

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fourth Session - Seventeenth Legislature
55th Day

Monday, April 22, 1974.

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

HON. W.E. SMISHEK (Regina North East): — Mr. Speaker, I should like at this time to introduce to you and to the Members of the Legislature a group of 40 students from St. Anne School, located in my constituency. They are Grade Eight students and are seated in the west gallery. They are accompanied here by their teachers, Mr. Zurowski and Mr. Bernhauser. On behalf of the Members of the Legislature I wish to extend a warm welcome to them and particularly invite them to stay with us for as long as possible this afternoon. We particularly want to draw their attention that later this afternoon we will have an exciting visitor with us, His Excellency the Governor General of Canada, who will be here with us shortly and I do hope that they stay during his visit.

Mr. Speaker, I do extend to them a warm welcome and hope that their stay with us this afternoon will be exciting and educational.

HON. MEMBERS:: — Hear, hear!

HON. W.A. ROBBINS (Saskatoon Nutana Centre): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to take this opportunity to introduce to you and to the Members of this Assembly some 40 Grade Seven and Eight students from St. Charles School in Saskatoon. The school is situated in the present Nutana Centre constituency. They are accompanied by their teachers, Mr. Noonan and Mr. Werbecki. I understand they will be spending a bit of time in the city today and I hope they don't have any major difficulty getting back through the Lumsden area tonight. I noticed a lot of water running over the road there this morning.

I sincerely hope their stay will be an educational one and like the Hon. Member who preceded me I hope they are able to stay for the proceedings while His Excellency the Governor General is in the House.

HON. MEMBERS:: — Hear, hear!

MR. H.H. ROLFES (Saskatoon Nutana South): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to join with my colleague from Nutana Centre in welcoming the children from St. Charles School. I had the privilege, Mr. Speaker, of being the principal of that school some years ago and I remember many of the older brothers of the students who are here today. I also had the privilege of working with Mr. Werbecki for a number of years.

I hope that the students will find their stay here in the

Legislative Building educational and worthwhile and I hope they have a pleasant trip back home.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

STATEMENT

APPRECIATION TO VOLUNTEER WORKERS WHO WORKED IN REGINA LAKEVIEW AREA

MR. E.C. MALONE (Regina Lakeview): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I wonder if I could beg your indulgence for a moment to make a brief statement of thanks and appreciation to the many people who worked in the Regina Lakeview area the past weekend. I think it is fair to say, Mr. Speaker, that without the several hundred volunteer workers, the great work by the City Engineering Department and the EMO that there would have been a disaster in Regina just the same as the disaster that has affected Moose Jaw. On behalf of the people of Regina Lakeview, as their elected representative, I want to express their appreciation to all of the hundreds of people who worked along the banks of Wascana Creek on Friday night, Saturday and Sunday.

I think it is fair to say, Mr. Speaker, that adversity brings out the best in people and I think proof of this was shown along the banks of Wascana Creek over the past few days. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

QUESTION

FORECASTING OF FLOOD INADEQUATE IN MOOSE JAW

MR. D.F. MacDONALD (Moose Jaw North): — Mr. Speaker, I should like, in light of the very heartbreaking disasters that we have encountered in Moose Jaw, I should like to ask a question of the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Byers), for it seems that other areas in the province plus Regina seem to have had fairly accurate forecasting in preparation. I should like to ask why was the forecasting that took place in Moose Jaw so totally inadequate? I refer to the pitifully low estimate of flow in the Moose Jaw River and Thunder Creek and the lack of any forecasting in Spring Creek. It seems the only accurate forecasting was from this side of the House when we predicted a lack of forecasting. Is it true, Mr. Minister, that little attention was paid to Spring Creek because of the very fact that it has not flooded to any extent in the past years?

HON. N.E. BYERS (Minister of Environment): — Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw to the attention of the Members of the House that insofar as the flooding at Moose Jaw is concerned we are this year dealing with the one in 200 flood, which means that this only occurs once in 200 years. Whereas previous record floods were of the order of one to 50 or one in 50 years possibility.

The art of forecasting still requires a good deal of refinement. It is true that there was considerable forecasting done on the Thunder Creek basin which caused the initial

difficulty at Moose Jaw. I think that the, I don't have the exact wording of the forecasts as they were made by the Forecast Division, but I think they were in the order of what was the minimum amount expected and what was the greatest possible amount that could occur. The art of forecasting is still being refined, we did the best we could. We certainly had no figures in the Forecast Division to anticipate what levels might be expected with the one in 200 flood which unfortunately did hit Moose Jaw. I think that although that is a very unfortunate situation we did the best that could be done with the resources and with the knowledge and with the manpower that we did have available at this time.

MR. MacDONALD: — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. The Minister is a very shaken man and he appeared very confident before this House when we were asking questions before and now he has admitted that there was no forecasting of any significance done. And the statement about one in 200 sounds like a Russian roulette game. It is very sad that we should get into this kind of a situation. It is like the Minister of Agriculture's statement that you shouldn't be residing in it. I should like to ask the Minister has the Government considered or has it declared Moose Jaw as a disaster area and is it true that financial aid is available from the Federal Government in a formula where the province picks up the first so much and the Federal Government and province splits so much and the Federal Government picks up the rest entirely? If so I should just like a statement from the Minister on what the Provincial Government is prepared to do to give financial assistance to the city and to the flood victims?

HON. A.E. BLAKENEY (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I think I can assist the Member with respect to that. I think it will be known there is a formula which exists currently. There are some proposals for renegotiating it among the several western provinces but this is nothing more than a proposal at this moment. The present formula for federal-provincial cost sharing involves the province picking up the first \$1 per capita. The province meaning, not the Federal Government, but rather the local people — the people who suffered the loss — and the Provincial Government. The next \$1 million is dealt with on a 50 per cent Federal. The second million, 75 per cent Federal and so on.

With respect to that, the Province of Saskatchewan has informally advised the Federal Government some days ago that we would likely be making a claim and we have today advised the Federal Government formally in a wire to Prime Minister Trudeau in the following terms:

It is apparent now that damage resulting from spring floods in Saskatchewan will be in the millions of dollars.

I think this is probably accurate.

I wish to advise you that the Government of Saskatchewan will be applying for Federal contributions to assist individuals in local governments in meeting the costs of flood fighting and rehabilitation.

And then I asked:

Please advise the appropriate Federal officials with whom we should make arrangements to initiate our joint efforts in this regard.

That is the current state of the relations between the Federal and Provincial Government.

With respect to what the position of the Provincial Government will be in respect of individuals who have suffered loss, the matter is still under consideration. We are making arrangements for the assessing of the loss at Moose Jaw. I have been in touch with His Worship, Mayor Taylor, this morning on two occasions and have put our officials in touch with him and I anticipate that probably by tomorrow arrangements will be under way for assessing. We will be using adjusters, insurance adjusters, both independent adjusters and adjusters from the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office to make adjustments of the losses suffered so that we can ascertain the nature of the loss. Then we, together with municipal officials, can discuss the appropriate measures which should be taken in the light of the facts which will thus be ascertained.

MR. MacDONALD: — Mr. Speaker, I know I'm not allowed a second supplementary but I think the question is important enough and I did ask the question as to whether or not Moose Jaw had been designated as a disaster area and I should like the Premier to comment on that.

MR. BLAKENEY: — I looked into this matter and I found that designating an area as a disaster area apparently meant nothing, except from the point of view of being a P.R. presentation. It seemed to me that this situation required not an application of P.R. but an application of an effort to deal with the problem. I'm not suggesting for a moment that those who were talking about its being declared a disaster area were interested in the public relations aspect, not for a moment. I think some people are of the view that it is necessary to make such a declaration in order to apply for federal sharing. This is my advice that such is not the case. We could have declared it a disaster area but there didn't seem to be any particular point in that. But if anyone feels that there is a point in it, we obviously can do so. It seemed to us that such a declaration would perhaps cause a degree of public awareness outside of Saskatchewan which might have caused a misconception to arise as to the nature of the problem in Moose Jaw. Accordingly we did not act in that way.

COMMITTEE TO ASSESS FLOOD DAMAGE IN RURAL AREAS

MR. C.P. MacDONALD (Milestone): — I appreciate and I am sure all Members of the House and the people of Saskatchewan and Moose Jaw particularly will appreciate the Premier's comments about assessing the damage at Moose Jaw. I wonder if the Premier is considering the damage to rural municipalities, roads, bridges, other aspects. I wonder if he is considering my suggestion of last Friday, that a committee be made up of urban and rural people as well as the Government of Saskatchewan. I am sure that the Premier is aware that flood damage is not restricted to Moose Jaw alone but many rural areas, many rural municipalities have suffered a great deal from flood damage.

MR. BLAKENEY: — We are certainly considering the appropriate way to handle this. It appears to us at this point that it is far too early to attempt to assess and to adjust any damages that might be suffered by the RMs. Most of the areas in question are still under a fair amount of water, and we are not in a position to assess what the damage might be. The urban damage in Moose Jaw is in a different category as the water there is now beginning to recede and it is possible to get into the places. The return to the flooded buildings is not going to happen as fast as some people think it is; there are inspections with respect to health, with respect to power and with respect to engineering soundness that need to be carried out. But I think that is, commencing today, that is my understanding and, therefore, that work will start.

FOREST DEVELOPMENT IN NORTHERN SASKATCHEWAN

MR. J.G. RICHARDS (Saskatoon University): — Mr. Speaker, I have a question I would like to direct to the Premier. In the public release of April 18th by the Government, the Premier stated to the Legislative Assembly that the Government has no plans, as outlined in the newspaper story, concerning forest development in northern Saskatchewan as I tabled in the material on Tuesday. In the Prince Albert Herald of Saturday is reference stating that a reliable source, whom I understand is a senior official of the Prince Albert Pulp Company, is claiming that there has been for some considerable time consultation between his corporation, Prince Albert Pulp Company and the Saskatchewan Government with respect to a hardwood pulp mill line. Would the Premier comment on the state of these negotiations?

MR. BLAKENEY: — The answer shortly put is, No. The answer shortly put with respect to the newspaper story is that I think it inappropriate to comment.

MR. RICHARDS: — As a supplementary, Mr. Speaker, would the Premier give any guarantee that Prince Albert Pulp Mill will not be afforded the right to develop a hardwood pulp mill line? In other words that it is the Government's policy not to allow any further expansion to Karl Landegger's outfit in Saskatchewan?

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I think that it is pretty clear that if I answer any of these questions one way or the other, the process of attempting to elicit the policy by process of negation will go on and accordingly my answer is that I have no comment.

STATEMENT

STATE OF FLOOD SITUATION IN SASKATCHEWAN

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to make a somewhat more general comment on the state of the flood situation in Saskatchewan. May I report to the House that the situation in Regina is, I think, encouraging. The lake levels have dropped slightly. The lake levels are above those of 1971.

They have not yet reached the peaks that were thought possible, something over 4,000 cfs, and accordingly the situation in Regina continues to be encouraging. We think that the level will drop off a few inches in the next 24 hours and then perhaps drop off more rapidly over a period of some ten days.

In Moose Jaw there is a slow recession. The water went down one inch over night I am told. Moose Jaw Creek is now beginning to recede. Thunder Creek is expected to sustain a high flow for some time. There is a great deal of water in the upper reaches of Thunder Creek. Spring Creek has crested at 600 cubic feet per second and is down to 400. Spring Creek is unpredictable, I think this situation is thought to be in hand but I suppose no one is perfectly sure of Spring Creek.

Mr. Speaker, with your indulgence I should like to say something about Lumsden but if I may leave it until after the visit of Their Excellencies, I think it might be more appropriate judging from the notes which are being passed on to me by the House Leader. So with your indulgence I will defer the statement until then.

The House recessed in order that His Excellency Governor General Leger could address the Assembly.

**VISIT OF HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR GENERAL
JULES LEGER AND MME. LEGER**

MR. SPEAKER: — Your Excellency, Mme. Leger, it gives us a great deal of pleasure on this occasion to be able to recess this Legislature for a short interval during our working Session, to be able to welcome Your Excellency and your good wife to the Legislative Building of the Province of Saskatchewan. I believe this is the first time that Saskatchewan has ever had the privilege and the pleasure of having His Honor the Governor General visit our Chamber. And I believe it is indeed a day which will go down in the pages of history within our province. I can assure you that we welcome you and your lady and your party to the province and as I said outside, we have additional swimming pools if anyone wants any they can have them for taking them away. But we do wish your stay here to be enjoyable and that your memories of the West will be pleasant. I don't know whether this is your first visit to the West or not, but if it is, I'm sure that it will be a memorable one for you.

At this time I am going to call on the Premier to say a few words of welcome to your Excellency and your good wife. Mr. Premier Blakeney.

HON. A.E. BLAKENEY (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, Your Excellencies. It is a rare honor that you bestow upon our House. I would like to echo the words of Mr. Speaker and welcome you and Madame Leger on this your first official visit to Saskatchewan and to this Legislative Assembly. I and my colleagues join with Mr. Speaker in expressing the hope that your visit to Saskatchewan will be a pleasant one.

Not only is this a relatively rare occasion for us but also your visit brings, perhaps unfortunately, a relatively rare moment of harmony within these walls. By the very nature of our calling, politicians to the right of Mr. Speaker and to the left

of Mr. Speaker tend to accentuate the differences which divide us. Sometimes feelings run high, and on those occasions we appear to be adversaries. Sometimes we appear to be adversaries never to be reconciled. Indeed, that is some people's view of the political process. And I must say that we sometimes give justification for that view. This occasion, I think, makes it fitting for us to recall that, however spirited our debates may be, the forces which unite us are far stronger and far more lasting than those that divide us.

You, Sir, and your office symbolize those forces of unity. You remind us that all of us on both sides of the House share a pride in being Canadians and that our loyalties extend beyond our constituencies, our Party and our province. They extend to Canada — and all of Canada — which we are so grateful to be able to call our homeland.

You remind us too of the great traditions of the British Parliamentary system of the democratic process of which we are a part. A tradition which permits us to have a head of state removed from the cut and thrust and the controversy and the animosity of the party political arena.

