

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fourth Session - Seventeenth Legislature
63rd Day

Thursday, May 2, 1974.

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

QUESTIONS

AUDIT REPORT - DEPARTMENT OF NORTHERN SASKATCHEWAN

MR. D.G. STEUART (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I think it's refreshing to hear The Finance Bill coming in to raise the auditor's salary.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. STEUART: — It only hurts when you laugh doesn't it.

I wonder in view of the audit report that was brought to the attention of this House in the last few days concerning the Department of Northern Saskatchewan, the mishandling of funds and the whole situation in the Department of Northern Saskatchewan, would the Premier now agree to accept the suggestion — request put in the form of a motion by the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) that a judicial inquiry into the whole operation of the DNS be now carried out?

MR. SPEAKER: — I believe this matter is before the House for debate under a special motion and I don't think we can have questions on Orders of the Day which relate to motions which are before the House.

The report of the Public Accounts Committee is before the House where this whole topic is being debated.

MR. STEUART: — Surely, Mr. Speaker, let me ask then, without any reference to the auditor's report, would the Premier now consider carrying out a judicial inquiry into the alleged mess in the Department of Northern Saskatchewan?

MR. SPEAKER: — That question would be better asked after the House has dealt with the report if the satisfaction isn't given from the debate on the report that is before the House. If Members feel at that time the report hasn't covered what they have in mind, then I think it could be raised in the form of a question at that time, for further information.

REDUCTION IN WELFARE CHEQUES

MR. E.F. GARDNER (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to ask a question of the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Taylor). I wonder if the Minister is aware that letters are being sent out

May 2, 1974

from his department to elderly couples in the province, notifying them that their provincial welfare cheque is being reduced by an amount equal to the extra money they are receiving from the Federal Government due to the cost of living? In other words, if the Federal Government gives these people a few extra dollars to meet the increased cost of living, it appears that the Provincial Government is simply taking this off their cheques. Is this correct?

MR. A. TAYLOR (Minister of Social Services): — Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. GARDNER: — Could I then ask the Minister if he would consider reversing this policy because I'm sure he is aware of the need of the few extra dollars to these couples because of the rapid rise in the cost of living and I wonder if the Minister would consider changing this policy to allow them the full amount that they receive from the Federal Government?

MR. TAYLOR: — Mr. Speaker, the Provincial Government adjusted the assistance rates two or three months ago. We adjust on a yearly basis. The Federal Government had not made an adjustment at that point in the Old Age Security rates, they adjust on a quarterly basis. We felt our adjustment would take into consideration future increases. We believe this is still the case. If further adjustments are needed in the future, they will of course, be considered. But the policy as such, we are not considering changing at this time.

INFORMATION RE CONSTRUCTION STRIKE

MR. C.P. MacDONALD (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Snyder). The other day I asked the Minister of Labour if he was aware of the total value of construction projects in the Province of Saskatchewan that are shut down due to the dispute and I also asked him if he was aware of the number of men or employees who were now idle because of the construction strikes. He said at that time that he didn't have that information. I was wondering if today in the interim period of the last two days, he's been able to find out that information and if he could tell us the value of the projects shut down and the number of men who are now standing idle because of the dispute?

HON. G.T. SNYDER (Minister of Labour): — The answer today, Mr. Speaker, is the same answer as I provided the day before yesterday.

MR. MacDONALD: — Mr. Speaker, I find that once again very strange. Is the Minister aware that the construction industry has done an evaluation and they estimate it is in excess of \$40 million, the total value of projects shut down? Even the Toronto Globe and Mail has done an estimate of the number of people that are unemployed or thrown out of work because of this. Is the Minister aware that there are from 3,500 to 4,000 men idle because of the construction strike and is the Minister still not going to be personally involved or go for some kind of high level mediation in order to try and resolve this dispute?

May 2, 1974

MR. SNYDER: — I indicated to the Member I believe it was the day before yesterday, Mr. Speaker, that the Department of Labour is primarily interested in finding solutions to problems rather than being a statistical gathering agency and I think everything is being done. I think the involvement of the Department has been comprehensive at this stage. I don't think there is anything that could have been done that has not already been done or is not presently in progress. And for the Member to suggest that gathering statistics is in any way going to improve the situation, I can only point out to him that everything that could possibly be done is in the process of being done. We aren't contemplating Bill 2 if that's what the Member is suggesting, but we are attempting to work out solutions that will be favorable as far as both parties are concerned and we are optimistic that both parties, being mature citizens of the community, will work out a solution to the problem in the not too distant future.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

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. H.H.P. BAKER (Regina Wascana): — I wish to take a few moments to talk about the Hall Royal Commission and the Provincial Government's legislation which provides for an autonomous university in the city of Regina.

The Minister of Education, the Hon. Gordon MacMurchy, has again come up with answers for an involved situation that has lingered since 1961. He has mastered a problem which took great tact and diplomacy. The people of this province respect him and thank him for it.

I want to deal with some of the comments made by one of the Members, the Hon. Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald). The Member for Milestone made mention of the fact that our Government has demonstrated a complete lack of leadership and direction with regard to the University of Saskatchewan.

While I feel that Bill 90, which was introduced last year, was a good Bill from the standpoint of giving autonomy to the two campuses, however, I was satisfied with the appointment of the Hall Royal Commission. The selection of Mr. Justice Hall, an eminent jurist; Gordon South, a prominent businessman and Stewart Nicks, a well-known area farmer, was an honest and unbiased choice to study the present university structure and make recommendations. At that time the Member for Milestone applauded the appointment of the Hall Royal Commission, when he said:

The Hall Commission offers a much greater opportunity to find a solution to the complex problems of university reorganization than the ill-fated Bill 90 introduced by the NDP one year ago.

Contrary to what the Member for Milestone said about the Universities Commission, the Hall Report recommendation in regard to the Commission was accepted by this Government. Section 6 of Bill 98, which gives the powers of the Commission, comes

May 2, 1974

from the Hall Report pages 15 to 18. He has stated that the Commission was a 'powder puff'. Why? Because the Commission has been denied the power to determine academic policy. He said this would lead to duplication of programs and chaos in the running of the universities. I am very firm, Mr. Speaker, in my belief that academic decisions should remain in the hands of universities. This is a good policy and assures freedom and real democracy in our campus operations. Both the Hall Royal Commission and this Government are in agreement on this point. Further, the Universities Commission will be working with three standing committees; the Universities Co-ordinating Committee, the Capital Planning and Development Committee, and the Graduate Studies and Research Committee to prevent chaos at the university level. These committees will be well represented by faculty and students as laid out in the Hall Royal Commission Report.

As for the matter of NDP control of the universities, I have this to say. The Hall Royal Commission made it perfectly clear in its report that the Government must respect the integrity of the universities. The universities must respect government priorities, government policies, and legitimate claims on university capabilities. This Government will be an equal partner with the universities and as such shall respect the universities' autonomy.

The university campus at Regina means much to the people of Regina and to this province. Now, in the words of its principal, Dr. John Archer, the campus has grown to the point where it is an adult in an adult world and should be treated as such. The Hall Royal Commission Report recognized this. Faculty members of the University of Saskatchewan recognized this.

There are ten buildings on Wascana Parkway and four on College Avenue. Some of the fine buildings on the Regina campus include the Administration-Humanities Building, the Library, with some 250,000 volumes and other items, the Physical Education Building, with its fine facilities, and the multi-purpose Education and College West Buildings. College West, a residence for some 400 men and women, has also offices and classrooms. College West is unique in that it represents the university's belief that education involves the art of living.

The campus at Regina offers a full range of courses from Bachelor of Arts and Science through to Doctor of Philosophy levels.

The division of Humanities offers classes in the Humanities, Classics, History and Logic of Science, English, Modern Languages, Philosophy, Music, Visual Arts and Art History. The division is concerned with the literature, religion and thoughts of man to the present day.

