

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fourth Session - Seventeenth Legislature
60th Day

Monday, April 29, 1974.

The Assembly met at 10:00 o'clock a.m.
On the Orders of the Day.

QUESTIONS

FLOODING OF BEAVER RIVER

MR. H.E. COUPLAND (Meadow Lake): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I wonder if I could direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) or maybe better to direct it to the Premier.

Due to the exceptional flooding of the Beaver River, ranchers are having to move out of the river flats. The cattle are being stranded on islands. They are using boats to get feed over and some of them only have feed for eight to ten days and then they will have to try and swim them out. The crest of the flood hasn't reached there yet and it looks as if it is going to be one of the worst floods of the Beaver River. I wonder would the Premier assure the ranchers and the farmers in the Beaver River area there that they will receive the same compensation as the people in other parts of the province, especially Moose Jaw?

HON. J.R. MESSER (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, I don't believe the Premier heard the first part of the question. I know the Member was addressing the question to the Premier but in his absence addressed it to myself. I am aware that there is a possibility of the Beaver flooding to a greater extent than it ever has in the past. There obviously is little, if anything, can be done to offset that particular problem. We are undertaking an investigation which would hopefully give us some information in regard to what we may be able to do in the way of compensation if compensation is, in fact, deserving. Certainly we want to put into place a policy whereby we shall be able to recognize loss and provide Government assistance wherever necessary so that it does not become regional. We are most concerned that we don't find ourselves assisting some citizens in Saskatchewan in one particular region but finding others, because of the policy or the guidelines, not eligible, so we will look very sincerely at this problem and if there is any Government action taken we would like it to be available to all citizens across the province.

MR. COUPLAND: — I am glad to hear that and as a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, I was wondering if the Department of Agriculture would get some men up into that area to help facilitate the location of feed and so on? I was talking to a couple of the ranchers and they have had to move their cattle up on to the high lands and as you know, especially in the North, there is no feed in that high land at this time of the year. They are concerned that a lot of their feed is going to get caught in the flood. If the Minister would get some of his staff up there to help them organize and get this feed located, I think it would be tremendous assistance. I am glad to hear that they are going to watch the province, there is a lot of flooding

this year and I hope that the farmers and ranchers will be treated the same as other citizens of the province.

MR. MESSER: — Mr. Speaker, if the Member would give me the particulars we would certainly consider any kind of action that he thinks that we may be able to be of assistance in providing.

LOCATION OF GENERAL MANAGER OF SASKOIL

MR. D.G. STEUART (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cowley). Mr. Berg, who is, I understand, employed to be the General Manager or one of the chief officials of Saskoil., does he have an office in Calgary and is that where he is physically located?

MR. E.L. COWLEY (Minister of Mineral Resources): — Mr. Speaker, Saskoil has an office in Regina and a small office in Calgary. Mr. Berg, when his children are out of school at the end of June, will be moving his family to Regina.

MR. STEUART: — A supplementary question. He will be maintaining an office in Calgary?

MR. COWLEY: — I believe I answered that question on a previous occasion in the House and the answer was, yes, it will be used by Saskoil. We also anticipate it being used by the Saskatchewan Power Corporation from time to time and the primary purpose of that particular office is in terms of dealing with other oil companies, the vast bulk of which are operated from Calgary. That's what it will be used for.

MR. STEUART: — After Bill 42 they are all in Calgary, I can tell you that.

MR. COWLEY: — They were all in Calgary before Bill 42.

INVESTIGATION INTO THE WHOLESALE PRICE OF BEEF

MR. J.C. McISAAC (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Consumer Affairs (Mr. Tchorzewski).

A week or more ago I asked the Minister if he would consider, initiate or launch an investigation into the wholesale price of beef in the province. At that time he didn't indicate that he thought it was very desirable or very necessary. I wonder if the Minister is aware that since that time there has been continuing concern on behalf of many people really with respect to the unaccountable gap between the cost of beef on the hoof and the cost of beef in the retail chain and the cost to people insofar as the housewife is concerned. I think on Saturday, last, Mr. Speaker, I don't know if the Minister is aware but I believe the National Leader of the NDP, Mr. Lewis,

was on the air commenting on the same situation. He is convinced there is some kind of a rip-off by the packers or by the chain stores. On Saturday, last, again I am not sure if the Minister is aware, but there was a spokesman from the Cattle Buyers' Association in Saskatoon on the air in that city complaining about the same thing. There are a lot of unanswered questions and my question is: Will the Minister reconsider and conduct an investigation into this question? It shouldn't be a difficult thing. They have made a survey on grocery stores and drugs and on the housewife's concern last year, surely to goodness he can have a look at a more pressing problem right now, the wholesale price of meat.

HON. E.L. TCHORZEWSKI (Minister of Consumer Affairs): — Well, Mr. Speaker, we certainly are always considering the need for such investigations from time to time as difficulties arise. I agree with the Member that this is a very serious situation and if a decision is made to undertake such an investigation it will be announced in due course, as I said the other day.

Now I just wanted to comment on one of the comments the Member made. He talks about the gap between the farm beef price and the price that the consumer has to pay. There is nothing new about that gap, it has always been there. It is just unfortunate that there has never been a national policy in this country that would narrow that gap.

MR. McISAAC: — Mr. Speaker, again this certainly isn't good enough. My question would be: What kind of evidence would the Minister need in order to launch and conduct an inquiry? Surely the evidence is there, his own federal leader says the evidence is there. Housewives, the people involved in the meat industry in the buying, say the evidence is there for some inquiry to determine some answers. He is involved in Intercontinental Packers, it should be very simple and I just wonder what kind of evidence he wants before the Government acts?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Mr. Speaker, the evidence may very well be there. We have always expressed a concern as the federal leader of the New Democratic Party has again reiterated our concern in the whole area of the gouging that may be taking place in the food business as well as other corporate businesses. Because of our recognition of that evidence we have stressed, time after time, that there needs to be some national action and we have indicated this to the Federal Government. It is ludicrous for the Member opposite to suggest that you can do something effectively on the provincial basis in this whole area. Mr. Speaker, the whole aspect of inflation is something that is influenced very strongly, not only on national basis, but an international basis as well. In order for us to have something positive done in this country we have to have some national action and one of the best places that it could be taken, which we have suggested to the Federal Government on a number of occasions, is to have the Prices Review Board be in a position with the power and the authority to be able to prevent the increase of prices if they are proven to be unjustified and in fact roll back those prices if they have been increased unjustifiably.

MR. J.G. LANE (Lumsden): — I want to ask the Member, have you begun an investigation or have you discussed the matter of high prices with Intercontinental Packers?

MR. SPEAKER: — I think we have had three questions and are getting into a debate.

SECOND READINGS

HON. R. ROMANOW (Attorney General) moved second reading of Bill No. 121 — **An Act to amend The Automobile Accident Insurance Act (No. 2).**

He said: Mr. Speaker, I rise to move second reading of this Bill. I shall be very short in my second reading remarks.

This amendment is thought necessary from a legal standpoint to allow The Automobile Accident Insurance Act to receive the sums designated under The Fuel Petroleum Products Act as premium money paid to the AAIA. This matter has been debated at length. I think Members will know the arguments for and against the move and I don't intend to repeat them at this stage. I simply move second reading of this Bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. K.R. MacLEOD (Regina Albert Park): — Mr. Speaker, we oppose this Bill because the whole concept created by the Government and the Hon. the Attorney General is to destroy the basic and fundamental idea of the insurance and The Automobile Insurance Act. This is a method of juggling the books instead of giving people a reduction in their gas taxes and the Government has chosen not to do that and is doing so by a trick. The proper thing to have done would be to approach this as it was originally, a straightforward insurance matter and deal with it as such. I oppose the Bill.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

HON. E.L. TCHORZEWSKI (Minister of Culture and Youth) moved second reading of Bill No. 122 — **An Act respecting Lotteries.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, I rise to make some comments on Bill No. 122. In considering the legislation before this House I want to say that it is important to emphasize that the Province of Saskatchewan and its Government is not intending to get into the lottery business for itself. But lotteries, as you know, Mr. Speaker, are a growing phenomena in Canada and tickets are now beginning to be sold in the open and in open competition for buyers. I think it is important to recognize that lotteries do exist in the country as they do throughout the world. Federal legislation under the Criminal Code legalizes lotteries which are issued licenses within each or any province. This legislation, therefore, establishes nothing new in this respect. Alberta, Manitoba and British Columbia have had similar legislation very recently, in fact since the new year.

With the growing acknowledged popularity where even on

television a nationwide draw is staged, now is the time I think to take the step to prevent or curtail the many abuses that could take place with lotteries especially from out of the province if they are allowed to continue selling and promoting their tickets in Saskatchewan. It is the intention of the Bill before you to produce legislation that will control and regulate orderly lotteries in the province. Again, the Government will not be the selling agent but will have the power to designate the authorities to sell, promote and run lotteries with a minimum of abuse. The Criminal Code of Canada now permits the licensing of lotteries by provincial Attorney Generals within each province.

In passing this Bill there is an answer for many sports, recreation and cultural and leisure time agencies and their continual search for raising funds to finance ever-increasing demands and improvements in programming. These agencies have all experienced the problem of insufficient revenues to fulfill their financial needs and are willing to work to raise such money if a fund-raising tool is put in their hands. Provincial Governments may generally implement support programs as they do but it is sometimes doubtful that any Government could begin to give financial assistance on the scale answering the need of all agencies and by permitting approved lotteries in the province, well regulated, the many interested agencies are given even more room to participate and support for their own particular activities instead of being forced to sit idly by appealing but not always receiving the financial support which is needed.

It is also a stimulation for the agencies in putting their programs before the general public. It is important that the voluntary aspect of sports, recreation and cultural programming in the province and community is maintained. Volunteers have made vast contributions in programming in the past and continue to do so today. These volunteers coach, supervise, lead and raise funds and bingo, raffles and lotteries have been used to raise such funds. This has provided, what I consider, important independence.

In considering the present legislation before the House it can be pointed out that lottery schemes on a national or international level are not new in the world. With an increasing trend to take advantage of this means of raising money for many purposes the result can be an uncontrollable proliferation of schemes. And even now with legislation against it, it is a well known fact that tickets do pass many borders, usually through the mails with a reverse flow of receipts. The illegal sale of tickets can be estimated at hundreds of thousands of dollars a year in this province alone and with the new climate for lotteries this cannot help but increase.

Reports on lottery programs in Europe and North America indicate that lottery schemes are a viable means to finance worthy programs. In Canada well organized lotteries help to finance leisure time activities with, again, the marketing of tickets extending into those provinces without lottery programs. It is possible that a time could come when every province would have a lottery scheme creating a highly competitive situation with problems and difficulties arising in many areas. In western Canada, for example, where there is a limited marketing potential if each of the four western provinces decided to launch a similar lottery to that now held in Manitoba, there would be four major lottery draws a year in each province and this would

mean 16 major draws offered to a population of approximately five million people. It to gain a marketing advantage there would be no guarantee that prices would not be progressively increased affecting the financing of costs of each operation and possibly affecting the beneficiaries of the program, defeating the whole aim of the lottery program.

Four separate schemes would also mean four administration headquarters in each province, each needing separate financing of costs and a wasted duplication of effort. Despite the provisions under the Criminal Code, tickets and receipts would cross and recross provincial borders making policing costlier and unpopular. Fraudulent practices would also be harder to control. Nevertheless some western provinces would undoubtedly move unilaterally to restrict out-of-province ticket sales, particularly from neighboring provinces.

It was in recognition of these problems and other complications that the Minister of Recreation for the four western provinces at a meeting in Victoria, a year ago last January, agreed to investigate in general an interprovincial lottery scheme with a comprehensive program of lotteries administered on a co-operative basis. It was recognized at that time that the net profits would be used for culture, sport and recreation programs in each of the provinces. Approval was given to investigating the possibilities of a co-operative scheme and an interprovincial steering committee made up of two representatives of each participating western province was set up. The aim of the preliminary study, which was thorough in its investigation, was to recommend regulations for each of the provinces to regulate licensing and trade, an orderly atmosphere of lotteries in the four western provinces within the framework of a co-operative lottery.

In a submission by the Implementation Task Force to the four Ministers, minimum, uniform requirements were outlined to enable legislation in each province to carry out the intent of the proposal to conduct interprovincial lotteries. Some of the requirements were as follows:

1. Provincial legislation necessary to permit each province's designated representative to enter into agreement with other western provinces and a federally incorporated Western Canada Co-operative Lottery, Limited, subject to subsection (1) (b) of Section 190 of the Criminal Code of Canada which enables a government of the province in conjunction with the government of any other province to conduct and manage a lottery scheme in that province or in any other province so long as it is in accordance with any law enacted by the Legislature of that province.
2. Provincial legislation to provide government opportunity to designate an agency or agencies to act as provincial marketing organization and to act as an equal shareholder in an interprovincial co-operation under the Federal Companies Act and to retain its own profits for distributing to programs under its own priorities while contributing a fixed percentage of sales to the interprovincial co-operation for administrative costs and prizes.
3. Provincial legislation to seek to regulate, control and otherwise prevent sales of lotteries other than those licensed in the province by the province. For example, the Olympic

Lottery, licensed federally within federal jurisdiction sets its own regulations with regard to selling such items as advertising and commissions.

4. The provision of regulations governing maximum sales commissions would be required for both the marketing agency and the direct sellers with adherence by all provinces to ensure fair dollar return to the public.

5. Provision for the control of sales and common punitive control measures.

6. Provisions for the proper auditing of books and accounts of provincial selling agents were stated in the requirements.

7. Provision made so that each province would agree with the orderly phasing out of other large lotteries of \$100,000 and over and more than one lottery per 500,000 population will not be licensed.

8. Also a provincial marketing agency should be prohibited from appointing direct sellers resident in other participating provinces.

The justifications for the co-operative lottery would be in a major lottery providing profits to support programs in the sports, recreation and cultural fields, with an orderly interprovincial marketing of lottery tickets governed by regulations set by each province within the province. Such a lottery able to compete with anticipated lotteries in other provinces would give shared benefits which no province in western Canada could accomplish unilaterally.

The Lotteries Act before you, creates legislation enabling the province to designate nonprofit agents or agencies to conduct or manage any lottery scheme in Saskatchewan, either alone or in conjunction with other provinces as already required by Section 190 of the Criminal Code of Canada.

There is provision for such designated agents or agencies to enter into an agreement with the Government of Canada, other provinces or agencies to incorporate into a company to organize and conduct a lottery scheme. There is also protection for persons engaging in lotteries.

The Bill empowers the Minister, subject to the Lieutenant Governor-in-Council to pass regulations governing the conduct and operation of lotteries events or sellers fees or commissions, the keeping of accounts and records and other related matters.

I think, Mr. Speaker, there are a number of advantages to this Bill for Saskatchewan. The Government will benefit if only in avoiding a needless form of competition. And the people of the province will benefit in the orderly regulations for marketing lottery tickets.

Cultural, sports and recreation organizations will gain from such a scheme both financially and to some degree in self-sufficiency. There are benefits for everyone as the western organization grows enabling us to compete in the lottery field on the basis of population for all to benefit.

This legislation will make it possible for the umbrella

body such as SaskSport to become a partner in the proposed Western Canada Interprovincial Lottery. We have been urged and encouraged by SaskSport and other organizations to introduce this permissive legislation.

The legislation on the Interprovincial Lottery will help to prevent the proliferation of large numbers of lotteries which I think is undesirable. It will help to keep funds in Saskatchewan to assist Saskatchewan sports, cultural and recreational organizations to help themselves.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I just want to point out that basically in the briefest sort of way what the legislation does. It conforms to the requirements under Section 190 of the Criminal Code of Canada which deals with lotteries and which requires that provincial legislation be passed in the province in order to permit any provincial agency to join with another provincial agency in a co-operative or a joint lottery. Essentially that is what this legislation does. I have indicated some of the other arguments involved with the whole issue of lotteries and those are the arguments regarding a vast conglomeration of many lotteries developing unregulated, and I think it is important to consider those things in looking at the establishment of such an organization as a Western Interprovincial Lottery.