Your office, Sir, is the office of an incumbent who serves to represent those larger loyalties which we all acknowledge, but which we sometimes appear to forget. It is in this spirit which I wish to thank Your Excellencies for your visit here today. We look forward to the balance of your stay in Saskatchewan; we regret that we are not in the best position to entertain you; we look forward to an occasion when we offer a prospect of somewhat less water and somewhat more grass and vegetation. We look forward, in fact, to many future occasions when we hope that you will come out from Ottawa to the West, to this province and visit with, and I believe enjoy a growing association with, the province and the people of Saskatchewan.

MR. SPEAKER: — Thank you Premier Blakeney. I'm, sure all the Members of the Assembly join with you on your remarks to His Excellency, Mr. Leger and his good lady.

At this time I should like to call on Mr. Cy MacDonald, the Member for Milestone, to speak on behalf of the Opposition. Mr. MacDonald.

MR. C.P. MacDONALD (Milestone): — Your Excellencies, I should like to associate myself and the Members of this side of the House with the remarks of the Premier. And in extending a very warm and sincere welcome, I point out like the Premier, that your arrival coincides with a moment of tragedy and triumph for the people of Saskatchewan. We assure you that the flood waters now moving so violently through much of our province, in no way dampens the warmth of our Saskatchewan welcome.

To you, Sir, I want to point out that Saskatchewan like most of Canada is made up of people of many races, colors and creeds. But I want to point out also, Your Excellency, that many of our Saskatchewan communities have a strong ethnic background of your native tongue. I know that these people are justly proud of you and the manner in which you are carrying out your responsibilities. As a representative of Her Majesty we appreciate the strength and importance of your role as a

April 22, 1974

unifying force in our country. Your position has always been recognized as a Canadian position. It is a vital link with our historic tradition of democratic government. Your personal reputation and prestige will add a great deal of stature to the office that you hold.

To you and your good wife, we wish you a very warm and sincere welcome. I hope that your stay in the Province of Saskatchewan will be most pleasant and we look forward to many many such occasions in the future.

MR. SPEAKER: — Thank you Mr. MacDonald. I am sure that all Members join with you on the sentiments that you have expressed on behalf of the Opposition to His Excellency on this occasion.

Now, maybe His Excellency would like to reply and say a few words to the Members of the Legislature. So I shall call on His Excellency Governor General Leger to say a few words on this occasion.

HIS EXCELLENCY JULES LEGER: — Mr. Speaker, Mr. Premier, Members of the Legislative Assembly. I consider it a great honor indeed and a privilege to be invited to the floor of this House where the political fortunes of Saskatchewan have been discussed for so many years. I am aware that you wish in this way to mark your attachment to the Crown, to our parliamentary system and to our country.

For our part, my wife and I, are on a tour of the country which once finished will have taken us to all provincial capitals. We have already visited Quebec, St. John's, Victoria and Edmonton. We bring you greetings from the Premiers, the Legislators, the whole population of those provinces.

Yesterday on our way here we flew over the flooded areas of the province. I know that I am the faithful interpreter of Her Majesty, the Queen, and of the whole country when I tell you how saddened we are by these disasters. But notwithstanding the distances, the differences in racial origin, a strong feeling of community unites Canadians as is manifest in such periods of disaster.

It is difficult to imagine today with so much water around that this land was once a desert which resulted from the prolonged drought of the thirties. Those who lived through that time showed courage and tenacity. This stubborn fight for survival against the hostile forces of nature allowed your province against many expectations to take up again and pursue its primary vocation. This struggle made you strong, determined men whose spirit of solidarity is matched only by your propensity for hard work.

As early as 1905 one of my predecessors, Earl Grey, could observe here in Regina after the ceremony marking the launching of Saskatchewan as a province, the excellence on which the manhood, character and prosperity of a province so greatly, if not altogether, depend. Your capital, your city, your achievements testify that you lived up to this high standard.

The intensity and the intimacy of your association with the earth around you, whether one of love or of fear, is an example to Canadians. More and more of us would in fact envy

this dialogue with the soil. This search for harmony with nature is being sought by those living in large cities — silence and solitude so necessary to the equilibrium are getting to be rare nowadays. Your claims enable you to appreciate through this unique combination of space, land and air the relationship of man and his world and possibly even God.

In pursuing the vocation of agriculture you have fed, in addition to your fellow citizens a good part of the world's population and you have become a source of hope as well for the starving people.

Haut de la dès considérations géographiques, politiques et économiques je mi'explique à votre contacte du developpement de votre pays comme étant le résultat de cette volonté de dépassement qui fut celle des vos ancêtres et des nôtres. Et come la somme des aptitudes diverses et du travail des différentes composantes de notre société, source de notre grandeur, de notre diversité a pourtant été souvent percue comme une force contribué a l'interieur de notre vie nationale. Il est réconfortant maintenant et prometteur de constater qu'à mesure que ce multiplie les échanges entre les differétes parties du pays ce sentiment c'est de la place a la conviction grandissante que cette diversité en fait l'une de nos plus grandes richesses.

With faith one can move mountains but even with the faith of Canadians the Rockies could not be moved to Quebec, we could not catch cod in your rivers, nor make wheat grow in Labrador. That is what prompted the voyages of our explorers and remains the spring which drives our exchanges and our explorations in the Arctic, underground, and along our coasts. If the immensity of our land offers us the promises of great things to come it constitutes as well the real and permanent challenge to assure the harmonious development of our resources. We will have to show much prudence and wisdom, qualities made more and more necessary by the appearance of certain unforeseen problems and difficulties of growth. We now speak of exhaustion of our natural resources, of pollution. Of insufficient good production, of industrial waste and over population. We ought to acknowledge that the economic development of our country is also increasingly linked with the evolution of world systems. We are privileged that we can count on sufficient resources to keep ourselves fed and housed and to produce a great variety of goods. Moreover within our own boundaries we can count on the great diversity of experience and skills. The complexity and the universal nature of contemporary economic problems require more than ever that we overcome our national egoism and co-operate willingly and industrially. We have demonstrated on many occasions that we have an original way to reconcile our divergent and even sometimes contrary interests. Because of our long and rich experience I have confidence that we shall be able to rise to the task which faces us, the harmonious development of our natural resources in the interest of all Canadians as well as in the interest of our partners abroad.

It is quite natural that you strive to diversify your economy to protect yourselves against the changing moods of nature of which you now have a sad example, and against the fluctuating conditions of the international market of which you were victims so many times. You have been more than any other province beneficiaries and victims together of mechanization and automation. But you hold in your hand the destinies

April 22, 1974

therefore not only of the people of this province but of millions of people abroad. It is not a light responsibility.

May Providence, therefore, guide you in all your endeavors and my wife and myself thank you once more for the honor you have made to us this afternoon in inviting us in these Chambers. May I say that over the years now and then the temptation has been great for me more fully to join one or another of these assemblies but never have I done it until today and I am thankful.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: — Your Excellencies, on behalf of all the Members of the Legislature I wish to thank you for your kind remarks and the expressions which you have left with the Members of this Legislature. I think your visit here and your kind, warm words will mean a lot to the people of this province and I am sure that Saskatchewan looks forward to being able to renew the acquaintances with you again at a later day during your tenure in your office as Governor General of Canada.

May I on behalf of all Members wish you that your stay in office will be pleasant and enjoyable and that you will be able to travel all parts of the country bringing the good wishes and the good will to other parts of Canada that you have done to us here in this Assembly today. On behalf of all the Members thank you and thank you Mme. Leger.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

The Assembly resumed its proceedings.

STATEMENT CONTINUED

STATE OF FLOOD SITUATION IN SASKATCHEWAN

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to give an area by area report. I would, however, like to add comments on one other area and that is Lumsden. The river at Lumsden is still rising; the flow is now something over 13,500 cubic feet per second. It is expected to crest at possibly 15,000 cubic feet per second which would be six inches higher than it is currently. It will be above the safe level of the dykes for probably a week or more. It is believed that the dykes will now contain the flow in the sense that they are high enough. The concentration is now on sandbagging and reinforcing the potential weak spots. There is a vast amount of machinery and a vast number of people working at Lumsden. I would instance the Department of Highways; it has 65 trucks, 20 earthmovers, 20 front end loaders or bulldozers and something over 200 men there. The Public Service Commission has been sending public servant volunteers to Lumsden in shifts of 60 or 65, something over 200 have already been there. The roster is full until this evening. I don't know whether that has been extended beyond that or not.

I think it would be useful at this time to add a word or two more about Lumsden because I think you'll know that several weeks ago the people in Lumsden were advised that they would face a flood in the Qu'Appelle far greater than anything they had ever seen before, far greater than anything in living memory.

There would be almost twice as much water in the river as there ever had been before in recorded history, and it seemed that the town of Lumsden was doomed. It seemed beyond human ingenuity to save it. All the predictions as to flood levels came true. The flood is even higher than twice the previous record that had been predicted and yet as I speak the town of Lumsden remains dry, safe behind miles of earth works as high as house tops. The river has, we believe, done its worst but it has not been enough to dampen the spirits of the people of Lumsden nor the hundreds of volunteers or construction workers who have been sweating night and day to hold back the deluge. The danger is not yet over; the river will rise even higher. No one can say, with confidence, that the town is safe. The people of Lumsden were told of the dangers so they moved their valued possessions to higher ground and having done that they rolled up their sleeves and went to work. The Provincial Government joined the fight. As I indicated, more than 100 pieces of heavy earthmoving equipment was brought in and men and volunteers came by the hundreds. They worked behind the dykes with the people of Lumsden. They worked around the clock; they worked and so far they have won.

We knew that to save the town we would have to move a mountain and a mountain has been moved. We knew that men would have to perform feats of endurance beyond expectation, and the stories of these feats of personal endurance will be told for many years to come. The people of Saskatchewan can be proud of the way the flood waters in Lumsden have been held. Let us hope that the dykes will hold until the water reaches its peak perhaps tomorrow and until it recedes which will perhaps be another week. I have been there yesterday and the day before and I have seen the spirit of Lumsden has so far prevailed and seems ready and able to prevail in the future over the challenge which will be faced in the days ahead. And if this battle is won, as I hope and trust it will be, it will be an epic story in Saskatchewan's struggle against the elements, one more such story and one more very much to the credit of the citizens of Lumsden.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. J.G. LANE (Lumsden): — Mr. Speaker, I would beg the indulgence of the House to make a comment or two on the situation in Lumsden. We believe the figure given by the Premier of 13,500, I believe the flow right now could be approximately 14,000 which is well over double what the record highs were in the past. He talked about consideration of the fact that the town of Lumsden was doomed. There was one group of people that never believed that for a moment and that was the citizens of Lumsden. They are exhausted now but they are certainly not beaten and they are tired but they are certainly not ready to quit. If anyone can beat the waters of the Qu'Appelle and the rivers it is the people of the town of Lumsden. They are presently, as the Premier said, reinforcing and widening the dykes. It is kind of a strange situation to walk over dykes that are higher than the level of the school, above the roof tops of the school and the water is six inches on one side and the dykes 12 to 13 feet on the other and still being added to. The courage of the heavy equipment operators, as the dyke gets higher it gets narrower and they are driving this heavy equipment and they have got a foot on either side and they are nervous and you can't blame them. The courage of

these people is to be commended.

We talked about the tragedy of Moose Jaw and it certainly was. I think, and I am using the words very, very carefully, we have got a possible miracle in the town of Lumsden because they have fought, they have worked and it never entered their minds that the town was going to go and, as I say, they are exhausted, they are tired, they have been going at it for weeks. The dykes are at record heights. We hope they can get through the next 24 hours. If they do the town of Lumsden is going to be dry. The people deserve the credit, the volunteers deserve the credit and we can only hope for the best, but it looks pretty good right now.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

STATEMENT OF APPRECIATION

HON. G.R. BOWERMAN (Minister of Northern Saskatchewan): — Mr. Speaker, I want to thank your office, Sir, and many of the Members of the House, particularly among my colleagues and specifically the Members of the Opposition caucus who sent greetings and consideration during my absence from the Session. I say, Mr. Speaker, it's good to be back although there is no indication that I am here to stay, although I hope that that is so.

I want to say while I am on my feet, Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) that on the Saturday before I left this Session I attended a provincial hockey meet down in Milestone where the Shellbrook Kinsmen were meeting in a playoff of the provincial finals in the Midget C. I was going to bring that information to the Member for Milestone so that he would be aware of that fact that Shellbrook Kinsmen Midget C hockey players again came up with a provincial championship. I only wanted to indicate that to show the Member for Milestone that we do play our hockey like we play our politics and that is to win.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. C.P. MacDONALD (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, I want to join with all Members of the House in welcoming the Minister back. I am sure that all of us always share the concern when a Member has an illness and is forced to leave the House and be hospitalized. The only thing I would have said, it's regrettable that he came back before his Estimates because we would hate to send him back.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MOTIONS

HOUSE SITTINGS

HON. R. ROMANOW (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to move seconded by the Premier (Mr. Blakeney):

That notwithstanding Rule 3, this Assembly shall, commencing Tuesday, April 23, 1974 meet at 10:00 o'clock a.m. each sitting day and there shall be a recess from

12:30 o'clock p.m. until 3:20 o'clock p.m.

Mr. Speaker, before I take my seat, I believe this has been discussed with my colleagues opposite and in effect it means morning sittings starting tomorrow morning.

Motion agreed to.

WITHDRAWAL OF MOTION NO. 3

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I should like to have leave to withdraw Motion No. 3. Just by way of explanation, I should then like to have leave of the Assembly to substitute for it a motion which calls on the House to sit Wednesday evenings only. The motion as it is presently worded calls for Wednesday evenings, Friday evening and Saturday and we wish to withdraw that for the time being and simply put in for the Wednesday, so may I have leave to withdraw Motion No. 3.

Withdrawal agreed to.

WEDNESDAY EVENING HOUSE SITTINGS

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, then by leave I should like to move, seconded by the Premier (Mr. Blakeney) by leave of the Assembly:

That on Wednesday, April 24, 1974 and on each Wednesday until the end of the Session, Rule 3(3) be suspended so that the sitting of the Assembly may be continued from 7:00 p.m. until 9:30 o'clock p.m.