The Division of Natural Sciences and Mathematics offers classes in biology, chemistry, geological sciences, mathematics and physics.

The Division of Social Sciences deals with the social history and development of man. Classes are offered in

May 2, 1974

anthropology, economics, geography, history, political science, psychology, social studies and sociology.

The Faculty of Education offers programs leading to the Bachelor of Education degree for certified teachers, for students, who have earned a previous degree, and for those without a university degree. The programs are designed to prepare graduates for careers at both the elementary and secondary school levels. Graduate studies in Education lead to a Postgraduate Diploma or Master of Education degree.

The Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research co-ordinates all postgraduate education at Regina campus. Academic programs lead to the postgraduate Diploma in Education and to the Master of Arts, Master of Education, Master of Science and Doctor of Philosophy degrees.

Regina campus has a fine bilingual program. The program is offered jointly by the Divisions of Fine Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences in the Faculty of Arts and Science. There is also a bilingual degree program offered by the Faculty of Education. In College West there is a fine bilingual centre which offers facilities to students wishing to meet and converse in French. A small but expanding library includes French language newspapers and periodicals.

The Department of Extension offers many non-credit programs aimed at personal development with classes in the fine arts, modern languages and philosophy to name a few. This department also offers various degree credit programs leading to degrees in all faculties. Classes are held at Weyburn, Moose Jaw, Yorkton, Swift Current, Estevan, Gravelbourg, Fort Qu'Appelle and Esterhazy. The Department of Extension also offers credit courses during the summer months.

The Canadian Plains Area Program, unique to Regina campus, offers classes in a number of areas related to the physical and social development of the Canadian plains.

The new School of Social Work offers a program of studies leading to a certificate in social service or to the degree of Bachelor of Social Work. Content of classes and field experiences focus particularly on the Saskatchewan scene and its special needs.

The Department of Computer Science offers programs in computer science leading to Bachelor of Science and Bachelor of Arts degrees. There are 17 computer science classes offered.

This is just a sample of what Regina campus offers. A good nucleus for a new university to build on.

Let's discuss for a moment the Hall Royal Commission Report and our Government.

The Hall Royal Commission recommended that the two campuses be established as two independent universities. This has been achieved through Bills 99 and 100. The Royal Commission recommended that the University of Regina have powers, responsibilities and duties similar to those of the University of Saskatchewan. This is outlined in Bill 99. The Royal Commission recommended that a Universities Commission be established to co-ordinate the two universities' programs. This has been made

possible through Bill 98.

Bill 99, respecting the University of Regina, enables the present Regina Campus to become a full-fledged university. There will be a chancellor, a president, a senate and a board of governors. There are to be a number of faculty and students on both the senate and the board of governors. The latter body will have to consult with the proposed Universities Commission on fiscal and administrative matters. This was recommended by the Hall Royal Commission, and concurred in by our Government. Similarly, both the Hall Royal Commission and this Government agreed that the two universities control their own internal affairs, such as faculty appointments and programs.

The purpose of the University of Regina is to concentrate on building a quality of program that is fully integrated with the needs and development of Regina and the Province of Saskatchewan. An independent university can fulfil this purpose. This Government has drafted legislation to carry it out. Our Government acknowledges that Regina is ready to be an equal partner in an adult world. It will be the dawn of a new day for higher education in this province when these fine Bills are completely approved. I would hope debate would be cut short so that the individual universities can get on with their much needed plans. I would be greatly surprised if the Members across the way would oppose this, especially the local Regina Members.

We hear a lot of talk about local autonomy in this House, this Bill gives just that.

I support the two universities concept. I back this fine Government in its effort to make Regina campus an equal partner in an adult world.

I support the Bill, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. J.G. LANE (Lumsden): — Mr. Speaker, just a few comments. I find myself in kind of an unfortunate position. I am not aware and I don't have the answers as to whether the Province of Saskatchewan can afford to have two universities. We probably have more public universities relevant to our population size than any other jurisdiction in Canada. I say public universities — some are privately supported. I am especially concerned that Regina campus may detract from the fine university in the city of Saskatoon. I have several questions. Will the University at Saskatoon suffer because Regina University will have better access to the small 'p' political powers which will determine the fate of the universities and determine their monetary position? I ask another legitimate question, as a result of this lack of access, is there any possibility that Saskatoon could become a second rate university? If that is the case, I will strongly oppose the formation of a second campus.

I unfortunately don't have the answers. I am sure some of the Government Members do and I know that many eyes will be upon the Saskatoon Members as we try to find out how they feel on this very important issue and whether there will be an assurance that Saskatoon will still be a major and respected institution. I am sure that the eyes of the citizens of

May 2, 1974

Saskatoon will be on the words and the actions and the deeds of the Members for Saskatoon and in the interest of improving the position and the awareness of the Members, I should like to hear what the Saskatoon Members have to say on this very important issue.

MR. T. WEATHERALD (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a few very short comments on this Bill. I intend to oppose this Bill and I want to say why I intend to oppose this Bill.

First of all the University of Saskatchewan has become known throughout our country and indeed North America as one of the finest universities there is, particularly in scientific subjects. Our population has been declining for some years and there certainly is no obvious reason to conclude that it is going to quit declining in the very near future. Even if it levels off, it does seem doubtful that we can support two universities of as high a calibre as we have had at the University of Saskatchewan at Saskatoon.

I think much of this Bill unfortunately is directed at prestige, prestige here for a university in Regina. I think that it is most unfortunate because I think some of the prestige that will be given here in Regina will be at the expense of Saskatoon. I think basically for the majority of the people of Saskatchewan that do not live here in the city of Regina, that will be a step backwards.

For that reason I think that it is very important that we concentrate our efforts and our energy on one excellent university that is recognized throughout all of North America and has been recognized throughout North America in the past years. I think that if in this sense we are trying to create two universities of the same excellence in Saskatchewan it will be impossible. I think graduates will be recognized as they leave the Province of Saskatchewan and certainly in the future many will be and they will be saying I am from the University of Regina or the University of Saskatchewan, I think that this will dilute our prestige which is extremely important as far as graduates are concerned from any university.

There are some universities throughout the world like MIT, Harvard, etc. which have built up reputations in particular fields. It has been a concentration in some particular areas that they have been able to achieve this record.

Unfortunately, I think, as I mentioned earlier that attempting to place two universities on similar footing in Saskatchewan will be a dilution of the product and it will be a product which will not have the same prestige that it has had up until now.

The major beneficiaries of this Bill as I see it are not the majority of the people of Saskatchewan. The major beneficiaries of this Bill will be some added prestige which may be only in name to the university here in Regina and some added prestige for the city of Regina.

Under normal circumstances these are admirable things but I don't think they are admirable when they come at the expense of something else. For that particular reason I am going to vote against this Bill because I think the prestige that we will be giving the city of Regina and the University here in

May 2, 1974

Regina is at the expense of the University of Saskatchewan and at the expense of future graduates from the University of Saskatchewan.

MR. A.R. GUY (Athabasca): — Mr. Speaker, I just want to join with my colleague from Cannington. I said while we were discussing the Commission Bill that I opposed the setting up of a separate university in the city of Regina for many of the reasons that have already been mentioned.