So with these few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill 122.

MR. C.P. MacDONALD (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, just a few comments on second reading of this Bill.

First of all I support the principle of the Bill which is enabling legislation in order to allow the Government of Saskatchewan to enter into an agreement with the other prairie provinces or any province or the Federal Government in the orderly management of lotteries.

But I have got two suggestions for the Minister. I would suggest that the Minister get off his backside and get a lottery going in the Province of Saskatchewan as soon as possible. We now have a vast proliferation of lotteries going in various areas of the province and I think if we wait for the co-operative effort of the four western provinces it may be two or three years down the road. I think there should be one major lottery managed and sponsored by the Government of Saskatchewan. It should have a specific purpose for the promotion and organization of recreation and sport in the Province of Saskatchewan, amateur sport. As he has indicated, SaskSport has been promoting this concept for several years. I think they are willing to take the leadership and put the organization behind it. They are willing and ready to take the marketing responsibility for this. I think it would be one of the major benefits to amateur sport in the Province of Saskatchewan. If we are going to really promote amateur sport we are going to have a major initiation of capital facilities. I am thinking of Olympic size swimming pools, tennis courts and so forth. I think there is a valuable source of dollars, I would urge the Minister to proceed as quickly as possible. This has been under discussion in Saskatchewan for four or five years. For some strange reason we seem to be sitting on our backsides.

2. I want to register an objection. An objection to the

Government of Saskatchewan for failing to permit the citizens of Saskatchewan to participate in the Olympic Lottery sponsored by the Federal Government to finance the Olympic Games in Canada. I don't know how the Minister feels but I am one of those who believes the coming of the Olympics to the city of Montreal is a major win for the Dominion of Canada, it is a major win for amateur sports in Canada, not only in the Province of Quebec or the city of Montreal, but right across Canada. I think if there is anything that will encourage amateur sport in the sphere of organization promotion and also in the development of skills and excellence of athletes, one of the great tragedies of Canadian amateur sports is that we have, in the past, taken a second place in international competition. Canada is now beginning to come into its own in international competition. I think that the Canadian Olympics to be held in Montreal in 1976 will do more to encourage amateur sport and develop this spirit of excellence, the kind of initiative and imagination that Canadian athletes require if they are going to really compete on an international level and Canadians to hold their own.

All of us are aware of the Canadian record as far as physical fitness is concerned. And it is areas of this kind that will encourage it.

I also want to suggest that I think that the concept of the lottery to finance the Olympics is an excellent one. A great number of people in Canada have objected very vigorously to the federal taxpayer becoming involved in the financing of the Olympics or Expo and, therefore, this technique of trying to provide the funds required for the capital programs and also the operational costs of the Olympics, I think was a good one. I think many Saskatchewan citizens are purchasing these Olympic tickets illegally, simply because they support track and field, they support tennis, they support swimming and they support the whole philosophy of bringing the Olympics to the Dominion of Canada. So I want to register an objection in that regard. I think the Government of Saskatchewan should have permitted the Olympic lottery tickets to be sold in the Province of Saskatchewan. It should have permitted the Olympic Committee to set up a marketing agency in Saskatchewan so that the people of Saskatchewan could have participated at least in this way in helping to finance the Olympic Games in Montreal.

With those few comments, Mr. Speaker, I will support the Bill.

MR. D. FARIS (Arm River): — Mr. Speaker, I intend to oppose this Bill. I intend to oppose it because I believe it will be a step towards what the Member for Milestone is suggesting we should have done. It will be a step towards a government sponsored lottery. I think that is what I am really afraid of happening here as it is happening across North America and in other provinces.

I believe that taxation should be based on the ability to pay. As I view this lottery scheme and the other lottery schemes across North America, I view them as an alternative to the financing of amateur sport from general taxation. I view it as a choice of a regressive form of taxation. All studies of who buy lottery tickets around the world have revealed that a disproportionately large number are purchased by people from low income groups. Viewed as a form of taxation, lotteries are admittedly a regressive form of taxation.

As I believe that history will record that one of the most significant contributions of the present Saskatchewan Government is the way we have shifted taxation away from regressive sources of revenue to more progressive sources of revenue, I believe that taking the lottery alternative to support amateur sport is most unfortunate. We have taken deterrent fees from the sick, medicare premiums from senior citizens and then from all families, we have stopped taxing the estates of most mental patients, raised the sales tax exemption on meals from 15 cents to \$2.50; shifted 20 mills from property tax to general revenue, increased income taxes and resource revenues which are progressive taxes. All of these steps give us in Saskatchewan perhaps the most progressive tax structure in Canada. I am sorry we did not choose to support amateur sport from general taxation. I would give high priority to a tax financed program of sports, recreation and physical fitness. I think an initial budget of \$4 million would not be too much.

Such a program would see sports and recreation field workers spread throughout the province. Possibly they should be related to community colleges as they expand. The problem in most rural areas today, as I see it, is not a lack of recreation facilities or possibilities, in most areas — it is a lack of programs and leadership.

This shortage of leadership is the second reason I am opposed to the lottery route to finance amateur sports. It will mean that the time and energy of sports organizations will be taken up selling lottery tickets. I have nothing against clubs or groups or organizations selling their little local raffle tickets. I only wish they didn't have to spend their time and energy doing this when their members might have supported them more strongly voluntarily and then when their leadership which is rather scarce as I say, particularly in the rural areas, could have spent more of their time and energy on the more important and more beneficial aspect of programs.

The third reason I am opposed to the lottery route to finance amateur sport is that we already have enough lotteries, raffles and so on in our province. No one is suggesting that this sort of thing can be wiped out or abolished in our society. The point is that we don't need any more. We don't need any more government promotion, surely of the "something for nothing" philosophy that unfortunately goes along with this kind of thing. We particularly should not get the government involved in lotteries. This Bill does not set up a government lotteries commission in Saskatchewan. I think that should be made perfectly clear. Rather it is umbrella legislation which will enable private groups to do what a lotteries commission might do. I consider it, therefore, a step towards a lotteries commission as I believe that once you agree to the lotteries alternative to the financing of amateur sports — how do you persuade people that there is any fundamental difference between private or government operation?

In the light of what has been said by the Member for Milestone, this Bill looks relatively good. But unfortunately, I believe it is a step towards what the Member for Milestone is suggesting. Therefore, I will be opposing the Bill.

HON. A.E. BLAKENEY (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, just let me add a word, speaking as the Member for Regina Centre, if I may.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Hard to do that.

MR. BLAKENEY: — I know it is. I have some feelings of sympathy with the comments of the Member for Arm River on the undesirability of attempting to promote lotteries as a method of financing any major government program.

However, I think we do have to face the fact that lotteries are with us. They apparently are not going to go away. It is quite impossible, I think, to eliminate lotteries in our society because there is no substantial sentiment for the elimination of lotteries. Any law which attempts to eliminate lotteries will be disregarded, and we should have what I think would be a distressing degree of contempt for the law.

I think this was the previous situation when lotteries were illegal and you and I were walking around with wallets full of raffle tickets sold by organizations for which we had a very great deal of respect. Yet, probably they were engaging in an illegal lottery in selling them and we were engaging in an illegal lottery in buying them.

Accordingly that system didn't work.

The next question is how do you attempt to regulate lotteries? It is again perfectly clear that some major lotteries are developing in western Canada. Our information is that the number of lottery tickets sold in Saskatchewan for provincial lotteries based outside the province, is rising and rising substantially. One could see lottery tickets for Manitoba lotteries, if I may use an example, freely displayed and freely sold, I think, illegally in Saskatchewan.

The question then was how to regulate. The Bill before us is a compromise, it is an attempt to see that lotteries are regulated, an attempt to see that the Government as such does not have a substantial stake in promoting lotteries since there will be no direct government revenue coming from lotteries. It can be argued that, in a sense, there will be indirect benefit to the Government because organizations will benefit who otherwise might ask the Government for money; that is an argument. But certainly there will be no incentive on the part of the Government, no direct incentive to promote lotteries. The Bill does, I think, ensure that the Government has not too much of a stake in the promotion of lottery tickets.

It is our belief that the Bill will mean that the great bulk of lottery tickets in this province will be sold on behalf of nonprofit and charitable organizations. This Bill deals particularly with sport and cultural organizations. It is our belief that the great bulk of these tickets will be sold by people who will not personally be getting a commission, who, therefore, will not be making their living selling lottery tickets. It is our belief that this method of lottery sale will mean that the greatest percentage of the ticket dollar, the lottery ticket dollar, will go into the hands of either the winner of the lottery or the organization for whom the lottery is operated.

It is our belief that in most cases the profit to the seller will find its way into the hands of a local sporting organization or a local cultural organization. If there are

to be lotteries, then I think this distribution of the proceeds is perhaps as desirable as we can find, and this organization which does not encourage either the Government or the private individual to promote the sale of lottery tickets in order to get revenue for themselves, is desirable. Accordingly, taking all of the situations that appear to be before the Government and viewing it in its ethical context or moral, in which I am viewing it, I think this Bill is as good a compromise as we can get.

I acknowledge the position of the Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) that there is nothing particularly ethically undesirable about lotteries. I don't entirely share it. We don't expect everyone to have exactly the same ethical framework in our society. I don't in any sense, regard my position as better than his, it is just slightly different. The Member for Arm River (Mr. Faris) will take a position slightly different than mine on this, but considering all the aspects of it, it seems to me that this is a reasonable compromise and I will be supporting the Bill.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Mr. Speaker, I shall not take a great deal of time. I think the Premier summarized it very adequately and I shall certainly not attempt to repeat the things which he has said. I think the points raised in these moments of debate that we have had on this legislation are very good ones. I, too, must indicate that I do not necessarily disagree with the Member for Arm River when he talks about the Government not financing major government projects by the lottery system.

I think we have to recognize the fact, as I indicated earlier, that lotteries existed in Canada before we had legislation in Canada promoting lotteries. I am certainly one of those who can recall very well my next door neighbor living a half mile away who used to get the Irish Sweepstakes on a regular basis. The first place he called was at the home of my parents. Lotteries are there, Mr. Speaker, and I think we have, to some degree, an obligation to make it possible for their utilization for the optimum benefit. Also incumbent with that responsibility I think is the need to regulate so there is not a great proliferation of them because there is danger of that certainly happening and, in fact, it has been happening to some extent. I think to that extent it meets some of the concerns expressed from the point of view that there is no need for a great many more.

It is my hope and I think it will turn out to be correct, that the establishment of a Western Canada Lottery will help to prevent that from happening. Let me give you an example. With the establishment of the Western Canada Lottery the Manitoba Golden Sweepstakes, for example, will phase out of operation and become part of this one lottery. The two lotteries held in Alberta, associated with Klondike Days and with the Calgary Stampede will not be two separate lotteries, they will join together and become a partner in the Western Canada Lottery. So that I see already some degree of preventing the proliferation of large numbers of them. I think that is good and beneficial.

The Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald), and I appreciate his support of the legislation, touched on a number of points which I want to make one or two comments on. He indicated that there should be a lottery in Saskatchewan. I have indicated

that we are certainly not promoting it nor do we agree that the Government of Saskatchewan should be establishing a lottery and I want to make that very clear. At the same time there is a lottery in Saskatchewan and has been operating for almost a year under SaskSport, having done very well and being administered very ably by the organization. It has proved of benefit to SaskSport which is a relatively new umbrella organization for sports bodies in Saskatchewan and doing very well and has proven to be of benefit to all sports organizations in the province, so there, in fact, is such a lottery now.

The Olympic Lottery is a different kind of situation. One of the reasons that we did not pass the Order-in-Council that is required to permit the Olympic Lottery to operate in Saskatchewan was because of the fact that there were negotiations going on for a Western Canada Lottery. We did not want to put that effort or the efforts of existing lotteries in the Province of Saskatchewan or other western provinces in a position where they may be jeopardized by an Olympic Lottery. I recognize that the Olympics in Canada are going to be of benefit to Canada, it's going to be of benefit to Canada in the same way as the Young Canada Games have been and the Saskatchewan Games. I am not suggesting that these are the only efforts that should be made in the area of sports and athletics, but I think they are part of that whole package when you talk from the level of participation at the local community level, to the level of the high calibre competition, that's part of the whole steam that you necessarily must have. I think the Olympics will help to contribute to that in the same way as these other games have done.

Mr. Speaker, I don't want to take any more time except to say that I am convinced that this legislation which will permit the establishment of the Western Canada Lottery and permit an agency in Saskatchewan such as SaskSport, which is a nonprofit organization, and I think it should be nonprofit organizations who should be in lotteries. I certainly don't think it should be a profit organization or business enterprise, that's not what it is all about. But it will permit that kind of an organization and I think it will prove of great benefit to sports, cultural and recreational organizations in Saskatchewan in the short-term and certainly in the long-term.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Robbins that Bill No. 92 — **An Act to amend The Gift Tax Act, 1972**, be now read a second time.

MR. K.R. MacLEOD (Regina Albert Park): — Mr. Speaker, I just have a word or two about this Bill. As we have made clear on previous occasions the Liberal caucus and the Liberal Opposition entirely opposes the imposition of a succession duty or gift tax at this time in our history and having regard to the fact that we are living next door to a wealthy neighbor which does not have one and in some ways is benefitting economically from development because it does not have this kind of taxation in its province. I refer, of course, to the Province of Alberta.

With respect to the particular amendments before us we cannot oppose an improvement in the present situation. Clearly the present Bill is an improvement in which is previously the law. I cannot avoid reflecting in assessing this Bill it does not recognize the contribution of women to the marriage partnership. It still does not recognize the joint contribution to the production of the assets of the family which may be in the name of one part or the other. There is discriminatory taxation all down the line in this area. And the gift tax is deliberately designed to prevent appropriate transfers between husband and wife during their lifetime. Certainly the amendments before us are an improvement on that situation. They present to us rather clearly the kind of continuing dilemma that a person such as myself has in dealing with this Bill. You have an amendment which is better than what we have now. How can I oppose it? It fails to give amendments, which I think ought to be included in the Bill, therefore I am disappointed in it, but it proposes to amend an Act which I don't think we should have at all.

Consequently, with a considerable amount of reluctance I shall be obliged to vote for the Bill because it is an improvement.

Just one other comment on it. The Gift Tax and Succession Duty Bill to which it is a companion, do not give adequate recognition of the transfers of assets during the lifetime of fathers to their sons or daughters with respect to business. The once in a lifetime provision with respect to farmers is certainly welcome. But the business community is, I think, entitled to the same type and consideration and regrettably the Bill does not make any provision at all for business. Consequently with some reluctance I will support the Bill.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Robbins that Bill No. 93 — **An Act to amend The Succession Duty Act, 1972**, be now read a second time.

MR. J.C. McISAAC (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 93 is a kind of a companion Bill to the one that was just passed by the Legislature, Bill No. 92, The Gift Tax Act. It is another piece of legislation where there is undoubtedly a pretty clear philosophical difference as was put forward by the Minister and the Member for Whitmore Park when this Bill was first debated. There is a clear philosophical difference between the approach in this respect of the Government opposite and the Opposition. It is worthwhile noting, Mr. Speaker, that this field of gift tax and succession duties was vacated by the Federal Government in tax reform measures of two or three years ago. Since that time, Mr. Speaker, a number of Canadian provinces have got into the field and many of those that got into the field have since decided to get out of it. First of all I think they discovered that the kind of return and the tax revenue accruing from this tax was one that didn't make it that worthwhile considering the problems that it imposed on its citizens and the problems with respect to the competitive aspect of one province against another. Here we only have to look to the Province of Alberta, which has no such tax, to demonstrate the fact that by levying such a tax in the Province of Saskatchewan it is undoubtedly doing this province harm in the long run. It is undoubtedly doing us harm.

I think when we look at laws and legislation, Mr. Speaker, we have to consider the fact that indeed we are a federal state, and what is done in one province, while we may have authority to do it, we should certainly consider how that is going to affect future development of our province. While over the past number of years a good deal of progress has been made, in some of the social legislation in Canada to the extent that Medicare, social services and other programs are fairly uniform insofar as their application to Canadian citizens are concerned, it seems to me that we are going backwards in some other areas and this tax has to be a good case in point. I think resource development policies have to be another case in point. Again, we have had ample evidence of that in this particular session.