Motion agreed to.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of 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. E. KAEDING (Saltcoats): — Mr. Deputy Speaker, in resuming debate on the Workmen's Compensation Bill, I wish to think back to a time only three years ago when the people of this province turned out the party opposite and placed their confidence in this New Democratic Party Government. One of the contributory factors to that victory was the promise made by Members that workmen would be supported by this Government in their fight for a fair deal in union negotiations, in Occupational Health and Safety legislation and a much more responsive attitude towards the whole area of protection of workmen in their place of work.

One of the first official problems I faced as a new Member was a number of seriously neglected cases of past injuries which had not been fairly dealt with by the Workmen's Compensation Board and there is very little wonder, Mr. Speaker, since that department had been downgraded to a mere skeleton staff with a very limited budget. I am not blaming the members of the Board for their lack of consideration of claims brought to them but

rather on the restrictions placed on them by the niggardly, inconsiderate Government which is now sitting opposite.

A great deal of credit Mr. Speaker, must go to the present Minister of Labour (Mr. Snyder) for having immediately gone to work to improve the staffing and in taking a more humane approach to the entire field of Workmen's Compensation. Probably the most important immediate move by the Minister was the appointment of a more responsive Board and later the appointment of a Workmen's Advocate whose job it is to provide a second avenue of appeal for an injured workman if he feels he has not been properly dealt with by the Board. As a result many of the complaints we received were appealed and in those cases where adjustments were justified they were made. I know personally of a case of a man who lost an eye in an accident at IMC (International Mineral Corporation, Canada) and after hospitalization was paid a temporary disability pension for a few months and then cut off in spite of the fact that he was unable to return to his job. After two years of trying to obtain suitable employment he brought the case back and is now being paid a permanent partial disability which he should have had from the beginning. He will certainly appreciate the improvement brought about by this Government.

Due to the rapid increase in the cost of living many of the benefits payable under the old formula have become eroded and the old rates were no longer realistic. The provisions in this Act providing a two per cent increase for all disability pensions now being paid for past accidents for each year that they have been in existence is a welcome step. Dependent widows will now receive \$275 a month instead of \$134 a month, an increase of over 100 per cent. Dependent children receive \$65 rather than \$52. Minimum pensions payable to permanent totally disabled workers will rise to \$325 a month from \$173, almost 100 per cent. Certainly these are desirable improvements and reflect the desire of this Government to provide a reasonable level of protection to injured workers.

An item of particular interest to workers in my constituency relates to the coverage for industrial disease. Under the new Act payment for disability due to an industrial disease will receive the same compensation as would a worker who had sustained a disability due to an injury even though he was still able to earn full wages. Because of the high salt dust factor common to all potash mining operations the danger of impairment from this corrosive dust is always present and it would be surprising indeed if cases do not show up after some years of working in such conditions. This will be added protection for our workers at the mine. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased and yet much concerned over the fact that the Section relating to the inclusion date of farm and ranch workers under the provisions of The Workmen's Compensation Act have been withdrawn for the present not because I do not believe that there is an urgent need for such coverage because there is, but because I believe a great deal more study and publicity must be undertaken to convince farm operators of the serious position they could find themselves in by not being protected in cases where workmen are injured on their farm. A number of cases have recently come to light of some very large settlements being awarded to workmen, either killed or totally disabled, in farm accidents. Settlements of \$50,000 to \$70,000 are not uncommon and in some cases higher costs have been

assessed. To a farm operator without some form of insurance protection this could well mean the loss of his entire assets to pay the claim.

Employees in all walks of life including farm laborers are now much more aware of the protection that they have in the courts through civil suits in case of severe injury. Where once the farmer could pay the hospital bill of an employee or maybe continue his wages for a few weeks while he was disabled now he often finds himself confronted with a civil action which could cripple him financially. A large number of private insurance plans are now available to protect farmers against liabilities in case of injury or death of workers. In almost all cases there are some exclusions and loopholes which can be extremely costly either to the worker or to the farmer depending on the legal interpretation made by the courts. For instance many plans will not cover back injuries or hernias although these may have been a direct result of an accident. In almost all cases legal action would have to be instigated to cover damages and the resultant court action could drag out for many months during which time the injured would not receive any payment. Most companies have a voluntary compensation package which can be purchased in addition to the regular liability policy. These are generally based on payroll and vary with the company. I should like to give a few examples.

Company A provides the farm operator with personal coverage against accidental death or disability anywhere from \$1,000 to \$50,000 maximum. The rates vary from \$1.75 per thousand and may go up consistently to \$87.50 for \$50,000, the coverage against accidental death. In addition dismemberment coverage of \$1,000 can be purchased at \$1.05 per thousand up to a maximum of \$50,000. Wage protection can be purchased to a maximum of \$50 per week for a maximum of 148 weeks for about \$47, and an additional \$15 can buy \$100,000 of liability insurance. The cost of such a policy to a farmer for \$10,000 would be \$17.50 for death benefits, \$10.50 for dismemberment and at a \$50 a week wage loss indemnity another \$47, plus \$15 for liability. A total of \$100 for this basic protection for himself as a farmer. Having paid the above he can purchase protection for his paid labor at the rate of 50 cents per \$100 payroll, which is low. Benefits, however, would be for deaths or dismemberment \$3,000 which is again very insignificant; wage benefits of \$30 per week for 126 weeks and \$500 for medical expenses.

Company B provides the basic employers with liability of \$100,00 coverage for three years at \$16.50 plus \$1.35 per quarter section of land operated by the farmer, which recognizes the greater risk as land size increases.

Employers are covered at \$1.50 per hundred of payroll with a limited liability of \$3,000 per injury. Benefits payable are \$30 a week for 26 weeks, for total disability and 2/3 of wages not exceeding \$30 per week. If death occurs as a result of the injury within six months \$175 is paid for funeral expenses and dependents get \$30 a week for 100 weeks, or just about two years.

I simply record these two plans which are typical of almost all the plans now being offered to farmers as protection against liability. These plans would provide reasonable protection for the employers in case of short-term disabilities, but would prove totally inadequate should a long-term disability or death result from an injury.

April 22, 1974

Rates under the Workmen's Compensation Plan would be somewhat higher than most of these private plans but are much more comprehensive in many important respects. 1. There will be no liability attached against the employer in any case under this plan. 2. Permanent total disability pensions of \$325 per month for life with permanent partial disability pro-rated as to the degree of disability, also for life or until such circumstances change, as compared with \$30 per month disability pension if under the private plan.

In case of fatal accident a lump sum is paid for the funeral expenses plus a lump sum of \$500 to the spouse, plus a monthly pension of \$275 to the spouse until death or remarriage. All drugs and medical costs are covered. Industrial diseases could have some important implications for farm laborers because of dust, pollen or damage to hearing due to excessive noise.

It can be seen from the examples given that the Workmen's Compensation package is much more comprehensive than the average private plan plus the fact that no legal liability is incurred by the employer. Benefits are paid as long as the effects of the injury exist even for life. Another benefit not normally provided under any private plan is the program to rehabilitate an injured worker after an accident.

Under this provision the board may make whatever expenditure is necessary to lessen or remove any handicap due to injury. This kind of post-injury care is extremely important in severe injury cases. The value of these features to the employer is obvious, particularly in an occupation such as farming, which rates as the most hazardous occupation on most insurance ratings.

At a time when competent farm help is extremely hard to find this added protection would certainly be an added attraction which could well determine whether competent help will be available to all in the near future. Most employees have now come to expect this kind of protection and will hesitate to work if it is not provided. It would appear to me that this will become one of the normal costs of farm operation in future farm budgeting.

In order to reduce the paper work involved, in assessing costs under the plan, a simple form of procedure will have to be used. This could well follow the form now being used by businesses where an assessment is made on an estimated payroll at the beginning of the year and balanced with actual payroll at the year end.

Because it is urgent, Mr. Speaker, and important that adequate protection be given to farm employees to bring them up to the same level with industries, I would urge all farm organizations to immediately begin a campaign of information to farmers and ranchers, advising them of the dangers of lack of protection and the benefits available to them by coming under the umbrella of The Workmen's Compensation Act.

Such a familiarization program could well be a project for local Wheat Pool and United Grain Growers committees, Agriculture Societies and other farm groups. Before a need can be met it should be identified by the people involved.

The Member for Moose Jaw North (Mr. MacDonald) was critical of this Bill because it does not contain provisions for a

universal sickness and accident plan, which would cover employees on or off the job, as proposed in the Task Force Report. I certainly agree that this plan would be desirable, however, it would of necessity have a substantial price tag, and I question whether the cost of such a plan could be borne, even in part, by an employer except for that portion which reflects his time on the job.

I am hopeful that this Government will see fit in the next year or two to propose such a plan to the Legislature. It will be very interesting at that time, Mr. Speaker, to see whether the Member for Moose Jaw North really supports such a plan or whether he reverts back to the normal Liberal stance of protecting the large insurance companies, against what they would call an encroachment on that industry. We will be watching with interest to see what his stand will be when the time comes.

Since this Bill extends additional protection to the work force of this province, both through higher payments and wider application, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased and happy to add my support to the Bill at this time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. D.F. MacDONALD (Moose Jaw North): — Mr. Speaker, when I adjourned the other day I said that I would have a couple more words about this and I won't take very long tonight in this House. As I made mention before I adjourned I said that the most serious deficiency in the Bill is that there is no ..

MR. MESSER: — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order. If the Member is talking about having adjourned the debate on this matter I am wondering what he is doing now re-entering the debate.

MR. GUY: — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order. Of course the Member was not in his seat the other day when it was called and the Minister of Agriculture should know by this time, he has been in the House a few years, that when a Member is out of the House he still has the opportunity to participate in the debate.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: — Yes, the Member for Moose Jaw North has the right to speak.

MR. MacDONALD: — I did make a plea for escalator clauses to be attached to pensions as they were granted and I said that the pensions that we are granting now will quickly fall behind and we will soon be asked again, in this Legislature, to bring them up-to-date.

I think there was wide representation for the escalator provisions and it was recommended by two Task Force Reports. It was also suggested that the Government should become involved financially with the financial cost of the escalator provisions.

I want to say something about merit rating. I think there is a great deal of desire by many employers for some sort of merit system for those employers who have an exceptionally good

safety record. Consideration should be given to the concept. There is provision for this concept but it is not being used. This is presently a method being used in other provinces. I understand that Alberta, for example, has a system whereby an employer with a good record is given a rebate.

The Task Force Report recognized both advantages and disadvantages to using a system of merit rating. On the balance of advantage and disadvantage, the report recommended that a merit system not be instituted. The report also recommended against a demerit system used as a penalizing system.

Bill 80 incorporates the penalizing demerit system but does not incorporate a merit system. The Report recognizes several disadvantages.

It cites a resistance to recognize injuries and an over-enthusiasm to get people back to work quickly. It cites that employers may refuse to hire people considered to present a risk of injury. It also cites an example where an employer may have bad luck. There is also concern of administrative expense. However, on the positive side a merit system could be a real incentive for employers to expend moneys to reduce injury and accidents. This is something that is taken away from our system. The very nature of Workmen's Compensation takes the risk away from the employers. It makes them not liable for court action and so on. It really takes the incentive, in large part, away from the employer to spend sums of money to reduce injuries and accidents.

Surely the reduction of accidents must be the first consideration. Getting financial protection to employees has to be secondary to the aspect of prevention of injury. We must remember that assessments to employers are a very significant cost to an employer. He may be paying four or five per cent or higher of his payroll to the Worker's Compensation Fund. On a construction site this could be a considerable amount of money.

If a merit system were to be an incentive to provide extraordinary preventive measures with the employer knowing that he could get a rebate of assessments, this could possibly mean a large amount of money could be directed to accident prevention. We must remember that especially in a construction industry work obtained is obtained by competitive bidding, so that it could be a very important measure.

Under the present system an employer is forced to bid as low as he can and then he must keep his costs as low as possible. There is little attempt to provide any more accident prevention techniques than are required by law, because of the financial position of the contractors.

There is much to recommend the merit rating system. The Workmen's Compensation Board should give serious consideration to implementing this system.

I should also like to suggest that because of the fact that we are not including an escalator clause for pensions, that a review of the Workmen's Compensation Act, in four years, or every four years, is not going to be good enough. With the rate of increase in the cost of living this Act will soon be outdated and I suggest that it should be reviewed in less than four years because of this. If the review was started in four years from

now, and it would take the best part of a year to report, and then action taken by the Legislature it could well be 1979. So in light of the rapid changes occurring in our society I feel that a review could be undertaken sooner than the four years as stated in the Act.

The Workmen's Compensation Act requires that employers, through the fund, must pay for the medical and hospital bills of injured workers. Our universal health schemes are not universal in this province. All of the public are covered by MCIC and SHSP except the worker who is injured on the job and who is covered by Workmen's Compensation. If the worker is not covered by Workmen's Compensation then MCIC will pay. However, if a worker is covered by compensation then the employer must pay for medical expenses. There is really no logical reason for the Workmen's Compensation Board to be responsible for medical expenses. This is a carryover from the time before hospitalization and medicare and I would suggest that the Workmen's Compensation fund be relieved of paying for medical and hospital benefits.

With these few words, Mr. Speaker, I would indicate that I will support this Bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. K.R. MacLEOD (Regina Albert Park): — Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to make any remarks to this Bill but having heard the Hon. Member for Saltcoats (Mr. Kaeding) I felt that a few explanatory words might be in order.

It does seem that the Hon. Members, as a matter of habit, tend to like to take a few swipes at some mythical position that they have established for the Liberal Party, even on a Bill such as this, which I think should receive the concentrated and, if possible, non-partisan attention of both sides of the House.

Regrettably, the Member for Saltcoats had these remarks in his speech because otherwise he had obviously done some work on the subject and I think that if his basic thesis was that farmers should receive more information and hopefully with the result that they would find it advisable to participate in the program, if that was his basic thesis, then quite frankly, there is much to be said for his remarks.