What I find rather difficult to understand is that there is no support for the city of Saskatoon, from Members on the Government side of the House. One wonders why the city of Saskatoon elected six MLAs to look after their interests, because certainly the setting up of another university here in Regina is going to have a major effect on the University of Saskatchewan as we know it. As I said earlier it is a black day for Saskatchewan when the NDP Government destroyed the University of Saskatchewan and this is exactly what they have done. By creating two separate autonomous universities they have blackened the good name of the University of Saskatchewan. There is no way that two universities will ever reach the excellence that we have had in the University of Saskatchewan in Saskatoon. It is hard to believe that Saskatoon elected six Members to speak on their behalf, to speak on behalf of the University which is so dear to them and which has made such a contribution to the city of Saskatoon, and they sit there and refuse to stand up and support the city which has given them such support. It is hard to believe that the Member for Saskatoon South (Mr. Rolfes) would not at least say a word in favor of maintaining the University of Saskatchewan which he has graduated from and which provided his training for him. Two Cabinet Ministers, I think of the Minister for Mayfair and the Minister for Riversdale. Surely to goodness the people of Saskatoon should be able to call on their Cabinet Ministers to at least support the position of maintaining the University of Saskatchewan and the standards which it has established. And yet they sit there completely numb, completely befuddled by the Members from Regina who have silenced them in this most important issue to come before the House during this Session. It is unbelievable that the Members for Regina would have such a strangle hold on the vocal cords of the Members for Saskatoon, particularly, when there are three Cabinet Ministers from Saskatoon. They are silent. They let the Mayor of Regina get up and bamboozle them and convince them that the setting up of a second university is in the best interest of the people of Saskatoon. Yet, they know it is not in the interests of the people of Saskatoon, in fact, it is not in the interests of the people of Saskatchewan. That is the reason why I will oppose this Bill.

HON. R. ROMANOW (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I simply must rise as a result of the words by the Member for — I am not sure whether it is Athabasca or the Member for Rosthern. I simply want to say to the Hon. Member that I don't believe that anybody on this side of the House, when we view problems such as the one we are debating here or a situation such as we are debating here, the university, that we view them from the point of view as suggested by the Member for Athabasca. That we should look at them from the very narrow parochial interests of Saskatoon or parochial interest of Regina or the parochial interests of any individual community.

May 2, 1974

Yes, there will be times when we as MLAs have to speak for the interests of our individual constituencies and ridings. But when we are looking at the University of Saskatchewan, we are not looking at a plaything or a preserve which belongs exclusively to the citizens of Regina or the citizens of Saskatoon. We are looking at an institution which is financed by the hard earned tax dollars of all people in the Province of Saskatchewan, everywhere.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — Our position is simply this, Mr. Speaker, that no one supports the proposition that this is the destruction of the University of Saskatchewan. No one supports that. Not even the city council in Saskatoon or the Chamber of Commerce. The Chamber of Commerce being the most serious critic of this legislation, even does not support that proposition.

If you take a look at the faculty association and all the people involved with faculty at the University of Saskatchewan at Saskatoon campus, they don't support the Member for Athabasca. The faculty association to a man, supports the establishment of the legislation which is introduced before us in this House. I can tell the Hon. Member, I am not going to name names, but I have received many letters, and many letters from prominent people in the Liberal Party on campus in Saskatoon who support the thrust of this legislation. I can tell you of friends of mine who are supporters of the Liberal Party, in not a passing way but in a strong way, who support the thrust of this legislation. They will have quarrels with individual sections, perhaps as we all do, but they recognize the basic facts.

I come from Saskatoon, I can't wish away Regina. I can't wish away the million dollar complex which exists. I can't undo the millions of dollars that your administration, when you were Minister of Public Works pumped into Regina for the establishment and development of the university. That is fact and we have to deal with that problem. We have to deal with the situation that exists.

When you have the principal of the University in Saskatoon supporting this, when you have Emmett Hall supporting the operation, when you have the University of Saskatchewan maintained, I say this legislation is in the best interests of the people of the Province of Saskatchewan.

I want to tell the people in Saskatoon that they have got one of the best universities in Canada. And I predict that after this legislation has passed, they will continue to have still one of the best universities anywhere in Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS — Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — This Government is committed to giving the University of Saskatchewan at Saskatoon full financial support as we have over the years past. It will be a leading institution and a leading campus in this nation. It is not good enough for the Liberals to play cheap politics, some of the Liberals from Regina getting up and saying that they are for the University of Regina and some of the boys from around Saskatoon saying that they are against the University of Regina, trying to walk both sides

May 2, 1974

of the street.

The people of Saskatchewan won't accept that incredible position taken by the Grits. You can't have it both ways and hope to get the Regina vote and get the Saskatoon vote at the same time. It is not going to buy you one extra seat in Saskatoon. Because the people in my riding who pay the hard-earned taxpayers' dollars and look at this as a positive move to rationalize university facilities, aren't going to be bamboozled by that kind of Liberal talk. I can simply tell the Member for Rosthern in training . . .

MR. BOLDT: — . . . this debate and the Attorney General knows well, he better wake up. Unless you are in election 1975, he will not address the present Member for Athabasca as the Member for Rosthern.

MR. ROMANOW: — . . . the alter ego to the present Member for Rosthern. I simply say that they are not going to accept that and I say to the Member for Athabasca, I say to him sincerely that if he wants votes in the Province of Saskatchewan he ought not to be playing with the university to try and get them. That is what you are doing by that particular position. If the Liberal Party wants any credibility in the university community and in Saskatchewan, they should have a unified stand on this issue. And you are not going to get it with your present position.

You have got to tell the people where you stand on this. And you haven't told them. They can tell what is up. They can see the political game which is at play and the people of Saskatoon resent the fact that the Liberals in this House and in one or two parts of the province are trying to make a political football of the University of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — We are just not going to stand for it in Saskatoon. You tried to make the University a football in 1968 with the Potashville speech. And the University of Saskatchewan stopped you then and will stop you when this Bill is passed and we get one of the finest university institutions re-established in Saskatoon after this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I support the thrust of the package of the university due on the evidence submitted by Mr. Justice Emmett Hall, the faculty associations in Saskatoon, Principal Begg and a whole host of other people. I believe it is a rational way to go and I am sure that it will benefit all of the citizens of Saskatchewan and even the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) will realize that in the months ahead.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. H.H. ROLFES (Saskatoon Nutana South): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few words on Bill 99, I believe it is, the establishment of the University of Regina.

Mr. Speaker, I too want to suggest to Members opposite and especially to the Member for Athabasca, the narrow views that

May 2, 1974

he presented this morning or the tunnel vision that he presented this morning on the university simply will bring no good to the people of Saskatchewan. The University of Saskatchewan is not there to serve only the city of Saskatoon. The University of Saskatchewan is not only there to serve the city of Regina or the city of Saskatoon, it is there to serve all the people of Saskatchewan. Today we have in effect, and have had for two or three or four years, two separate universities. Two universities that really are working separately one from the other. We have got to realize this, Mr. Speaker, there is no sense in wishing it away. As the Attorney General has already said we have millions of dollars of buildings on the campus here in Regina.

When the Member for Athabasca says that we as Members of Saskatoon are not protecting the interests of the city of Saskatoon, let me tell him that I think the city of Saskatoon has never been served as well, if I say so myself, than it has by the six Members whom we have in Saskatoon right now. I don't mind saying so, this Government has served the city of Saskatoon well. All you've got to do is look at the facts, which you don't like doing. Look at the facts. This particular Bill will take nothing away from Saskatoon. Nothing. It will do something, Mr. Speaker, it will give time to the members of the University of Saskatchewan to devote their attention to the University of Saskatchewan rather than to the conflicts that have existed within the last five or six or seven years. This Government, Mr. Speaker, doesn't mind taking a problem, looking at it, finding solutions and then acting. It is different from the previous government.

