

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fourth Session — Seventeenth Legislature
46th Day

Monday, April 8, 1974

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Hon. A. E. Blakeney (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to take this opportunity to introduce to you and to the House a group of students from Thomson School in Regina in the existing Regina Centre constituency, a group of 26 Grade Eight students who are in the Speaker's Gallery. They are there with their teacher Mr. Jim Adair. They will be with us until about 3:00 o'clock; they then hope to do a tour of the Legislative Building. I know that you express, as I do, the hope that their visit with us this afternoon will be a useful part of their studies of Canadian government and that they can by seeing the Legislature in action have a better grasp of those traditions which are part of the government of this province and of this country. To you, Sir, I introduce them and to them I bid a warm welcome.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

Riot at Correctional Centre

Mr. C. P. MacDonald (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Taylor), in charge of Corrections in Saskatchewan. I am sure the Minister is aware of the reports on the radio and in the news media this morning about the riot that occurred in the Correction Centre yesterday. Could the Minister advise me and the Members of the House first of all, what prisoners initiated the riot, was it prisoners from the remand unit, or was it the prisoners under normal sentence at the Correction Centre? Number two, could the Minister advise, was there any reduction in the supervision due to weekend leave or was there a normal, full complement of guards and supervisory staff there that are normally present from Monday to Friday?

Hon. A. Taylor (Minister of Social Services): — Mr. Speaker, I am not only aware of the disturbance, I have visited the Centre and looked at the damage myself. I can tell the Members that it was, as the Member from Milestone put it, prisoners from the normal sentence area and not remand prisoners who were involved, about 45 or 46 prisoners. To the best of my knowledge there was a normal complement of staff on hand but I would have to check further to see what difference there normally is between weekends and week days, but there was no unnatural reduction in staff.

Mr. MacDonald: — A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The Minister is also aware that this is the second major disturbance at the Correction Centre in the last six or eight months. Subsequent

to these disturbances in both cases there were some serious complaints about the conditions at the Correctional Centre. Is it the Minister's intention to hold an inquiry or an investigation about the moral and the general conditions in the Correctional Centre other than what was indicated in the Press this morning or by the media? The regular RCMP checked to see if evidence is available to lay charges under the criminal code. And second, I would like to ask the Minister if there is any consideration being given by the Government to building a separate remand unit? Now there was \$100,000 damage even though the remand unit prisoners were not necessarily involved. I am sure the Minister is aware that there have been renovations in the Correctional Centre in Regina but there is one unit that usually generates most of the problems and troubles in the Correction Centre and that is the remand unit. Is the Government giving consideration to separating remand prisoners from the normal prisoners in that Correctional Centre?

Mr. Taylor: — Mr. Speaker, the two disturbances referred to by the Member, one seven or eight months ago and the other one last night are quite different. The one seven or eight months ago was an escape attempt which is an entirely different situation.

In answer to the Member's question, the Government is considering the correctional program and one of the things under consideration are the possibilities of a separate remand unit. We say this without any commitment at this time but it is one of the things being studied.

Policy on Government Advertising

Mr. K. R. MacLeod (Regina Albert Park): — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might ask a question of the Hon. Premier. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that there is a policy of selectivity in using the names of the Ministers of the Crown in connection with Government advertising and I wonder if the Premier would be good enough to state that policy to us? I would be interested to know what it is.

Hon. A. E. Blakeney (Premier): — I don't think there is any hard and fast policy, Mr. Speaker. When we took office we found a very considerable tendency to attach the name of a responsible Minister on all types of advertisements, such as highway signs or the like, on construction projects. There have been some conscious steps to remove the name of the Minister and to introduce the name of the agency. Not, I think, because there is any great difference, but because there are from time to time suggestions, I know unfounded, but nonetheless suggestions, that Government advertising is used for partisan political purposes and we didn't want to allow that unsubstantiated view to continue. We have, therefore, reduced that practice but I am not sure it has been fully eliminated yet.

Mr. MacLeod: — A supplementary. I wonder if the selectivity and the reduction doesn't relate, Mr. Speaker, to the question of the kind of advertisement. It seems, and I might ask if it is correct, if the policy is followed in connection with the two advertisements which I have? One is national wildlife week, April 7th to 13th advertisement, with the name John R. Kowalchuk

very prominent as part of the Department of Natural Resources. But it seems that the Hon. Minister of Public Health is a little more reticent in connection with the Saskatchewan Department of Public Health V.D. ad. It seems that the selectivity has to do with whether or not the Hon. Minister believes that he is associated with the particular policy concerned.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacLeod: — The Government advertising goes on as much as ever but the Hon. Minister of Public Health (Mr. Smishek) is not prepared to advertise himself in connection with V.D. The same reticence does not appear with the Minister of Natural Resources or any other Minister of Government.

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I know that the Member is entirely correct in his allusions to the Minister of Public Health. He has no association other than his ministerial responsibilities with the subject of that particular advertisement. I am not sure that the Minister of Natural Resources will concede any relationship to wildlife, at least not in the particular context which the Member for Albert Park has placed it, in juxtaposition to the venereal disease ad. If we understand by wildlife the protection of the environment of Saskatchewan and the protection of the non human animals, then I think that the Member for Melville, the Minister of Natural Resources, (Mr. Kowalchuk), would be happy to claim association because the program is an excellent one for which he would want to take his modest share of the responsibility.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Delta Holdings and Delta Systems

Mr. J. G. Richards (Saskatoon University): — Mr. Speaker, I wish to address a question to the Minister in charge of the Housing Corporation, the Minister of Co-operative Development (Mr. Cody). I have heard reports that Delta Holdings and Delta Systems have folded. To that effect there is evidence because they are not in good standing with the Registrar, they're not paid registration fees for 1974. Furthermore, Thorpe and Mamchur, the owners of Delta Holdings have formed a new company, La Ronge Concrete. The question, Mr. Speaker, is what happens to, I understand, the \$675,000 outstanding credit union loan guaranteed by the Government to Delta Holdings for the construction of 30 houses in La Ronge, not all of which by any means are near completion? And secondly, has the Housing Corporation taken over this housing stock if it is true that Delta Holdings and Delta Systems have folded? I would appreciate if the Minister could elaborate on the situation.

Hon. D. W. Cody (Minister of Co-operative Development): — Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not know of Delta Systems or Delta Holdings going broke. I have been in contact with the Prince Albert Credit Union people as late as two hours ago when I met them at a Co-op Trust meeting and they have indicated nothing of the kind to me. So in that regard certainly I can't say whether or not they have gone broke. I haven't heard a thing about them going broke. We certainly have had no indication

April 8, 1974

of that and as a result I wouldn't be able to tell you whether or not that we are taking over the lots or whatever the case may be. Certainly we do not have a \$675,000 loan as the Member has indicated, it is considerably less than that. If he would like to put a question on the Order Paper in that regard we certainly would be able to answer it.

Mr. Richards: — As a supplementary, Mr. Speaker, I did check with the Registrar and Delta Holdings and Delta Systems are not in good standing inasmuch as they have not paid their registration fees for 1974 and the owners have formed this new company. Would the Minister undertake to report back to the Legislature whether or not Delta Holdings and Delta Systems are in good standing and if I am incorrect on the amount of the loan, there was a guarantee from the Provincial Government — I wasn't talking about a direct loan from the Housing Corporation. If I am incorrect on the \$675,000 figure I would quite happily be corrected.

Mr. Cody: — Well, certainly I am not in a position as Minister in charge of Saskatchewan Housing Corporations to check into all companies which have gone bad or are in bad standing because I am sure there are a lot of companies in this province not in good standing. Delta Holdings and Delta Systems may be one of those, I am certainly in no position to tell you whether they are or they aren't. In that regard I have no right to investigate them in that light.