Mr. Speaker, we have had the adoption of a capital gains tax in Canada two or three years ago and as I say at that time we abolished succession duties. Today, we are told by the news media that Ottawa will introduce a Bill known as an excess profits tax to be presumably made part of the tax law and tax legislation of this country. So we are seeing moves in this direction. We saw in this particular session a 100 per cent excess profits tax with respect to oil companies and with respect to resource revenues; how far can we go in taking away any incentive to capital investment which is necessary because we yet have many resources to develop in this province and in this country? We have seen, as I say, in the last two or three years a capital gains tax, an excess profits tax coming in at the federal level and in both the federal level and in the Legislature of Saskatchewan the initiation of a 100 per cent excess profits tax in the form of Bill 42 and the other federal moves with respect to windfall profits of oil companies. I just say how far can we go?

At the moment figures indicate that about 40 percent of the gross national product of this country goes to the three taxing levels of government, municipal, federal and provincial and that figure is certainly much higher in the States, it is much higher than the similar figure from any other of the western industrial nations. Quite aside from the philosophical argument I ask the Government opposite just how far they feel we can move in this direction when it is recognized that here, again, we are a federal state that some provinces do not have and Alberta particularly similar legislation. I think we have to judge the return to the Treasury on what it is going to do with respect to development of the province, with respect to people moving out, moving their estate out to avoid this tax.

Mr. Speaker, we oppose this Bill. When it was first brought in we opposed the principle of this tax at this point in time in Saskatchewan. We oppose the Bill in the first place, I suppose here again, in relation to Bill 92. While there are improvements in this Bill, we would have to welcome the improvements, but I still want to make it clear that I oppose, and I am sure that goes for most, if not all of my colleagues. We oppose the legislation that is before us and while we welcome the little changes that are here I should point out that when the Bill was first brought in and debated it was pointed out to the Government opposite that the limits that they set and the restrictions that are imposed by this legislation were too narrow and too small and too low at that time. The mere fact that they are bringing in these changes is proof that we were correct in that regard, Mr. Speaker. As I say, again, while we would agree with the changes that are being proposed, I want to make it clear that

I oppose the principle of this legislation.

MR. D.G. STEUART (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a word or two on this Bill on the principle of the Estates Tax or death duties. If you look in the Estimates, as the Hon. Member for Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac) just pointed out, the Government take about \$4 million. They probably won't take that much. I doubt if they even hit the estimate of \$2.8 million last year. I am not sure, but I doubt if they did. However, even if this tax produces a revenue of \$4 million, when you look at the total revenue picture of the province, this year which will exceed \$1,000 million, it is such a small amount that one has to wonder why this Government persists in imposing this tax. Whom does it really hit? Businessmen are able to escape this tax by and large if they wish to, they can pick up bonds, securities, you can transfer business interests, you can transfer the site of your headquarters to Calgary or to Edmonton and soon the number of provinces left in the estate tax field will be in the minority, I think.

Whom is it really aimed at? It is really aimed at the farmers and the ranchers. There is no question that most of the people who are hit by the estate tax in the coming year will be rural people. Again, this begs the question of why. I think the answer is that you have to look at the Land Bank, the control of farm ownership Bill, that is now before this House and the estates tax and the companion pieces, to limit the number of people who actually can purchase farm land and do what they can to force people in this province to sell farm land or at least to give the Land Bank the right of first refusal or the first option to buy farm land. That's I think, one of the major thrusts behind this stubborn insistence of the NDP in staying in this tax field when every piece of evidence that is available to be looked at, if they would just be honest and look at it, it indicates that it is bad taxation, it is bad law and it is actually hurting the people of the Province of Saskatchewan, not the rich people. I am not talking about the rich as there aren't that many of them and those who can move will move and that is the unfortunate part. It is part of the picture of the NDP's war on business, it is part of the whole picture of the NDP's philosophical attitude towards investment, towards people who have been successful, towards people who are able to accumulate some wealth, and in the process, 80 per cent of the time create jobs, thus creating a better tax base for this province.

What is the other reason for this Bill? Well, actually it is revenge! The NDP philosophically cannot stand the idea of successful people and so the thought that someone might pass some wealth on from one generation to another, even if it only took in a million dollars, this really upsets the Members opposite and their followers. It is the basis of NDP philosophy, it is envy, it is to tear down the people who are successful, hold them down, hold them back.

Actually a membership in the NDP is an admission of failure in life and there is nothing that indicates that clearer than this Bill.

There is an old saying 'that you can't take it with you' but when the NDP passed this law, they say in the NDP Saskatchewan you can't even leave it behind.

Mr. Speaker, I think we should be very clear why they love this particular form of taxation; why they support it. The great thing when the old CCF Party came into being and now the NDP, is again it is people who are failures in life, who haven't got the courage to try to make it on their own. It gave them a haven, it gave them a warm feeling to associate with other people who feel exactly the same way. This Bill indicates that we are going to tax the people in every conceivable way who are successful in their lifetime and if that isn't enough they are going to get them after they die.

That is the real basic reason why the NDP support this legislation and keep it in in the face of mounting evidence that it is poor legislation. It hurts the economy of the province and is, in fact, helping to build up our sister province, the Province of Alberta. And it is the reason why sensible administrations, administrations that don't have this bitter bias towards business success are taking this legislation off their books.

I would predict that within two or three years the only governments in this nation that will have death duties, succession taxes, on the books, will be the NDP provinces in this nation.

Of course, we oppose this. Again, I remind the people our slogan that all they have to do is stay alive until '75 and they will beat this tax because we will take it off the books as one of our first acts.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. T.M. WEATHERALD (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a few comments on this Bill.

The first comment that I should like to make is that if I were a socialist, which I am not, the first thing that I would do, Mr. Speaker, and of course, I should like to define to my friends what a socialist is. A person who believes in state ownership not a person who helps out the poor.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WEATHERALD: — I might add that my friends also confuse that issue. They think if you help the poor you have to be a socialist and I assure them you don't.

Anyway I want to say that if I were a socialist, what I would do to destroy the capitalistic system is precisely what they are attempting to do — is I would put on a good stiff succession duty tax. The fastest way to destroy the individual enterprise system is to prevent pools of capital being formed and, of course, through the succession duty tax this is precisely what they are doing.

Unfortunately the succession duty tax is a levy against people who make their living from profits. It is essentially a tax against a person who is forced to own substantial amounts of property in order to make this living. In Saskatchewan, today, we are suffering very severely economically because we don't have any large pools of capital. I am not talking about multi-millions of dollars, I am talking about \$500,000 or amounts of this nature, Mr. Speaker.

If we had more pools of capital in Saskatchewan, in individual hands, there would be a lot more businesses and factories built. It is simply this type and lack of capital of various individuals throughout our province which is hurting the province in many respects.

You can look at various small manufacturing implement dealers operating around the province. At least half a million dollars is required to start a factory. Well, if you can't accumulate a pool of capital it is very unlikely you are going to build a factory. In fact, many of the small businesses, factories and so forth, are built by people who are able to put together a pool of capital and, of course, they construct a facility that employs people and provides jobs.

I want to make it very clear that the succession duty tax is a tax against people who make their living from property. I want to cite to you an example in my own constituency. I recently had a very successful druggist retire and by his own admission he would have qualified for a substantial amount of succession duties.

Well, he won't because six months ago he sold the drugstore and he moved to Calgary to live. Now if you want to take a comparable situation of being a farmer or a factory owner, you couldn't do it, you would stay in Saskatchewan and pay the taxes because you would have no choice.

So what we are essentially saying is that if you are a professional person that makes a large income — and I must admit that I would rather doubt if there is anybody on that side of the House who makes his living from property, being a farmer or so forth. I think most of them are teachers, professionals, etc. in other words they can make a very substantial living of \$25,000 or \$30,000 from age 25 with a good education all their life and accumulate savings and at age 665 move to another province and not pay one single cent of succession duty tax. It is not so easy if you are a farmer or run a small factory, because a farmer — as one farmer said to me not long ago, he said that he had worked all his life to try and pay for the farm and accumulate this farm, so that his son wouldn't have to do what he did by starting to pay for it again.

You can accumulate a farm today which is a reasonably good farm, not necessarily a large farm, if it is well stocked with livestock. But if that man has any savings in the bank he would easily pay substantial succession duties because he doesn't want to, say, accumulate a \$200,000 farm and no savings. So if he has some savings on which he anticipates on living the rest of his life on, say \$100,00 or something of this nature, if he is fortunate enough to accumulate it, he anticipates living off the money that he has accumulated, without having to sell the farm.

In essence what he hopes to do is to be able to transfer the farm to his family and live off what savings he has. But, again, it always comes back to a tax against a person who makes his living from property. You can go all over and you can look at all the professions and have a much higher standard of living for 25 or 30 years and never pay one cent in succession duty tax.

I just want to make it clear, Mr. Speaker, that this is a tax against those who happen to make their living from property,

and may most of their life, have substantially lower level of living for all of his life and yet he will be the one paying succession duty tax upon his death.

Of course, there are other very substantial inconsistencies in this type of a tax. First of all if you happen to be lucky you probably won't have to pay any because you are allowed to give away \$4,000 a year. Well, if you are fortunate enough to live to be 80 and you start giving away at the age of 60, you will give away an awful lot by the time you are 80. But if you happen to all of a sudden drop dead at the age of 50, your family may well become responsible for succession duties. So it is a matter to a large extent of luck.

So first of all the Government — if you take a look at who the Government is catching in succession duty taxes in the Province of Saskatchewan — they are not catching the rich. Most of the rich are in the professions in Saskatchewan and they move out and live in Alberta or somewhere to retire and pay no taxes. They catch people who are making their living on property, they are catching those people who are unlucky. They are catching those people who are unsuspecting and don't go and spend some money to hire a good lawyer to find out how to get out of it.

Mr. Speaker, these are precisely three good reasons why I am opposing this tax. I think it is hurting the formation of capital in Saskatchewan that I think would show a great benefit. It is too bad that we haven't got more people in Saskatchewan with \$300,000 because I think in a lot of cases they would go and build a small business or build a small factory and employ people. So if we are trying to destroy those people I think that is most unfortunate.

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 (Minister of Education) that Bill No. 98 **An Act respecting the Saskatchewan Universities Commission** be now read a second time.

MR. J.C. McISAAC (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, Bill 98 is an Act respecting the Saskatchewan Universities Commission and along with that Bill are two other Bills No. 99 and 100 that are somewhat related and some of my remarks might run over on the following Bills.

This Bill before us is the result of the Government's efforts to resolve a problem, a problem that perhaps it is not fair to say they created, but it is certainly one that was aggravated and compounded by the NDP Government opposite, and that is the question of some recognition or some further recognition of the Regina Campus of the University of Saskatchewan.

While as I say they may have not created that problem but there is a lot that they could have done to avoid the problem had they taken action two and a half or three years ago. That problem and a need for a Regina Campus, totally independent and free and on its own, began, I think, it is probably fair to say, as a result of a lot of talk by a few local politicians from Regina, the Mayor for one and a few professors who were

attracted to that campus in the beginning when good experienced college professors were in short supply and very difficult to attract anyone and when Maoist and Marxist type professors were in growing and increasing supply and they flocked not only to Regina Campus but to Simon Fraser and other new universities that were springing up in the early '60s in Canada and elsewhere.

And the cry to set up an independent campus and an independent university away from any involvement from Saskatoon really initially came from some of those extremists professors who came here first. The cry to set up an independent university was nothing more than a coverup insofar as they were concerned. They were looking for a total free university to espouse their Maoist, Marxist ideas.

However, the facts are that today first of all most of those people who launched that concept of a free and independent university insofar as being a university professor is concerned are no longer resident in the province. In the meantime the cry was taken up by many other people, as well as politicians, and the seeds were fairly well sown and developed through the years. And it is no doubt true today that there are many people who are deeply concerned and very sincerely convinced, Mr. Speaker, that a separate university for Regina is the only answer in light of today's situation.

As I say I think the NDP Government could have prevented this development three years ago and they could have squelched the idea instead of encouraging the concept as they did. They could have supported the board of governors in its plans to develop this campus and perhaps in some way, I think perhaps we made a mistake, and I think perhaps the former CCF administration when they set up the campus, made a mistake by not giving it some distinctive name or some distinctive term rather than just, everyone has to admit, is a kind of a common term, Regina Campus. I think had we given that University, in our term of office or, indeed, had the former CCF Government given it a definite name of its own, something that you could build around, it would have helped in the development and in a sense of feeling or sense of belonging to the city of Regina, which really didn't develop as quickly as it should have with the development of the Regina Campus.

Somewhere along the line the Regina Campus, Mr. Speaker, never really enjoyed the support of the people at large from the city or from southern Saskatchewan that one would have expected that it might. I suppose that isn't too surprising, really, when one thinks that for years this province was considered to have one university and that one university had been located since the beginning of its inception in the city of Saskatoon. People throughout the province, whether they were from Last Mountain, Wilkie or Milestone or wherever, were acquainted with faculty members located in the city of Saskatoon. They were familiar with programs and with projects be it at the medical research Cobalt Treatment Centre or some of the efforts of the Agricultural Engineering Faculty and so on.

As I say it certainly isn't surprising that that feeling of loyalty to the Saskatoon Campus was and is fairly firmly rooted right across this province. So to try and develop a new sense of loyalty to a new institution in Regina is something that is going to take some time.

I say that it will be a long time before there is the same feeling in the city of Regina and in the Province of Saskatchewan for any campus in Regina whether it is independent or whatever you call it, it will be a long time before there is the same feeling existing that does today for the Saskatoon Campus at the University of Saskatchewan.

I suppose, Mr. Speaker, one of the questions the Government has to answer and the people will be asking themselves; can we, indeed, afford a second university in this province?

I suppose the answer today might be, yes, we can afford it this year. I am not so sure if we can and I am not so sure that if in years to come we will be able to afford that university.

There is no doubt that there will be additional costs and duplication of staff and services, despite the best efforts — and I am sure of the best intentions of the Minister and the Government, in this regard. It happens with respect to any high school, any other kind of institution in education. You do have a duplication to some extent and you do have additional costs that seem unavoidable. I am sure there will be additional costs.

The next question is; will a second university, if it is going to cost — and I think we will all have to agree that it will cost some more — will it result in better education or better educational opportunities for students and other citizens of our province? Mr. Speaker, I don't think that it will.

Will this commission and the second campus and all of this proposed legislation, help encourage the acceptability of Regina Campus by the citizens of Regina and other citizens of Saskatchewan? I hope it will but I doubt very much if it will be a big factor, because, as I am sure the Minister well knows there are other basic requirements to the acceptability and the development of Regina Campus other than legislation of this kind. A top quality administrative staff; good programs; excellent teachers; good research and graduate studies programs are much more essential to that feeling in the development of a university along with — and I forgot to mention — a good active alumni. Such points, I think, are much more essential to the development and acceptability of the Regina Campus than any legislation we can bring in here.

Mind you, there is no doubt that we are getting and we are developing all these things in Regina Campus now. I have no criticism to make of programs, administrative staff, teaching staff in general. I think they are doing a good job and I think their own record will do more for this university and for university education, again, than any legislation that we can bring in here into this Legislature.

Certainly with the dying out of the so-called radical activity that has characterized universities across Canada and across the United States and elsewhere in the western world, and I refer to radical activity both among students and professors, I think that fact alone will help a lot to enhance and encourage the development of the kind of campus at Regina that we would all like to see, more so than any move of government.

Mr. Speaker, last year the NDP Government introduced, I think it was called Bill 90 at that time, that would have

resulted in the Government taking over complete control and direction of the university system in this province, had it been implemented. Now, that is one route to go, to have everything come and stop at the Minister's door or at the Government. And there is a lot to be said for that route, there is a lot to be said for that particular route insofar as handling and making decisions with respect to university affairs generally in this province or, indeed, in any other province.