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt in anybody's mind that there have been differences on this side of the House as there have been differences on the other side of the House when it comes to solutions to this problem. And no one should be surprised at that. I am not overly enthusiastic about have two autonomous universities, so we might as well recognize the fact. You are not going to wish those buildings away. But let me say, Mr. Speaker, that although basically I support the Hall Commission, there is one thing that I do not support in the Hall Commission and that is when they advocate that there should be a full-fledged College of Engineering here in Regina. And I want to say this, Mr. Speaker, that I hope, I agree with the Member for University (Mr. Richards) that when we pass this Bill that the Commission that is going to be set up will recognize the fact that you cannot at the present time afford two full-fledged Colleges of Engineering and as long as I am a Member of Saskatoon, and I hope that will be for a number of year to come, I will do everything possible to keep the College of Engineering in the city of Saskatoon, I will do everything possible to support the original aim of the Government of that time of Woodrow Lloyd of establishing a faculty in the Social Sciences here in the city of Regina.

But let me emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that no one, no one here in Regina and no one in Saskatoon should adopt the views that were taken by the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) that the university serves only the people in Saskatoon or the people in Regina. That is not fair to the rest of the people who are supporting the universities by their tax dollars. The universities must serve all the people within the boundaries of this province. That is why, Mr. Speaker, I will support the Bill. I will support these Bills although I do have some reservations.

May 2, 1974

I don't mind expressing my reservations but, Mr. Speaker, it is better to do something to solve the problems that are existing today than do nothing but gripe about the problem.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROLFES: — Mr. Speaker, although I must admit that I have some reservations I will support the Bills and I do think that if we all work together in harmony and forget about the tunnel vision of some of the Members that the universities are there only to serve Saskatoon and Regina, and work for the good or the benefit of all the people of Saskatchewan the universities will succeed. I certainly will support the Bills.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. E.F. GARDNER (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, representing an area in southeastern Saskatchewan, I feel I must reply to the Member for Saskatoon Nutana who just spoke, because personally I represent an area from the southern or southeastern part of the province and I feel that the people in my area could be better served in this province by having one university, not two. I find also right now in my area that many people are bypassing the University of Saskatchewan, Regina campus, because they don't feel that it would suit their needs. Either the young people or their parents don't feel that this University campus would suit their needs. They like the idea of the stability that they have at the University campus in Saskatoon which has been there for a number of years and I would suggest that those people on the campus themselves, certainly the university community in Saskatoon very strongly favor having one university. I think if you will check with the university campus in Regina, you will find that the staff here is divided. The staff at the Regina campus partially feels that we should have two universities and partially feel that we should have one university. I might say also that I have been a member of the staff of the University campus at Saskatoon for quite a number of years and I know many of these people and in my opinion I feel that the Province of Saskatchewan would certainly be better served with one university and they can have the branches where they like.

The Member who just sat down made a strange distinction, he said that he would like to see the Engineering College kept in Saskatoon. I am sure he is well aware that when you get two universities it is going to be pretty difficult to have them change their programs because they are going to be basically autonomous. If they want to start an Engineering College or expand the one they have now on the Regina campus, they are going to do it, because they are going to be a separate university and there is absolutely nothing going to stop them.

As far as the Attorney General getting up and saying that the taxpayer is going to save money with two universities. I don't think anybody would take that statement very seriously because certainly the cheapest way is to have the one university where you can have some control over the program. Because I am quite sure right now that there are many classes in both the campuses that are already a duplication and this is one of the biggest problems to any university set-up is to prevent duplication of classes. We all have seen the statistics on this, there are many classes at both of these campuses where there

May 2, 1974

are only two, three or four students in the class and that is all there are. In some cases there is only one student. The cost of providing that particular class for that person, or a very limited group of people, the cost is very, very high and there is no doubt that this will get worse if we have the two separate universities. There is no way that we can get away from having more duplication of programs. This is already a problem as we know in western Canada. If there was some way that we could get together with the universities in Alberta and Manitoba to get away from some of this duplication of courses it would certainly be desirable.

I think that the Premier is probably aware of this and the past Premiers of the province have had something to do with trying to work with the other provinces and surely if we want courses in journalism or veterinary science or a dental college or something else, a population of 900,000 just can't support that and I don't think with 900,000 we can support two separate universities. I would suggest also that the university population is very likely to decrease and the projections with the birth rate in this province would indicate that the university population in the province in the next five to ten years is certainly going to be less than it is now. And this again emphasizes the problem of duplication of courses. Apart from the duplication that is involved you get a certain rivalry when you have two universities, one of them says we're going to give a class in this particular subject or particular field and the other one says we are going to give that class too and we'll give a better one. I don't believe that this type of competition is good for the students or for the taxpayers or the university set-up itself. I think that any method is going to have its problems and I think the problems are going to be more complicated if we divide them completely.

I just want to re-emphasize the mention I made to start with about stability on university campus. We all know that many young people of this province hesitate to go to the Regina campus because we know that it is somewhat radical. Their parents hesitate to send them there because of the radical nature of some of the staff but this has been improving in the last few years. It's not perhaps as bad now as it was a few years ago. I would suggest that this has been due to the basic stability that has been provided by the campus in Saskatoon. They have an Engineering College, they have a College of Agriculture, they have a Medical College and these provide a stability to the whole university set-up that you don't get when you are basically a new university providing a lot of classes strictly in the social sciences. So I would think that as far as the taxpayer is concerned and the future of the students themselves that the concept of one university is desirable. It is obvious that I am not speaking this way because of a regional bias because being from the southeast we are a long piece from Saskatoon and for the students in my area to go to Saskatoon campus it is more difficult. I feel that the students from my area would be more inclined to go to the Regina campus as long as it is associated with the Saskatoon campus because of the association with the long term stability that is built into the Saskatoon campus that is going to improve the quality of the Regina campus and for that reason I would support the concept of having only one university.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

May 2, 1974

MR. P.P. MOSTOWAY (Hanley): — Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a few words on this. I believe that the people of Saskatoon and area, and I have talked to a lot of them, certainly want this whole university business cleaned up. I hesitate to call it a mess but I do say that it is not working the way it should be for the good of the people of this province. I say that all that this Bill is going to do is recognize a fact that already exists. My colleague for Saskatoon South (Mr. Rolfes) has already pointed out that in fact there are two universities and that what the Bill simply does is recognize that fact.

I believe that if this is cleared up that the two campuses can get on with the job because there is no doubt, as I mentioned before, that there is a stalemate and there is quite a bit of hesitation on the part of university personnel, administration wise. They don't exactly know where they are going, and I think they should maybe be given the opportunity to know, and that is what this Bill will do.

I just wanted to say one thing in regard to a University of Regina. I certainly am hoping and am under the impression that it will not hinder the growth of the Saskatoon campus. It is my belief that it will take away nothing from the Saskatoon campus. If I believed that it was going to hinder or subtract from the Saskatoon campus, I would hesitate to support the Bill, but I do support it because I believe that this will not be the case.

I do want to commend the Minister for what I believe is real courage for finally taking the bull by the horns and doing something about this issue which has been with us for many years. I support the Bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. G. MacMURCHY (Minister of Education): — Mr. Speaker, in closing debate on The University of Regina Act, I just want to comment very briefly on some of the statements made by the Members opposite with respect to their positions on this Bill.

Now obviously there is difficulty on the other side of the House with respect to where they should stand because I notice the Member for Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod) commending the legislation. And then I noticed other Members saying they were going to be opposed to the legislation.

MR. GUY: — We are independent thinkers.

MR. MacMURCHY: — Mr. Speaker, who is in favor of the legislation? The Member for Albert Park; although he hasn't spoken I suspect the Member for Whitmore Park (Mr. Grant); and I suspect the newly elected Member for Lakeview (Mr. Malone) is in favor of the legislation. Who is in favor of the legislation on this side of the House? Everyone on this side of the House is in favor of this legislation.