ANNOUNCEMENT

National Wildlife Week

Hon. J. R. Kowalchuk (Minister of Natural Resources): — Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question raised by the Member for Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod), I just want to say that I was not aware myself as to the advertising that was being placed in the paper but I am sure that the people in the Natural Resources Department are doing a very good job. I should like, Mr. Speaker, to report to you right now that the week of April 7th to 13th has been designated as "Wildlife Week in Canada" and I should like to bring observance of this week to the attention of the Members of this House. The theme of the week is "Preservation of Wetlands Habitats", and certainly a most timely subject for those of us who live in Saskatchewan. Most timely, also, Mr. Speaker, when we think of all the snow that is melting outside right now and soon to fill these lowlands.

When we take a close look at the value of the wetlands to our province it is easy to see why there is such concern. Our province's marshes are some of the most productive wetlands in North America but they are also the most vulnerable to land use conflicts. Farmers want them drained to increase agricultural lands, while sportsmen and natural history groups want them retained as water fowl habitats and natural areas. We must resolve these land-use conflicts in a manner acceptable to man and resource to secure the future of our wildlife heritage. The Government of Saskatchewan and the Department of Natural Resources in particular are developing policies and programs to come to grips with these problems. Our wetlands committee which was formed in 1971 has received almost 200 flood control and drainage projects and we work closely with the Canadian Wildlife

Service and Ducks Unlimited on lure crops and land control projects.

I am pleased, Mr. Speaker, to bring National Wildlife Week to your attention. On his desk every Member of this House will find an attractive booklet published by the Canadian Wildlife Federation which contains a number of articles on the preservation of wetland habitat.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

SECOND READINGS

Hon. J. R. Kowalchuk (Minister of Natural Resources) moved second reading of **Bill No. 72 — An Act respecting the Department of Tourism and Renewable Resources.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to introduce Bill No. 72, An Act respecting the establishment of the new Department of Tourism and Renewable Resources.

This Act introduces a significant and indeed historic change in the management and development of tourism and renewable resources in our province. It is an exciting and challenging new concept which will place Saskatchewan ahead in the field of tourist promotion and development and in the management of renewable resources in North America. We are in this Act bringing together the responsibilities of tourist development and promotion and the functions of resource management on which so much of tourism in Saskatchewan is based. Indeed in the foreseeable future tourism in Saskatchewan will largely be based on our renewable resources, our forests, our fish, our parks and recreation areas. All the former activities and programs of the former Department of Natural Resources will be continued in this new Department.

As for tourism this program has undergone rapid and even dramatic rise in the province in the past 25 years. Yes, I hear the Leader of the Opposition say, “Hear, hear!” I still recall when they used to laugh when the former CCF Government started out in the late 1940s with a program to develop and promote tourist and recreation attractions in Saskatchewan. I remember that, Mr. Speaker, they said, “who would want to visit Saskatchewan”, was the theme of a lot of barbs thrown by the people who are sitting to your left today at the tourist promotion of those days, which wasn’t great I’ll admit. No one is laughing now, Mr. Speaker. People today more than ever are looking for the pure air, for the deep blue skies and the clear streams which we have in Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kowalchuk: — Our province is a refuge from the smog and the heavily polluted areas where most people live at the present time in the big cities. Along with these wonderful kinds of things that we have in Saskatchewan, aggressive, inspiring tourist promotion programs, wise management of our resources and wide development of our parks and recreation facilities, all will help to make Saskatchewan a haven for the tourists. In recent years with the growing examples on tourism and recreation in our everyday lives there has been a tendency for several provincial government

April 8, 1974

departments and agencies to become involved in these activities. Now with the formation of the new department your Government is putting it all together, so to speak. So the planning and organization necessary for the future management of our renewable resources can be better co-ordinated and carried out.

In introducing this Bill I must say there are some regrets. The title, Department of Natural Resources, will be passing out of existence. This is one of the most popular and respected departmental names in the period of the history of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. Indeed the initials DNR are household words throughout the province. However, while we will be losing the name DNR, we will be going forward with new and progressive programs in the integration of the tourist development and promotion functions with our renewable resources management programs. As for our parks and recreation development, we have developed one of the best provincial parks and recreation programs on the North American continent, Mr. Speaker.

I am pleased and happy that many of the staff who helped formulate these resource management and tourist programs will be with me in this new department, Mr. Speaker. Their know-how and experience will be most effective in the challenge that we now face.

The new Act will provide for a deputy minister and a normal departmental structure. The development of an organizational structure for the efficient administration of the department is now being prepared, Mr. Speaker. All the Acts which were previously under the jurisdiction of the Department of Natural Resources will now be administered by the Department of Tourism and Renewable Resources, with the exception of those Acts which have been made the responsibility of the Department of the Environment.

The new Minister is provided with the opportunity to develop, manage, utilize and conserve the renewable resources of the province. The Act also provides for him effectively to promote and develop tourism on this resource base.

The Budget speech, Mr. Speaker, made reference to a significant budget for the new department with major expenditures in the expansion of recreation facilities, the development and expansion of our historic heritage and in tourist promotion as well. There are provisions in the Act for the issuing of grants for encouraging and assisting promotion, conservation and development of renewable resources and tourism. This includes the preservation, restoration and maintenance of historic sites in the province.

An advisory committee will be set up under the Act to assist the new department in developing programs which deal with renewable resources, the promotion of tourism and the development and expansion of provincial parks, recreation sites and historic sites. This committee will replace existing advisory bodies such as the Tourist Advisory Council and other similar advisory committees currently in the Department of Natural Resources, for example the Game Advisory Committee. The resources of the various organizations represented on the existing advisory committees and others will be called upon for their assistance in programming development and in promotion. The advisory committee concept is in keeping with the policies of this Government, Mr. Speaker, to encourage public participation

in planning and policy formulation, an area in which the former Department of Natural Resources has been very active in the past years. Authority to establish tourist offices outside of Saskatchewan is included in this new Act.

These offices will be developed in co-operation and in conjunction with the trade promotion offices of the Department of Industry and Commerce. The establishment of these offices has been under consideration and this legislation provides the means for their implementation.

The Department will work closely with the Canadian Government Travel Bureau and with other provinces in their establishment, Mr. Speaker.

The forest protection and development advance account provided for in this Act, is similar to the present one being used under the Department of Natural Resources. Its objectives will be to provide forest protection and development services. A commercial activities advance account is also provided in the Act. It will be much the same as the parks advance account presently in The Department of Natural Resources Act which allows the operation of the commercial concessions in provincial parks and recreational areas. These commercial activities are valuable providing services, accommodation, materials and supplies to the vacationers, Mr. Speaker.

The policy of this Government is that where possible these commercial concessions in provincial parks and recreational sites should be owned by the Department. The expansion of these concessions which is allowed in this Act will enable the public to receive the type of services which we feel they have a right to expect in our provincial parks and recreation areas.

Those of us who have had the happy privilege of living in Saskatchewan, have come to expect a lot from our Government, Mr. Speaker, and well we should. We have developed a spirit of co-operation among all our people that has enabled us to work together for the common good of man, and to organize those public agencies which will provide needed services for ourselves. That is why Saskatchewan has long provided the leadership in health care services, in hospitalization and medicare, in co-operative organizations, labor legislation, in welfare programs, northern development and in many other areas, Mr. Speaker.