At that time I found that move particularly strange, Mr. Speaker, coming from the NDP, because I recall very well they objected so strenuously to moves made by the former Liberal Government in seeking tighter financial control on the university in the latter 1960s. And the policies of the NDP in the latter 1960s was definitely a hands off policy, you keep writing the cheques and let them proceed and let them do what they will and do what they wish. So that last year's Bill 90 was a complete turnaround of that philosophy. However, Mr. Speaker, they backed off that Bill, they backed off of that direct blunt government approach to university affairs. And the Bill before us, Bill 98 sets up a commission that is still controlled by the Government, they appoint all of the members, or almost all of them. In no way does it get the Government out of dealing with university affairs. It very much keeps them in there and perhaps that is okay, I am not saying that. I am just saying there are two ways you can go. Direct involvement of Government, of the Minister, or whoever may occupy his chair, or basically none whatsoever and you can do that by setting up a truly independent commission which this legislation doesn't do.

There are different ways you can go about setting up a truly independent commission and my seatmate, the Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) put forward one. Have the alumni of each university in the province appoint three members, the Government appoint three and there you have a board that can be and will be independent and it will be seen to be independent and it will not be suspect of government interference or government involvement.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I am sure the Minister is well aware that similar kinds of commissions to the one he is bringing in here, basically, have failed in most other provinces. There may be differences, his may be somewhat different than Alberta or Ontario, but these commissions have failed because they either didn't have the power or the authority or the guts to make the necessary decisions and accept the responsibility for them. And I suggest his commission won't be any different from those that have failed in the past. They may have failed too, I'll say, because of political pressures on government, be it his Government, his Party or ours, which in turn met political involvement in university planning, in university affairs generally. I think the classic example has to be one not far from here in Regina, and that has to be the University of Lethbridge, that was established and there is no doubt about the political involvement in the establishment of that. Whether or not it is good or right, I am not prepared to say.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, this Government had a chance in this Bill to show a new way of handling university affairs. And that is to set up a totally independent commission with some real powers to proceed and give it a try. I don't know, Mr. Minister, if it would work. I am not sure if we can keep political

involvement out of university affairs and university decision making in this country or this province today. I am not sure if we can.

Your Bill 90 of last year would have given you complete involvement and, of course, complete accountability through the electoral system. This Bill here leaves with you involvement, it leaves too many places to shift and dodge responsibility and accountability. The other route would have been to set up a completely independent commission, with, as I say, some real powers, powers to act, power to make some decisions and let's see if it, indeed, can be done, if it can, indeed, be done.

That commission would be able to act in the best interests of the people of the province. I am not saying that any government can't or won't because we all certainly make every effort to do so. A commission, Mr. Speaker, that would be above criticism, and this one is not going to be above criticism because it is a government appointed agency almost completely. This commission is starting off without a clean beginning in that sense, and I don't say that is the intent of the Minister at all. I am not criticizing the Minister for having devious thoughts in this regard, I know the difficulty he has been through. I know the difficulty the Government has had in trying to resolve some of the problems in this regard and I recognize the Hall Commission Report and the work that they have done. I know this is a changing scene, a fluid kind of scene, what might be apropos for universities today would not have worked two, three, four years ago, might not work two years from now and so on. But I think at this point in time there was a real chance for the Government to set up a definitely independent universities commission and let it deal with the question.

At the moment, Mr. Speaker, at the moment we have four groups still very much involved with university affairs. We have the administration of each university here in Saskatchewan, the Saskatoon Campus and Regina Campus, we have the Senate of each university, we have the Board of Governors of each university, we have the Department of Continuing Education, which is a fairly new addition to the scene in the last year or two, I think perhaps a good idea. But we have those four agencies and those four groups and now we have a fifth, we have a commission. And I say, Mr. Speaker, that this will not rectify the problems and the difficulties with respect to decisions involving university affairs and university education and I suggest to the Minister that his commission, I would like to think it will work, I would hope it will work. I would hope for the sake of the students and the people seeking university education in this province, it will work, but I don't think it will. I would hope, also, that it will work, Mr. Speaker, for the sake of those people who are providing the educational service in the province, and I am not speaking about the taxpayer here, I am speaking about the professors and the administration and the people involved in both university campuses in giving the courses, setting out the programs and so on. I hope it will work for their sake, I hope it will work for the sake of the students, but I doubt very much if it will.

I want to tell the House, Mr. Speaker, and the NDP Government opposite that this Bill is viewed in the eyes of many people and I am one of them and there are many others not in this House, and there are many others that support both the Government and the Opposition in this regard.

I want to say that this legislation is considered and cannot be considered in any other way, as a slap at the senior administrative staff of the University. It may not have been intended that way, but it is certainly obvious that it is. It is a slap at Dr. Spinks and Dr. Barber and others. It is a slap at the kind of men, Mr. Speaker, who ran, what I think, is certainly the best administered university that you will find in Canada today. Because nowhere in Canada will you find per student costs lower in the various courses — you may find the odd one that is lower in the Maritimes, yes — but there are very few that are lower and certainly I suggest there are none that are better in any sense of the word than the academic aspects of these programs.

So they are running and have been running good programs, they have been running them well, they have been running them efficiently and along comes a series or a set of bills and legislation that tells them, we don't like the kind of thing you have been doing, we don't like the job you have been doing and the results you have been producing, we don't need you, we don't want you any more. I oppose the Bill for that reason, Mr. Speaker, as well as for reasons that I believe we are getting too many groups and bodies and agencies involved and we are still not coming down to settling the question of who, indeed, is going to run and who is going to determine matters of university affairs. I know it is a complicated question, Mr. Speaker, I know it is one that is changing as time goes on, but I just say that this Government appointed commission is not going to resolve the problem. The Minister had a chance to bring in a commission that was truly independent, that might have had a chance to establish itself as an independent agency, accept responsibility and accountability and go from there. It was well worth a try and I regret that he didn't do it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. D.G. STEUART (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, this Bill establishing a universities commission and the other two Bills are classic examples of a government failing to face their responsibility and through legislation setting up something that they know in advance won't work. It is also a classic example of government action that is going to result in a great deal more cost for post-secondary education in this province, university education in this province, a great deal more cost and I think if the results that we can follow in other provinces in this nation, we will see a reduction in the quality of the university education in the Province of Saskatchewan.

There is no question there is a problem concerning the mounting cost of university education in this province and right across this nation. The cost of post-secondary education is one that all governments in this country, including the Federal Government, are going to have to face sooner or later and this Bill goes in the opposite direction.

To begin with, as the Member for Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac) pointed out, this type of a commission has been a failure in every other province. The Minister's staff is aware of this. The people involved in education in Alberta and in Manitoba are aware of this and yet in spite of the evidence that was plainly there for them to see and examine, they are proceeding with this

particular type of legislation, this particular type of a commission that is doomed before it begins. Let's take a look at the problem of university education, not just in this province, but let's look at it in connection with the three prairie provinces.

Before we became the government in 1964 there was a concern by the old CCF Government and I discussed this at times with the late Woodrow Lloyd, there was a concern in Alberta and a concern in Manitoba, that in the three prairie provinces, where we have about three and a half million people, we actually had enough university courses, we had a large enough university structure to service probably three or four times that many people. There was a recognition that there needed to be a rationalization of university services and facilities in at least the three prairie provinces, if not all of western Canada. So back in about 1965 or 1966 at one of the first meetings of the Prairie Economic Council, the organization set up by the late Premier Thatcher and Duff Roblin when he was Premier of Manitoba, and Mr. Manning when he was Premier of Alberta, one of the first problems that the three Premiers turned their attention to was the rationalization of the overlapping of university facilities in the three prairie provinces. And so they set up a committee and Dr. Spinks played a very prominent role on that committee. I think it was called the Interprovincial Committee on University Rationalization. I became involved in that in 1967 or 1968, around that time. They had made no progress. In fact, after two years of requesting the universities on the three prairie provinces to just give to the three Premiers a list of all the offerings, all the courses, and the number of students and the number of professors, assistant professors, readers, teachers and so on, connected with those courses, so we could begin to recognize if, in fact, there was a great deal of overlapping, after two years we still hadn't received that list. That doesn't sound like a very difficult thing for a university to list the courses offered, the number of students involved in each one and the number of professors, or teachers part-time and full-time. And the reason that we never got it from the universities is they didn't want to give it to us.

Now the University of Saskatchewan co-operated, it's very interesting the University of Saskatchewan co-operated. There was absolutely no co-operation from the Universities in Manitoba and there was no co-operation from the Universities in Alberta, in fact, there was open resistance. The open resistance came from the universities and came at the beginning from the commission itself. The reason it came was that they didn't want anyone looking into the empires that they had built up. They wanted to run and manage their own affairs and all they wanted the governments to do was hand them the money and keep their noses out of it. They said this, university autonomy was at stake.

Dr. Stewart who was at one time the President of the University of Alberta — and later who became the head of the university commission in Alberta and I dealt with him because I represented Saskatchewan — Dr. Stewart represented Alberta and the Deputy Minister of Education, or the former Deputy Minister of Education represented Manitoba. Dr. Stewart said this on many an occasion, that when he was President of the University of Alberta, he was convinced that if governments would just hand universities sufficient money, keep their hands off, that the people at the university were intelligent enough

and responsible enough that they would develop first rate universities with little or no overlapping and they would be able to prove the value of every dollar spent. He said after being head of the commission for a couple of years, he had changed his mind. He came to recognize that when you had competing universities and that their desire to have a complete offering, that each university should be not just autonomous and independent, there was nothing wrong with that, but that they wanted to make complete offerings, that someone had to set the guidelines, someone had to say no.

The commission in Alberta never said no. All the commission in Alberta ever did was gather up the demands of the universities in Alberta, put them down on paper and transmit them to the Government of Alberta. The Government of Alberta had set up the commission and the Government of Ontario had set up a commission for a variety of reasons. One reason was to try and bring some common sense into the proliferation of university offerings into the overlapping of university services, facilities within their own province. But they failed. All they did as has been pointed out by the Member for Milestone and the Member for Wilkie is, they set up, in fact, one more group to put pressure on the government and act as spokesmen for the narrow interests, very often, of each university.

So these forms of commissions have been failures. It is very interesting that the real problem that exists in regard to universities in the prairie provinces should have been tackled by this Government. We were making progress. It is rather interesting that in the last year of our Government and one of the first years of the NDP Government in Manitoba and as it turned out the last year of the Social Credit Government in Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba ended up working very closely together and Alberta ended up under the old Social Credit Government dragging their heels because they felt they didn't want to offend either the commission or the universities who were mounting a very strong campaign against rationalization of the university facilities in western Canada and any interference or even of making any accounting of the money spent in the three prairie provinces to the three Premiers. There was nothing political about this.

When the NDP Premier of Manitoba was first elected, Mr. Schreyer, he came to the first meeting and when we discussed university rationalization in the three prairie provinces, he was very suspicious. He felt and he stated that this could be an unwarranted interference from the political level to the university level. But before much time had passed, I would say within a year or a year and a half, Premier Schreyer was probably the strongest proponent of rationalization of the three prairie provinces and was very disturbed at the slow pace that even the studies to try to identify the problems were taking.

Now we elected a new Government in Saskatchewan. Well it was natural that they would want to take some time to look at this whole question. They had had all kinds of time now and I don't know how things are proceeding as far as rationalization goes on the three prairie provinces, but I think what is happening here in Saskatchewan is that we are going to see the same problem that we have all across Canada, but very apparent in the three prairie provinces, duplication, lack of co-operation, lack of rationalization, and we are going to encourage it right here in Saskatchewan. Now we were the only province of any size

in the country that didn't have that problem. It didn't exist. Well, the engineering college was one example of a situation that was allowed to develop that turned out not too well, but outside of that, sure I know there was some unhappiness between the two campuses but these could have been straightened out. But outside of that one example the co-operation between the two campuses in deciding what courses would be offered here and what courses would be offered in Saskatoon, was excellent. We were the only province of any size that was not faced with this costly duplication. And here by this Act, setting up this Commission and not giving them the power to decide whether there will be a College of Architecture at Regina or one in Saskatoon, if the people involved in our universities decide that we need such an offering here in the Province of Saskatchewan. And this can actually happen and will happen with the lack of control that is inherent in these three Bills.

Just take the case of the College of Architecture. Now this came up, it was very prominent in the three prairie provinces and it was decided that we needed one more school and the question was where that school would be located. Now, they wanted it here in Saskatchewan and they wanted it in Alberta. A decision was made, at least when I was working with the Interprovincial Commission on University Rationalization, the decision was made to put it in Alberta. But here is what can happen here: the University of Regina can start one, the University of Saskatchewan in Saskatoon can start one, the Commission can do nothing but it. The Government can do nothing about it and it costs very little to start these programs at the beginning but once the universities start down this road and they make certain commitments to educators, to professors, they make certain commitments to students, then these programs grow and by the time they are large enough to be even noticeable we can be in the same mess as we are in regard to the two schools of engineering, one here in Regina and one in Saskatoon. So you have diluted the power down to the point where you won't have control and the Commission won't have control. And instead of turning your attention to the sensible approach to the spending of post-secondary education dollars in this province and in western Canada, you are going in the opposite direction.

The question of whether we need two universities in this province or not I think at this stage we are almost past that question because it is obvious that we are going to have two universities. I don't think we need two universities. I think we needed to find some way to settle the constant disputes that were being carried on between Regina and Saskatoon and I think that could have been settled. I freely admit that we weren't able to settle it but we were working on it and I don't think the problem was one that was insurmountable. But to take this route and in other words to hand your responsibility away, certainly not only it is not going to answer the question but I predict that within two or three or five years, as time goes by, the infighting between Saskatoon and Regina universities will make in the future anything that has gone on in the past look like a pink tea party.

If you study, Mr. Minister, and I am sure it is available to you, the report we got about the duplication and the overlapping of university offerings in the three prairie provinces, you will find it was a disgrace. We found, for example, that there were more than a thousand courses being offered in the three prairie provinces where they had only two or three students.

We found the overlapping and the waste of money in the three prairie provinces was, as I say, disgraceful. Now it is not an easy problem to settle that between the three prairie provinces because somewhere along the line I think each province had to be prepared to give up some sovereignty to an overall board. They had to be prepared to transfer money back and forward. There had to be a great many steps taken and maybe you are still pursuing that particular goal. But if you are, then what you are doing here in Saskatchewan is an exact contradiction to that whole idea and that whole philosophy.

Another thing that has been mentioned and I just want to say it in passing because I worked with these two people. We have excellent people at the University of Saskatchewan, Dr. Spinks and Dr. Barber and many others, but there is no doubt that this whole proposal, this whole scheme, the Bill the Minister brought in a year or two ago and had to pull out because of public reaction and is now replacing it with these particular three Bills, they are aimed at getting rid of those people and I think it is shameful. Dr. Spinks has been an outstanding man in the field of university education right across the nation, there is no argument about that. Dr. Spinks and Dr. Barber and their staff played a very vital role, keeping duplication and overlapping down and using the money they were given in this province to develop an excellent university, a university that is held in the highest esteem throughout this province and throughout this nation. It is not good enough as the Minister stands up and says, we are doing nothing about Dr. Spinks and Dr. Barber, they will be welcome at this campus or that campus. He knows the truth, that part of the reason they want to get rid of these people is that they did have the intestinal fortitude to speak up when you brought that other Bill in, and they have had the intestinal fortitude to speak up against this particular Act. Because in the final analysis, down through the years, you are not doing a service to university education in this province, in fact this particular Bill will do a great disservice to the future of the University of Saskatchewan.

I oppose the Bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. G. MacMURCHY (Minister of Education): — Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the comments from the Leader of the Opposition. This morning to the Member for Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac) and in previous debates to the comments of the Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) with respect to Bill 98, An Act to Establish the Universities Commission.