Now outside of the Legislature, who is in favor of this legislation? The Hall Commission, obviously, because they put forward the recommendation after consulting the people of the

May 2, 1974

province, and the people of the province including the university community, and the parents and the graduates of the university, and the students who are going to be going into the university. So they are in favor of it. The University of Saskatchewan, Regina campus faculty is in favor of the legislation; the University of Saskatoon Council is in favor of the legislation and despite what the Member for Moosomin said this morning, so is the Faculty Association because they presented me with a brief this morning, suggesting some amendments to the legislation, which is fine and they wound up by saying, the Faculty Association stresses that although the organization is making suggestions for amendments to the Act it agreed with the main purposes of the legislation.

So where is the opposition to the legislation? Where is the opposition to The University of Regina Act? It is on the opposite side of this Legislature by a few of the Members, for political reasons. Well they are making a very gross misjudgement and I say it is time that they got back and talked to the people in their constituencies and they will find out what the people of Saskatchewan think about this legislation. Because just as they were out of touch in 1971, with respect to education, they are out of touch now with respect to education and they had better find out what is going on and what the people of Saskatchewan think.

Those who said that they are in favor of one university, two-campus system, had an opportunity to support the one university two-campus system in this House one year ago. But they voiced opposition to that kind of a system. And the university voiced opposition to that kind of a system and that is why we had to withdraw the Bill. It was right and just that we withdrew because we didn't know fully the feelings of the people of Saskatchewan who wanted, not the one university two-campus system, but wanted two separate independent autonomous universities. That is what they said to the Commission. And that is what the Commission said to us, and that is what the university community is saying to us today.

Granted, we are going down a new road for the universities. And when I meet with the Faculty Association from Saskatoon and they recommend to me some amendments, I think that is a good thing, because, obviously, as we examine legislation, obviously as we put this legislation into practice there will need to be some changes. But it is obvious that we have the support and, therefore, I find it strange that there should be opposition.

I just want to comment before sitting down, Mr. Speaker, with respect to engineering.

It must be the job of the Commission to tackle this issue of engineering. I want to point out that the one university two-campus system simply did not accept its responsibilities with respect to engineering. When they came to us with their budget requests in the fall of 1971, they were asking for capital construction to the tune of almost \$20 million for engineering in Regina and in Saskatoon. We said to them, justify this for us.

They set up the Lapp Commission and the Commission recommended a transfer of engineering to the University campus Saskatoon. And what did the Board of Governors do? The position of the Board of Governors, today, with respect to engineering is

May 2, 1974

that there be two years engineering at Regina campus and that if that campus can come forward with a unique program the Board of Governors is prepared to extend it to four years.

Now that is the kind of job of rationalization and co-ordination that has been going on under the one university two-campus system. Obviously the Commission will have the responsibility of dealing with that particular issue. I say two separate autonomous universities with a Commission that is totally independent of those two universities and independent of the Department of Continuing Education in representing the people of Saskatchewan will be able properly to make a decision with respect to that issue and other issues dealing with duplication, better than a system that has become deadlocked with confrontation because of the existing structure.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge every Member of this Legislature to support this legislation because the people of Saskatchewan have said to us that this is the best road to go in terms of university post-secondary education.

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. Smishek that Bill No. 102 — **An Act relating to the Acquisition, Distribution and Sale of Certain Drugs** be now read a second time.

MR. J.G. RICHARDS (Saskatoon University): — Mr. Speaker, having for two years served as Legislative Secretary to the Minister of Health and having been involved with this program, it is with pleasure that I see there is finally a Bill before the House. I shall certainly in principle be supporting it.

One could argue, Mr. Speaker, that the entire problem of pharmaceutical drugs is insignificant looking at the per capita average of expenditures in the province — \$18.69 in 1971, clearly not an earth shattering figure. But it would be totally superficial to consider only the average because one of the aspects of drug costs is the inequity, even inequity of the distribution of the burden on society of such costs.

In a 1966 survey in Weyburn, for example, 39 per cent of families had no drug costs during the year; 64 per cent of families had less than \$20 expenditures; 5 per cent, however, had over \$100 and one per cent had over \$200 of expenditures on drugs in that year.

According to an American survey those over 65 spent on the average three times those under 65. This age differentiation shows up the factors which go together — chronic illness and old age producing thereby the unjust distribution of the burdens of drug costs.

Mr. Speaker, the basis of the program as envisioned by the Government, is bulk purchasing and the attempt to use the bargaining power of the provincial government to secure, in large tenders, drugs at considerably cheaper prices than the individual pharmacist with his limited bargaining power vis-a-vis

May 2, 1974

drug companies, can accomplish.

I shall make several references during the course of my speech to a survey which went under the somewhat exotic name "Operation Sunrise", a name invented by Doctor David Penman, who has a flair for such things. For our survey we chose six different drugs. We found a range of eight to one in the unit price to pharmacists of different brands of the same drug. For example, with ampicillin, the capsule cost ranged from 14 cents to 28 cents; for chlorthalidone, from .6 of a cent to 5 cents per tablet.

Certainly there were several factors involved in explaining the ranges. The lower costs reflected not only cheaper generic brands, they also reflected large lot purchases by large pharmacies such as the Saskatoon Community Clinic Pharmacy.

There exists within the drug industry very high profitability for according to Statistics Canada data, there was a 23 per cent rate of profit on equity in 1969. But the program as envisioned, involving bulk purchasing as the major tactic in an attempt to reduce the drug costs, is going to run into very serious problems.

The situation has been so profitable in the drug industry that there were developed during the last decade, a large number of "generic drug companies", which should be distinguished from the so-called large "ethical drug companies." These new generic houses have tried to compete in the market for particular drugs, given the high profitability. But the ethical drug companies have fought back in a number of ways against their small generic competitors.

The Ontario Government introduced a program of prescriptions at reasonable costs which goes under the name of "Parcost". The Ontario Government supplied information to pharmacists and to doctors about the per unit costs of different brands of drugs. They have faced problems, ranging all the way to kickbacks in trying to make that program work. Ontario has faced the problem for example, of drug manufacturing companies supplying information to the provincial government of unit prices, unit price figures above what they were actually charging the pharmacists, and the pharmacists being encouraged to pocket the difference if he dispersed the brand in question. That is one problem, although not the major problem.

A second way that the major "ethical drug companies" have fought back against the encroachments of generic drug companies has been simply to buy them out. In 1972, when last I spoke in this Legislature on the issue, I quoted an article from Drug Merchandising which listed 20 Canadian companies recently bought out. That same article estimated that 92 per cent of the Canadian drug manufacturing industry was foreign controlled.

Since then the process has continued and to take one concrete example, ICN has bought out, in the last two years, six Canadian drug companies, including three I shall mention, Winley-Morris, Sabra, and Empire.

Mr. Speaker, the Community Clinic in Saskatoon, under the very capable direction of Stan Rice has done some interesting work on the implication for his pharmacy of International Chemical and Nuclear Canada buying out these small independent drug companies.

May 2, 1974

In 1973 the Saskatoon Community Clinic Pharmacy purchased 79 separate items from these three independent companies, Sabra, Empire and Winley-Morris, which have now been purchased by ICN. In 1974 the costs of these items, to the pharmacy, increased by an average of 40 per cent in one year. There were some products such as a particular analgesic which went from \$6.48 per thousand to \$25.46 per thousand, in one year a 400 per cent increase in the price of the medication.

Clearly in an attempt to defeat any bulk purchasing program, which might be introduced by hospitals, large pharmacies or government, one of the tactics being used is simply to buy out the competition so that there will not be any effective price bidding on bulk tenders.

Perhaps more insidious even than the process of buying out the competition or the direct unethical aspects of kickbacks, is the attempt to discredit the competition by implying that any drug purchased from a small independent company will be of inferior quality and will suffer from being less bioavailable than the product of a large ethical drug company.

