matter, that there is no violation where there was reasonable ground for belief that the matter published was of public interest or was fair comment on a matter of public interest. That is in the printed Bill now.

Mr. Speaker, that is the protection for the Press. The Press has under 4 2(a), now in the printed Bill, every opportunity to continue with their activities with or without the House amendment that I proposed. Anything which is fair comment; anything which is commenting on reasonable grounds in the public interest is the Press avenue for their full continued activities.

All the amendment does is elaborate on 4 2(a) to simply say that in ordinary news gathering activities on a day to day basis, the Bill doesn't apply. This is precisely what 4 2(a) says. So then you ask, why did you bring in the House amendment?

We brought in the House amendment because at that time the Press media in Saskatchewan, I say wrongly, didn't understand the impact of 4 2(a). The Opposition said they misunderstood the impact of 4 2(a) and we felt that nothing could be harmed by the Bill. Nothing much would be gained by it, but at least we could allay concerns of those who felt the freedom of the Press was an issue.

I need not move that amendment and the Bill would still give full protection to the Press. Make no mistake about it! When the Member for Albert Park says that the proposed amendment singles out the Press for special privilege, that is not true. Absolutely not true! All I say to the Member for Albert Park is that he has allowed himself to be trapped in the games that the Liberal Party plays, with respect to positions that they tell the public of Saskatchewan. He has allowed himself to be trapped into a position where the Opposition feels that it is fulfilling its role, when it opposes everything and anything that this Government advances.

He has made the mistake, Mr. Speaker, of not giving credit where credit is due, as a general tactic and he finds himself now in faulty legal reasoning and in pure political logic advancing the point of view that this is a special exception for the Press.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, there are no special exemptions for the Press. Without the House amendment, Section 4 2(a) as it is in the printed Bill, I said then, I say now, was adequate protection for the Bill and the only reason that we advanced the amendment was to try to appease some of the concerns that the Opposition had at that time and that members of the Press had at that time.

I have concluded now, sadly, that all the Liberals are

interested in is playing politics rather than improving upon Bills. I was prepared to listen to you and to make the changes as you recommended but now I am going to be very careful, with respect to any other Bills that we introduce, about taking your word seriously. I am sure the people in the Province of Saskatchewan will be very wary with respect to any of the words that you have to say and they certainly aren't going to take it very seriously.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say, in conclusion, that the stance of the Liberal Party on this Bill is 19th century at its worst or at its best. In fact I tell the Hon. Member for Lakeview (Mr. Malone) and I tell him for his benefit because he hasn't been here very long, everything that this Liberal Party provincially has done is 19th century. I tell the Hon. Member that the Liberal Party opposite opposed the Ombudsman. They opposed The Human Rights Commission Bill. They opposed the Consumer Affairs Bill. They opposed the Environment Bill. Everything that this provincial Liberal Party does is 19th century and that is why you are only 15 in the Opposition.

I want to tell the Member for Lakeview, if I can, that it is very easy for a government to govern in Saskatchewan so long as we have an Opposition Party which adopts this type of right wing, out of touch, out of date approach on all issues. As far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, from the pure partisan political point of view, they can maintain their 19th century attitudes right beyond 1975 and beyond, because as long as they do there will be 14 or 15 sitting to the left of you, Mr. Speaker. And all that I can say is that perhaps that is 14 or 15 too many.

When they oppose The Privacy Act, when they oppose a Bill the principle of which is an attempt to ensure privacy in a complicated, increasingly technological world, when the Bill may not be the perfect Bill but at least a Bill that most of the 10 provinces have agreed upon; when the Bill can be amended at a later date; when the Bill should be given a chance to operate, on the principle of protection of the privacy of people. When they oppose that I ask the Hon. Member for Lakeview, are they not back in the 19th century? Mr. Speaker, they are! They oppose everything because they think their role is simply to oppose. They don't advance positive ideas. They don't give credit where credit is due.

Mr. Speaker, this Bill, small as it may be in the scheme of government activity; this Bill coupled with Bills on Land Bank and coupled with Bills on Workmen's Compensation and Farm Ownership, positive Bills dealing with 20th century problems, will come back to haunt the Liberals, mark my words, in 1975.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — They will haunt you and the people of Saskatchewan will defeat you because of your reactionary approaches to these and other issues.

Mr. Speaker, it is not too late yet. Some Members of the Liberals opposite voted for the Ombudsman. There was a split vote at that time. They said they were going to oppose it in second reading, but it is not too late yet. I urge the Member for Lakeview (Mr. Malone), I urge the Member for Morse (Mr. Wiebe) to break the 19th century approach of the Liberal

April 4, 1974

Party and to vote for this Bill.

Some of us still have confidence in a few of the young Members and some of the new Members in the Liberal Party opposite. If their continued voting record however maintains itself the way it is, we will soon have to conclude that the Liberals in Saskatchewan really haven't changed from the days when they were in power in 1964 to 1971.

So, Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to introduce and move second reading of this Bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Hon. G. MacMurchy (Last Mountain): — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could interrupt proceedings to introduce the students from Nokomis School with their Science teacher, Mrs. Paronsky, seated in the Speaker's Gallery. They have had a most exciting day, they tell me. They visited the RCMP Barracks this morning and visited IPSCO before coming here. They witnessed an explosion at one of the furnaces at IPSCO but I assured them that while it gets exciting here, that they are quite safe and will not be injured by any explosions in the Legislature.

They are going on to the Science Fair this evening, so they are having a very full day. We welcome them here and we hope their day will be an enjoyable one.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Assembly adjourned at 9:34 o'clock p.m.