Those of us on this side of the House believe that with the establishment of this department, this new department, Saskatchewan will once again be leading the continent. This time in the field of tourist development and management of our renewable resources. By this Act we are providing for the management and conservation of our renewable resources so that they will be there for the utilization for the generation that will follow us — for our children and our children's children, Mr. Speaker. By this Act we are bringing together the resource management programs with our tourist promotion and information activities so that we can guide the proper utilization of these resources for the people of this province and where applicable for visitors of other provinces and other countries. Planning and wise management of our renewable resources, coupled with intelligent tourist promotion activities, are the keys to this new department.

Long-range planning and wise management of our renewable

April 8, 1974

resources will ensure that Saskatchewan will be able to conserve these resources for generations to come. It will ensure that we can provide healthy tourist and recreation opportunities for our people and for visitors from other areas as well.

In moving second reading of this Bill, I should like to point out that no public agency or government department can do it all, Mr. Speaker. Indeed, it should not be expected that they should do it alone. In the administration of this new department we hope to enlist the participation of every man, woman and child in this province. All of us have a vital stake in how these resource programs are to be managed. We will look for an input from all elements of Saskatchewan society in planning our programs, from local government, urban and rural, from natural and human history groups, sportsmen and wildlife groups and organizations, tourist organizations, Chambers of Commerce and Boards of Trade and business and retail groups as well.

I had expected to begin this second reading, Mr. Speaker, on this Bill some two weeks ago but due to the fact that I have been ill and away, I want to apologize to the House for not being able to proceed with the second reading of this Bill for the creation of the new department so that it could have begun on April 1st. However, I hope that I will get the agreement of this whole House to this new Department of Tourism and Renewable Resources.

I say, Mr. Speaker, there are no sleepers, nothing hidden, nothing sinister in the Bill. I hope that we will get unanimous support on this Bill creating a new Department of Tourism and Industry.

I want to extend my personal congratulations to the Premier of this province for having the foresight and the determination to proceed with the establishment of this new department, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kowalchuk: — This, in my opinion, will set an example for the rest of Canada to follow. I also want to express my own personal appreciation to the Premier for giving me the opportunity and the challenge to guide and to initiate the establishment of this new department.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kowalchuk: — Mr. Speaker, I hereby move second reading of this Bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. D. F. MacDonald (Moose Jaw North): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to start out by saying that I intend to oppose this Bill, I think the Minister is making a mistake by bringing in a Bill that combines tourism and renewable resources.

The industry of tourism combines a great deal more than just that of renewable resources and what some people think of as regional parks and so on. The field of tourism involves

private investment, private capital, private facilities, it should deal with the matter of conventions, encouragement of conventions and of recreation other than that to do with natural environment of our province. There is a great deal that must be done in this province to bring the tourist and the recreational facilities up to the levels of other provinces. I think of Ontario with such things as 'Man and his World', I believe it was called. This is one of the directions that the tourist industry is going to have to go in this province.

The promotion of tourism and the management of our natural resources may, in fact, at times conflict. And for this reason these two fields should not be combined into one Bill, Tourism and Renewable Resources.

As a matter of fact I think that the parks branch or the parks division should be taken out of the Department of Natural Resources and placed with the Department of Tourism whether this be a separate department or one as it is today, combined with the Department of Industry and Commerce. This is where the parks department should be, it should not be in with the Department of Natural Resources.

The Bill before us today goes even further in combining this. The Department of the Environment and the Department of Renewable Resources should be combined instead of the Department of Tourism and Renewable Resources. The function of a new department which combines Environment and Natural Resources would be to protect and renew our natural resources.

The Department of the Environment has been a failure, we can well do without it. It has been a do-nothing department, it's a department with no power, it's a department that is not even able to co-ordinate the actions of other departments. It's a department that has shown no results, it's a department that we don't even know what the objectives are. They haven't even been defined.

The expansion of parks in this province and the development of other new parks must be made to conform to good environmental practices. There is tremendous demand for recreational facilities in our province. In this new department that is being formed by this Bill today, we will find ourselves being concerned primarily with one or the other of the two objectives. One objective being to protect the environment and the other to rapidly expand new facilities for tourism and recreations.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — One of these two objectives will be subverted to the other one. They are both very important objectives and they are as I said not necessarily compatible, they are very likely to conflict.

The Department of Natural Resources and the Department of Environment must set the rules and must enforce these rules for new and expanded parks. The Department of Tourism must promote the tourist industry and this should be the objective of it. We must remember that much of the tourist industry is private, it is not public. If all the tourism and the facilities of tourism were public then maybe there would be some justification for combining them as we are doing in this Bill. But I say again

April 8, 1974

that these two objectives should be divided and not combined and I intend to vote against this Bill. At this time I should like to ask leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

Hon. D. W. Cody (Minister of Co-operatives) moved second reading of **Bill No. 81 — An Act to amend The Department of Co-operation and Co-operative Development.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, as Minister of the Department of Co-operation and Co-operative Development, it gives me a great deal of pleasure in presenting three new amendments to The Department of Co-operation and Co-operative Development Act which of course is the Act which provided for the setting up of this department.

The reasons for seeking approval of these amendments relate to the need for more input other than a supporting role into co-operatives in Saskatchewan by the department, as well as to enhance the economic viability of associations engaged in production, feedlots, co-operative use of farm machinery, to name a few. And the unlimited perspective of co-operative endeavor that certain segments of the people of Saskatchewan may wish to engage in.

The co-operative movement is looking to the department more and more to offer some financial assistance in the formative stages of operations in order to get a satisfactory start which should ultimately result in a sound on-going business operation.

For example, I use the Porcupine Plains alfalfa cubing plant. It is a primary industry to promote some crop diversification in areas especially adapted to specialized crops. This type of co-operative derives benefit for the grower-producer, for the people engaged in raising cattle and the ultimate user, and indeed the co-operative provides employment for some local people. These were some of the considerations I am sure.

Then there is an organization such as the Poor People's Credit Union in Saskatoon, which may need financial assistance in order to get it going and get it on the road to do the kinds of things that it set out to do in its objectives. There is only one of this type at present but there may be more to come and in my view this kind of an organization certainly is a needed one. It may be timely to point out here that the assets of credit unions in Saskatchewan now approximate the billion dollar mark. My Hon. seatmate who is not here today, the Finance Minister (Mr. Robbins) will no doubt be interested in this fact when it comes to financial statistics.

Only a few examples, Mr. Speaker, have been cited in this presentation but I submit that the furtherance of the co-operative movement in certain specialized areas of business endeavor on a co-operative basis will now warrant some financial assistance by my department. Additional powers are therefore necessary to be vested in the Minister, in order to overcome problems that arise in the movement, that are urgent, and for which at times immediate action is necessary.

I shall, therefore, undertake to explain the reasons for requesting the amendments. In Section 5(a) the Minister may appoint committees, consultants, professional and technical

personnel and assign to them such duties as he deems advisable. Subsection 2 — may make payment of such per diem allowances, traveling expenses and other remuneration as may be determined by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, to the members of the committees, consultants and professional and technical personnel so appointed.

By way of explanation it is desirable and prudent in view of the rapidly changing times and new innovations in business, merchandizing and in general administration of business that the Department of Co-operation keep abreast of all matters that affect co-operatives generally. The services of highly specialized and competent people are essentially to perform work of this nature.

The duties might conceivably be a study on financial structure for consumer co-operatives, economic feasibility studies, statistical profiles, a study on solvency or new approaches to administration. The proposed amendment permits the Minister to appoint committees, engage consultants and other technical and professional people as deemed necessary and advisable for the purpose of performing special duties.

Number two, this clause in the amendment makes provision for the Minister of the Department to reimburse employees in the foregoing category for services rendered in such amounts as the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may determine by regulation.