I should like to read, for example, from an ad by Hoechst Pharmaceuticals in the December 1973 Canadian Medical Association Journal entitled, "Product Selection is No Game of Chance." It contains a large picture of a roulette wheel and the implication is, as I shall read to the House, that the use of a brand of drug other than that produced by a large ethical drug company, involves risk to the patient. I quote:

Within sensible limits it doesn't matter if you lose the game of chance, it is only a game. Physicians and pharmacists know that medicine is no game. Not to their patients. Not to them. But if they didn't have reputable pharmaceutical manufacturers to rely on, specifying medicines for their patients could become very chancy indeed.

The implication, Mr. Speaker, is that the reputable drug manufacturer's name is a guarantee of drug quality. I shall return to that argument in a minute.

On the one hand, there is the vendor of 'generic equivalents' who may or may not have manufactured the product he sells and who, indeed, may merely be a loosely knit marketing organization with immediate sales volume as its true *raison d'être*. Such a company is unlikely to be able to supply accurate information about its products beyond the price list, or more seriously, to even have any consistent control over standards of quality.

The implication is crystal clear. The major "ethical drug companies" are attempting to convince the medical profession and the pharmacist that to dispense brands others than their high-priced brands, involves the sacrifice of quality, and risk to the patient. How can we, Mr. Speaker, make some independent assessment of drug quality?

I would submit that the problem is certainly a real one. For example, I will now quote some examples of inferior quality drugs and medications received by the Canadian Government through its central drug purchasing system. Some of these

May 2, 1974

examples would be quite humorous if it weren't so serious a situation.

Company A — Elixir Terpin Hydrate — dirty precipitate of growth in the bottles. Product had passed tests, lack of stability.

Company B — 432 gallons of antacid, now full of bacteria and forming gas and blowing bottles. Product had met test and was in stock.

Company C — 8,000 pounds of antiseptic went bad under ideal storage conditions; tins rusted out, lack of manufacturing know-how. Tincture of Thimerosal — hair and fingernails and other foreign matter found in bottles. Inspection services claimed okay in spite of the complaints.

Company D — Penicillin tablets rejected. Assays revealed no penicillin. It was destroyed in the manufacturing process.

Company E — Aluminum hydroxide gel — after three retests and rejections company went out of business. The stock was thrown away on local dump; killed all the rats in the area.

Company F - Cetylpyridinium (I don't know how we pronounce that) chloride mouth wash. Product forming gas and blowing bottles. 3,000 bottles returned from a local Manitoba hospital; preparation contains a precipitate and patients were made sick and nauseous by its use. The preparation had met all tests and had been distributed, obviously lack of pharmaceutical know-how.

Here, Mr. Speaker, are references by the Government of Canada to the problems they have had with different preparations. However, it is not clear that the brand name is any guarantee of quality. For example, a recent United States survey was trying to assess to what extent different companies were responsible for sloppy products, by the criterion of frequency of recall. By that criterion of frequency of recall the worst offender was Abbott Pharmaceuticals, a large well established "ethical company."

Finally I should like to quote from the Food and Drug Directorate of Ottawa and its publication "Rx Bulletin."

Problems with drug availability cut across company size, brand names and type of product. There are some big companies who do an excellent job but some who don't do so well and the same holds true for the little company.

Drug quality is of prime concern but we cannot use price as the criterion. The existence of a formulary committee conducting research into drug quality as part of any drug program will be essential. I think this problem has been duly recognized by the Government, the medical profession and the pharmacists.

Mr. Speaker, having referred to the tactics of buying out, kickbacks, and bioavailability being used by the large drug manufacturers in an attempt to destroy the effectiveness of any competition in reducing drug costs, the fourth, most amusing and probably the most insidious way in which the drug industry is attempting to defeat such programs is by the use of mass

advertising.

It has been said many times before, but I don't think it hurts to repeat, that the drug industry spends in the order of 25 cents out of every dollar you and I spend on drugs for the advertising of their products. This compares with something in the order of six cents out of every dollar used for research.

I have taken the trouble, Mr. Speaker, to collect a few prize examples of the kind of advertising directed at the general medical practitioner. I have lumped them under three categories.

The first are those derived from the detergent ads. I am afraid not everyone will be able to appreciate it but this is the level of highpower clinical medicine which is being advocated to the physicians. We have this powerful arrow which strikes down the ugly bacterium and from Burroughs-Wellcome research a new kind of anti-bacterial in the form of a super blue arrow which kills germs on sight. That is the kind of graphic presentation, and obvious lack of scientific sophistication which is being used by the drug industry.

Another category I put under the category of witty. We have here for example a full page ad — "Great Expectations for a Dickens of a Cough." Very subtle, very sophisticated use of the English graduates in Madison Avenue to advertise a particular anti-cough expectorant.

We have here another category — the graphic. We have a full page picture of a moose. "Orbenin Stands Out." "Extraordinary Every Day Medium Spectrum Antibiotic." There is certainly a lot of information here about the quality and the clinical effectiveness of this brand relative to others. What moose have to do with clinical effectiveness I really don't know. Not only is it a full-four color reproduction, Mr. Speaker, but it is also in relief. The same company has another glorious ad which Members might like to write away for, and use to decorate their walls, a prairie elevator. Again, "Orbenin Stands Out." An elevator, a full page elevator to discuss the clinical benefits of this particular antibiotic. Four-page color embossed, an outstanding picture. I am sure the company will be delighted to send you a sample to hang up on your office wall.

The latest trend, Mr. Speaker, has been towards pornography. We now turn to Schering's Ointments. We have here on a sensuous black page, a nude woman's stomach tattooed with the name of this particular ointment. Nude woman's breast not just quite visible in the photograph. We turn to pages two and three of this four-page glossy color spread which in the October 1972 issue of the Canadian Medical Association Journal we have eight little snaps which do include nude breasts, thighs, various other erogenous parts of the woman's body all tattooed with this particular antibiotic ointment's virtues. The final page contains the bare scalp of a gentleman containing a tattoo arguing the virtues of this ointment in attacking seborrhea.

More recently the same company has come up with a four-page spread worthy of Playboy. We start on the first page with a nude woman staring off into the distance on these rocks. Then we turn the page and we have a naked woman reclining on the beach with the waves undulating in the distance and a few drops of water splashing upon her beautiful hips. The text discusses

May 2, 1974

the importance of maintaining the integrity of the skin as being equally as important as maintaining the integrity of the environment. All of these virtues are brought to us courtesy of Schering Corporation and their ointment. The final page is a nude woman sitting in the surf contemplating presumably the virtues of this ointment.

Mr. Speaker, I suspect that the drug company in question has something more than bioavailability in mind when they placed and paid in the Canadian Medical Association Journal these four-page nude women spreads. I suspect they might have had some inkling that in a male dominated profession such as medicine, the members of the profession would be more likely to remember when prescribing ointments, the four-page nude spread than some sophisticated discussion about the clinical benefits of one brand of ointment relative to another. I don't imagine that this particular company would be spending the amount of money that it costs to place four-page colored nude ads, if they didn't think it was going to have some impact upon the prescribing and dispensing of drugs.

I do not introduce these matters merely for comic relief. Obviously this is part of a multi-pronged attack by the drug manufacturers in order to preserve their markets and make sure the physicians do prescribe their brand of drugs. It is going to take some considerable effort to overcome the quantity of brain-washing to which medical students have been subjected since their days in medical school and to make them think in terms of quality of medications. If this drug program does succeed in improving the level of debate, the level of discussion from that which is propagated by the drug manufacturing companies, it will have made a singular contribution to medicine.

And so far from viewing the Government program as an attack upon drug quality, as the major drug companies will doubtless argue, we may well be in a position where we can singularly improve the quality of medications used. As one pharmacist in Saskatoon said to me in confidence, the average pharmacist, and the average physician has no knowledge about the clinical effectiveness of one brand of a medication relative to another.

It is simply not possible in the conduct of ordinary clinical medicine for a physician to be conscious of the side effects of one brand relative to another, the relative manufacturing conditions of one company relative to another. And accordingly, if this program does involve the medical profession, the government and the pharmacists, in serious discussion about the relative virtues of different brands, that will be a contribution.