It was, however, the distortions in his speech that lead me to make a remark or two at this time. First of all I should like to make it clear to the Hon. Member that I continuously resent the suggestion that I am a protector of the large insurance companies because, in fact, I believe that governments at all levels have been duped by the insurance industry, first of all, in the number of things that are in the Insurance Act. Almost every Insurance Act contains a very joyful provision for the benefit of the insurance industry and I refer to that as the arbitration clause. Those people who support that clause in these Acts tend, not in very case, to be people who have either had no experience or virtually no experience with that type of clause. Those of us who have had experience with it recognize how fully and thoroughly it is to the advantage of the insurance industry and it is something which this Government has done

April 22, 1974

nothing about, since 1971, something the Liberals did nothing about from 1964 to 1971; something that the CCF did nothing about from 1944 to 1964.

The record of the CCF and the record of the Liberals in that respect is a tie for first place in supporting the best interests of the insurance industry. I am talking about the insurance industry insofar as it applies to fire, all forms, except life insurance. They tended, both Governments, tended to be in the pocket of the industry, perhaps because they didn't understand the business and in that case I don't think a lot of credit or discredit should be handed around by anybody on that side of the House or for that matter on this side of the House.

Therefore, the remarks of the Hon. Member for Saltcoats, quite frankly reflect, despite his obvious industry for which I congratulate him, nonetheless a certain lack of information and clearly a lack of experience in this particular business.

I should like to suggest as clearly as possible that if anybody has assisted the insurance industry the CCF-NDP have since 1944 supported them for more years than have Liberals and both take good credit in helping them out in their claims.

I agree that farm workers today can suffer injury and they will either receive a lot of money, as a result of somebody's negligence, or they will receive none at all. I do agree with the Hon. Member for Saltcoats that the addition and the inclusion of farm people in this would probably overall be to the benefit of farm workers and in the long run, I think, of some benefit to farmers themselves. The problem, of course, is that there is an assessment to be made to the farmers and quite frankly, I am not sure that farmers like to be assessed by government any more than they have up until now.

The only thing that I should like to mention is this, that when we are comparing plans it is clear, from my experience, that if you collect money you either collect all that you are entitled to or you don't collect anything at all. And if you don't collect anything at all then the public purse must support the individual involved. So if a man loses both arms by amputation, obviously if he can't go to work, the people of the Province of Saskatchewan are going to have to support him and consequently, Workmen's Compensation, through a considerable extent helps the public purse in the sense that people are kept off welfare payments.

But let's take a look at The Automobile Insurance Act. I just did some quick calculations while the Hon. Members were speaking. I want to do this merely for the purpose of showing that all government plans tend to shaft the people they are supposed to benefit.

Take a look at this. If A loses his arm somewhere up to the shoulder, he gets a maximum of \$3,000, but if it's just below the elbow he gets a maximum of \$1,600, and that is it. It doesn't matter what he does for a living. That is the maximum benefit that he can get.

The fact of the matter is this, that government programs by and large are not much more generous than private programs. The only difference with the private programs is that you get what you pay for and you know it in advance; the public program

you get what you pay for but you don't have much choice in picking the level.

Take a look at another one. If you lose your hand you are regarded as having a 40 per cent disability, you get \$1,200. If you lose part of your hand, you get \$60. Sixty dollars, that is not exactly a marvellous recovery. What I am suggesting is that by and large I agree with the Hon. Member's basic thesis and I am disappointed that he had to take a swipe at the Liberal Party because the fact of the matter is that the NDP have not exactly covered themselves with glory and to be honest there hasn't been a major improvement, not one major improvement to the Workmen's Compensation plans for 40 years. This period covers I believe a Conservative — the tail end of a Conservative government, the one and only one in the province — probably the only one we shall see in this century, and by the way in case the Hon. Member wonders about this, Workmen's Compensation was instituted as a Liberal program, not as a CCF program. I am sure that historically — I don't like to go back that far — the fact of the matter is that it is a Liberal program. The fact is also that both the CCF and the Liberals did virtually nothing to improve the program. I practised law from 1954 to 1974 now. I have had the opportunity of practising law eight years under the CCF, seven years under the Liberals, and I want to tell you that there wasn't a great deal of difference in the administration. In both cases the officials were very sympathetic but limited by the amount of dollars they had and the legislation before them. That has continued to this day.

I think that the Hon. Members would do well if they tried on occasion in the House to get their facts right before involving themselves in partisan politics. When you want to be partisan, be right.

I am rather hoping that the Hon. Member — I want to congratulate the Hon. Minister of Labour for the activity that he has shown in this particular area. I am very pleased with it. Quite apart from the fact that the Hon. Minister is one of the two or three Ministers who promptly responds to correspondence from MLAs, a matter that I think on occasion should be commented upon, quite apart from that the Minister has shown some activity in this area which is long overdue. I congratulate him. I agree with the Hon. Member for Moose Jaw North (Mr. MacDonald), there are many things that can be done. I agree with the Hon. Member for Saltcoats (Mr. Kaeding), we are not doing enough, but by golly it is more than has been done in about 35 years.

Therefore I support the Bill, but it doesn't go far enough.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. W. ROBBINS (Minister of Finance): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a brief comment if I may with respect to the remarks of the Hon. Member for Moose Jaw North.

He worried about the fact that an escalator clause hasn't been put in Workmen's Compensation benefits. I agree with him that an escalator is required in terms of cost of living. But I think you must agree that you take a reasonable amount of time to really assess the cost of an escalator. I am afraid that a

lot of the Members in this House perhaps on both sides haven't really assessed that cost. I just did a bit of calculation here while I was listening to the long dissertation by the Member for Albert Park. I took an example of an individual who might have a disability pension of \$400 and assumed that he was 65 years of age, that is a rather rash assumption because most people injured on jobs aren't 65 years of age when they are injured. If you increase that through an escalator clause of five per cent per year for ten years, the pension would then be up to \$651.26 a month. And if you took the differential between the actual pension which is assumed has been paid for out of the rates currently applicable under the Workmen's Compensation Regulations, you would have to find another \$28,913.20 to meet that one claim.

Now that is on the assumption of a five per cent escalator clause. Suppose it was ten per cent per year as the rate of inflation is currently. That \$400 pension in ten years would climb to \$1,037.56 a month. And the cost of buying that pension would be in excess of \$74,000 for one claimant alone.

We better think fairly carefully in terms of setting up an escalator clause. I assure you that I favor it but it has to have a fair bit of study before it can be inaugurated.

HON. G.T. SNYDER (Minister of Labour): — Mr. Speaker, I want to say just a few words in closing debate on second reading of Bill 80. I want first of all to express my gratitude to Members on both sides of the House for their vocal support of what I think is a very good piece of legislation. If my mail is any indication, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is virtually unanimous support for the changes that are to be found in this piece of legislation. I do feel obliged, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I want to comment very briefly on the remarks made by the Hon. Member for Moose Jaw North (Mr. MacDonald) when he spoke on this debate some time earlier and when he resumed debate today.

He reactivated the argument with respect to merit rating and I suppose I shall be repeating myself if I bring forward some of the arguments that have already been offered in this House. I think it is a well established fact that the provisions that the Hon. Member suggests, the merit rating provisions, are provided for in the present legislation and in the legislation that is being contemplated.

There are a number of features which I think cause the board to use the merit rating system judiciously, basically because experience has indicated that where a merit rating system has been used, there is a tendency for some employers to fail to report injuries in order to keep their accident ratio in good proportion and accordingly the board has shown some reluctance to use a widespread merit rating system. Also the board points out to us some of the very difficult administrative problems which arise with a merit rating system in light of the fact that it is necessary to keep track of individual employers for a merit rating system and accordingly in other jurisdictions where a merit rating system is used it is generally only applicable to the larger employers because it creates such a giant administrative problem. So the merit rating system in effect is discriminatory against the smaller employers.

In addition to this the Member for Moose Jaw North drew attention to the fact that he believed that medical costs, I believe in his words, should be borne out of the public purse and that medical costs that are traditionally the responsibility of employers should now become the responsibility of the public purse.

I should say that we have looked at this matter and I believe most other jurisdictions regard medical costs as a legitimate responsibility in connection with an accident that has taken place in an industrial setting. I should remind him too that the provincial purse is contributing under the terms and conditions of this Bill, some \$6.5 million. Provision is being made for a total of \$6.5 million. I think at a time when the generosity of the public purse has been extended to that point I wouldn't think we would be considering at least at the moment, the relief of employers of the additional costs for medical care, which I said earlier, has been a traditional responsibility of employers.

I find it rather significant, Mr. Speaker, that Liberals left it to a Member who was not part of the previous Liberal Government to express whatever dissatisfaction or whatever criticism could be marshalled about Bill 80. The Member for Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod) join in half-heartedly, I thought. It seemed to be something of an afterthought and actually contributed very little at this point. But I think this shows that Liberals realize that for any Member of the previous government to rise in their place with words of criticism about this Bill would be totally unconscionable.

During the infamous seven lean years, Mr. Speaker, the Liberal government did so little about Workmen's Compensation, that the sum total of the changes made during that period amount to basically nothing. As a matter of fact I found it rather amusing to hear the Member for Moose Jaw North quoting from the Murchison Committee of 1968.

The Murchison Committee Report wasn't really nearly as extensive as the Task Force Report on Workmen's Compensation. It actually proposed very little in the way of meaningful change and yet even though those few things that the Murchison Report did recommend were almost totally ignored by the Members opposite when they made up the government.

The Murchison Report recommends, for example, that a worker's counsellor be established to aid and assist injured workmen in presenting their cases before the Workmen's Compensation Board. It wasn't until 1971 when we formed the Government that the legislation was enacted to provide for a workmen's advocate much on the same basis as what was recommended in the 1968 Murchison Report.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is obvious that no one opposite who was a Member of the government between 1964 and 1971 had the courage to rise in their place and offer objections or observations concerning Workmen's Compensation in this Legislature.

The Member for Moose Jaw North expressed some concern during his remarks about the fact that changes to the legislation were brought about in this House in the form of a new Act, a new piece of legislation. He seemed to be concerned that this

April 22, 1974

was an indication that we weren't seriously considering other amendments.

I should like to point out to him that even if the only change that we had made to the Act was to change the word 'Workmen' to 'Worker' wherever it appeared, it would have meant that practically every section of the Act would have had to be amended in order to accommodate this very minor wording change. The simple fact of the matter is that the amendments that we introduced meant that almost every section of the Act was changed if only by a minor wording change and that made amending the existing Act completely impractical.

There was no more obscure motive than that behind the introduction of a new Act when Bill 80 was brought forward. It cannot in any sense be taken to mean that we are completely satisfied with the Act as it is and that we do not intend to introduce further amendments in the foreseeable future.

The Hon. Member referred to the universal Sick and Accident Scheme which was recommended by the Task Force also, Mr. Speaker. I would want to say at this point that I am very much in sympathy with the idea expressed by the Task Force and I would not disagree with the Member on this particular point. However, I should like to make a point also, a point that perhaps should be obvious that to implement such a plan would be a very major undertaking and could not be embarked upon in any kind of good conscience without a most thorough advance study and preparation.

We have been closely watching the developments of such a scheme in New Zealand where they were several years between the initial recommendation which gave rise to that scheme and its actual implementation on April 1, 1974, less than a month ago.

The Department of Labour has been actively researching this idea and has taken an initial look at some of the options involved and some of the questions that will have to be answered before any further action can be taken on the idea. I will give Members of the House my personal assurance that I have no intention of letting this recommendation lie dormant and I intend to pursue very actively the possibilities for introducing a scheme into this province.

The Member for Moose Jaw North, I think believes or attempts to judge the motives of our Government by the do-nothing performance of his own colleagues when they were in a position of authority between 1964 and 1971. Let me assure all Members of this House that we won't be content to sit on our hands and refuse to consider new programs and new ideas as Liberals did for seven long depressing years.

The Member for Moose Jaw North also referred to the Task Force recommendation that suggested compensation should be payable under two headings; loss of bodily function and income maintenance. I should like to inform the House that the first draft of the amendment to the Act did contain a section which would have attempted to accomplish the dual heading system of compensation. However, the Workmen's Compensation Board quite rightly pointed out to us some of the administrative problems inherent in the sections which were in the first draft of the Bill.

Members of my staff and the Workmen's Compensation Board spent several hours wrestling with the concept and we finally

came to the reluctant conclusion that we couldn't proceed with such a section at this time. I think, Mr. Speaker, the key to present difficulties with the idea is the concept of income maintenance. If we can find a method whereby the Board can compensate disabled workers for their actual income loss without at the same time putting the Board in a position where it must keep day to day, or at least week by week track of the incomes of disabled workers, then we shall be well on the way to implementing that particular proposal.

The Member for Moose Jaw North also commented on the fact that the legislation presently before the House does not contain a future escalator clause and he repeated that suggestion today. I should like to quote from my remarks when I opened debate on second reading. I said and I quote:

We have not lost sight of that recommendation. We are continuing to give the matter the most serious study in an attempt to find the appropriate mechanism by which this can be accomplished.

Those are not just empty words, Mr. Speaker, it is the truth of the matter and it is under serious consideration by the Government.

The Member for Moose Jaw North also mentioned in passing the fact that teachers had not been included under the new Act. I should like to say that wherever the Department of Labour has considered changes in legislation we have made a determined effort to consult in advance those groups who are most directly concerned with the legislative change which we contemplate. For example, when the Workmen's Compensation Board regulations were changed to bring in several new groups under compulsory coverage, we made a determined effort to speak to those groups, to locate them, to have them make representation to us in each of the areas involved and we carried on discussions with them about the matter prior to the regulation change being implemented.

In the case of school teachers, my Deputy Minister and his assistants met with representatives of the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation to discuss the possibility of bringing teachers under the Act and it was determined that teachers have, through their collective agreements, negotiated a very complex series of private forms of coverage where disability coverage relates to the pension plan and the sickness benefits relate to the disability coverage and so on. Bringing teachers under Workmen's Compensation would have affected a whole number of things outside the realm or outside the scope of the Workmen's Compensation Board. So on that basis it was the feeling of the representatives of the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation in which we concurred that at this point teachers should not be brought within the compulsory coverage of Workmen's Compensation.