Section 5(b), subsection (1) subject to the approval of the Minister, the Department, may make annual or other grants not exceeding \$5,000 in any one case to any one person, agency, organization, association or institution, to assist in development, expansion or maintenance of co-operative and credit union services in Saskatchewan. An example would be the Poor People's Credit Union again in Saskatoon. These grants would be made subject to the approval of the Minister.

Subsection (2), subject to the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, the Minister, may make annual or other grants in amounts in excess of \$5,000 to any person, agency, organization, association or institution to assist in the development, expansion or maintenance of co-operatives or credit unions in the province. By way of explanation, in this amendment it is proposed that grants in excess of \$5,000 may be made to these kinds of persons, agencies, etc., for purposes mentioned in the previous amendment, subject to the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council.

Section 5 (c), subject to approval of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, the Minister, may make loans and take security in respect of such loans and may purchase shares in co-operative associations and credit unions. By way of explanation, Mr. Speaker, on this Section:

(a) occasions have arisen in the past where it is in the best economic interest of co-operatives and credit unions if the department were able to offer some financial assistance under circumstances where it may mean the discontinuing of services if financial assistance was not forthcoming, or if it meant that a new co-operative organization could not get off the ground, so to speak, if some starter fund were not made available and that is again cited in the example of the Poor People's Credit Union in Saskatoon, where they require funds to get

going to carry on the worthwhile aid of the kind of people named in their objectives. This amendment makes provisions for granting loans on which certain security would be taken. The loans would be repayable under the terms of an agreement which should be entered into between the department and the co-operative or credit union.

(b) This clause in the amendment makes for provision for the Department of Co-operation and Co-operative Development to purchase shares in a co-operative association or a credit union. The reason is primarily to assist co-operatives and credit unions that may be experiencing difficulties in the formative stages or where other extenuating circumstances may exist. Money invested in shares in a co-operative or credit union should receive some priority from the directors in regard to repayment. In other words in a co-operative, for instance, where a share capital requirement was deficient in order to obtain other financial assistance, the department could invest in shares in the association. Subsequently as more shares were sold locally it is the intention that that association would redeem a like amount of shares held by the department until all the shares being held by the department were repaid.

Mr. Speaker, I feel the amendments for this Act which are before you today show the commitment which this Government has toward co-operatives and the development of co-operatives in Saskatchewan. It is a commitment to help people work together for a common goal, not only an economic goal but a social goal. It is with pleasure that I, at this time, move second reading of this Bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. C. F. Loken (Rosetown): — Mr. Speaker, the Members on this side of the House no doubt will support Bill No. 81, however, in doing so I would again point out to the Government that we remain opposed to any attempts by the Minister to centralize Saskatchewan Co-op movements. We are not in favor of the Minister of Co-operatives interfering with decisions made by local boards. Mr. Speaker, I am a supporter of the Co-operative movement in Saskatchewan. I have seen the Co-op Association at Rosetown that was organized in 1952 in November, with a board of directors and a part-time manager, grow from a part-time manager to a thriving business in a modern building with ten full-time employees and the support of most of our community. This was done without the Government interfering and by decisions made by the local board of directors. I hope the NDP will not decide that they know best and take over the powers of the local co-operative associations. This type of action would be contrary to the spirit of the co-ops and would be resisted not only by the Members on this side of the House, but by most co-op members.

I hesitate to think that any Minister would want to take the full responsibility of appointing committees, consultants, professional and technical personnel. There is no limit put on this, how far is he going to go? He is also going to direct what they are supposed to do, whether they are supposed to go out and spy on co-ops, bring back reports and create a lot of problems and also why any Minister would want the power to have the full authority to spend even up to \$5,000, it says \$5,000 in any one case, and it leaves it wide open to many places and I hope in closing debate of this Bill that the Minister will

explain or point out what the extent of some of these things will be.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. H. E. Coupland (Meadow Lake): — Mr. Speaker, I should just like to say a few words on this Bill. As the Member for Rosetown has already said we are a little concerned about Government interference in co-ops and credit unions throughout the province. We had an example of this interference in Meadow Lake in our credit union. The manager of our Credit Union who was let go on the first of this year brought the Meadow Lake Credit Union up from a one-man office, back about 15 years ago, to one of the most thriving businesses in the town of Meadow Lake, employing some 10 or 12 people. If I could have permission, I should like to read this letter to the people of Meadow Lake, which is self-explanatory, after his discharge. I quote:

As most of the people of Meadow Lake and district know, my position as general manager of the Meadow Lake Credit Union has been terminated. I shall no longer be with the Credit Union after the week of January 26th, 1974. For myself, my wife and my family, I wish to say a few words regarding my dismissal.

It was the opinion of the Government Inspector that I was not managing the Credit Union completely within The Credit Union Act and standard by-laws governing all credit unions in the Province of Saskatchewan, where the policy directives are set out by the board of directors of this Credit Union. Therefore, the Department of Co-operation's Inspector and the Mutual Aid Board felt there were enough irregularities including what they thought to be too high a delinquency that I could not continue as manager. The board of directors were advised that a change of management would have to be made. I was asked for my resignation by the Department and Mutual Aid Board representatives on December 3rd, 1973 and the local board received it on December 4th, 1973. Officially I was through as manager of the Credit Union on that date, however, I was asked if I would remain until the end of January, or until a new manager was hired. I agreed to stay on and do all I could to assist and to take off the year-end statement. I continued to have full access to all credit union operation. I trust this fact will remove any doubts regarding the reason for my dismissal.

As I will not have the opportunity to present the annual financial and statistical report to the members at the annual meeting on the year-end, 1973, I wish at this time to give some of the highlights. In spite of my dismissal I am very proud of the achievements made during the past year. For the first time the assets surpassed the \$5 million mark. Net assets at December 31st, 1973 were \$5,027,353, an increase of \$1,182,269 over 1972. Net earnings for the year amounted to \$82,329 after allocations for statutory reserve raised this figure to \$88,000. Five per cent interest or dividend was again paid for the year 1973, amounting to \$49,633. Also, \$10,000 set in the general reserve for future use as needed. The cash reserves for the Meadow Lake Credit

April 8, 1974

Union were over the necessary requirement by \$532,428 as of December 31st, 1973. The Credit Union enjoyed its biggest year in 1973 and was in a very sound financial position at year-end.

He goes on to say:

On behalf of myself and my family we wish to express to the people of Meadow Lake and district the deep feeling of gratitude we hold for their support and efforts in endeavoring to keep me on as manager of the Credit Union.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if that isn't interference by Government and Government Inspectors, I don't know what is because as near as we can figure out the main reason this manager was let go was because he was lending too much money to the Indians and Metis north of Meadow Lake. They were able to go into that Credit Union in Meadow Lake and get loans. In most cases their records were very good, as can be shown by the statement that he presented. This man was, and is, held in the highest regard by all the people in Meadow Lake and the area north of there, which was evident by the large number of names on the petitions which were sent in to the Department of Co-ops, but all to no avail. They will not listen to the local people.

I understand that the business since that manager has left, has dropped drastically. So much so, I am not sure of this, but almost half of the employees have had to be laid off. The money is going out of there just something terrible due to this Government interference in this Credit Union in Meadow Lake. I am sure that they have done irreparable harm which is going to take years to overcome.

Now this Bill here gives the Minister more powers, powers to set up committees, hand out money, etc. and these committees could probably be a good thing, but when we have this sort of experience I am a little afraid of giving this Minister any more authority. As I have quite a bit more to say on this, Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

Hon. J. R. Messer (Acting Minister of Municipal Affairs) moved second reading of **Bill No. 87 — An Act to amend The Urban Municipality Act, 1970.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, the main purpose of this Bill is to clarify and update existing provisions in The Urban Municipality Act and they do not involve any major changes in principle or in policy. The Saskatchewan Urban Municipal Association has in fact requested that the Act be made clearer and more explicit on the disqualifications that prevent a person from becoming a councilor or that can be used to unseat him from his elected office. The Association has also requested that we provide legislation in a way similar to that being discussed for Members of this Assembly, requiring each member of council and certain appointed senior officials to disclose their interest in any land holdings within their respective municipalities.