However, there is another conclusion which I think must be drawn. If Mr. Rice's experience in the Saskatoon Community Clinic is of any value, merely to engage in bulk purchasing tendering may not achieve the kinds of savings that we all want to see. It may very well be that in order to achieve the savings which are potentially feasible, the Government will have to involve itself in drug manufacturing. By that phrase I don't necessarily mean the actual working up of raw chemicals into finished pharmaceutical preparations. The process of drug manufacturing involves everything from that to the relatively simple process of importing from foreign sources, conducting the necessary tests to satisfy federal authorities, and packaging of drugs.

May 2, 1974

It must be understood that in many of these particular preparations where there exists virtually no competition, the Saskatchewan drug program will have to be prepared, not only to put out tenders in many cases, it must be prepared to seek out alternate sources of supply. For example, it may have to go to foreign sources in Europe and find a reputable producer of a particular preparation and if the Saskatchewan program considers this preparation to be of sufficient quality, to import it, to conduct the tests which are required for it to pass the federal regulations and then use it. The program must have that flexibility.

Having discussed the problems at the manufacturing level, I think that it must also be realized that there exist serious problems at the level of distribution of pharmaceutical preparations. Let me return to "Operation Sunrise" which I quoted briefly at the beginning, Mr. Speaker. Operation Sunrise was probably one of the most comprehensive drug price surveys ever conducted — certainly in the Province of Saskatchewan, if not in the country. We chose six preparations, three antibiotics, two tranquillizers and one analgesic. Five of the six are in the top ten drugs by volume of sales in Canada and in fact, we included the leading seller which is a tranquillizer — which may indicate something about our society. The methodology was that we contacted the Saskatchewan Pharmacists' Association and the Saskatchewan Medical Association and told them that we were interested in conducting a price survey. We did not inform them of the particular drugs to be surveyed or what particular pharmacies were to be surveyed. We then chose approximately 100, 113 to be precise, out of the province's 300 pharmacies, and six surveyors, in teams of two travelled the province filling one prescription for each drug in each of the pharmacies, generating a total of six times 113, or 678 prescriptions. There were some problems with the methodology as anybody who has read the report will be aware. In some of the smaller communities there was some suspicion about non-local purchasers. In Humboldt one pharmacist took singular objection to our surveyors. He called the RCMP and we had to explain to them what was proceeding.

Nonetheless the data received is of singular importance in attempting to complete a drug program. We found price ranges of six to one for one particular drug. For example tetracycline prescription cost from \$1.30 to \$8 for the filling of an identical prescription of tetracycline. In fact, for the filling of the identical prescription with an identical brand, we had ranges in the order of four to one. For example, sumyicine, one particular brand of tetracycline. The retail price for that brand of drug ranged from \$1.85 to \$8.

The conclusion is that although there obviously are significant differences in prices-to-pharmacists of different brands, there also exists a major problem at the moment in terms of different dispensing fees being charged across the province by different pharmacists. In fact, we concluded that in explanation of the differences in retail prices of prescriptions, at least as much emphasis had to be put upon variation in dispensing fees as variation in the price-to-pharmacist of drugs dispensed.

Let us take one glaring example, the experience at North Battleford. One prescription — this is an exceptional case and I am not in any way implying that it is typical — for

May 2, 1974

tetracycline cost \$8, of which the cost of ingredients were 98 cents, implying a \$7.02 dispensing fee being charged. For all North Battleford pharmacies — and there were seven at the time — our surveyors filled one prescription for tetracycline in each. The experience in North Battleford was that the average dispensing fee charged by North Battleford pharmacists for tetracycline was \$4.20, fully 90 per cent above the average dispensing fee charged in the province.

One of the refreshing voices of reason in this debate is that of Alf Pepper, the Registrar of the Pharmacists' Association. He quite freely admitted, while defending the profession as a whole that some of his colleagues price with their "blood pressure", to use his expression.

Ironically in attempting to justify the experience found in North Battleford during the survey, the editor of the North Battleford News Optimist claimed that pharmacists had recognized me as I got prescriptions filled in North Battleford and that they consciously decided to overcharge hoping that I would refuse the prescriptions. The unfortunate aspect of that in my defence, interesting as it may be, is that I have never in my life had a prescription filled in North Battleford. So either some poor unfortunate soul who happens to look like me gets dinged for his prescriptions every time he walks into a North Battleford pharmacy, or the North Battleford pharmacist prices his prescriptions according to the ideology of his customers, both of which are interesting explanations of drug price variation. But I am sure that the pharmacists' Association, if it is going to be defended on those grounds, would prefer more "vicious attacks" as Operation Sunrise was described in the News Optimist.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the pharmacy profession, the Government and certainly I, recognize that there has to be rationalization within the retail distribution of drugs. The present structure is quite unsatisfactory.

We have in Saskatchewan the largest number of pharmacies per capita or, put the other way around, the lowest number of people per pharmacy. There is one pharmacy for every 2,900 people in Saskatchewan as compared to the Canadian average of one for every 4,500.

What is happening at the moment is a process of capitalist rationalization. Given a large number of pharmacies, given the insufficient volume of pharmaceutical work for the pharmacists in these pharmacies, there is a process afoot whereby large chain pharmacies, such as White Cross, are driving independent pharmacies out of business, such that there is a constant decline in the order of five to ten pharmacies per year in the province. But this process of market rationalization probably has little to do with the efficient provision of pharmaceutical services around the province. The large chain pharmacies are coming into the big cities and admittedly, according to our experience in Operation Sunrise, they are providing drugs at lower costs. But they are not assuring that there will be the provision of pharmaceutical services where needed and when needed — especially in rural areas.

It is of interest that the present situation results in the average pharmacist earning over half of his revenue not from the sale of prescriptions but from the sale of everything from cosmetics and candy bars to magazines. The average pharmacy in

May 2, 1974

Saskatchewan in 1971 earned 38 per cent of its revenue from the sale of prescriptions as compared with 62 per cent from other sources. So we have the situation in which a highly trained health professional, trained at public expense, winds up spending a considerable proportion of his time not engaged in the provision of a health service, but acting as a general store manager. Alf Pepper described it in the following way: "We as pharmacists do not want to be lipstick salesmen. We want to be 100 per cent health workers."

I trust that we can address ourselves to this problem of how do we make pharmacists into 100 per cent health workers. I think we have to be prepared to use paramedical people in pharmacy as in other health fields. We have to be prepared to use dispensers with less training than pharmacists to do some of the simple dispensing functions. The dispensing function has become progressively less sophisticated as the drug manufacturers have done an increasing amount of the compounding themselves.

More important, we have to involve the pharmacists themselves in the process of active health delivery, whereas now most pharmacists view themselves in a passive role in which they are merely carrying out the instructions of the physician who has prescribed. We must continue to break down the idea that the physician is top man in a hierarchy of health workers, and understand that the pharmacist has an important role in primary health care with respect to drugs. Very often physicians use drug therapy as an easy way of solving fundamental health problems. We all know of the problems of physicians over-prescribing in order to get a patient out of the office. The pharmacist with knowledge of the drug intake of various patients is in a far better position very often than the physician to advise upon the use of drugs. Certainly the ultimate decision on prescribing remains with the physician who has got the maximum training. Nonetheless pharmacists, who are aware of the over-the-counter preparations which the patient may be consuming, should be — although less than 10 per cent are at the moment — but he should be keeping a family card of drugs prescribed to the particular patient, he is in a position to advise both the patient and the physician as to the advisability of certain drug treatment.

In sum, Mr. Speaker, if the Government's program is to succeed, it must involve three elements. First we must be prepared to have an integrated program in an attempt to reduce drug costs, not only engage in bulk purchasing but also engage in manufacturing as the need arises in particular drug preparations for which we are receiving no benefits via bulk purchasing.