The Member also mentioned rehabilitation, and while I would not pretend to claim that we meet all of the objectives of the Task Force a beginning has been made. The sum of \$169,000 has been set aside in the Budget of the Department of Health to provide for the capital costs, for the equipment and the facilities of a 'work conditioning and assessment' unit at the Wascana Hospital. This project is only in its planning stages and I understand hospital personnel are examining facilities in Edmonton and in Vancouver before proceeding further. The

April 22, 1974

Workmen's Compensation Board will have an input into the development of this facility and it is clear that some steps have already been made.

I should like to point out that when we do deal with the Task Force recommendation on Rehabilitation it will not necessarily be by way of legislation. At this stage it does not appear that any of the recommendations of the Task Force on Rehabilitation will require legislative changes to implement. Those changes can be accomplished by way of administrative procedures either through the Workmen's Compensation Board or through the administration of various agencies or departments of government.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, acknowledging the fact that continuing attention must be paid to the plight of injured workers and recognizing that changing circumstances will require regular assessment, I think that it should be observed that Saskatchewan, with the passage of this Bill will assume again the pre-eminent position which it enjoyed a decade ago with respect to Workmen's Compensation.

Accordingly, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am particularly pleased to move second reading of this 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 by the Hon. Mr. MacMurchy that Bill No. 98 — **An Act respecting the Saskatchewan Universities Commission** be now read a second time.

MR. J.G. RICHARDS (Saskatoon University): — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I should like to address some comments to this Bill and I trust if I lapse somewhat into discussion of Bill 99 and 100 we will not be too strict inasmuch as all three constitute a package.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think the first point I wish to make is to congratulate the Government, that finally we have passed the psychological barrier and have recognized the reality of there being two institutions of higher learning in the province and that we are over and done with the various games of two campuses, one university formulas which were so dear to the heart of President Spinks of the University. I think that it is a psychological advance of some importance and I am pleased that we have come to recognize that we have in the province, imperfect as they may be, two institutions which have evolved in different directions.

In Saskatoon we have the more orthodox institution with emphasis on professional schools, natural sciences, the institution which has done the bulk of the graduate work and doubtless will continue to do so in the future.

In Regina we have the emphasis on under-graduate teaching, oriented towards social science, humanities and fine arts. In many ways those two institutions can and should complement one another, provided appropriate rationalization occurs. I shall return, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to this word rationalization. It is

a word I am afraid we have too much as a simple concept to define what we want to do without over defining the word. Nonetheless we do have these two institutions which have gone in their different directions. I suppose at this juncture there could be nothing finer than to quote into the record some of the statements by Woodrow Lloyd at the time of laying the foundation stone for the Regina campus back in 1963, in which he stated in a speech of some impact, some import, what were his hopes for Regina campus in particular:

We in Saskatchewan have here an opportunity, if our need had just been more classrooms and laboratories this might well have been achieved elsewhere with greater ease and good effect. But something different can be done here. Different and worthwhile and needed. So let me express the hope that this will not be just a small scale model of that which has been done on the Saskatoon campus. A university must, of course, serve its students in helping them to find the way to be disciplined and informed and I hope sensitive minds. But the great tradition of universities being, which I sometimes am afraid we lose, is it ought to be on the cutting edge and not merely observing from a safe distance the scene which has passed by. It and its graduates will do this only if it is properly immersed in the lives of those who make it possible.

Let me express the hope that those of that future date satisfy their curiosity of what we really did, will know because of history that the best hopes of Saskatchewan people were advanced by the fact of this institution.

Glowing words, Mr. Speaker, many of them not to date fulfilled, nonetheless, I hope that these three Bills constitute a new beginning in the most unhappy state of university administration which has characterized the University of Saskatchewan for the last decade.

I want, in particular, to address myself to two issues. The role of the proposed university commission and the question of engineering.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, there are two basic functions which the commission can play. That of the advocate, that of the judge to use the legal analogies. Either the commission can serve as an advocate of what the university wants in presenting and being a facilitator of presenting university demands to government, or it can have executive authority and judge upon the merits of various demands which come to it.

One of the problems with the previous structures which we've had is that everybody wanted to be the advocate, nobody wanted to be the judge. The department made recommendations to the departments within each individual college, then made recommendations to the college. The college made recommendations to the principal; the principal made recommendations to the Finance and Personnel Committee of the Board of Governors; the Board of Governors advocated these recommendations to the Government. So we have the department advocating to the college, the college advocating to the principal, the principal advocating to the F and P Committee and the F and P Committee advocating to the Board and the Board to the Government. Somewhere along that line decisions got made with respect to budgets, with respect to

staff and the decisions come back down the other way and everybody said, I didn't make the decision, somebody else up there made it. All I did was argue your case. So a department which found that a particularly cherished program didn't get approved, learned from the Dean of the College, I argued your case, but somebody in the principal's office didn't do a very good job; and you went to the principal and the principal said the Board of Governors weren't in favor of it; and the Board of Governors said we didn't have anything to do with it. This was the Government's fault.

Now, the question obviously has to be asked, has this Bill settled the issue, as to what extent the Commission will be judge, with respect to the various questions which will come before it or to what extent will it continue to be advocate, merely a facilitator, passing on the question, buck-passing if you like, further along the line. I trust that the Commission will have a great deal of authority and will exercise its powers. Obviously, you can't interpret how, the proof of the pudding is in the eating, and no amount of legislation or descriptions in legislation is going to determine precisely what happens when the actual thing is in operation.

For example, if you read Clause 6(d) the powers of the Commission; the Commission can receive, allocate and distribute capital and operating funds and any other money allocated by the Government for the purpose of the institutions. The implication from (d) and from (e), and I shall read (e), 'subject to the terms of any trust upon which it may be held it may divide between the institutions as the Commission sees fit.' Section (d) and (e) imply that the Commission has the authority to be judge with respect to many of the crucial questions of which one of the most crucial obviously is the question of the division of funds as between the two campuses.

However, if you read Clause (c) the responsibility is to receive, review and rationalize the budgets which could imply that the role of the Commission is merely to receive, review and pass them on. Likewise if one reads Clause (b), it implies that the responsibility is to inquire into financial requirements of the institution and advise the Minister of the sums of money required. There will remain the question, and I submit that it has not been satisfied to date, to what extent is the Commission going to be making decisions or to what extent will it continue to play the role of the Board of Governors, as advocate of what lower echelons of the university want.

I'm not asking that there be any finer writing of this in the legislation. I would prefer there to have been no Commission which would have clarified the responsibility of the Department of Continuing Education in many of these areas. Nonetheless we can hope and pray that we will get out of this legislation some firm decision making from the Government with respect to matters which lie within its domain.

I must note with some concern Section 6(o) which states that the Commission can delegate to the institutions any of the powers conferred upon it by this Act, which would seem to be something of a loophole clause, which means we may be back, God knows where.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, at this juncture I think it's appropriate to turn to this contentious word, well, not a

contentious word, but this magic word, which appears throughout the legislation, the word 'rationalization'. I refer to it in Clause 6(c) that the commission may receive, review and rationalize the budget. In 6(m)(ii) it states that the Commission shall establish committees, for example, there should be a program co-ordinating committee, the purpose of which is to advise the Commission on all matters relating to the rationalization of undergraduate programs. And in the following clause it talks about rationalizing programs and other matters having to do with post-graduate programs.

Throughout the legislation there occur references to the Commission's responsibility to rationalize. It is almost as if there does exist somewhere this platonic ideal of the rationalized university, which somehow we shall strive towards in Saskatchewan. So be it, being human we shall fail. There is no platonic ideal university, Mr. Deputy Speaker. There exist bricks and stones and people and conflicts and fights and political decisions to be made. There also exist academic decisions which should not be the purview of the Government. But there is no magic rationalized ideal. And to take one very concrete example, we cannot solve the dilemma of the engineering college by the search for the rationalized, ideal, platonic engineering decision. Plato cannot tell us about how to resolve the engineering dilemma. We, the Government as politicians will have to make a tough decision. I personally think that the right decision is that all engineering should be concentrated in Saskatoon and the Regina faculty closed out. I think that engineering in Regina conflicts with the primary purpose of the Regina campus as outlined by Woodrow Lloyd in the laying of the foundation in 1963. Nonetheless that is not my decision to make. Neither is it a decision of each of the individual campuses. I hope that the Commission will grasp firmly this nettle and will make decision. I think we have seen in going through the various inabilities of the Board of Governors to decide on this issue, the result being the formulation of the Lapp Commission, which provided an excellent report and with whose recommendations I agree. That was not acted upon and the Board of Governors continued to recommend the continuation of two years of undergraduate training in engineering in Regina. And now we've got the Hall Commission, which comes back and recommends a reversal of the Lapp recommendations. We don't have a rationalized decision, we don't have any decision. And I'm afraid no amount of rhetoric, referring to rationalization in this Bill is going to solve that problem. I only hope that the University Commission will see fit to make a decision shortly, quickly and neatly.

A final comment, Mr. Speaker, on this Bill, before I take my seat. I have additional comments about which I should like to make on Bills 99 and 100. I trust to as great an extent as possible we will follow the Wilsonian doctrine of, 'open decisions, openly arrived at.' In particular, with respect to major programmatic decisions, such as to what extent we should have new programs, engineering being an example. In most of these kinds of decisions by the Board, there is no reason why these should not be open to the student body, the faculty and the general public who may be interested in the administration of the university. With that, Mr. Speaker, I will support the principle of this Bill, Bill 98, an Act respecting the Saskatchewan Universities Commission.

MR. H.E. COUPLAND (Meadow Lake): — Mr. Speaker, before we call the vote on this Bill, I

would just like to record my opposition to the Bill in that I don't think the Bill would really be necessary if we continued with the one university concept in Saskatchewan. It should really follow Bill 99 instead of preceding it because if it was possible to defeat Bill 99, this one would not be necessary.

I oppose the two universities in Saskatchewan, because I don't think the population in Saskatchewan warrants it and with the declining population I feel sure that the university in Saskatoon can look after the educational needs of our young people in Saskatchewan at this time. You know, I get a little tired of the cities of Saskatoon and Regina fighting over who is going to get the most for their cities, I think this is what it amounts to in a lot of cases. A lot of these decisions are made because of political rather than because of economic factors and for this reason I'm opposed to the next Bill which will create two universities in Saskatchewan and therefore I have to oppose this one too.

MR. A.R. GUY (Athabasca): — Mr. Speaker, I'm afraid that I can't share the enthusiasm that the Member for Saskatoon University (Mr. Richards) showed a few minutes earlier for this Bill, in fact, the three Bills, setting up two separate universities in Saskatchewan. Like my colleague from Meadow Lake (Mr. Coupland) I am opposed to the principle of two separate universities. I think that 1974 will go down as the year that the NDP destroyed the University of Saskatchewan and its good reputation in educational circles throughout the North American continent.

In 1973 they tried to destroy the university, but thanks to the university faculty and students and the people of Saskatchewan and the Liberal Party they were staved off for one year, but unfortunately it was only survival for one more year until the NDP through other devious means have now seen fit to desecrate and destroy the University of Saskatchewan as it's been recognized throughout the North American continent.

Saskatchewan has always been noted for a high standard in their university, high standard of faculty, high standard of curriculum, high standard of graduate studies and a high standard of graduates who come out of the university. And even after the Regina Campus was started there was still hope that the University of Saskatchewan would maintain those high standards. True enough, the Regina Campus being new had to go through some growing pains and it was hoped that the stability of the University of Saskatchewan as such would raise the standards of Regina Campus, rather than see the standards of the University brought down to the standards of a new campus. This was happening if the NDP Government would have left them alone. The standards at the University of Regina Campus were being raised as each passing year went by.

There was concern, of course, when Regina Campus was started that the University of Saskatchewan, the curriculum and the faculty would be watered down, but the hope remained that the Board of Governors and the Senate would, as I say, bring the new campus, the fledgling campus, up to the standards of the original university and it appeared that this was being done. But this hope is now gone. We have two separate universities. There is no strong co-ordinating agency to make sure that there is no overlapping and to make sure that the standards of both will be maintained. They are now both free to go their own way.

They will both be weaker rather than stronger. There will be a deterioration in the faculty and staff; the curriculum will be watered down; there will be overlapping — unnecessary overlapping, jealousies will arise. In fact, I suspect that jealousy is behind most of the desire of Regina to have a separate university. Of course, conflicts are sure to develop between the two universities in a province where the population is decreasing, as my colleague from Meadow Lake (Mr. Coupland) pointed out. There is no need and there is no way that the taxpayers of Saskatchewan can support two universities with the standards and at the level in which the University of Saskatchewan has made its mark.

The University of Saskatchewan, as it is known by the people of Saskatchewan, has gone as a result of the NDP probably playing politics for the benefit of the Regina campus and the Regina Members. I can really see no other reason than that for creating two universities at this time.

You know we have always been proud of the University of Saskatchewan. The administration, the faculty, the students, we have always been proud of the standards that have been set by the university; we have been proud of the way that the business and the professional communities have welcomed graduates from the University of Saskatchewan. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this will no longer be the case. Students will no longer be sure when they graduate from either the University of Saskatchewan or the University of Regina that they will be welcomed with the same feeling that they are coming from a single university that has as high a standard as any in Canada, in fact, any in the North American continent.

MR. ROLFES: — That's nonsense and you know it.

MR. GUY: — Yes, and I notice that the Members for Saskatoon have been very silent and I was expecting some of them to have the courage to stand up and be counted in regard to their university in Saskatoon and they are not. They are prepared to let this Bill go through and they sit there just as a wet sop to the Members from Regina. The Minister of Health has got the young backbencher from Saskatoon, cowed to the point where he won't even stand up and defend his university. He has been bulldozed into it. No, Mr. Speaker, I tell you if there has been one disservice done to the people of Saskatchewan during 1974, it has been the destruction of the University of Saskatchewan by this Government. No longer will students from all walks of life who will go through these hallowed halls of this University, be able to go out and make a living with the knowledge that they have come from a university whose standards have been recognized throughout the world.

This is why, Mr. Speaker, I cannot support these particular Bills, 98, 99 nor 100, which is destroying the very fabric upon which the University of Saskatchewan has been built.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. K.R. MacLEOD (Regina Albert Park): — Mr. Speaker, I believe that I may well have a remark or two about this and subsequent Bills and I beg leave to adjourn

April 22, 1974

the debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. MacMurchy (Minister of Education) that Bill No. 99 — **An Act respecting the University of Regina** be now read a second time.