Mr. Speaker, the growing practice of persons investing in real estate has created situations where municipal councils have

approved or have been in a position to approve zoning bylaws, develop plans, sales and purchases affecting real estate in which members of the council had a beneficial interest. The ever-increasing value of real estate makes it imperative that action be taken to ensure that a fully impartial decision is rendered by a council when considering any transactions involving real estate. We acknowledge the validity of this request from the Saskatchewan Urban Municipal Association that provision be made to remove any conflict of interest on the part of members of council and this legislation will require all elected members of council and certain appointed officials to disclose any interest each member may have in real estate within their respective municipalities. Provision is also made for disclosing any change that occurs in each individual or person's holdings.

We are providing the necessary authority to permit a council to appoint one of its councilors to replace the mayor where the position of mayor becomes vacant during the period of time between regular elections. The implementation of this provision will permit the council to conduct its business in a formal manner pending the holding of an election to fill the vacancy. This position will also permit a council to waive the necessity of holding a by-election to elect where the vacancy occurs during the last year of office.

Mr. Speaker, a new section of the Bill will allow a municipality to assist a company or a society that is formed for the purpose of managing or conducting a major athletic sports event. The city of Regina has been selected to host the 1975 Canada Summer Games and the city requires legislative authority to enter into any agreements which are required to establish a corporate structure to operate the necessary facilities and to administer the complete event. We are making the authority of this legislation retroactive to February, 1974 since timing has made it necessary for the city to enter into such agreements prior to the enactment of this Bill. This is permissive legislation, Mr. Speaker, that will allow our city to plan and bid for the opportunity to host major events such as the Canada Winter and Summer Games.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this Bill is one primarily of a housekeeping nature and to incorporate into the Act recommendations of SUMA. I feel that the questions that any Hon. Members may have could be best answered in Committee. It is for that reason, after making these few brief comments, Mr. Speaker, that I move second reading of this Bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J. G. Lane (Lumsden): — Mr. Speaker, we read with interest the proposed legislation. We still are amazed at the inconsistency of the Government opposite when seemingly it wants everyone else to comply with full disclosure laws and yet is afraid of the full disclosure laws within its own political party. There is a very consistent argument, Mr. Speaker, that the Government should not be involved, should not give contracts to Service Printing in any way, shape or form because it is a conflict of interest and surely, Mr. Speaker, if the Government opposite is going to talk about conflict of interest, we've got it for the Legislative Assembly, the Government has now extended it to urban governments, surely if the Government opposite was to be consistent in its supposed desire for full disclosure and to let the public know what is happening on contracts, that the Government should immediately

April 8, 1974

cease its contracts with Service Printing. In its failure to tender contracts with Service Printing the Government is very, very inconsistent on its approach to full disclosure. I say it is an unfair inconsistency, it's something that hopefully the public sooner or later will realize that the Government is force-feeding Service Printing and what's wrong for individuals in urban government, what's wrong for Members of the Legislative Assembly surely must be wrong for Members of the political party opposite.

We'll have more to say on this legislation and I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

Hon. R. Romanow (Attorney General) moved second reading of **Bill No. 88 — An Act to amend The Bill of Sale Act**.

He said: Bill No. 88, Mr. Speaker, is a Bill to amend The Bill of Sale Act and I think I can very briefly sum up what the Bill intends to do. The effect of the amendment will be three-fold. Firstly, it will require a secured party to provide a discharge to anyone with an interest in the goods covered by a bill of sale within ten days of demand. Secondly, it will allow a judge of the district court or the Court of Queen's Bench to order discharge of the bill of sale where the secured party has not provided discharge within the time limited. Thirdly, it will allow any person suffering damages by wrongful failure of the secured party to provide a discharge within the time limited to recover those damages by court action.

The request for this type of an amendment has come from a number of members of the practicing bar in Saskatchewan and the form of the proposed amendments follows closely the form of the uniform bill which it is hoped will be adopted by other jurisdictions in the forthcoming months.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this will be an advantageous amendment to ease the transactions of this nature in bills of sale and I would, therefore, move second reading of this Bill.

Mr. E. C. Malone (Regina Lakeview): — Mr. Speaker, looking at this Bill it would seem to be similar to the Bill that was entered by the Attorney General on The Conditional Sales Act. The provisions seems to be of a housekeeping nature. I should, however, like to speak to this Bill at a later date so I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

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

He said: Mr. Speaker, when I moved second reading of this Bill I explained that the purpose of the Bill is to consolidate and update the legislation. The Members of the Opposition said that

they are basically in agreement with the Bill except for two items: one is the provision which would no longer require that the Deputy Minister of Public Health be a medical doctor; the other disagreement they had was Item (2) of Section 12.

Mr. Speaker, let me first of all deal with the argument presented by the Opposition dealing with the provision that the deputy no longer be a medical doctor. First of all, Mr. Speaker, let me point out that the Bill does not preclude a medical doctor being a deputy, all it does it no longer makes that provision mandatory. It seems to me when you look at the function of the department you will find that much of the work that has to be done by the department is to administer various health programs. This should not require automatically that the chief administrator be a physician.

Now the Hon. Member for Moose Jaw North (Mr. MacDonald), in his remarks, said that somehow we are de-emphasizing the value of professions, that we are attacking the profession. Mr. Speaker, perhaps the Members of the Opposition know what it is to attack people and professions, they are expert in that particular area. We know the kind of attacks that they subjected all the people of this province to during their seven years of government. Not only did they attack them, they declared war on the medical profession when they introduced their deterrent fees. They declared war on the hospitals and the people of Saskatchewan. They declared war on the nurses and the teacher. They declared war on trade unionists and on the farmers. They even went as far as to attack the church, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Lane: — Which one?

Mr. Smishek: — The United Church, if you want to know. When the United Church came in with proposals to your government and made representation what did you people do? You attacked the United Church for their proposals. So the people on the other side know what it is all about to attack people. Mr. Speaker, there is no attempt in this legislation to attack anyone and certainly we value the help of professionals as we value the medical profession. No one can tell me that you can run a health service without medical doctors, or that you can deliver a dental program without dentists, but it doesn't automatically follow that the senior administrative officer has to be a medical doctor.

Mr. Speaker, let us take a look at other departments. Do we say in The Department of Education Act that a teacher must automatically be a deputy? Do we say in the Department of Mineral Resources that we have to hire a geologist to be the deputy? Or in the Department of Agriculture that he must be a graduate from the School of Agriculture? Or in Highways that the deputy must be a highway engineer? Or in Government Services that he must be an architect? Certainly that is not the case. Mr. Speaker, in our department we have over 100 doctors employed within the service. Surely when it comes down to the question of getting advice on medical matters we have people and employ people who can give us advice on personal health matters.

Mr. Speaker, I didn't quite fathom the argument presented by the Hon. Member for Whitmore Park (Mr. Grant) when he argued about the number of hospitals that now fall within the jurisdiction of the Department of Public Health. If it is necessary to have a medical doctor to be a deputy then it seems to me that

April 8, 1974

we should be having medical doctors as chief administrators of hospitals. Certainly that is not the case. Nor does it preclude having a medical doctor being chief administrator in a hospital? But we do have a lot of people who can give us the advice on direct medical matters. I bring to the attention of the Hon. Members that this is not establishing any kind of a precedent. Other provinces like British Columbia, Alberta, Manitoba, Ontario have provided that it is no longer required that a deputy be a physician. But I stated earlier it does not preclude having a medical doctor a deputy.