I'll not go back into the history developing this legislation because I think I commented on that fairly thoroughly during introduction of the legislation and second reading. I do want to report before I forget with respect to what is happening in the four western provinces. Now that we have an NDP Government in British Columbia, British Columbia has become part of Canada, a part of the West. I report that the Western Economic Council, which is now a Western Economic Council instead of a Prairie Economic Council, has established a post-secondary co-ordinating committee of the four western provinces, made up of the Ministers and the Deputy Ministers of the four

provinces. In fact we meet on a fairly regular basis, about twice a year and you may have noted that I was away from the Legislature in Victoria a couple of weeks ago at such a meeting. Mrs. Dailly, the Minister in British Columbia, is the chairman at the present time. The items under discussion are many of the items to be discussed under IPCUR but under the new council have been transferred to the Minister's post-secondary co-ordinating committee. We met at that meeting with the presidents of the universities from the four western provinces and had an excellent meeting. We also discussed as one of the key items, the expansion of the Veterinary College in Saskatoon and that's about got underway in the very near future. So we are considering university matters at the Ministers' level.

Now with respect to this legislation, Mr. Speaker, we came to office and we found that there was a very strong feeling for autonomy from the campus here in Regina. But I think that is something that is bound to happen with a growing university as we see it. Campus growing, campus expanding, a real desire for autonomy. We found out as well that the system, the one university system, two campus system, was having difficulty in making decisions in terms of rationalization and co-ordination. This led us to an examination of that system and therefore we brought forward Bill 90. Now those who criticized Bill 90 and say that it was a takeover of the university by the Government, that criticism is simply unfounded. Yes, we did withdraw the legislation. Yes, we did establish a commission to look at university education in the province. Yes, Mr. Speaker, all the Members opposite agreed with the establishment of the commission and the members of the commission. They said we could not find in the province men that were better qualified to do the job than the former Chief Justice Hall, Mr. Stewart Nicks, a former board member, and Mr. Gordon South, a former Board of Governors member. And they, looking at the legislation as I said before, Bill 90 legislation, said there was no justification for the accusations that it was a takeover by this Government. They could not find it.

They went around the province and they received briefs and they held hearings. Now I conjecture that they had three choices basically. One, to maintain the one university two campus system but, as in Bill 90, giving more autonomy to each of the campuses. Two, they could split, give full autonomy and independence to each of the universities, or third, they could split and have a commission, either with a complete separation, each university reporting to the Government; or in the alternative establish a commission as a buffer. And they chose, this group that the Members opposite agreed with, they chose to go the complete autonomous route, the complete independence route, establish the University of Saskatchewan and establish the University of Regina and set up a Universities Commission.

I recall when the report came to the public in late December, the Opposition critic, the Member for Milestone, said that it was a pretty good report and he generally agreed with it. Yet, Mr. Speaker, in the House I see that the Member for Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac) and the Leader of the Opposition today opposed The Universities Commission Act. Now they say they oppose The Universities Commission Act for three reasons: One, that they do not have control. I suggest that this must mean that they think that the Commission should have veto power. Now I find that extremely interesting. We had in Bill 90, one university system which provided too much control . . .

MR. MacDONALD (Milestone): — Control by the wrong people.

MR. MacMURCHY: — Oh, he says, control by the wrong people. The Regents that were the controlling body under Bill 90 were a 12-man body, six appointed by the university and six appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. But that was too much control by the Government, a six-six proposition, yet the existing Board of Governors is made up of 21 members, 11 of which are appointed by Cabinet. Now that is very strange that there is a difference in control. I think, Mr. Speaker, it is rather a weak argument.

I say that there is sufficient control provided in this legislation for the Commission to operate and operate adequately. It to review, to rationalize, budget, to have committees available which can provide information for the decision making, seems to me a good and sensible route to go. Now they say they oppose the Commission because it is going to be costly. One thing to argue cost and another thing to argue duplication, Mr. Speaker.

Yes, we are going to be spending more money as a government on university education in Saskatchewan, across the board, than the Members did when they were sitting on this side of the House because our approach is vastly different than theirs in terms of education. A basic philosophy of not saying that it is a frill as they said, 'an expensive frill' but rather an investment and, Mr. Speaker, an excellent and a good investment. So we are going to spend more on university education, we are spending it now. But to say that it will mean duplication is just not necessarily true because the Commission will have the power to co-ordinate and rationalize and make decisions, Mr. Speaker, with respect to duplication.

The third criticism is the independence of that Commission, and suggested alternatives of naming the Commission members. The fact that the Government appoints the Commission is rather a serious problem with them although it wasn't a problem, Mr. Speaker, with the Commissioners, those people whom they so generously supported when they were appointed. No problem for them.

Now Manitoba which has a very successful Commission is a fully appointed Commission. It has worked well for many years and far from abandoning the Commission idea Manitoba's most recent report suggests the Commission approach for other forms of post-secondary education. There has been great concern over finding some alternative to the Government appointment of all the Commissioners. The idea of direct representation from the University Board or other university bodies has been rejected for obvious reasons. We, as a government, Mr. Speaker, endorse the Hall Commission idea of a body entirely detached from the University identification to avoid polarization so they can make decisions from an impartial approach.

Now we have had ideas that election or nomination of some of the members be recognized bodies like the SSTA and STF or the SARM or the Federation of Agriculture and so on, but, Mr. Speaker, how do we distinguish the bodies to be so favored. It is easy to start but where do you stop. The Member for Milestone suggested that the two university convocations should each elect three members. I mention, once more, the obvious disadvantages

of this idea again would tend to build in too much identification with one or the other university. We would simply have, once again, polarization.

But I put forward with respect to these arguments an observation that might be made of the whole exercise of trying to find some means of electing members to the Commission. In our democratic system of government we tend to elect Members of legislative bodies, bodies which establish broad policies affecting the lives of all people who elect the Members to it. But this Commission, Mr. Speaker, is by and large not a legislative body, its functions are mainly regulatory and duties responsible for investigation. You may obtain a staff to analyze provincial manpower needs, to look at the economic and social trends of public aspirations and the like. And on the basis of such investigations it will assist the universities with their planning and most important it will regulate the flow of resources to the universities based on findings that it has made, based on findings that the university has made. An important part of its function is to interpret university needs to the Government which is the source of most of the funds required by the universities but its success in doing this will depend in no small measure, on its demonstrated ability to regulate university development in a responsible manner. So it's a body to regulate, not a body to legislate and, therefore, the appointments, the appointments by the Government of the day, seems to me the one and only approach to follow in terms of our given situation in this province.

Mr. Speaker, this Government is convinced that two universities, the University of Saskatchewan, the University of Regina is necessary in the 1970s and in the 1980s. We are convinced that the Commission as is laid out in the Commission Act will work, it will do the job in developing and promoting and expanding post-secondary education through the university in this province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time on the following recorded division:

YEAS - 27

Blakeney	MacMurchy	Faris
Smishek	Byers	Owens
Romanow	Whelan	Mostoway
Messer	Kwasnica	Gross
Snyder	Carlson	Comer
Bowerman	Cody	Oliver
Thibault	Tchorzewski	Feschuk
Larson	Cowley	Kaeding
Brockelbank	Taylor	Flasch

NAYS - 11

Steuart	MacDonald (Milestone)	MacDonald (Moose Jaw No.)
Loken	Gardner	Wiebe
Coupland	McIsaac	Malone
Guy	Lane	

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

MR. K.R. MacLEOD (Regina Albert Park): — I have only a few words to add to what I said before.

Universities have traditionally been the home of some of our finest thinkers. It is the home of scholarly activity of the highest level in the broadest definition including research. Now universities are unique as educators. The contribution that they can make to the community is enormous, both economically and culturally. In the area of research we need a lot more money. Governments, I think, must be more generous. It is very short-sighted to be niggardly in this area, holding back on research holds back the benefits that we can expect from our universities. I think we must demonstrate our support of the University of Regina by giving that university a full measure and perhaps even an extra measure of money at this time for the research activities of the University. I think, in addition to that we must encourage our students from this area to attend the University for at least part of their continuing education.

I hope I have made it abundantly clear that this Bill has my support and I support the creation and the future of the University of Regina.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. D.F. MacDONALD (Moose Jaw North): — Mr. Speaker, I strongly oppose this Bill, openly and frankly. I join with my colleague, the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy). I have no intention of supporting this Bill. I see absolutely no need for a University of Regina. The Province of Saskatchewan with a declining population, student enrolment declining and lower, it is time, if anything, that we should be rationalizing services at our university, not creating new universities. It is exactly the same time as we are embarking on a program to shut down and consolidate small rural schools, increase busing for children and yet we go about creating another university. We seem to be going in the opposite direction for university students.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MacDONALD: — I can think of only two reasons for justification of creating a new university in Regina. The first reason, of course, is to satisfy the ego of some of the academics on the Regina Campus. I don't think that this applies to other people employed by the University Campus at Regina and I think of maintenance employees and so on. They are opposed to creating a separate University of Regina. I think a second justification is to satisfy the ego of Regina. Somehow the capital city must have its own university and I can't buy this as a justification. I don't think that this applies to most of the residents of Regina. I think, in fact, that most of the residents of the city of Regina do not think they need their own university. And I especially think of the graduates who have graduated from the Regina Campus, I don't think their ego needs boosting, they don't feel that a special University of Regina is necessary. I

have in mind two very close members of my family, my wife and my mother, who are both graduates of the Regina Campus and I don't think that either one of them see any justification for creating a University at Regina.

I think the taxpayers outside of Regina see it very differently than possibly the Mayor of Regina who has for a long time advocated a special university. I think taxpayers outside the city of Regina see an increased cost. We see duplication of services and most importantly we see a destruction of the very historic institution, the University of Saskatchewan, which has had the highest reputation and standards and quality and recognized all over North America as being a top rated university. The rest of Saskatchewan residents see some destruction and deterioration in the University of Saskatchewan in Saskatoon. The people of Saskatchewan have some wants and requirements for a university. There is no question about this. But these wants and needs are not met by creating two universities. The people of Saskatchewan want a university with a high quality, they want a strong university with some discipline. The public of Saskatchewan would support colleges being split off from the Campus at Saskatoon, certainly Regina is one of the places where a college should be and there are likely other centres in the province which could also have colleges. What the people want in this province is some co-ordination so that duplication and costs will be kept down. People expect that credits should be transferable from one campus to another. Even with two campuses the people of Saskatchewan find that this is not possible. It is an impossible situation when credits from Regina Campus are not recognized at Saskatoon. The separation into two universities will not meet these desires. The situation is bad now and it will only get worse, with the creation of two universities.

Mr. Speaker, I see this Bill, the formation of the University of Regina, as an attack on the University of Saskatchewan as we have known it in Saskatoon. It can do nothing but damage the reputation and the strength of the University of Saskatchewan at Saskatoon and it is entirely unjustified in my mind.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask 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 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 I was speaking to this previously, I asked several questions about the Drug Plan and I said that these questions were not fulfilled by the Drug Plan as proposed by the Minister. I asked; does this plan redistribute the cost more fairly across the population? And, clearly, it does not do the job of properly redistributing the cost. It does so partially I admit by the fact that the public purse will pick up about half the cost of purchasing drugs. This Bill does not do a good job at finding solutions to the two biggest problems, one, the unfair distribution of costs and two, often those least able to afford drugs have the highest costs in comparison to the rest

of the general public.

What the Bill clearly does is to reduce the over-the-counter costs of prescription drugs by one-half by drawing on the public purse. This objective will not help the average family because the average family will pay in taxes the amount equal to the savings he gets from the purchase of prescription drugs. This objective will help the chronically ill because it will reduce his bills in half but it will not reduce the inequities that exist. It will still exist that two per cent of the families will still be paying a very high percentage of drug expenditures that are made at drug stores. These families will still be the least able to afford the cost involved.

What the drug plan quite clearly is was outlined in the speech by the Minister. It is a drug plan where deterrent fees are charged each time a prescription is obtained. The Minister made several remarks to show that this is a plan for distributing drugs with a deterrent fee being charged each time. I would like to quote from the Minister:

We propose that there should be one standard charge to the consumer. No matter where the consumer lives, no matter what store he buys his prescription in and no matter how large or small the pharmacy.

This statement does not acknowledge ability to pay. This seems similar to the doctor visit deterrent fee. Now the NDP are experts at deterrent fees and they told me that . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MacDONALD: — . . . a standard charge of \$1.50 deterrent fee was not fair to the sick, the elderly and the poor and they are experts so I guess they should know. Now I ask, if the \$1.50 was not fair to a certain segment of the population then is a deterrent fee for drugs any more fair to these same people?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MacDONALD: — The Minister further said:

Our Government recognizes that drug therapy is an integral part of the treatment of many patients.

And he further went on:

We believe that good drug health is a right and not a privilege and that individuals should not be denied access to health care for financial reasons.

The Minister would appear to recognize the need and also to recognize the right. They recognize a right that should not be termed a privilege, as he puts it. It seems to me that these statements were the same statements used by the NDP when they argued against deterrent fees, exactly the same statements.

The NDP argued that a visit to the doctor was a right and not a privilege, therefore, deterrent fees were a terrible thing, taxing the poor, the sick and the elderly. Now the Minister says the same thing about drugs as they said about doctor visits. I point this out to demonstrate the hypocrisy of the Government

opposite.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MacDONALD: — The Minister went on to say in his speech and I quote:

In other instances we believe that there has been a delay in filling a prescription because individuals cannot pay the drug bill. And yet in other instances we believe that some individuals do not visit the physician for fear of receiving a prescription they cannot afford to pay for.

This may well be true that some people won't get a prescription because of the cost involved, they won't even go to a doctor because they are afraid he might suggest taking a drug. This is strangely similar to the arguments used against the deterrent fees for doctor visits and for hospital stays. We all remember the NDP said that some people wouldn't go to a doctor because of the \$1.50 deterrent fee and that some people wouldn't go to a hospital because of a \$2.50 deterrent fee. Why does the hypocritical Government opposite now feel that deterrent fees for drugs is any different?

The deterrent fee for drugs will likely be about \$2. The Minister indicated this when he said that the average prescription in Saskatchewan is about \$4.25 and that this is made up half by pharmacist's dispensing fees and half for drug material. He also indicated that the plan would be expected to cut the cost of drugs to people by at least half, therefore, it follows that the deterrent fee will be about \$2. If the \$1.50 deterrent fee for a doctor visit was so bad and \$2.50 deterrent fee was so bad for a hospital bed that cost about \$50 a day, I might add, then what does that say for a \$2 deterrent fee for a prescription that costs an average of \$4.25? Either the arguments against deterrent fees were sheer hypocrisy or else the provisions of this new plan are hypocrisy with its built-in deterrent fees. Make up your mind, deterrent fees are either needed or they are not needed. I suspect your argument will be that a deterrent fee is needed in a drug plan to avoid abuses. These abuses have been reported from England and I suspect your argument will be that they are needed to avoid these abuses. However, I remind you that people can't get prescriptions unless the doctor gives the authority to have them filled. The doctor will control the abuse, your deterrent fees are not needed for this reason. I will remind the NDP that this is the same argument that they used against the hospital deterrent fee. It is the same situation, you have to make up your mind one way or another.

Some Members have told me that they don't think it is a deterrent fee but they explain it this way. Simply the Government has decided to buy the drugs and supply them free, the customer will then pay for the services of the pharmacist, and therefore it is not a deterrent fee. This is not true. And I would like to quote, again, from the Minister. He said:

If the negotiated dispensing fee exceeds the standardized charge to consumers, the prescription drug agency will make up the difference. We therefore see that the public is not necessarily obliged to pay for the services of the pharmacist.

In other words no matter what the dispensing fee of the pharmacist the deterrent fee will be set by the Government. In fact, the Minister indicated that he is willing to pay pharmacists on other than a fee for service basis and that he will consider different methods of paying the professional component of drug services. It is obvious that there is a very clear-cut deterrent fee, the amount of which will be set and controlled by the Government.

With this reasoning from the Government opposite, I would suspect that they will increase the deterrent fee if their costs go up or if they feel abuse is being made of the plan.