MR. E.C. WHELAN (Regina North West): — Mr. Speaker, just a word in support of Bill No. 99.

I think those who misunderstand the real issue read politics into natural advances. You know distortion was met and discounted by the Hall Commission and I commend them for it. I leave the decision to these wise, objective and learned commissioners. I don't see anyone on the Opposition benches, Mr. Speaker, who compares with them in intelligence or good logical reasoning, yes, or even good looks. I understand the sort of Liberal trouble-making that is brewing over there. But I think that this Bill will (1), expand the educational opportunities that are available for the young people of this province; and (2), it will involve more people in the administration of education; (3) it will bring the University much closer to the community.

Mr. Speaker, the first consideration of any legislation such as this, which we write, should be what services it will provide and what standard of education will be made available to the young people of our province. In my estimation the separate university on this campus, by its concentrated nature, will make available a wider variety of subjects, more special application in the type of subjects that are needed. The operation of a separate university, I predict, will eventually provide educational opportunities not only for the student graduating from Grade Twelve but for the adult student as well.

In every respect increased educational opportunities for southern Saskatchewan are advantageous, and they are needed; not rivalry between universities, but the welfare of students is the real issue, so that the educational opportunities will increase, will be sharpened and will be more effective.

With a separate Board of Governors, with its own administration, its own Senate, there will be a stepped-up interest in the University of Regina. The day will come, I hope, when the new senate for this university will hold within its ranks, a wide representation in areas across the rural and urban areas of southern Saskatchewan, so that the ingenious, imaginative guidance of southern Saskatchewan people will be utilized to the full.

Mr. Speaker, with the cost of education increasing it will require the most representative people we can find to make up the Board of Governors and the Senate, in order to put at the disposal of a wide cross-section of Saskatchewan students an academic program that meets the needs of the province.

With the prospect of investment in the huge steel complex in the province, the educational program of our province changes from day to day. Even the location of such a complex will dictate, to some degree, the type of educational endeavor that

will take place at the University of Regina.

Autonomy of operation for the University of Regina, with involvement of new people on the Board of Governors and the Senate, will bring the University of Regina close to the community of southern Saskatchewan.

This is as it should be. This University in no way should be distinct and separate from the rest of the province. Its organization came about after much thought; after much public discussion; following the recommendations of a commission competent and thoroughly knowledgeable, dedicated to the best academic interest of Saskatchewan.

Organization presents a challenge to the people of Regina, to the people of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, it also presents an opportunity to expand and make available better educational opportunities to the student; a chance to involve more of our people in the University itself and finally, by so doing, by accomplishing these two objectives, to bring the university, with its advantages, much closer to the community.

Mr. Speaker, I will support the motion, for it opens the door on new opportunities for education in southern Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. J.G. RICHARDS (Saskatoon University): — Mr. Speaker, during your absence I spoke on Bill 98 with respect to the University Commission and I should like now to address a few remarks specifically to the Bill concerning the internal structure of the universities. The remarks I will make I think are equally applicable to both Bill 99 and Bill 100.

Mr. Speaker, I should first like to preface any remarks by stating that I think there are very severe limits to what structural changes can accomplish. I don't in any sense, have a view that if we can write the perfect legislation, to refer back to remarks I made with respect to Bill 98, if we can arrive at the platonic structure of the ideal internal working of the university, that thereby we will have the perfect university, that is obviously a chimera. Nonetheless it is probably valuable to concern oneself with structures of universities as indicating the ideal, the goals, the directions in which one wants to move.

Let me first refer to the Senate. I can dismiss, I hope, my concerns about the Senate very quickly. I think the Senate is a useless appendix to the university and should be struck out in order to effect, as all of us so much want, a simplification and rationalization in university structures. I have yet to find anybody who can tell so precisely what the senate usefully does besides occasionally meeting, providing appropriate appointments for a few people.

With respect to the Board of Governors, the Board of Governors is constituted on page 16 and 17 of the Act, Section 56 referring to Bill 99 and provides for, in Section E and F, one student, one faculty member respectively. I think that this structure of the Board of Governors risks posing, again, all the problems of a Board of Governors dominated by political appointees of whatever government is in power, who may or may not be particularly knowledgeable with respect to the universities.

April 22, 1974

It is no new idea, I am plagiarizing it blatantly from the ideas which circulated in the Regina Campus, but I think the concept of the tripartite structure for the Board of Governors is an excellent one. Tripartite is a sense that one third would be public representatives appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council; one third faculty representatives elected by the members of the faculty of the university institution in question; one third students elected, I would argue by senior students, third year and above.

Mr. Speaker, I think the advantages of this structural format are many. When you arrive at an institution of 5,000 as in the case in Regina, 10,000 as in the case in Saskatoon, when it is a very large institution one could only, I would say, get the input of all the people involved in the institutions if there are mechanisms whereby all of them can easily have access to it. I think the faculty, as much as the students, have by and large been excluded from real decision-making at the level of the Board of Governors.

It would not be in any way difficult to arrange for the appropriate length of time, length of term, the faculty could elect a certain number — one third of the members of the Board of Governors, as with the students. There are objections on the grounds that one of the decisions being made could refer to faculty salaries, student tuition rates. Nonetheless if the commission has the power and the strength it is supposed to have according to the contentions of the Minister of Continuing Education, these matters should be able to be dealt with.

To come down to the Department level, I would argue that with qualifications, parity is the right ideal to have in the formulation of committees within departments.

I can refer to failures and to successes. I think maybe at this juncture it is more useful to cite some successes of where students have played major responsible roles in delicate decisions involving good academic judgment. One of the examples, ironically, comes from what one might expect to be one of the most conservative of faculties, the College of Medicine in Saskatoon.

On the Admission Committee for the College of Medicine, students play a key role in determining who should actually be admitted to this professional college. The Biology Department in Saskatoon has long had an enviable record of involving students up to and including the level of parity on its major committees within that department.

Obviously that is not an unambiguous nor simple success story. If we refer back to the recent Caldwell Report, and the full title of it is I am afraid a typical indication about the state of internal university administration. The Report is entitled, "Report to the Saskatoon Council of the Special Committee to Review the Progress of Implementation of the Report of the Council Committee on Student Participation." That is a mouthful, Mr. Speaker, but it means that it is a committee to study the report of another committee and to see whether anything has happened in the other committee and this report has gathered about as much dust as the original committee report.

Nonetheless I should like to read a passage which illuminates to me what I think is the most unenviable reactionary

attitude which I am afraid characterizes a certain percentage of the faculty and the senior administration and I suspect also, government people dealing with university affairs, with respect to the students. I quote:

If we draw the line (the faculty) anywhere short of student participation in parity and completely open decision-making in all things there are people who will press by one means or another, by physical disruption if need be, as the occasion arise, or as they can be created to achieve their total literally totalitarian objectives. Their beliefs like those totalitarians are religious in as much they can only be confirmed, never refuted by events.

Whatever happens is never due to excitement but always to the system. Violence is never due to their provocation but always to the authorities it resists. We are condemned as much for discriminating against such people on the grounds of mere belief, as for extending to them what they themselves will dismiss as repressive tolerance. It is their slogans and tactics which induce others far more numerous than themselves, together with a few louts who can now get away with murder, by cloaking their behavior in ideological terms to demand that the universities be organized internally and align externally so as to become micro-causes of some kind of political democracy.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that you can appreciate the flavor of that medieval rhetoric, the fine words like louts included here, the totalitarianism, students who are concerned with parity or linked with totalitarianism; their ideas considered to be religious in a negative sense. That kind of metaphysical approach to students' demands to be involved in decision-making, sort of harks back, I suspect to the attitude of the 19th century bosses of the concept of trade unions. Unfortunately this characterizes too much of the senior thinking of senior people in both governments and universities upon the potential of students to make responsible decisions.

Mr. Speaker, before I take my seat, I shall support in principle this Bill as much as it follows from Bill 98, however, I should like to give notice that I shall move a number of amendments in the Committee stage which I hope will allow Members to give some more serious embodiment to the ideas that I discussed with the Board of Governors of tripartite structure, for the rest of Committees at a departmental level with student parity. As the Minister of Continuing Education stated Bills 99 and 100 as presented did not address themselves to any questions of internal reform of the university and I think that before we proceed further with this issue it is beholden that the Legislature do take seriously the ideas about reform of internal university administration that has been batted around for the last decade in universities across the country and across the continent. With that, Mr. Speaker, I take my seat.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. K.R. MacLEOD (Regina Albert Park): — Mr. Speaker, it is with a good deal of pride that I rise on this occasion to welcome the new member of the educational community, the University of Regina. I look forward to the

April 22, 1974

continued growth and development of this University. It already has a great tradition and as it grows in tradition and maturity I am sure that it will make a tremendous contribution to our entire community life. I do want to say that I have some particular comments to make about the University of Regina, and what I expect of it, and what I worry about.

First of all, I should compliment the many fine people already associated with the University of Regina. Secondly, I hope the University will look with disgust upon radicals who have intruded upon this University, those who would subvert the University to narrow and selfish political purposes. I attended a meeting on one occasion about a year ago at the University, speaker after speaker rose and said that what was absolutely needed was the conversion of this University (and all universities) to a socialist university. Now I believe that this is the utter condemnation and negation of the word 'university'. I do not want a socialist university, I do not want a capitalist university, I do not want a free enterprise university. Each and everyone of these is a contradiction of the word and the term 'university'. It is a denial of the essential characteristic of a university. I believe that the University can and should weed out the radicals but, of course, it must be done from within the University itself. But I want to emphasize that it is one thing to teach what communism is, it is quite a different thing to advocate communism from the podium at the University. I am sick and tired of some of the nonsense that goes on at some of our universities. I am sick and tired at the failure of some of our Government leaders to take a stand against this nonsense. Without discipline there is absolutely no freedom. In this respect I believe that our academic leaders are entitled to, they need and they must have the legal and moral support of the political leaders and the members of the community. I hope to see more discipline at the University. The selfish students, some of them professional students, who seize offices, destroy records and so on are no credit to themselves, they interfere with students who actually go to university with the intention of getting an education. Now, quite frankly, I believe that these people ought not to be allowed to continue to interfere with the orderly process of education. I hope to see a full recognition of the role of teachers in our universities, with appropriate salary provisions in the budget. Buildings are fine but a machine does not have judgment. It has been a great habit of late to downgrade the professions, while the Saskatchewan Power Corporation people received a well-deserved 15 per cent raise, teachers received about two thirds of this, nurses today are short changed. Throughout society we see the professions being totally short changed and our teachers, quite frankly, rank among the worst. They are, quite frankly, not receiving appropriate recognition for the contribution they are making to society. I hope people recognize that the teachers and particularly those at the University do not operate on an eight or nine month year, many of them are as close to being full time educators as possible.

I hope that the University of Regina is a university of outreach. I hope that it will go ahead and move into the community, contributing to the community and, of course, being nourished by it. This is being done to a considerable extent right now, in the faculties of education, recreation and in technical areas. I hope this process continues. The ivy walls of the university have to come down, the university must be

part of the city and the province, and I agree with the Hon. Member who spoke a moment or two ago, of the entire province. Saskatchewan cannot afford useless duplication in its services. Where the student body is large enough, such as Arts and several other areas, there will be appropriate duplication, instead of duplication on one campus there will be appropriate duplicate facilities on the other. In general, however, I am sure that the University of Regina will be mature and reasonable, that its representations to the University Commission and to the Government will not make unreasonable demands but will make a fair and even-handed contribution. I feel confident that the University of Regina will make a great contribution to the city and to the entire province. I hope it will be a good companion to the University of Saskatchewan at Saskatoon. I hope that the university team, the University of Regina and the University of Saskatchewan will be a one-two academic punch, unrivalled in Canada.

As a graduate of the University of Saskatchewan I have and will continue to give my support, respect and best wishes to the University of Saskatchewan but to the University of Regina, I wish it well, I wish it good luck, I know that it will make a fine, new addition and I welcome it.

I may have something further to add to this, Mr. Speaker, and consequently, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

Debate adjourned.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

GOVERNMENT MOTION

CONSTITUENCY BOUNDARIES COMMISSION

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Blakeney:

That the final report of the Constituency Boundaries Commission established pursuant to The Constituency Boundaries Commission Act, 1972, laid before this Assembly by the Honourable Mr. Speaker recommending that the area of the province

(i) lying south of the dividing line as defined in Section 14 of the said Act, be divided into 59 constituencies, and (ii) lying north of the dividing line as defined in Section 14 of the said Act be divided into two constituencies, be hereby approved and adopted by this Assembly; That the descriptions of each of the constituencies as recommended by the said final report, except the description of the boundaries of the constituency of Saskatoon-Mayfair, be approved and adopted by this Assembly; and That the final report of the Commission be altered by deleting the description of the constituency of Saskatoon-Mayfair, and substituting therefore the description as set out in the schedule which was attached to the final report, and that the final report of the Commission as so altered be approved and adopted by this Assembly.

MR. P.P. MOSTOWAY (Hanley): — Mr. Speaker, as one who now

April 22, 1974

represents a constituency which will be dissolved at the time of the next Provincial Election, I must say a few words on this Bill. The words I have to say can really be summed up by saying I am in complete agreement with this Bill. I am in complete agreement because I see the end of vicious gerrymandering. I see the end of ridiculous boundary changes made by politicians such as in the past to save their own skins.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Who?

MR. MOSTOWAY: — Well, I didn't really say, "Who?"

I see the end to confusion in the minds of voters as to what constituencies they might live in. Mr. Speaker, I also see this Bill as being the closest thing to true representation by population — something we have not had in this province for a long time.

Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned earlier, Saskatoon-Hanley constituency will no longer exist after the next election. For those of you who may be interested I harbor no animosity towards the Commission which recommended this should be so. I harbor no ill feelings because I know it was charged with doing a job, and it certainly did it well. I also know it did its job with complete independence, and I stress the word complete independence.