In fact, Mr. Speaker if it ought to be a condition to have a medical doctor as a deputy, perhaps the same thing should apply to other branches of our department. The Hon. Member for Whitmore Park, when he was the Minister of Public Health, in the case of the Medical Care Insurance Commission, there was a doctor who was the executive director, when the time came for a change, what did he do? Did he reappoint a medical doctor? Certainly not, he appointed a health administrator with expertise to be the Chief Executive Officer of the Medical Care Insurance Commission. In the case of the Hospital Services Plan, there used to be a doctor but what did happen when a change was made? A person in the field of health administration was appointed, not a doctor. Later on again a physician was appointed. So, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that there should not be a specific requirement that automatically we should have a physician as a deputy. Certainly there is need to have medical expertise in the department and we propose to have that and at the same time may I assure the House that the provision does not prohibit a doctor being a deputy. So I think that the provision is a proper one and it is time that we made this change while we are revising the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the other argument that was raised by the Opposition is under Section 12 (2) of the Act. In this provision we have put in that the Minister may require any person appointed to a board, commission or committee or council to take an oath not to divulge any information received by him in the course of his duties as he is serving on a board, commission, committee, or council. That does not mean, Mr. Speaker, that the final reports of such bodies would not be made public. It seems to me that there is valid reason for boards and committees when they are dealing with personal health matters, they may be required to take an oath of secrecy.

When I moved second reading I said that boards and commissions are being used increasingly in the administration of health programs therefore, such a measure, I feel, may on occasion be necessary to ensure that information on health disorders and private affairs of individuals be kept confidential. That was the main reason for us bringing in that provision. Mr. Speaker, we copied that particular section from the Alberta Act which has been there for some years. You know if the Members opposite are so concerned about an oath of secrecy, I recall when The Trade Union Act was amended or when it was butchered by the former administration, why did they require an oath of secrecy to be taken by the Labour Relations Board? Now it seems to me that the Labour Relations Board does not deal with such important personal matters as would boards and commission in the case of personal health.

However, Mr. Speaker, in order to ensure that our intent is clear, which I think I made it clear, but it might be

misinterpreted, I will therefore, during Committee of the Whole, bring in an amendment to ensure that in those things dealing with the names of patients, their illnesses, their injuries, whether it be physical or psychiatric, or the diagnostic or treatment that may have been prescribed, or the names of physicians or other persons providing professional services, it will only be these matters, which was the original intent, will be matters of confidentiality. During second reading I said that was the intent of this section, but perhaps the provision as written is too broad and we will propose an amendment to narrow this section to these areas I have described, which I trust that the Hon. Members will support. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Lakeview (Mr. Malone) has on a couple of occasions talked about an inquiry in a particular area of health. If such an inquiry were ever set up I would hope that such an inquiry be kept confidential and that people who did the inquiring and looking into profiles of individual patients would keep those matters secret.

Mr. Speaker, I will be bringing in such an amendment during Committee and now, I move second reading of the Bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of 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. C. Malone (Regina Lakeview): — Mr. Speaker, in introducing The Saskatchewan Farm Ownership Act, in my opinion the Blakeney Government and the NDP have once again demonstrated clearly their narrow parochialism and divisive philosophy, in this particular case an attitude that is clearly anti-Canadian. Let there be no doubt of whom this Bill will most directly affect. It is not the large corporations, it is not Americans, it is not other foreigners. It is Canadians who reside both within and outside the Province of Saskatchewan.

This Bill says to the vast majority of Canadians that they are not entitled to the basic rights and privileges in Saskatchewan that they enjoy not only in their home province but in practically all the other provinces of Canada. It says to these Canadians that they are second-class citizens in Saskatchewan.

It is for this reason that I am completely and unalterably opposed to the Bill.

I listened carefully the other day to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) when he introduced the Bill and I noted that he very carefully avoided discussing the implications of it on other Canadians. He talked at great length about German and Japanese and Arabian concerns buying land in Manitoba. He spoke of Americans buying hunting reserves in the Torch River area. He talked of Americans buying land near Weyburn.

If the intent of the Bill was to control or prohibit these types of transactions I would support it. But not only does the Bill affect Americans, Arabians, other foreigners and large

April 8, 1974

corporations, it put Canadians into the same category and this I object to. For surely if Saskatchewan takes an isolationist attitude towards its fellow citizens there is nothing to prevent the governments of other provinces from passing reciprocal legislation directly aimed at the residents of this province or at Canada as a whole.

I want to enjoy in all parts of Canada the rights and privileges that I enjoy in Saskatchewan. To be able to do this I must insure that residents of those other provinces enjoy these same rights and privileges in Saskatchewan. If this Bill passes they will not be able to do this.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, if the Province of Quebec had passed legislation similar to this, providing that only native Quebecers could own property in Montreal or other places in Quebec, the rest of Canada would be outraged. What would we do in Saskatchewan if the Province of Ontario passed legislation providing that only residents of that province could buy the stocks and shares listed on the Toronto Stock Exchange and that if a resident of Saskatchewan inherited any of these shares he must sell them within five years?

What the Blakeney Government apparently does not realize is that Saskatchewan is not an island within Confederation.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! I think there is a man on his feet speaking.

Mr. Malone: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What is fair in Saskatchewan is fair in other provinces. Legislation of this nature merely encourages regionalism in all parts of Canada, which if taken to its logical conclusion, would result in the complete breakup of Confederation as we know it today.

I say, Mr. Speaker, as well that it is particularly outrageous to introduce a Bill of this nature at this time when the Government of Canada has shown its desire on behalf of all the people in Canada, to redress the long-standing grievances of the West. Why should the rest of Canada be the slightest bit interested in supporting Saskatchewan in its demand for fair freight rates when we tell them they cannot own property in Saskatchewan? How can this Government expect the Federal Government on behalf of all Canadians to take the lead in correcting the errors of the past when we are here asked to pass legislation that is contrary to the very spirit of Confederation itself?

No doubt we shall hear speakers from the Government side during this debate attempt to justify this Bill by saying that Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia have similar statutes. Surely we cannot compare Saskatchewan with about one million people still underpopulated and with vast areas of land, with tiny Prince Edward Island with a total population of about the same size as Regina. Their legislation seeks to protect ownership of recreational land. Our legislation goes far beyond that and covers all land not contained within an urban area that is capable of being farmed and this, of course, means all rural land in the province as all of it is capable of being farmed in one manner or another.

The fact that this Bill contains certain exemptions for

people who are closely related to existing owners of land, does not in any way take away from the principle of the Bill. It still means that Canadians such as David Lewis or John Diefenbaker or Otto Lang could not purchase land in this province in excess of an assessed value of \$15,000. Mr. Lewis does not reside here at all and Mr. Diefenbaker and Mr. Lang did not reside here for more than 183 days in a year.

However, the Bill allows Americans, who reside within 20 miles of the border, to have this privilege even though they have no allegiance whatsoever to Canada. I had hoped, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Agriculture would have given us several examples when he spoke of large areas of land to be controlled by absentee landlords or large corporations.

He did not give one single example of this. I understand that there have been several questions in this regard directed in the past to him in this Legislature, questions that remain to date unanswered. I can only, therefore, assume that there is no problem, at least at this time, of this kind of ownership or I am sure that specific examples would have been given. Surely if there was a danger of this in the future we should have been given specific examples of it and not vague references to Arabian oil tycoons who are trying to buy land in Manitoba. Why, therefore, Mr. Speaker, do we need this Bill?