The plan outlined by the Minister is indeed a strange one. It doesn't provide a solution to the unfair distribution of drugs, of costs; it doesn't eliminate the burden on the chronically ill, the elderly, the poor, etc; it doesn't satisfy the requirements set forth by the Minister that a person has the right to good health care no matter what the person's financial capabilities are. It is a strange kind of plan that might be considered by those of us less charitable as some kind of an election gimmick. It is a plan that would give everyone the appearance of getting cheaper drugs. The thinking public of course will realize that he will pay for them in one way or another. It is a plan that does not meet the real needs of our society. As I have said before there is no argument that this Bill will give drugs at half price. There is no argument that if handled properly, bulk purchasing will affect some savings to the public. There is no argument that one-half price to a needy family with expenses of \$400 will be of considerable help. So even if the drug plan does not meet the requirements that it should it is still a plan that is of some help to those in need and some good provisions.

We must also remember that the plan as outlined by the Minister is not incorporated in this Bill. The Bill is very wide in scope and would allow many types of drug programs. There is nothing in the Bill that would provoke a philosophical argument. However, I would suggest that as Members opposite vote on this Bill, they keep in mind the plan as proposed by the Blakeney Government. A plan that does not meet all the requirements but a plan that does incorporate a deterrent fee.

I would ask Members opposite to consider some of the many speeches they have made against the vicious deterrent fees in the past. I ask Members opposite to consider these speeches and to vote in good conscience. If Members opposite feel that deterrent fees are needed to control abuse in the drug plan, then Members opposite may approve of the NDP drug plan and swallow their pride.

It will be interesting to watch from this side of the House to see how much conviction of belief of some of the Members opposite.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. P.P. MOSTOWAY (Hanley): — Mr. Speaker, I thoroughly enjoyed that little bit. It really amused me no end. I think maybe I can go home and I can say I have finally run into the human chameleon.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MOSTOWAY: — But you know it is true, Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member is right when he says, "We are experts in deterrent fees," absolutely correct. We are experts in smashing them to smithereens and they are experts in putting them on people. I tell you one thing, that if he goes out into the country with that little spiel about deterrent fees, he will absolutely be the laughing stock of the country.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MOSTOWAY: — Mr. Speaker, I should have changed that to hyenas. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to have the opportunity to speak in favor of this Bill which will assist citizens of Saskatchewan in purchasing prescription drugs.

I am pleased because it once again puts into practice the principle I wholeheartedly endorse, the equalization principle insofar as the cost of good health is concerned to the people of this province. It is a principle that obviously our friends opposite don't buy, don't go for.

Mr. Speaker, I have seen too many people in my lifetime who have been crushed by burdensome medical costs. I have seen too many citizens having to deprive themselves of good food and shelter because of oppressive drug costs.

The Assembly recessed from 12:30 o'clock until 2:00 o'clock p.m.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. A. THIBAUT (Melfort-Kinistino): — Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to introduce a fine group of students from Minaki School in St. Benedict. They are nine in number, they are led here by their teacher and principal, Mr. and Mrs. Jim McLoughlin and Mr. Roman Kwasnica, secretary of the Basin Lake Branch of the Saskatchewan Wildlife. These students are the winners of an essay contest that was carried on by the Basin Lake Wildlife Branch. They have taken fire arm safety, wildlife and forestry. They range from Grades Six to Eleven. I am sure that the House will join with me in welcoming them for their achievements. I am also told that they carry on defensive driving in their community which I am very proud of as their Member — I am actually not their Member, they belong to Watrous, but St. Benedict is right close to my home. It gives me great pleasure to welcome them here. And I am sure you join with me to wish them a safe journey home.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

The Assembly resumed the interrupted debate on Bill No. 102.

MR. MOSTOWAY: — Mr. Speaker, prior to noon I had mentioned that I liked the principle involved in this Bill whereby it involves the equalization principle in so far as the health of people of Saskatchewan is concerned.

I also had a few remarks directed to the Hon. Member who is just entering the Chamber right now expressing extreme

surprise at the stand that he has taken. I also mentioned that I have known many people who were oppressed by burdensome medical costs. I have seen too many citizens having to deprive themselves of good food and shelter because of oppressive drug costs. I have seen numerous people who have gone without prescribed drugs end up in hospitals where in the long run it cost the public much more than the cost of the prescription needed in the first place.

Mr. Speaker, if we consider that the health of other people is of direct concern to everybody in this province then we must admit that remedial prescription drugs and their availability to people is also a concern to everybody. And if this concern is granted then it logically follows that the cost of drugs to others must be a concern to everybody in this province too. And if this is the case, then every one must admit some degree of responsibility to the less fortunate in the acquiring of these drugs.

Mr. Speaker, I like knowing full well that most drugs will be available to all people in this province, the poor, the young, the old, the housewife, the worker and all others, and the sick and the Liberals, too.

MR. STEUART: — Mrs Henry . . .

MR. MOSTOWAY: — Mrs. Henry who? Mrs. Henry. You know her do you?

MR. STEUART: — Married Joe what's his name.

MR. MOSTOWAY: — Oh, I see, he has a couple of stories to tell. At any rate, Mr. Speaker, I am under the impression that bulk purchasing of many prescription drugs on the formulary list will save the people of this province millions of dollars.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MOSTOWAY: — I am also under the impression that generic drugs will be purchased; now this will save the public millions of dollars, too.

MR. STEUART: — What is that generic . . .

MR. MOSTOWAY: — For headaches, did you ask if it was for headaches? Mr. Opposition Member, I don't know; do you suffer from headaches?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: : — Hear, hear!

MR. MOSTOWAY: — Anyway, for this I am sure the people of Saskatchewan will be thankful.

Mr. Speaker, this time I should like to say a few words on the cost of prescription drugs. Generally speaking, I think there can be no doubt that the drug manufacturers of this continent are engaged in excessive profiteering. I say this from reading much material on the subject as brought to light by the late American senator, Estes Kefauver's Subcommittee which

studied the whole American prescription drug scene, and it is a scene which was and still is almost identical to the scene in Canada. At any rate, Mr. Speaker, Kefauver's subcommittee found that prescription drug price gouging existed at the manufacturing and wholesale levels. It found that in many cases monopolistic drug companies were making 10 to 15 times the amount of profit that they should have been making.

Consider one case the subcommittee studied where bulk prednisilone — don't ask me to repeat that — was bought by the Schering Corporation and made into tablets that cost one and a half cents per pill. The same tablets were sold to consumers at 30 cents per pill, an outrageous markup in the eyes of the subcommittee. And consider the president of the Schering Corporation's remarks, a corporation which makes millions of dollars in profits yearly, when he expressed the opinion that inability of people to pay for prescription drugs was not so much a matter of excessive prices as a matter of inadequate income.

Mr. Speaker, if a certain drug cost a billion dollars a tablet, I suppose one could truthfully say that Rockefeller suffers from inadequate income when he needs that particular drug.

Mr. Speaker, I don't presume to suggest that the Government of Saskatchewan can bring down the high cost of drugs; however, I do suggest that it can lower the cost to its people. This can well be the case in the purchasing of generic drugs.

Mr. Speaker, there seems to be some sort of unspoken hesitance on the part of people to use generic drugs. I suppose one could say this is sort of a filtering down to the public from manufacturers and processing companies who find that brand name drugs bring them more profits. Nine times out of ten brand name drugs and generic drugs come from exactly the same bulk stock. Nine times out of ten they are exactly the same except in name and price, with the brand name drug being much higher in price than the generic drug with the brand name drug being distributed by large corporations and in turn bringing excessive profits to these corporations.

Mr. Speaker, the Kefauver Subcommittee, and, incidentally the book is available right in this library, also found — if you fellows don't know where the library is we can certainly show you after — the Kefauver Subcommittee also found that the whole business of patent rights on many drugs stinks to high heaven. It found that many corporations hold patent rights to certain life-giving drugs.

AN HON. MEMBER: : — Hear, hear!

MR. MOSTOWAY: — It sounds as if one of the Members opposite needs a shot of some sort of a drug. It found that some of these corporations deliberately keep the supply of these drugs low so as to create an artificially high cost to consumers. It found that these corporations because of their patent rights often refuse to allow the importation of these drugs at lower prices so that the artificially high cost to consumers can be maintained.

Mr. Speaker, from facts such as these it is plain to see

that insofar as the drug industry at the higher level is concerned, there is no real competition. No competition which might well lead to lower and reasonable drug costs to the citizens of North America and particularly to the citizens of Canada.

Then, too, Mr. Speaker, it was found that advertising in the drug industry is really a farce. I say farce because the large concerns spend heavily in advertising the brand name drugs so as to create an artificial demand for them. Needless to say this demand keeps up the price on these drugs so as to maintain or overtake a particular concern's profits picture as compared to a previous year.

Mr. Speaker, I think we are all aware of some of the effects of high pressure advertising in the drug industry. Doctors are often visited by salesmen. Sometimes they are pressured into trying new drugs. Sometimes these new drugs produce disastrous results such as occurred a number of years ago when the drug thalidomide was tested on pregnant women before the true effects of the drug were known.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I should like to read a little article which I found in one of the local papers. It is entitled, "Hard Sell of Antibiotics May Contribute to Misuse."

A report published in the Press here (Toronto) quoted statements by an executive of Smith, Klein and French Laboratories in hearings before the US Senate Health Committee that the hardsell of antibiotics may have something to do with the misuse and overuse of these potent drugs.

The Senate Committee has produced scientific evidence that antibiotics have no effect whatever on virus infections such as colds and influenza.

The Committee is probing the possibility that thousands of people may have died because of improper use of antibiotics which in time create drug resistant bacteria.

Drug companies are still promoting the drugs for virus infections because the profit picture is good in that area.

Mr. Speaker, I have touched on certain points. I feel enough investigation of drug monopolies has been done in Canada and in the United States. I feel the time for action against these drug concerns has arrived. I feel that the provincial Ministers of Health of all Canadian provinces, plus the Federal Minister of Health, should sometime in the very near future, when they meet together, give serious consideration to really doing something about the excessively high cost of drugs in Canada.

I am thinking in terms of possible changes in drug patent rights. I am thinking in terms of presenting to citizens the true picture in regard to generic drugs. I say that because I know there is a promotion going on by the big concerns to downplay the use of generic drugs which have been proven to be exactly the same as brand name drugs and every bit as good.

I should also like to see more information given on drug advertising costs and the likes of that to the general public. Central to this, I should like to see any necessary action taken,

preferably by the Federal Government, because it has more jurisdiction, but in co-operation with Provincial Governments to force down drug costs to consumers.

Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned before, this formulary drug program will lower the cost of drugs to Saskatchewan people and it is for that reason that I wholeheartedly support this Bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. C.P. MacDONALD (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a few comments on the Bill and despite what the Member for Hanley says I should just like to tell the Members of the Opposition in voting for this Bill you are voting for one thing. You are voting to establish deterrent fees for a drug program in the Province of Saskatchewan. There is no question about it, Mr. Speaker. You talk about the leopard changing his spots, you know when the Liberals put on a deterrent fee or a utilization fee, it was called a deterrent by the NDP. But when the NDP put it on it's equalization of price.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I should like to read a couple of very important quotes for some very renowned people. Let me read this.

This is the reason why I was prompted to get into this debate, a terrific reversal by the Members opposite, a terrific political switch, an absolute reversal of direction one of the all time great reversals of mankind in Saskatchewan as witnessed in modern history. I don't think there has been a reversal as great since Christine Jorgeson took a reversal of a position in rank.

I wonder who said that! I wonder who said that? Mr. Romanow?

AN HON. MEMBER: — No!

MR. MacDONALD: — Our Attorney General. But the most interesting one is the man who is introducing the deterrent fees in the drug program. I should like to give you a quote from the Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek). Now here is the man who is introducing the deterrent fee, talking of putting on a \$2 charge to the lame, the old, the sick and the blind, the poor. Let's listen to what the Minister of Health said:

You know we made a commitment to the people. We intend to keep the commitment to the people and despite what the former Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) said that The Medical Care Act which was legislated back in 1961 made provision for deterrent fees, the fact remains that the New Democratic Government, or at that time the CCF Government, never applied, never used the provisions of the Act. It was included in the Act based on the advice of the Thompson Committee but based on the convictions of the CCF Government, the deterrent fees were wrong, they were not implemented.

Mr. Speaker, this is the man who is now introducing the deterrent fee to the Province of Saskatchewan. And the interesting part about this deterrent fee its not like the deterrent fee on hospitals, the deterrent fee on hospitals was \$2.50 to

\$50 a day costs, about five per cent. The deterrent fee for the old, the sick and the lame and the halt in the drug program is 50 per cent, half of \$4.25, almost 50 per cent of the total cost of the drug. The deterrent fee is astronomical. Mr. Speaker, who is going to pay for it? You know, it's a cinch that it is not going to bother me. Thank goodness that my family has had good health, even though I have seven children, it costs me — I maybe have one or two drug prescriptions a year. I won't mind paying the \$4 or \$6, but do you know who is going to really be concerned because 90 per cent of the drugs bought in the Province of Saskatchewan is bought by 10 per cent of the population. They are the diabetic, the chronically ill, who have to go week after week or month after month to get a drug prescription filled. The old people! Go to some place where there are a lot of senior citizens, go and talk to the druggists. Who are in there purchasing the majority of the drug prescriptions, it is the old people. The people now who have reached an age where health is deteriorating, who are going to doctors regularly. You know, Mr. Speaker, it is a real tragedy to see the NDP in Saskatchewan lose their principles completely in the field of medicine, lose their principles completely. The Minister of Health, the great champion of anti-deterrent fees in the medicare and hospitalization.

Now, I want to tell the Minister that I am going to support this Bill. I supported the utilization fee, but it is really going to be interesting to see what the Member for Regina North West (Mr. Whelan) says because I heard him speak against deterrent fees. It is going to be interesting to hear what the Minister of Labour (Mr. Snyder) says because I heard him give an hour and one-half speech against deterrent fees. It is going to be interesting to hear what the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer), who talked about the old and the blind and the sick and the halt, has to say. It is going to be interesting just what he votes in this particular Bill.

Mr. Speaker, there is one other aspect of the Bill that does bother, aside from the terrible, insidious, obnoxious, horrible deterrent fees that the Minister of Health is putting on the sick, and the old, and the lame and the blind, and that is the power in the Bill that is not being implemented at this time. That power of the Bill is this. It gives to the Minister of Health and the NDP Government the opportunity of getting into the retail business for the selling and retailing of drugs in the Province of Saskatchewan. I want to warn the pharmacists, there have been other people, the hearing aid people, as an example, who thought that government intervention in their business only meant a slight effect. Now they are being satisfied, oh, we will get the dispensing fee, our livelihood won't be challenged. But I suggest to them like so many other Bills that have been passed in this Legislature in the last 2 1/2 years that this is just a foot in the door and that two and a half or three years from now, after the next election if that Government is successful in being returned, which they won't, but if they are in the little town in rural Saskatchewan where there is a drug store, it will be a Government NDP drug store inaugurated across the street because that is the power obtained in that Bill and the Minister of Health knows it. Why, Mr. Speaker, did he put that power in that Bill if he had no intention of using it?

The Minister of Labour (Mr. Snyder) starts to laugh. I wonder if the people in Northern Saskatchewan, when the

Government tore up the contracts in the forest industry are laughing. I wonder if the farmers and the hog producers are laughing when the Minister of Agriculture didn't give them a voice in the management of their affairs. Don't ever kid yourself the one direction of the NDP has been power and control and ownership and here in this Bill it gives them the power to retail drugs in the Province of Saskatchewan. Oh, yes, for the next year and one half until the election campaign is over they are not implementing the power in that Bill. But it is a threat and if he didn't want to utilize that threat, why in heavens name was that power enacted in that Bill? And I think the pharmacists in this province should be beware and despite all the platitudes of the Member for Hanley and the platitudes of the Minister of Health, this Bill is dangerous and if the Minister of Health wants to guarantee the pharmacists that there will be no intrusion into their business then withdraw that particular section of the Bill, withdraw that power which enables the NDP to go into the pharmaceutical business in the Province of Saskatchewan and run the private businessman out of the province.

Mr. Speaker, I have a great deal more to say in this debate and I should like to adjourn the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: : — Hear, hear!

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. MacMurchy that Bill No. 120 — **An Act to establish The Saskatchewan Educational Communications Corporation** be now read a second time.