Mr. Speaker, the principles involved in the setting up of the Independent Boundaries Commission were noble ones, ones I agree with, for who could really argue that each Member of this Assembly should not represent a number of constituents roughly equal in number to the number any other might represent?

Mr. Speaker, might I just point out some of the indignities Saskatoon-Hanley constituency has been subjected to in the past. In the first place, it is probably the only constituency which was ever gerrymandered four times in three years. It is probably the only constituency which once shared an area with another constituency at the same time. It is probably the only constituency which experienced or was involved in a retroactive gerrymander. It is probably the only constituency which has as one of its boundaries the main street of just a tiny, tiny village. Mr. Speaker, it is probably the only constituency which started out noble in shape and ended up with the outline of some grotesque, repulsive monster.

Mr. Speaker, the passing of this Bill in this House could quite possibly assist in narrowing the credibility gap which sometimes exists between the people of Saskatchewan and the politicians of the day. In fact, I know it will, for in my campaign prior to the last election, many people I met welcomed our party's promise to stop gerrymandering from ever rearing its ugly head again. I also know that these same people and many others are pleased with this Bill and await its speedy implementation.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the people of Saskatoon-Hanley I want to say that I will most certainly support this Bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. J.A. PEPPER (Weyburn): — Mr. Speaker, it is with a

great deal of pleasure that I have been given this opportunity to participate in this debate. The legislation we have before us tonight reflects the completion of another commitment that our party made with the people of Saskatchewan during the last election campaign. I am confident, Mr. Speaker, that all Members of this Assembly will lend their support to this report as the people of Saskatchewan have made it very clear that they have little regard for the past practices of allowing politicians to dictate constituency boundaries.

Over the years, Mr. Speaker, we have watched boundaries change from time to time. These changes were made for political purposes and nothing more. Some of the changes were quite subtle, however, but for the most part the gerrymandering which was carried out was blatant to say the least. As Members of this Assembly, if we are serious about honoring a principle of representation by population we must support the recommendations of this Independent Electoral Boundaries Commission.

I commend the members of the Commission for the fairness which is reflected in these recommendations. As one studies the proposed boundaries, Mr. Speaker, it becomes very clear to me that impartiality formed the basis for their deliberations. It is clear that the redefined boundaries will eliminate the advantage or disadvantage which certain candidates have had to deal with in the past due to the political nature of the boundary line. One only has to examine the boundaries as they exist presently to understand, Mr. Speaker, the necessity of an independent redefining of constituency lines. There are many people across this province who never knew from one election to another which riding they would be in in the next trip to the polls. The defence of Members opposite as they attempted to influence their chances by carving up the riding to their own advantage to me, Mr. Speaker, was in no way justifiable. It was the New Democratic Party which during the last election campaign stated that this political gerrymandering would be done away with if we were elected. The voting public of this province responded to that commitment and I am pleased today that I have a chance to debate this issue, an issue which marks the fulfilment of that election pledge.

During the past two years there have been many political pundits who have speculated on the reasons for the political demise of the former Liberal Government and I agree with those who say that their gerrymandering was the major reason for the voter rejection they suffered in 1971. One of the fundamental principles of a democracy is the principle of representation by population — that principle was not followed in the year of 1971. One can state many examples, however, the most blatant case occurred right here in the city of Regina where the Regina Centre constituency had over 17,000 registered voters I believe and Albert Park had slightly over 4,000 voters. There can be no justifiable defence for boundaries such as this.

During the course of our brief provincial history, politicians and governments were given the responsibility to articulate and define constituency boundaries. I am afraid that governments of the past have not honored that commitment and have chosen rather to base their decision on political motivation. The people of Saskatchewan do not expect, and I say, Mr. Speaker, they will not tolerate such practices. I am confident that these proposals which install a new era of impartiality and fairness will win the wide-spread approval of the people of this

province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. PEPPER: — Again, Mr. Speaker, the issue is clear. Why should an Independent Boundaries Commission be necessary? Current boundaries surely point to the need; however, just as important the public must be assured that the changes which are made are in no way a reflection of political parties meddling with the fundamental principles of democracy.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the issue of constituency boundaries was drawn into the political arena during the last election campaign. Our party made a political issue out of the redefined boundaries, however, Mr. Speaker, that was done for reasons quite different than the political motivations of Members opposite as far as this issue is concerned.

The Liberal Government of the day politicized the matter by instituting unprecedented gerrymandering. Members on this side of the House made the issue political by pledging to end the gerrymander and place the responsibility of redefining boundaries on a fair and equal basis, in the hands of an independent procedure.

The proposals that we have before us today mark the fulfilment of that pledge. I am hopeful that Members opposite, Mr. Speaker, do not attempt to make a political issue out of these recommendations, with the assertions that these proposals are in any way a reflection of favour in the direction of the Government.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, it could be argued that these proposals, in some instances, work to the disadvantage of several Members of this side of the House. In spite of the fact, however, Members on this side of the House wholeheartedly endorse the principles of an Independent Boundaries Commission and we are prepared to lend support of the report that they brought in.

I hope Members opposite are similarly inclined, as the issue to me, Mr. Speaker, is too important to be dragged through the political wringer with both sides attempting to score a political point.

Mr. Speaker, the upcoming provincial election in Saskatchewan will mark the first time ever that all candidates for public office will enter the arena on an equal footing. There will be a new public confidence in the democratic system as all ridings will be fought on the basis that no single candidate will have a built-in advantage prior to the vote being taken.

The next vote, Mr. Speaker, will result in the election of candidates who will not be faced with future changes, that his only claim to office is the advantage gained through inequitable boundary revisions. I am confident that these proposals will result in the attraction of new candidates into the political arena, candidates who in the past have declined nominations, knowing that the odds were stacked against them even before the election day.

For a moment, Mr. Speaker, I should like to add a word with respect to the Weyburn constituency. On the proposed

changes the Weyburn constituency is affected quite drastically. Much of the traditional area will be included in the Milestone and the Estevan constituencies, if these proposals are approved. From a political point of view these areas have been very good to me over the years. I have been fortunate enough to receive a considerable amount of support from them. Mr. Speaker, I hope that during those years, as their representative in this House, I have served them with equal consideration ..

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. PEPPER: — . . . a consideration which they so rightfully deserve.

If, Mr. Speaker, I so decide to again let my name stand for the nomination in the new Weyburn constituency, and if I am fortunate enough to win the next election, I will continue to work diligently on behalf of not only those citizens residing in my constituency, but also I will work towards the furtherance of programs and policies which will result in beneficial changes for all of the people of Saskatchewan.

The election to public office is an honor which has few parallels. The responsibility which is entrusted to public servants, is one which cannot be viewed lightly. I am very confident that all Members of this Assembly recognize the tremendous trust which has been given to them as a result of the elevation to the public office.

I also believe that everyone in this Assembly will, Mr. Speaker, in no way deliberately set out to jeopardize and I feel because of that, this Assembly will unanimously give its support to this legislation as it reflects the very basis of democracy, a democracy which those before us fought and died to preserve.

Mr. Speaker, I offer to you and Members of this Assembly my fullest support for this legislation. There are a few other comments that I should like to add at a later time, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

Debate adjourned.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

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

MR. PEPPER: — Mr. Speaker, if I can beg the indulgence of you people to listen to me a little longer, I will try and speak on this one as well.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. PEPPER: — I am pleased to have this opportunity to address myself

to this, which I think is very important legislation.

As a Member of the Special Legislative Committee which toured the province with the original White Paper, I can tell this Assembly, Mr. Speaker, that I have been very interested in this question. The question of who should own and control our agricultural land is one which has been intensified over the past couple of years.

The Government was perhaps not the first administration in Canada to recognize the problems of foreign and corporate ownership, however, it was the first Government which was prepared to come to grips with the issue and prepared to take a stand in favor of the people who it represents. My colleague, the Hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) clearly pointed out the necessity of legislation of this type. I think all Members of this Assembly have recognized for some time the pressing necessity of coming to grips with the ownership of land question.

It is not too surprising that Members opposite should heap criticism on this legislation, because if you remember, Mr. Speaker, while they sat on the Treasury Benches, they certainly did not at that time exactly jump up to the defence of the farming industry in Saskatchewan with legislation to offset the adverse effects of foreign and corporate ownership.

I recall vividly the viewpoints of Saskatchewan people as we held hearings across the province. Yes, there were concerns over some sections of the original White Paper; however, there was an overriding feeling by the vast majority of those people who appeared before the committee, that something had to be done.

When our Committee's final report was presented and debated in this Legislature, I gave my qualified support to it, although I too, had some reservations respecting two of the recommendations which were placed before this House. However, my reservations in no way lessened my concern over the ownership of land question.

In many instances, Mr. Speaker, the problems which were placed before the Committee were local, or regional in scope. There were few proposals which gained the unanimous support or rejection of those who presented briefs. This reality further taxed this Committee in its interpretation of views and its compilation of the final report.

Our report also presented this Government with the heavy responsibility of interpreting the direction we should follow in the presentation of legislation.

I commend the Government and the Minister of Agriculture for this Bill. It certainly reflects and takes into account the reservations many people had about the original White Paper and I think that it offers sufficient leverage to satisfy the skeptics. There have been a number of political interest groups, including the Liberal Party, who have consistently opposed our Government's move into this arena.

It was not the first time that they have opposed our initiatives in agriculture. One only has to review debates on the Land Bank legislation. It is, to my way of thinking unfortunate that all Members of this Legislature could not have taken this issue on collectively, outside the political sphere, however, such was not the case and our Government, for the most

part, was forced to go it alone. However, I do not have any doubts concerning the outcome, as I am confident that our initiatives will result in the type of overall positive affects which we feel this legislation will create. I am not suggesting that this legislation will solve all the problems associated with this matter. I do not feel that any single piece of legislation is going to have a 100 per cent effect, however, that does not mean that government has a lessened responsibility to deal with problems as they arise.

As we debate this legislation, the question keeps coming back to me: Who should own and control our agricultural land? This New Democratic Party Government has consistently argued that the family farm unit is the most efficient method of farming. However, I want to stress our viewpoint that we do not look to agriculture in simple economic terms. Agriculture has long been and will continue to form the basis of this province's number one industry.

In terms of economic and social responsibility we believe the family farm unit is the only way to proceed. For generations family farmers have worked and toiled to provide men and women in all parts of the world with the necessary sustenance to keep on living. Their contribution to society cannot be measured in dollars and cents and this Government firmly believes that we have a responsibility to ensure that this segment of society is afforded the protection necessary to offset and combat unfavorable situations that arise from time to time. Such is the case tonight as reflected in this legislation.

Many other provinces have addressed themselves to this problem, however, they have failed to come to grips with the best way to proceed, the result being that the problem is intensifying monthly and yearly.

This Government is not prepared to proceed on the 'let the other guy try it first' basis. The issue is clear; it has been studied; it has been taken to the people and it has been drafted into legislation. It is now up to all the Members of this Assembly to decide whether or not we proceed.

When we all study carefully the implications of the action, or inaction, I am confident that most Members will find themselves of the opinion that we must move now if we are to provide our family farmers with the necessary protection against the unfavorable impact of stepped-up foreign and corporate takeover of our agricultural land base.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. PEPPER: — I say, Mr. Speaker, the impact will be stepped-up due to the fact that the agriculture industry is presently experiencing unprecedented buoyancy. Prices for our agricultural produce continue to escalate as the national and international demand for food intensifies and grows.

Corporate interest in Canada, and outside of our nation, see the advisability in investing huge capital sums in agricultural production and at the present time, agricultural land is the most attractive investment opportunity.

If, Mr. Speaker, we allow these interests to expand, what

we are really saying is that from here on in, the market is open. We welcome all comers. The one with the most money will be the one who reaps the most benefits from increased agricultural production.

Mr. Speaker, this is where the New Democratic Government holds out a different philosophy. We feel that it is the family farmer who should reap the benefits derived from the accelerated supply and demand situation. Now at a time when the agricultural economy is riding a crest of relative prosperity should we alienate our relationship and let the farmer fend for himself in this capital intensive marketplace? When we brought in the Land Bank legislation we clearly displayed our commitment, Mr. Speaker, to the agriculture industry of this province and through this legislation we simply reiterate that commitment. I, for one, am pleased to lend my support to this legislation.

Yes, as I said earlier, Mr. Speaker, this legislation is unparalleled. There is nothing to compare with it in other parts of Canada. Because we present something untried, that, Mr. Speaker, is not to suggest that future amendments might not be needed, we have prepared for that eventuality. However, if we had waited until any legislation was fool-proof I doubt very much if we would today have such experimental programs operating as medicare, Government Insurance or Land Bank. This legislation is not as rigid in scope as was the original White Paper. Many provisions of this Act follow closely to the recommendations of the Legislative Committee.

During that debate, I think you will remember, Mr. Speaker, I forwarded a couple of reservations I had respecting the retroactivity of the proposals with respect to corporations operating in Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, at this time I want to tell the Assembly that perhaps I still have some reservations with respect to certain sections of the legislation. However, I still support its scope. Many of the issues and concerns which were discussed and debated during our hearings were local or regional. However, it is folly to think that we would ever be able to assemble legislation which would recognize and encompass all regional problems and fail to recognize the overall impact of the subject matter.

If we are serious in saying that we believe in the maximum number of family farm units in Saskatchewan, I say, Mr. Speaker, we have a responsibility to demonstrate that commitment in terms of positive action. To date, I have received very little unfavorable reaction to this Bill. I know there are cases in the Weyburn constituency whereby this legislation is going to have a somewhat problematic impact. However, I feel that it will, Mr. Speaker, result in far-reaching positive effects for the vast majority of farmers in this province.

I believe there are an adequate number of provisions in this Act to deal effectively and flexibly with the variety of problems which exist in the farming industry.