The only reason that I can think of is that the Government is seeking still more ways to control the ownership of land in this province, through the operation of the Land Bank or otherwise. For obviously, when companies or individuals are forced to sell land in the future because of the provisions in the Act, the Land Bank will be the largest purchaser and this, of course, fits in with the NDP philosophy of government control of all means of production whenever and wherever possible.

The Bill will also, through the provisions of Section 19, give the Government power to inquiry into the personal and private affairs of every farmer in the province. Any farmer on demand of a government official will be required to turn over all his records to the government, to prove that he owned land prior to March 1, 1974, to prove that he resided in Saskatchewan for more than 183 days. A farmer, under this Section, is given less protection under the law than a person accused of a criminal offence, for the Government does not even have to have reasonable and probable grounds to believe that an offence has been committed under the Act in order to obtain this information. There are no restrictions whatsoever on the Government from snooping and prying into the everyday affairs of every single farmer in the province. Not only does the Bill declare that the vast majority of Canadians living outside Saskatchewan are second-class citizens it does not even afford citizens of this province the protection of the law that is given to common criminals.

Mr. Speaker, it is for these reasons that the Bill takes away from basic and fundamental rights of every single person in this country that I oppose it and it is the reason that the Liberal Party opposes it and hopefully it is reason enough to convince the Members of the other side to reconsider the Bill and throw it in the waste basket, where it belongs.

Mr. Speaker, I have other things I want to say about this Bill at a later date and I now beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

April 8, 1974

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

Mr. R. Gross (Gravelbourg): — Mr. Speaker, a few short and brief remarks on a simple and direct and worthy program to assist our urban governments.

Once again, the Members on this side of the House have come up with another new and dynamic and welcomed program for urban governments. This program is more than a blessing, it will guarantee that nearly every small community in Saskatchewan will be guaranteed an existence. \$75, Mr. Speaker, is real money to bring forth real programs for our urban municipalities. It is clear that this program is no nickel and dime gimmick, it is a solid commitment to major urban centers and in particular, a solid commitment for rural and urban Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, in the past few days there has been some controversy and misunderstanding by the Opposition. They busily went around the province — or the Press has gone through the province — telling people that in order to apply or be available to apply for capital community grants they would have to have a population of over 500 in order to qualify for a \$75 grant.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to quote from a little green brochure put out by the Department of Municipal Affairs, and incidentally not by Service Printing, grants from the community capital fund, and I quote:

Allocation of funds. Grants from the fund will be allocated to all urban communities on the basis of the population at a rate of \$15 per capita, per year, to a maximum of \$75 per capita for a five-year period ending March 31, 1979.

They couldn't understand that language, Mr. Speaker, so I will quote from the Minister's speech which they had some problems with:

The amount of \$47 million will be allocated to a special community capital fund and from this fund between April 1, 1974 and March 31, 1979, grants of up to \$75 per capita may be made to every urban community in the province to assist in financing the cost for acquisition or construction of capital works projects of their own choosing.

Mr. Speaker, every urban community will be eligible for \$75 per capita grants.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gross: — Mr. Speaker, I defy anyone to criticize such a program. Yet sadly our feeble minds opposite have managed to mar this very worthy program. We have had, and I have already got feedback, in regard to these less than half-truths. Our singing friends to your left, Sir, obviously have misled the Press as well as the people of Saskatchewan. It is my understanding that they have been saying that small centers are not available or cannot receive the capital community fund. Indeed unfortunate, and indeed, untrue.

Mr. Speaker, I have contacted a few secretaries and mayors of local governments in my riding and have advised them personally of the new program. Let me assure you it will be with more than pleasure they will accept this new program. I have taken the time to break down what it would mean to the different communities and urban governments in my riding. We come out with this kind of figure: In Gravelbourg we have a population of 1,450, the \$75 per capita community unconditional grant will total some \$108,750. Mr. Speaker, \$108,750 the town of Gravelbourg has never seen before.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gross: — An unconditional operational grant will also be available, some \$10 per capita — \$14,500 — they will receive a total of \$123,250 in a small community of 1,450 and, Mr. Speaker, that is real assistance.

The town of Vanguard with a population of 307, and I quote, 307, not over 500, but 307 people — \$23,025 that they will be eligible to receive. A conditional grant of \$10 for 370, total \$26,095. Mr. Speaker, Hodgeville will receive something like \$30,125 in total; Neville will receive \$12,580 in total. Mr. Speaker, that is real money to perform real programs, programs that they have been waiting to implement for quite some time.

What kind of programs might they apply for, Mr. Speaker? I quote from the brochure just to make sure that there is no misquoting:

Kinds of projects — all projects of a capital nature will be eligible under the program provided that they are included in the municipality's approved capital budget.

Here are some of the programs:

Street paving, storm sewers, water and sewage systems, civic buildings and recreational facilities, are only examples that some of the programs rural and urban government will be looking forward to getting under way, come this year and in the following five years.

Mr. Speaker, it is an excellent program, a very worthy program, a program that urban governments have been waiting for for their entire lives.

Mr. Speaker, I will be supporting the Bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. P. P. Mostoway (Hanley): — Mr. Speaker, I fully support this Bill to establish the community capital fund. I welcome it because the various capital projects which will arise from it will directly benefit urban centers and indirectly benefit rural communities because much rural economic and social activity gravitates to our local urban centers.

Mr. Speaker, I think it should be pointed out that the Hon. Member for Lumsden (Mr. Lane) probably deliberately tried to mislead this House the other day when he tried to have us believe communities under 500 would have little or no say in

April 8, 1974

these grants. Mr. Speaker, this is plain nonsense. It will not, as he claimed, force spending by urban municipalities. I, for one, and I am sure all other Members in this House will agree, that our urban councilors are quite capable of determining whether or not they will utilize the grants and to what extent.

Mr. Speaker, the kind of gibberish that came from the Member for Lumsden is typical of the gibberish that comes from those Members opposite. The Member for Lumsden says that the community capital fund is a payoff to Saskatoon and Regina councilors. Mr. Speaker, this is an insult to the good councilors of these two cities. Mr. Speaker, I know Saskatoon and Regina councilors are honest and work for the good of their people. The Member for Lumsden should publicly apologize for trying to smear their good names. Maybe he thinks in terms of corruption, our councilors do not.

Mr. Speaker, I think certain Members opposite really feel guilty about the brutal way they answered urban councils' requests for assistance when the Liberal junta was in power.

Mr. Lane: — What?

Mr. Mostoway: — Junta. Mr. Speaker, I am just saying it once. Maybe some feel guilty of the near bribes they offered to certain urban centers just prior to the last election, in an effort politically to win certain communities. Well, Mr. Speaker, I know what one community in Hanley constituency told the last Liberal Government. Translated into votes, it told that regime to take a rest, a long, long rest, and that is exactly what it is going to do.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatoon Hanley will certainly agree with this grant program. Many will welcome it because it will now mean that certain projects, not suitable for winter, spring or fall undertaking will now be able to be undertaken in the summer, projects such as swimming pools and outdoor recreational projects.

Mr. Speaker, the community capital fund will mean nearly \$10 million for Saskatoon. It could well mean \$56,000 for the town of Allan, and this is what Liberals are against. If the Hon. Member for Lumsden thinks that amounts such as these are peanuts, then let him tell Saskatchewan people just that. If he is against this grant program let him tell his constituency to vote against this Bill. And if he does this, I am sure that they will vote him out of this House in the next election. I just don't know where he is going to run. Someone said to the nearest hole, I don't know.

Mr. Speaker, I find it incredible that anyone might be against this grant program unless he needs a saliva test. This Bill recognizes that increased provincial revenues should be shared by our urban municipalities.