MR. J.G. LANE (Lumsden): — Mr. Speaker, the Bill is just another exemplification of the funny interests that the Government has in television and the control of the communications media in the province of Saskatchewan . The name itself of the proposed corporation SaskMedia is misleading to say the least. Supposedly this is done for educational purposes and to acquaint the limited field of education with the general term media is wrong and is certainly misleading and because the Government has seen fit to do that there must be certain questions asked.

We made it clear to the Legislature a year ago when the Government brought in the requirement that the school units were going to have to put in television sets whether they wanted to or not, it is done by a government decision, that there had to be an adjunct to that program. Of course, the Government very sneakily said, no, no, we are just going to do this at this time and there won't be anything further. This is certainly the adjunct to television in the school program that was brought in last year. As I say the Government's interest in the communications media in Saskatchewan is very, very interesting. We are looking at in Saskatchewan Government control of cable television in Saskatchewan. We are looking at a private media operation here in the Legislature to feed information propaganda to the NDP areas, that their backbenchers aren't doing the job so they need some help to get some press.

As I say it is very surprising that the Government opposite wants to take this with the control of cable television now that we have this SaskMedia Corporation, their own

propaganda mill that has been set up for the Legislature and the possibility of press councils. We are just about ready to have, with the control of production and what not, the Premier being called the John Bassett of television in Saskatchewan. Because he will have more say and he will have more control than any other individual in the province of Saskatchewan if the Government continues with its program to set up production and control of television in the Province of Saskatchewan. This is their second step in the matter of television by Government control. And the people of Saskatchewan are rightly starting to ask themselves, how far does the Government opposite intend to go? I say they are going to go as far as they legally can to put their information through, their propaganda through to the people of Saskatchewan. The concern of the people of Saskatchewan are just and legitimate concern. We have no choice but to say, at this point, that it is time for the Government to stop attempting to control all aspects of communication in the Province of Saskatchewan.

This Bill is unnecessary, and is merely one, as I say, adjunct to the Government program to control media, to control news and control information and control education in the Province of Saskatchewan. For that reason we oppose the legislation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. D.L. FARIS (Arm River): — Mr. Speaker, I want to say that having heard some of the remarks of the Members opposite concerning this Bill, they, of course, would want the public to fail to realize that similar sorts of corporations already exist in other provinces, in the neighboring province of Alberta and certainly there are activities all along these lines in Ontario and Quebec.

MR. LANE: — Are they proposing cable television?

MR. FARIS: — Neither is this Bill. The point is that the proposals of the former government when they were looking at this area would have involved some sort of similar kind of structure but their plans would have outlined the expenditure of some \$18 million in costly television facilities, and that is why this wasn't proceeded with. They say now. But, of course, if they had any alternatives we don't know what they would have looked like. We only know the alternative they did look at and they didn't proceed with it. We do know that this Bill is designed to use the existing facilities. There are already existing facilities in the city of Saskatoon and Regina and it is the intention of this Bill to save a great deal of money by utilizing the existing facilities and co-ordinating their use. That is going to save some millions of dollars to the people of this province. That's a very important point.

The other one is in regard to rural Saskatchewan and that is with the predicted decline of student enrolments and so on the media are going to have an extremely important role to play in that area. Certainly through the retail library system it is hoped that all sorts of media, not only print, but audio visuals could be distributed to reach the educational system and as well through the Community College mechanism reach adults to provide them with continuing educational

opportunities they have never had before. Now all of this sort of integration and co-ordination of media requires some such agency as proposed in this Bill.

This Bill will, along with the Community College System, out of which this recommendation came provide Saskatchewan with probably the leading system of adult education and community education in Canada. I don't know why the Members opposite are opposing this Bill except for political reasons. When you look at their proposals the only proposals they had before them when they were the Government, were much more costly and much more ineffective. It is to be hoped that this Bill will receive the support of all Members of this House because it is going to do a great deal of good for all our citizens.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. J.E. BROCKELBANK (Minister of Government Services): — Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a few words on this particular Bill. I noticed when the Member for Lumsden, Mr. Lane) spoke he strayed rather far from the topic. He was talking about cable television which is not necessarily pertaining to this Bill. It is interesting to note that the Member for Lumsden is very interested in communications. As a matter of fact he is so interested in communication that he exercises the free mailing privileges of this House more than even the Leader of the Opposition does. He has the largest mailing of any Member of this House and he says we are concerned about communication, Mr. Speaker. The Member for Lumsden is certainly concerned about communications, as a matter of fact he would like to move forward one seat and then he would be in the position of Leader of the Opposition.

It is interesting to note at the beginning of his remarks he attempted implicitly to suggest that the Government of Saskatchewan was going to control cable television and he also suggested that the Government of Saskatchewan, through SaskMedia would control communications. Well, I say, Mr. Speaker, and it is common knowledge, except apparently to the Member for Lumsden, that he who controls the licence controls the system. In both cases with cable television in Saskatchewan, the licences will be obtained by the community groups, not from the Government of Saskatchewan, but from the Government at Ottawa or one of its agencies. And if SaskMedia obtains licences they will obtain them from Ottawa or an agency of the Government at Ottawa and not from the Government of Saskatchewan.

I just wanted to correct any false impressions that the Member for Lumsden may try to leave with the House in the dying moments of this debate on SaskMedia, a Bill which I will certainly support.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to and Bill read second time.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. J.A. PEPPER (Weyburn): — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Privilege, I should like to take this opportunity of introducing to you and through you to the Members of the Assembly on behalf of the Hon. Minister

Mr. Kowalchuk, a group of students, I believe there are 15 in number, from Goodeve School, who just now entered the Chamber and are sitting in the west gallery. They are accompanied here by their teacher, Mr. Bohay, their bus driver, Mr. Ken Rathgeber. I am sure I am expressing the wishes of all people that are here this afternoon that the students day may prove beneficial and profitable to them and that they enjoy it. I am sure that it is the wishes of all of us that their journey back home will be a safe one as well.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Romanow that Bill No. 118 — **An Act respecting the provision of Police Service in Saskatchewan** be now read a second time.

MR. D.G. STEUART (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I am opposing this Bill because I think it is unnecessary and I think that it gives far too much power to the Government of the day and to the Attorney General, not particularly this Attorney General, but any Attorney General of the province.

To begin with I think we have to question first if there is a problem. The Province of Saskatchewan is policed generally by the RCMP and by municipal or local police forces. And while there is no question that we can point, from time to time, to local police forces, that they've had problems or that their standards in some cases are not on an equal level even and there have been some problems. By and large if you look over the history of the Province of Saskatchewan in regard to municipal police forces our law enforcement has been good. It has been honest and I think it has reflected the feelings of the local people. Now again we can all point out instances where local police forces over the history of the Province of Saskatchewan have had some difficulties and the public have felt from time to time that they have been not properly dealt with by local police forces. The same thing can be said of the RCMP. You go into some areas and you will get complaints about the RCMP as well.

Now, I think that we all admit that in the RCMP we've got a police force with one of the highest standards in the world. I think that some of the steps this Government has taken, having a school or a college, an academy where municipal police forces can send their recruits for training and other people for advanced training, is a step in the right direction. For many years we sent our police recruits, municipal police recruits and members of municipal police forces to training programs put on by the RCMP and this was good.

But what I am afraid of in this Bill, is the power it gives over municipal governments and over municipal police forces to the Government and in particular to the Attorney General or to a commission appointed by him.

Let's look at some of the powers that this Bill gives to the commission. There shall be a Saskatchewan Police Commission which shall consist of three persons appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, one of whom shall be designated a chairman and another as vice-chairman.

To begin with the Police Commission will be appointed and responsible totally for their jobs, and as suggested here they may be paid by the Cabinet, to the Government of Saskatchewan.

Let's look at the powers they are being given. Subject to the approval of the Attorney General, the commission may make regulations to establish minimum standards for the selection and training of municipal police personnel. In other words, at the word of the Attorney General or his appointees, the Government of Saskatchewan can decide exactly who can or who cannot be on the local police forces. They can establish and maintain a communications system for all or any police force in the province and regulate its operation and procedures in a manner not inconsistent with the laws of Canada and of the province. They can prescribe the minimum number of members of police forces that shall be employed, either upon a basis of population, area, property assessment or any combination thereof. In other words, the Attorney General and the people he decides to put on that Board, and they are on there by his power, by his say so, can decide how many policemen there will be in the city of Prince Albert, who will be recruited, what the standards will be. They can even tell them the kind of records they will keep, the kind of reports they can make. In fact, if you read this Bill the Attorney General, through the Police Commission, will have total control over all the municipal police forces in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Now, let's look at some of the other powers that the Government is giving to itself and this is all part of the pattern of the NDP Government, taking more and more power unto themselves. I think when a provincial government starts taking over policing power, it is a dangerous thing.

Now, I am aware that the Province of Quebec has had a provincial police force for years. And it always hasn't been that happy an experience for the people of Quebec. I think it has been one of the blessings of Canada that the RCMP have throughout their long history been by and large above reproach, but I am nervous and I am concerned when a provincial administration, especially an NDP provincial administration, assumes this kind of power over policing in this province.

Let's look at some of the other powers they are giving themselves. The Commission, and remember the Commission is the Government. The Commission is the Government because they will appoint the commission, they can dismiss the commission, the commission will be totally responsible to the Government of the day. And if there is ever a dispute, it would be the word of the Attorney General that will take precedence over what the Commission wants to do. You just have to read the Act to find that out. For example, the Commission shall, prior to making regulations under this section, inform the boards or councils of municipalities. In other words they don't have to consult with them, they don't have to say to the city of Regina, or the elected representatives of the city of Prince Albert or Saskatoon, "do you want this done or is this a good idea?" All they have to do is inform them.

The commission may and when directed by the Attorney General or requested by a board or council to enquire, they can carry all kinds of enquiries out, they can carry out enquiries into the operations of a police force, into almost any matter that pertains to the policing in our municipalities.

Let's see who has the final authority. It is the Attorney General, he may stand up and say, we will select very highly qualified people, they will be retired judges, they will be people above reproach. But let's see exactly what kind of power the Attorney General is taking unto himself in this Act.

In Section 4 of the Act, on page 6, it says, where the board or council is not in agreement with the findings or recommendation of the commission it may within ten days of the receipt of the report of the commission refer the matter to the Attorney General who may consult with the board or the council or commission and direct what action shall be taken with respect to the findings or recommendations. In other words, if there is a dispute it goes to him, he may or may not consult with the people concerned, but then he can make an order and that order shall be carried out.

Section 5, where the board or council neglects within a reasonable time to implement the recommendations of the commission, made under subsection (3) or comply with the direction of the Attorney General made under subsection (4), the Attorney General may take such action as he considers necessary to bring the policing or provision of equipment or accommodation to a suitable standard, and any expense incurred may be charged to the municipality and may be deducted from any grant made to the municipality by the Government of Saskatchewan or recovered by action in any court of competent jurisdiction as a debt due to Her Majesty in the right of the province.

In other words, the Attorney General can himself make the decision and then he can decide what is a reasonable time for the council or board to carry out that decision, and if they don't carry it out he can do anything he wants. He can replace them, I presume, he can hire new policemen, he can do anything he wants and any expense that may occur as a result of this, he can charge back to the municipality in question.

Well now, Mr. Speaker, I just read some of the provisions in this Act. And the Attorney General may get up and say, well the municipalities have asked for this. I don't know whether they have or not. But I say to the municipalities, to SUMA and in some cases even to the SARM, although I don't think they will be involved in this, but certainly the councils of our cities and our larger towns are involved. I say they had better take a hard look at this Act, because if they did ask for it, I am sure they didn't ask the Attorney General to go this far. What they may have asked for is some standardization of our policing. They may have been asked . . .

MR. ROMANOW: — They have seen the Bill.

MR. STEUART: — Well, then I suggest they had better read a little closer, because what they are doing, and if they agree with this, then I disagree with them because what they are doing, and I don't think they do agree with it, what they are doing is handing over one more piece of authority, one more piece of

power that they have had up to this point, they are handing it over to the Government. And if they are handing it over because they think they are going to get some extra money, if this is the deal the Attorney General made with them, in other words, you people go along with this Act, where the Government can take the power, we can control your local policing then we will give you more money to help reduce your mill rate, then I say local government has made a very, very bad bargain. I think this is a dangerous Bill. I don't think it is necessary. I think, once again, the Government has indicated or isolated a very small problem. You name the problems we have had with municipal police forces over the years in all the cities and larger towns in this province and they are very few and far between. They have, by and large, given good service.

What they are doing in this Bill, and they should understand it very clearly, is they are handing over total power to operate and run the local police forces to one man, the Attorney General of the province.

So, I say I am opposed to this Bill. I give the Attorney General full credit because he has taken some steps that were long overdue to help out municipalities to raise the standards of local policing. But, in this particular Bill he is going far beyond what is called for. I think he should have continued the steps that he has taken, steps that were taken when we were the government, steps that were taken before we were the government, to continue to give our municipal governments the opportunity upgrade their local police forces, continue that help and left the control of our police forces where they belong and that's with the local police commissions answerable directly to the locally elected, democratically elected, councils of municipalities.

So I oppose this Bill. I think it is one more power grab by the provincial NDP Government, one more step in taking power away from local government

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. K.R. MacLEOD (Regina Albert Park): — Mr. Speaker, I am interested in the remarks made by the speakers to this point in the Bill. There are two particular points that I should like to emphasize.

The first one, is that in many cases the first person to arrive on the scene of an accident is the police officer. He is usually the first official person to arrive there. In many cases lives would be saved if that person had, in addition to his police training, training of a high standard in the saving of lives. This academy that is referred to, I hope will place a high priority on the training of policemen to the prevention of death in unfortunate and violent circumstances. There does not appear to be anything in the Bill which directs the attention of the police to this. The attention of the Act is to the prevention of crime and to the apprehension of people who have been suspected or accused of committing crimes, but there is nothing in the Bill which directs the attention of the police or the academy to that particular part of the Bill, namely, that particular part of police work, namely, the preservation of life where people have met with sudden and serious injuries. Consequently I urge that this be considered

because of its importance. I am sure that in the course of a year, dozens and perhaps hundreds of lives could be saved if police had this kind of training.

The second thing that I should like to suggest is that there is nothing in the Bill which gives any certainty that the cities and towns, municipalities, will have adequate funds to carry out their duties and responsibilities. It is my suggestion that we consider the police function as a profession. I believe that every effort must be made to upgrade the quality of our police, every effort must be made to make the police function a truly professional occupation. To do that, we require, first of all a great deal of training and experience and secondly, we require the kind of money which will attract into the police forces the kind of person whom we must have to accomplish what I have in mind.

I should like to consider the remarks already made before I speak further on this Bill and I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Romanow that Bill No. 97 — **An Act to amend the Election Act, 1971** be now read a second time.

MR. D.L. FARIS (Arm River): — Mr. Speaker, there are three parts of this Bill I'd like to discuss. I think in general it is a good piece of legislation. Three parts of it are in regard to disclosure of sources, the limitation of expenses and thirdly, the partial payment of expenses.

I am concerned as I study legislation similar to this around the world, through history, whether or not disclosure of sources is in fact going to be effective. The Members are probably aware that in the United States, from 1907 to the present time, donations from corporations to political parties for the presidential elections and so on have been illegal, they have been outside the law. I think we are also aware that in fact this has not at all prevented this kind of donation from being made. I know in a study made at the University of California in Berkeley by Professor Epstein, he suggested that it was simply impossible to police the kind of contributions that could come from corporate and other sources. He says on page 63:

Large donors have often attempted to conceal their contributions by making donations in the names of relatives and associates or giving contributions in cash.

The Canadian House of Commons, when they studied this matter in their election expenses report of 1966, came to a similar kind of conclusion and it was based upon the Canadian experience from 1907 to 1930 when once again no corporation was supposed to make any sort of donation. And, of course, this didn't happen. And they describe the experience in Canada as follows:

The report calls the statute perhaps the most radical and audacious attempt at legislative control over election expenses ever advanced in Canadian history on paper.

The attempt turned out in actuality to be only the most ridiculous chapter in an uninspiring story of ineffective legislation.