I commend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) for taking into account many of the serious questions raised respecting the original White Paper legislation, and I commend this Government for again involving the public in drafting this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, because of the overall favorable impact this

legislation will generate, and because of this Government's demonstrated sincerity and its determination in legislating for the benefit of the majority, it is a pleasure for me tonight to offer my support to this Bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. T.M. WEATHERALD (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a few remarks to this piece of legislation. I might say that the one thing that has come to my attention in this debate is that party politics is a wonderful thing and apparently the Whip on that side has a pretty good whip because he brought the seven Members into line awful fast. He brought them into line to supporting a position exactly opposite to what they recommended in the report, absolutely opposite, Mr. Speaker. In this report, of which I was a member of the Committee on the Ownership of Agricultural Land, the seven Members who sat on that side of the House — there were eight and one subsequently was appointed to the Cabinet — the Members were Mr. Kowalchuk, who is now in the Cabinet, was the Chairman, Mr. Carlson, the Member for Yorkton, Mr. Hanson for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley, Mr. Kaeding for Saltcoats, Mr. Meakes for Touchwood and Mr. Owens from Elrose, Mr. Pepper for Weyburn and we Liberals, Mr. Wiebe, Mr. MacLeod and myself. Mr. Tchorzewski was appointed but only was able to attend one or two meetings because of his subsequent appointment.

The most interesting aspect of this thing was that no where in the report did one single Member on the Government side recommend that there should be any restrictions against other Canadians, not one. They agreed totally with the Liberal position, the three Liberals and the seven NDP agreed totally with the Liberal position of no restrictions against other Canadians and it says precisely in this report under a resolution of that nature. Now, we have the very same Members standing in the House telling us of why they support restrictions against other Canadians. So the party system works well over there and the old system that we used to hear from the NDP about individual freedom and so forth certainly got lost somewhere in the shuffle because they brought the seven members from this Committee in line awful fast.

Now I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that we have met on this Committee that at no time did we support legislation against other Canadians because we thought it would balkanize Canada and our view of Canada was not to balkanize it into ten little countries across this nation. The NDP supported that position but I rather suspect that some of the ones in the Cabinet and some of the others of different thinking they just threw the report out the window and in other words told us that we had wasted our time and put in what they wanted to.

Even in the sense, Mr. Speaker, even to the extent that the last Member who spoke, and I have considerable respect for the last Member but he and the Member for Elrose (Mr. Owens) made a very, very lengthy recommendation on corporate ownership. This is one of the words they used, the recommendation was that any corporation accepting a farm family or community group or co-operative association now owning agricultural land are required to dispose of the land by a specified date, 20 years from now. This is what the two Members said. This recommendation if it is passed in the sense of retroactive effects, it should only be used under very special and urgent circumstances.

In this case we do not feel that there is sufficient agricultural land owned in our province by corporations to warrant such drastic measures. This was exactly one year ago, practically, today.

These corporations purchased land in good faith and under the rules and regulations and government restrictions in effect in the years in which the transactions were completed. They did nothing wrong or illegal. In some cases these holdings were purchased, buildings established and our Canadian citizens in many cases became the tenants of them. This all happened since the early part of the century. If this recommendation No. 3 is legislation, these tenants would be forced into a position where they would have either to try to purchase this land or give it to someone else who might be in a position to do so. I think this is very significant, Mr. Speaker, because this is why I am against the retroactivity of the Bill. This could very well be someone who does not require the land because they already have sufficient to carry on a viable farm unit. From the hearings that we held in the province, which covered many areas, there were only a few cases which caused alarm. And the Member went on, "Therefore we oppose Recommendation 5: No corporation except the farm family and the community group, or agricultural co-operative association should be permitted to operate any agricultural enterprise after five years from now." Now this was the Members' recommendation supported by the three Liberals on the Committee, the two NDP Members who recommended against retroactivity. Now, we on this side, at least, Mr. Speaker, are going to be consistent because we still are against retroactivity because we will find, just as the two NDP Members said in this legislation, that much of the land that is currently held in Saskatchewan today, the renters are getting a pretty good arrangement. As soon as they are forced to sell this land the person renting may quite possibly be forced into buying it. They will either have to buy it or give it up. Therefore, the idea of retroactivity is a poor one and it is a poor piece of legislation that the NDP have drafted as far as retroactivity is concerned.

As for future corporate ownership I support the Bill. In the recommendation and in the Bill it suggest that corporation ownership be restricted to one-quarter section and I support that provision for the future but I can suggest to the Members opposite that they will cause considerable hardship with the retroactivity feature in this legislation they have talked about. Because many of the people who are renting land from corporations of which there are extremely few — I think we found three in our hearings — it was a very small amount of renting from other individuals who are now currently American owners, that that retroactivity feature will force many renters to either buy or get off that land because the land will be sold to someone else. The Members said in their recommendation which I read to you and we support that, we still consider the retroactivity feature a very poor one.

Now I might say that all of the Members on that side of the House in the Committee hearings agreed that there should be no restrictions against other Canadians. We think that this was realistic at the time and we think it is extremely realistic today. Certainly if every province in this country is going to throw up a 20 mile border against other Canadians for any of a number of reasons we aren't going to have a country, we are going to have ten countries, Mr. Speaker. We aren't like Prince Edward Island where there is only a few miles of beaches and a few miles

of resort area, we are a country here in Saskatchewan of millions and millions and millions of acres of land and the kind of legislation that the Province of Prince Edward Island is possibly requiring for their beach areas and so forth isn't required here in this province.

I do support the legislation which is aimed at foreign ownership and I might say in fact I could quite truthfully say, I would support to a much greater extent than what the NDP have brought in. We recommended in the Committee Report, the three Liberal Members recommended that:

The Legislature enact legislation limiting the future acquisition of farm lands by non-resident aliens.

Now I would support very severe restrictions against non-resident aliens and not some wishy washy crazy ideas like we've got in this Bill that if you live 20 miles inside the United States border you can buy all of Saskatchewan. What kind of nonsense is that in this kind of Bill? We got a 20 mile border south of my constituency in the United States and if you live ten miles into United States you could buy up half the country of Meadow Lake and if you live 30 miles into Manitoba you can't, Mr. Speaker. Now no amount of logic will ever be able to tell the people of Saskatchewan that that type of draft can make any kind of sense.

So I want to sum up by saying that this Committee that has reported has absolutely received no attention whatsoever from the Government. It did exactly what we anticipated was the Government's intention at the time, to try and bail themselves out of hot water that they had caused trying to tell the people of Saskatchewan that it was some White Paper or some other proposal which nobody at the time believed and nobody believes today. It was a Bill just like any other Bill introduced into this Legislature of Saskatchewan that had the approval of the NDP and had the approval of the Cabinet. It came in here just like the 100 other ones we got this year. And then they found themselves in a jam so they came along and they said, "Oh, that's not a Bill, that's a White Paper." Somehow or other they printed 'Bill' at the top instead of White Paper. Well, Mr. Speaker, it was a Bill and everybody in Saskatchewan knows it was a Bill and so do all the front bench in the NDP know it was a Bill. So it was also an irony that the Minister of Agriculture didn't say it was anything but a Bill until after it had been here for a week, which was a rather strange arrangement you might say, to say the least.

So I want to reiterate, Mr. Speaker, three particular principles which should be in this piece of legislation which are sadly lacking. First of all, severe restrictions against foreign ownership and by foreign ownership, I don't mean Canadians. The second one, Mr. Speaker, is no restrictions against Canadians of any kind, this is one country. The third one, Mr. Speaker, is that I do support as far as the future is concerned a restriction on corporate ownership of agricultural land. This is in the Bill but I do not support retroactivity as far as this legislation is concerned because all it is going to do is do harm to the people who are presently renting that type of land. I want to also say that this Bill is attempting or the NDP is attempting to try and confuse people by really bringing in a law against corporate ownership. Most of the corporate ownership in agriculture in Saskatchewan to date can

can still take place on a quarter section just as well as it ever could before. Corporations are still allowed to own a quarter section of land, I approve of that, but make no mistake about it you can build a pretty big hog barn on a quarter section of land or a pretty big feed lot, so the NDP in effect are not really bringing in restrictions as far as corporations and much of agriculture is concerned. They are restricting it to the amount of land ownership and in that essence I support it.

So I just want to sum up by saying, Mr. Speaker, that I think it is disappointing that we spent all that money and all that time to draft a report, which I consider to be a good report. The Committee I think had harmony within it and certainly the original Bill didn't add to anything but some difficulties as far as Committee members are concerned. But in any event I think the Committee did draft a good report and the Committee, as I said before, was unanimous in having no restrictions against other Canadians. The key recommendation in the whole report has been totally ignored by this Government, Mr. Speaker, so how could you honestly say that there was any purpose in having a report if the Government paid absolutely no attention to its key recommendation.

I just want to say that I would support very much and I think it is absolutely necessary that we have a good foreign ownership of land Bill but this certainly isn't it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. T.L. HANSON (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley): — Mr. Speaker, I am absolutely amazed at the lack of knowledge of the Member who has just completed speaking. I think if he would have taken time to read Bill 79, he would have found that indeed the Bill itself almost copied in identical proportions, the Report of our Special Intersessional Committee. Corporations do indeed have 20 years to dispose of the land that they now have and in my opinion that is too long, however, we had to reach a consensus of opinion within this Government.

Another feature that the Member opposite stated the Bill was in error designating restrictions against other Canadians I should like to point out that it is totally within the power of the Province of Saskatchewan to control matters relating to boundaries. But totally outside of the power of a province to control matters relating or restricting people on the basis of religion, creed, color or ethnic background or place of allegiance and therefore this is the only avenue left open to this Government.

I think that the Intersessional Committee on Foreign Ownership of Land that we served on did prove to be of real value. In that Committee report on page 32, we stated that there were indications that nearly one per cent of the land in Saskatchewan was foreign owned. I questioned the value of this figure of one per cent and I should like to point out some facts that lead me to believe in the fallacy of statistics taken on a voluntary basis. Page 32 of the report states that the estimates from our questionnaires for the entire province is that .97 per cent of the agricultural land is owned by persons whose addresses are outside of Canada. I want you to remember the wording, 'whose addresses are outside of Canada.' And in questioning these statistics I did an analysis of some of the surveys that we did. I found out, for example that the CPR or

Marathon Realty was reported to have owned 1,079 quarter sections in our voluntary RM survey, which is essence, actually owned 1,625 quarters of Saskatchewan land. That is a total of 260,000 acres, Mr. Speaker, of fine Saskatchewan farm land.

Bringing this investigation closer to home, I looked at the records of Boll Land Company which farms in the Fillmore area, the same community where I carry on the business of farming. In the RM surveys it was pointed out that the Boll Land Company controlled 27 quarters of land. In actual investigation we uncovered the facts that Boll Land Company which is Florida based, in fact, actually owned 66 quarters of land — 10,137 acres of Saskatchewan land. So I did a little more investigating into the members of the Boll Land Company.

I find that the president is Morse Frederick Boll, a friend of ours in Fillmore who is the John Deere dealer; secretary is Albert Martin Andreas, Miami Beach, Florida; director is Martin Lowell Andreas, Miami Beach, Florida. When we look at the shareholders of this great corporation, which incidentally is registered as a Saskatchewan corporation, because the mailing address on the tax notices is to the Boll Land Company in Saskatchewan, 41,000 shares are owned by Morris Boll, sounds like a lot; one lone share is owned by Albert Martin Andreas and one lone share is owned by Martin Lowell Andreas. There are 163,998 shares owned by the Andreas Corporation, Miami Beach, Florida. From these types of investigations, I think the survey that our Committee did, as well as the survey done by Professor Jacob Brown, do not truly indicate the state of affairs in Saskatchewan regarding foreign and corporation ownership.

One fact that the Brown survey brought out was that in some RMs — seven to be exact — within the southern area of the province, more than nine per cent of the land within those RMs was owned by American interests.

The Liberal Members opposite said in their reservations that oftentimes the opinions of the Government Members of that Committee were prejudiced, but I say that it was only because of my prejudiced opinion that I carried on the investigation a little bit farther than our investigations within the Committee structure permitted us to do.

I say that the discrepancy between 66 quarters and 27 quarters as reported in the voluntary questionnaire proved that my prejudiced inquiring mind probably served Saskatchewan better than the minds which just take for granted any facts that are thrown at them.

Mr. Speaker, I am having a bit of trouble with my voice tonight, and I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Smishek (Minister of Health) that Bill No. 102 — **An Act relating to the Acquisition, Distribution and Sale of Certain Drugs** be now read a second time.

MR. D.F. MacDONALD (Moose Jaw North): — Mr. Speaker, as we consider

April 22, 1974

this Bill or if we consider an Act for that matter we should try to define the problem and once that is defined then consider what the solution is to that problem.

In this matter of The Prescription Drug Act, that we are dealing with today, the problem is clear in my mind and I think the Minister in his speech indicates that he is aware of the same problem and that it is clear in his mind. He made reference to facts that two per cent of the families bear about 20 per cent of all drug expenditures, and that five per cent of the families bear about one-third of all drug expenditures; that, indeed, 10 per cent of the families in Saskatchewan bear the cost of one-half of all the drug expenditures in this province.

I think this identifies the problem and I think that both sides of the House agree on that. I ask if the proposed drug plan deals adequately with this problem. Does the drug plan, as outlined by the Minister, redistribute the costs or, in fact, does 10 per cent of the people still pay 50 per cent of the costs that are incurred over the counter at the drugstore?

I think that the drug plan as outlined fails in this respect. I think it is a fact that 10 per cent of the people who pick up half of the costs will still pick up close to half the costs. I think a second problem is clear and, again, the Minister indicated that he agreed and that he was aware of this type of problem. I would quote from his speech.

People who must face these high prescription drug expenditures are often the people who are least able to afford the high cost; the sick, injured, chronically ill and the elderly.

He went on in another quote:

That elderly and chronically ill are particularly hard hit with drug costs because some individuals may be medically required to consume several types of drugs each day of their lives.

I think there is clear agreement on this fact. Does the proposed drug plan redistribute expenditures for drugs so that the chronically ill, the elderly and so on, do not have to pay proportionately more than those of us lucky enough not to have high drug expenditures?

I think the drug plan does not. The Minister indicated that the plan would cut the cost of drugs to Saskatchewan people in half. Well if my family has expenses of say \$20 per year, then I can expect that if the plan is introduced, to pay about \$10. If a family has a chronically ill member or more than one member, and average expenses as high as \$400, then I suppose they can expect to pay close to \$200 if the plan, indeed, cuts the costs in half.

Mr. Speaker, interrupted the debate.

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