It recognizes that this increased revenue can well hold down property taxes, and it does in most communities. It recognizes the confidence this Government has in urban people and their elected councils. It recognizes the confidence which this Government has in the wholesomeness of our Saskatchewan urban centers, large and small.

Mr. Speaker, it recognizes this Government's continuing faith in Saskatchewan, in spite of Members like the Member for Lumsden (Mr. Lane) who seems to be the very essence of pessimism itself.

Mr. Lane: — . . . clean Cody . . .

Mr. Mostoway: — Pardon me. You're going to clean Cody? You're the boys to clean up, aren't you? I would suggest that when you fellows come in contact with somebody, it might warrant some cleaning all right.

Mr. Speaker, I will certainly be supporting this Bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Debate adjourned.

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

Mr. P. P. Mostoway (Hanley): — Mr. Speaker, I'm glad you fellows enjoy it, I'm glad. Because I can honestly say I don't enjoy yours, and I'm being honest, and I appreciate your being honest.

Mr. Speaker, look, it's just like listening to a pack . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, I think we would make more progress if all Members addressed the Chair instead of each other back and forth.

Mr. Mostoway: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I certainly am pleased to be able to speak in support of the Workers' Compensation Act. I'm particularly pleased because over the past few years I have involved myself with various compensation cases in my area, and I might add, sometimes beyond its borders. I am particularly pleased to support this Bill because I know some of the trials and tribulations workers go through in order to get justice. I know this because I have been on compensation myself in the past, although not in this province. I know also from working first hand with many workers.

Mr. Speaker, the very fact that individual MLAs have had to involve themselves in individual compensation cases, must surely be an indication that in the past all was not well with Workers' Compensation. Now I don't pretend to think that all is rosy now, or that it might be in the future. However, I do believe this Government has done more for our injured workers than any other government in the history of this province.

Surely everyone . . .

An Hon. Member: — And that is a fact.

Mr. Mostoway: — . . . If you say it, Sir, it is a fact.

Surely everyone will agree that the Liberal regime didn't

April 8, 1974

care about our injured workers. They didn't care about their wives or their dependents and that's a fact. I think there is unanimous agreement that the Liberal regime tried every inhumane trick in the book to prevent injured workers from benefiting from a fund set up specifically for them.

Mr. Speaker, it's common knowledge that during the seven years of Liberal rule the Compensation Board was ordered to deny workers their rightful benefits. Far be it from me to suggest that they did this by ordering the chairman at that time to attack problems and look at cases in a cold and inhumane way, thus saving . . .

An. Hon. Member: — Who was the chairman?

Mr. Mostoway: — I don't recall, could you enlighten me?

Anyway, they asked the chairman to look at problems in a cold and inhumane way, thus saving the province money but causing unbelievable misery and hardship among our workers and their families.

Far be it from me to suggest that the Liberals deliberately made compensation difficult to come by for injured workers in the hope that many of them would have to turn to welfare and I have many cases to prove that. And many did to put bread on their tables.

Far be it from me to suggest that with many on welfare, even though they shouldn't have been, the Liberals gloated on the fact that the Federal Government was picking up half the cost instead of the Compensation fund.

Mr. Speaker, have you ever heard of anything so inhumane, so cruel, so stonehearted? I think not. And that is why I wish to inform you, Sir, that when the Liberals were wrenched from their position as dictators, thousands of injured workers saw it as a signal of better things to come.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to say our workers were not disappointed. Oh, I don't pretend to say that all have been satisfied since the NDP came into power. I don't even pretend to say that this Bill will satisfy all of them. I only wish to say that things are much better for our injured workers than they were and this Bill will make things even better.

Mr. Speaker, I want to go through some of the major changes this Bill will bring about. I notice that the income ceiling will be raised to \$10,000 as of July 1, 1974. To me this is good news. But equally good is a periodic review and automatic adjustment of this figure which will take place. To me it would seem that this mechanism should remove much of the time lag, the financial injustices suffered by injured workmen in the past.

Mr. Speaker, the inclusion of corporation executive officers in the near future certainly makes good sense to me. I don't really think they are so badly in need of coverage, but I do see this as a step in lessening the gap which often exists between worker and management. Then, too, most have coverage now through private insurance companies. Companies usually pay these premiums for their executives. Why should these premiums not be paid to the Compensation fund? Why should these premiums

sometimes leave our province and sometimes even leave the country?

I also note domestics or household servants employed by a central agency will now have to be covered. To me this makes sense because I believe that too often in the past these workers often had no recourse, no place to turn to for benefits when injured. Oh, it's true they could have tried to gain some sort of compensation through the courts, but, Mr. Speaker, very often in the past these very people, by the very nature of their positions, were reluctant to take on employers, particularly domineering employers. They were very often awed by the thought of long drawn out court involvement. In the past far too many did not exercise their rights.

I also like the new provision giving the Compensation Board discretion in dealing with students and apprentices. At long last potential earnings will be considered in the granting of benefits.

Mr. Speaker, I welcome the proposed amendments to allow the same benefits to workers suffering from industrial diseases as there are for accidents. I think this is a good idea, particularly when we consider the changing environment of many of our workers, especially those now working in the potash industry where I am sure nobody really knows what the long-term effects on workers might really be.

Mr. Speaker, I note this Bill provides for a monthly payment of \$275 for a surviving spouse who is a sole dependent. I notice this is higher than that proposed in the Task Force Report. I welcome such a move, and I welcome the move to grant more than the Task Force proposal of \$60 per month for the surviving spouse with children. In the past I often wondered why approximately 400 widows and about 600 children should have been shortchanged, along with injured workers.

Mr. Speaker, it should be quite obvious, in my opinion, that the main features of this Bill are good. But I do have a few bones of contention to bring up, and one of them is in regard to the way certain actual accidents are handled. I know of numerous workers who have been hurt. Some end up in hospitals, others in first aid stations, and others report the accident and that is that. What I am really concerned about is the way management sometimes tries every trick in the book either to prevent the injured worker from going on compensation or trying to entice the injured worker to report back to work too soon.

Mr. Speaker, in one typical case which I can verify, management employed very questionable tactics in order to get to talk to their injured worker who was lying sick in the hospital. They promised him an easy time should he come back to work shortly. Well, they simply said, come back to work and hang around, and you don't have to do anything, but just report for work. This is quite understandable when one remembers that the better the accident rate for companies, the lower the rate paid to the Workers' Compensation Board.

Mr. Speaker, this kind of situation doesn't arise out of extra special benevolence on the part of management. It arises out of a concern to keep the rates they pay low. And that is what the Hon. Member opposite, for Moose Jaw North (Mr. MacDonald) does not understand will happen much more

April 8, 1974

frequently if the merit rating system for companies is instituted.

Now, I know by far the majority of companies would not stoop to using this practice, but a few would, and it is their workers who would suffer if this merit system were to be introduced.

Rather than a reward for good accident records, Mr. Speaker, I think it should work the other way around — a penalty for those who are not willing to abide by good common sense rules and regulations. And in this regard I believe there is still much to be done in the matter of safety. There is much to be done by government, management and workers. In other words, Mr. Speaker, too many of our workers are still being unnecessarily injured. Safety records, particularly in our mines, are improving, but not quickly enough. Here I urge government to do all in its power to bring about better safety to our workers.

Mr. Speaker, only recently I had occasion to speak to certain people who have had dealings with Saskatchewan Compensation and some of these, incidentally, were involved with the now defunct Injured Workers' Association, which was pretty active a short while ago. Every one of them felt this Bill is a good step in the right direction. Every one of them felt this Bill is a good step in the right direction. Every one I contacted expressed amazement at how some Liberal MLAs could attack this Bill which will give workers protection, which is rightfully theirs.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I shall be more than happy to support this Bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Debate adjourned.

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