I don't know if our legislation is going to be any better than that Federal legislation that we had in Canada from 1907 to 1930 in terms of disclosure of sources. I suggest that sources that do not want to be revealed will find ways in which they do not have to be revealed.

But I feel that the second and third aspects of this Bill are such as to largely overcome this difficulty.

I think that the limitation of expenses is a very important section. I think that in practice it will be found that it will have to be amended and improved over the years, but certainly the principle of limitation of expenses particularly in those areas where you can get at the facts as to how much it has cost for certain radio and television ads or certain space in a newspaper. All of this sort of thing reported both from the parties and from the media, I think, will be and could be very effective. I think undoubtedly in future years there will have to be improvements but I think this is an important step and an excellent step.

The third portion of the Bill that I want to refer to is the partial payments of expenses and this, of course, follows the federal legislation in this area. It also follows the example in a good many nations around the world. I think it is a good idea and one that is long past due. There is one aspect of this in which I think it does not go far enough and that is in the matter of the continuing support of political activity between elections. All Members will be aware that in terms of collecting voluntary contributions which hopefully will always be a major source of funding of all political parties, there is a tendency for people to become excited about politics and so on around the time of an election. But hopefully elections do not occur at any particular level any more than every four years and this means that the parties have the difficulties of trying to raise finances between election periods. Certainly the finances which they raise at election time are important, but equally important is their necessity for carrying on their ongoing operations.

If it is important for the sake of democracy to help finance political activity at election time, it is equally important that there be some means found to support it between elections. In many regards, in terms of developing an enlightened intelligent electorate perhaps the period between elections is even more important than the amount that is spent at elections, often in a very shallow and slogan oriented type of approach. If we want an intelligent electorate it means a lot of hard work between elections. I should like to see in future years some form of continuing support for recognized political parties, it could probably be on a similar basis to that in Sweden where the support is in proportion to the support that the party received at the last election. That sort of thing would have to be worked out over time and hopefully could be worked out with agreement from all political parties. But I think that would improve the Bill. All in all I think this is a good piece of legislation and in some aspects perhaps some of the best in Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. E.C. WHELAN (Regina North West): — Mr. Speaker, these amendments to The Elections Act introduce the idea of controlling election expenses and contributions, the principle of reimbursement and the procedure for reporting on the cost of advertising by broadcasters and publishers. Unfortunately during the past years rather than an earnest effort to meet the voters by candidates, an election campaign has become a contest between publicity people based sometimes on the amount of money that could be put up.

Questions have been raised down through the years as to where the money came from. True, in this Bill there is a limit on the amount that a party can spend, and a limit on each constituency based on the number of voters, but it brings into focus the fact that we have been spending money in huge amounts, often wasted, and in some instances only disenchanting the public. These amended sections will bring about a change that will, of necessity, demand that candidates and representatives of candidates, do more face-to-face campaigning and this should be good for the democratic system in our province.

Mr. Speaker, the reimbursement principle has been practised in the Province of Quebec for a long time. One formula in the Act sets it out at 15 cents a voter, the other, half the election expenses based on a fixed maximum per voter. In Quebec the reimbursement plan has been tried, I think it has been successful. Anyone who can get a certain percentage of the vote, 15 per cent as it will be in this Bill, as will be set out in the legislation, if he gets 15 per cent of the vote the candidate receives payment of half the election expenses according to the formula. In effect, this means that anyone who is capable of campaigning effectively, regardless of his own individual means, can expect to be on an even basis with his wealthy neighbor, because the people of the province will reimburse him, in part, for his expenses. The inequality of economic resources has to a degree been alleviated and the opportunity to be an elected representative is now open and accessible to many more people as a result of this Bill.

It has been said many times that those who pay the election expenses control the representative. In this case at least half the election expenses will be paid by public funds. This, combined with the disclosure, will in effect control the representative, if the old adage is true, and I suggest it has some authenticity.

There is also the need to make available to every candidate the same opportunity, and to let the public know the amount that was paid and the cost, the time that was booked, and by whom, for radio and newspaper advertising. The Section that calls for this in the Bill is long overdue and certainly meets with my full endorsement.

The limit on expenditure, Mr. Speaker, the reimbursement Section, the report by publishers and broadcasters at the end of an election campaign, all are sections that establish principles that will aid and assist the practice of democracy in this province. Every Member of this House should support this Bill on second reading.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. D.G. STEUART (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words on this Bill and once again we find the Government opposite claiming to identify a problem, and moving in with massive government control.

I think the first thing we have to look at, before we pass such a Bill as this giving as much power as it gives to the Government and Government agencies, is to see whether there is in fact a real problem. Has the democratic process in this province really been downplayed, has it been thwarted, has the democratic will of the people of this province been thwarted. I see the Member from Watrous (Mr. Cody) nodding his head. Well if he thinks it has that's very interesting because of twenty three and one half years out of the 30 it has been a CCF or NDP Government that has been in power.

Now let's take a look what this Bill does. I think when Government begin to tinker with the democratic system it is very dangerous. Just as I think it is very dangerous when they tinker with the police forces in the province or in the nation. To being with this gives far more control to the leaders of political parties and to the Government than has ever been in existence before in this province. To begin with you now have to register and you have to do certain things before you can be a recognized political party.

MR. ROMANOW: — That is just to keep . . .

MR. STEUART: — That's right, you'll get to that a little later, that's if you want to be a political party. And if you don't do those things then the Government, through its agents, can strike you off the rolls, can deny people who want to support that particular philosophy as presented by a group of people, deny them the right even to be on the ballot. Now that's control, that's more control than any Government has ever had before in the history of this province, make no mistake.

Now let's look at the control they are giving to the leaders of political parties. Up until this time, you had your political party no matter what it was, the candidate got nominated by the local people, then he was a candidate for the NDP or the CCF or the Liberals or the Conservatives or the Social Credit. He may or may not agree with the philosophy of the leader or he may or may not follow the party line. In every political party in this province that is worth its salt, there are maverick people who stand outside but still run as NDP, still run as Liberals, still run as Conservatives or Social Credit. Once this Bill becomes law then the only way they can get on that ballot as a member of that party is if the leader signs and so the leader of the political party after this Bill is law will have total control over who can run for their party. Now this hasn't been the case before. The case before has been embedded and stayed in the local constituency. If the local constituency wanted to nominate the Member for Saskatoon University (Mr. Richards) to run as an NDP even though he has decided to differ with them on many issues, that was up to them, but not any more. From now on if the NDP don't like somebody, or if the Liberals don't they don't have to sign his paper. That's too much power to give any political leader in our democratic system. It never happened before in this country and I say the Government themselves are taking

far too much power when they, by their own law, which could be amended very easily, can decide who in fact shall be in a political party, who can even get on the ballot.

AN HON. MEMBER: — They want to get rid of the Wafflers.

MR. STEUART: — Now let's take a look at some of the other controls they have. They say we are going to control the raising of money. It is very interesting when you read that part of the Bill because both the controls on the raising of money and the spending of money are aimed by the Government of the day at Opposition parties. There is no question about that. Again, show me instances in this province when any political party has been able to buy an election; they just don't exist. Now the Member who just sat down said it was going to make it more even. I find this rather ironical coming from the NDP or the CCF who have held power in this province, have held power twenty three and one half years out of the last 30 and call themselves the poor people's party and yet they get up in this House and complain that obviously from their point of view money has played too great a role in deciding of elections in the Province of Saskatchewan. I say that's wrong and if it does happen to be right then they can point the finger at themselves.

Well now, if you read the Act in the sections that deal with publicly stating who supports a political party, you've got it by individuals, by corporations, by companies, by groups by labor unions and I don't think that this will particularly hurt although it may. Some people may decide that they don't want to be exposed to supporting our party, your party, they may not support any party. And I say that that really has been in the past and should continue to be their business. If an individual or a company wants to support all the political parties or one or two of them then up to this point in time in our history, they have been able to do that. Now, can you imagine a brewery or any other company that depends solely, a highway contractor or anyone else, who depends solely for their livelihood on the whim of a provincial administration daring to give any money publicly to an opposition party?

Well, I would say they would be a very brave company that would do that. Now they either will stop donating, these companies, highway contractors and breweries and a lot of other people who are very sensitive to the political scene, who have donated money to political parties of all stripes in this province, the CCF, Liberals, NDP, Conservative and Social Credit, well now they may just stop. That probably will be the result.

The unions won't stop for the simple reason that they will continue to give money to the NDP because the union donations are controlled by a handful of people. As a matter of fact the average union member probably has very little to say about whether his money goes to support the Liberal Party or the Conservative Party or the Social Credit Party. In this province it goes automatically to support the NDP.

What about the spending of money? Well, this gets very interesting because I am sure we are going to hear all kinds of speeches from the Members opposite, full of piety and sanctity about controlling the spending of money. And that's great, if I was sitting over there that would be a pretty good Bill and

I would like to put it through. Oh, they say we are going to cut out government advertising for the last 28 days. Well, that's great, 28 days. In the four years between elections they can spend all the money they want on advertising for 1,460 days. Four three years and eleven months they will pour out literally millions of dollars on government propaganda and then suddenly they will get very saintly and on the 28th day they'll stop. Well by that time they'll have inundated everybody all over this province with all the political propaganda they can stand and a great deal more and then they are going to become very holy and say, now we'll play by the same rules as the Opposition, we won't spend any more money. Well, I say, there is nothing we can do about it and they want to do it, let them go ahead. But don't let them try to kid anybody that that makes the rules even. The rules that are set by this Election Act are tilted. This is a one-sided Bill aimed at every opposition party in this province . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. STEUART: — . . . and aimed at maintaining the NDP political power structure in office. They used to talk about the old Gardiner machine, we used to think Tommy Douglas had a pretty good machine in his day. They were just playing little children's games compared to Mr. Blakeney and Mr. Romanow and the NDP that are in power today.

Let's take a look at their record. There has never been a government that has spent the taxpayers' money more arrogantly or more openly on political propaganda than the present NDP Government. Tommy Douglas in his heyday, Jimmy Gardiner in his heyday would never have had the nerve, or Ross Thatcher or Dave Steuart, to go one-tenth of the way you people have gone. Let me give you a few examples.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. STEUART: — \$10,000 in one day in four newspapers and analyze those ads and what do you find? You find that 80 per cent of them were full of NDP political propaganda in the name of Government advertising and that was just four newspapers in one day. We made the statement in this House that that Government opposite would spend at least \$15 million of the taxpayers' money on NDP propaganda both directly into the news media, directly into radio, television and newspapers as well as the number of employees they have to put out this propaganda and spread it all over the province. I think we were probably underestimating.

Let me give you another example. I was down in Estevan, the seat now held very temporarily by the Minister of No Industry (Mr. Thorson) and I am going to tell you, Mr. Thorson when the election is down there we are going to let you count the votes in the dark for four hours after they close the ballots and you still wouldn't win that election down there. I was down there and I saw this Government car parked across the street from where I was visiting and he said, "Oh, yes, that's Kim Thorson's appointee, he is one of these business consultants." I said, "That's very interesting, why is his car parked over there by the old folks' home?" Well he said, "That is where he is working today in the old folks' home." I said, "Is he

creating business in the old folks' home?" And he said, "No, he is creating political propaganda for the Minster, there is no self respecting businessman down here that would even talk to him because he doesn't know anything about business. He is down here for one reason, he is on the payroll being maintained in an office at the taxpayers' expense to push the political future, the political well-being of the NDP Minister, Mr. Thorson and make no mistake about it."

We have listed or tried to list the number of executive assistants and assistants to the assistants, the ones who are open and the ones who are buried in every department of this Government. No government in history ever approached the larding of the public payroll, the political hacks and political hangers-on that the NDP Government opposite has done. And they don't even make any bones about it. They sent them down East, there were three or four who went to Nova Scotia. I read the article out of the last Commonwealth and there was a note of "thank you" from the NDP in Nova Scotia, thanking the NDP Government of Saskatchewan for sending three or four people, telling Premier Blakeney what a wonderful man he had (That what's his name — that fellow) . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — Coulter!

MR. STEUART: — Coulter — \$12,000 a year and he spends most of his time all over this nation fighting elections, losing most of them fighting elections for the NDP in a variety of provinces. He is back, I presume, if he isn't down in Prince Edward Island and he will be back on the payroll. These people get up and say we are going to make this very even, we are going to make this very democratic so that any individual or any political party will have an equal chance to be re-elected or to be elected. What hypocrisy!

You go into any little radio station or small newspaper office in this province and you see a little ticker tape, they call it the peoples' propaganda machine. They have them in Prince Albert, in North Battleford, in Rosetown and you stand there and that NDP propaganda comes out by the yard. Is the Liberal Opposition permitted to put out anything over that? No, not a word are we allowed to put out over that machine.

Then what about the media centre for the exclusive use of the NDP MLAs? You see these fellows running around with a tape recording machine, stuffing them in front of any NDP Member who happens to stand still in the sometimes vain hope that they will say something intelligent and they can put it out over the air, at the people's expense, at the Government's expense. Then they stand up and say this Bill is going to be very democratic. It is going to make everything even.

Well, I tell you it is like everybody is born equal, but some are more equal than others. When this Bill is passed the NDP political machine, the Blakeney-Romanow NDP political machine — will be in firmer control of the levers of power in this province than any other government, not only in the history of Saskatchewan, but I say in the history of Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. STEUART: — You know, Mr. Speaker, I

think the thing we have to be concerned about is whether or not there was a need for this Bill. Was there a study done to show that elections in this province, over the years, have been bought and paid for; that the public has been swayed by candidates or political parties that have had the most money?

Let's take a look at that. I don't think it is true and I don't think it exists. I think the democratic process in Saskatchewan has worked very well. We have had changes of government the past 10 or 15 years, governments have come and governments have gone. And I say that the public are able to judge if a political party spends too much on television, too much in the newspaper, the public are intelligent enough to take a look at that and they would, in fact, be repelled by that, and they have been from time to time. I think this has affected individual candidates. It might even have affected political parties.

First of all there has been no study done; there has been little evidence, and no proof that, in fact, we need this law. Just exactly the same situation almost that exists in this Act we just considered in the Bill for the control of the police forces. Now we have the same thing here, in the control of the political process in this province.

I want to warn the people of this province that if you follow carefully and objectively what has happened in this province in the last three years, you will find almost every step taken by the Government opposite is to give them more and more control; control over our farmers with the Land Bank; control over who could buy land in this province with the control of foreign ownership or outside ownership of farm land in this province; control of how our farmers market the basic products; the compulsory Hog Marketing Commission; control over the business community; power given to the Government to close any business up for five days, move in on them anytime they want without any reference to the courts; control over our cities as to how they can elect the very people that are supposed to democratically govern them; the Ward System, imposed on the two major cities and that is just step number one. Control of our police force; control of the oil industry, seizing of rights, seizing of assets of the oil industry, no consultation and actually no payment; tearing up of contracts in the timber industry, taking over the timber industry and total control by the Government.

Follow them step by step. This I maintain, Mr. Speaker, is a final step through this Act and that is the beginning of control of the political process. I say this is a dangerous Act. If this Government can stand up or the Attorney General and identify the elections that have been won by people spending far more money than other people in this province, if you can say, you people spent more money in this by-election. I can point to the by-election in Athabasca, where we faced the entire strength and power of the whole Government. They had Cabinet Ministers flying in there and, in fact, the whole Government flying in there, where they poured money in day and night and still didn't win the election, in fact, I think it backfired on them.

So I say this is an unnecessary Bill; it is a dangerous Bill and people should be under no illusion what this Election Act is geared, aimed and tailor-made to do. It is purported in

April 29, 1974

the Bill to give Mr. Blakeney and Mr. Romanow and the NDP machine in 1973 and 1974 more control over the democratic electoral process than any government ever had the gall or the nerve to grab before.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very serious Bill. I think there are some things in it that need looking at and I understand there will be some adjustments made and I hope there are.

The limitations put on the total spending, I think, need looking at. The limitations allowed in northern Saskatchewan need looking at. I, in fact, think the whole Bill needs looking at. I should like to look at it a little longer and I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

Debate adjourned.

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