Secondly, we must involve ourselves in the process of rationalizing the distribution of drugs. This may involve many aspects — it may involve the need to nationalize National Drugs, the largest not particularly efficient drug wholesaler in this province. It will doubtless involve the placing of pharmacists in rural hospitals so that we can assure the supply of pharmaceutical services to rural Saskatchewan. It may well involve the payment of pharmacists on other than a fee-for-service basis, the payment of pharmacists on the basis of salary or various combinations of salary and fee-for-service.

A third component is the introduction of drug insurance. Drug insurance has been partially introduced in the present program inasmuch as the Government has undertaken to cover the cost

May 2, 1974

of the drugs purchased. However, there remains the question of the dispensing fee. I don't want to indulge in any cheap rhetoric, as have Members of the Liberal caucus in this House, in trying to compare this dispensing fee with the deterrent fee imposed by the Liberals on medicare in the 1960s. However, obviously the dispensing fee is a major component of the cost of drugs. On average dispensing fees amount to 50 per cent of drug costs. We should seek ultimately to remove it. I think it is legitimate, in trial experience before we know what will be the operation of the plan, to use the present formula as proposed by the Government of covering the cost of the preparations and leaving the fee to the patient for the time being. Various estimates based on experience in other countries indicate that there may be up to a 30 per cent increase in prescriptions if all direct costs to the purchaser are removed.

This 30 per cent increase could certainly be absorbed by the budget at the moment, but it has many unfortunate aspects which are worth looking at briefly. The increase in prescribing by physicians with the knowledge that no longer do drugs cost their patients anything directly, will further exacerbate the problem of overprescribing. Further, patients will have more prescriptions filled where at present up to 25 per cent are never filled. I think it is legitimate for the Government to proceed at this juncture to gain additional knowledge about how the program will work — the ability to rationalize drug distribution, the ability to effect substitution of Government brands bulk purchased drugs for brands manufactured by the "ethical companies." Given the need to have this kind of experience before going into an entirely free program I think it is legitimate for the Government to pay only the cost of the drugs dispensed. I trust however, that we realize the job is not done as long as the dispensing fee remains to be covered by the patient, given the inequity and iniquity of the distribution of drug costs.

In conclusion what seems initially to be a simple need for bulk purchasing in order to reduce the costs of drugs to the pharmacists, expands upon closer examination into a multi-faceted need to reform the entire production, manufacture, distribution, prescribing and dispensing of pharmaceutical preparations. I trust, as we proceed with this debate, both here in the Legislature, with the public and with the health workers involved, that the broader aspects of this question will always be kept in mind. With that, Mr. Speaker, I will certainly support the principle of this Bill before us.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. E.C. WHELAN (Regina North West): — Apparently the Opposition Members who have spoken think that a 50 per cent reduction in the cost of prescription drugs is the same as taxing the sick and the dying. There was no deterrent tax on medical services and hospital beds and they put one on. Prescription drug prices were exorbitant and we plan to reduce them 50 per cent. Mr. Speaker, their logic escapes me. But I say this to them, Mr. Speaker, that they please, please continue their arguments and their logic until election time. Fight the election on their contention that this reduction is the same as deterrent fees. We look forward with enthusiasm to such a contest on such an issue, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

May 2, 1974

MR. WHELAN: — This Bill in effect establishes a plan to distribute drugs at a reduced rate to everyone. It is necessary, long overdue and meets a need. This Government has fulfilled a promise that was made in 1971. The record is worth reviewing. Let's look at some of the political history of the drug plan in this province.

This is a moment of achievement that we must recognize as significant. When the Government, bearing the same label as Members opposite, was elected in 1964 it was elected — if one can imagine it — on the basis that there would be introduced in this province for all citizens a drug program. Lip service had been given by numerous members of that Party concerning the high cost of drugs. One loquacious and verbose senator in particular had quoted the markup on several items at over 1000 per cent. Investigations have been carried out regarding the cost of drugs and these investigations had convinced them beyond a shadow of a doubt, Mr. Speaker, that there was a need for a drug program. And with the utmost sincerity they promised the people of this province a drug program. Mr. Speaker, then they got elected.

For a long time they were quiet and then they said they were still in favor of it. Then they brought out that moth-eaten waffling, face-saving manoeuvre frequently adopted and utilized by the Liberal Party, they would have a plebiscite, Mr. Speaker. But as the cost of drugs continued to climb and the possibility that attention to the problem would be appreciated by more people than they had estimated, they didn't hold a plebiscite. They just forgot about the problem. The result was there was no drug program, no legislation, no reduction in the price of drugs and eventually, as it ought to be and as it should be, there was no Liberal Government.

Time and time again criticism is levelled at us that we are collecting taxes and that we are spending money. This program will use the tax money from those with the ability pay, those who can pay income tax, those who pay the Education and Health tax. Mr. Speaker, the money will be used to purchase drugs to pay in part or to some degree for drugs that will be made available to the public. Who will appreciate this? Mr. Speaker, the answer is obvious. The people who must have the drugs but because of their income find it financially difficult to purchase them. Sometimes it is the elderly, sometimes it is those in lower income groups with families. This Bill will, in effect, remove one financial hazard that haunts and has haunted the people of this province down through the years.

Increased provincial revenue has made this possible. The plan is practical and it is in a form that will make available drugs to those who haven't the means by contributions from the Treasury of the province, drugs that will guarantee their health and protect them from economic hardship.

Mr. Speaker, the Liberals talked about it. Mr. Speaker, they could have helped the sick and those in the lower income brackets. They could have made drugs available. There was nothing needed except the desire and enthusiasm to put an end to the high cost of drugs. But making available drugs, necessary drugs, at a reasonable price to all of our population just didn't appeal to them. Mr. Speaker, they talked and talked and talked and talked. The evidence that we were not just talking

May 2, 1974

is here in this Bill. I will support second reading because it indicates action to reduce the cost of drugs, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. A.R. GUY (Athabasca): — Mr. Speaker, I just want to say one or two words in reply to the Member who has just taken his seat. He talked about action. I want to remind the Member that this is the third year that they have been the Government and we see this action coming rather late and we find it coming in a very small dose. In fact when you consider the deterrent fee that the Minister has imposed upon the drug plan, one wonders what was the purpose of bringing in this plan in the first place. It's something like his dental plan, it's a bit of a last bit of repentance before he has to go back to the people. He made a promise during the election campaign in 1971 that he was going to provide dentist care for everybody 12 years and under. And what does he come in with? He comes in with a plan that looks after one year, the age six. Just think of the man that has a ten and eleven and twelve year old family, he gets no assistance whatsoever but because you have a six year old, then you get your dental bills paid. He calls that a fair dental plan.

The drug plan is on the same basis. It's a last minute repentance before he goes to the people because he made a promise. This promise was made when they weren't the Government and really didn't have the intention of becoming the Government. We would have had a drug plan and there wouldn't have been a deterrent fee on it, I'll tell you that. It is difficult to see the Minister today who was so vocal about deterrent fees only a few years ago bringing in a plan which has a far higher deterrent fee which will prevent the people who really need the assistance in getting their drugs and will prevent them from getting the drugs they need at a reasonable price. It appears to me that both the drug and the dental plan being brought in at this time were for political reasons. The commitment that they made in 1971 was to have a free dental plan for all under twelve and a free drug plan, now they come in with a substitute merely to get the drug plan on the books of this province. It is really a plan of discrimination and a deterrent to those who really need drugs in the Province of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. W.E. SMISHEK (Minister of Health): — First of all I wish to express my appreciation to those Members who have spoken in support of this Bill and the program that we are introducing. I particularly want to thank the Hon. Member for Saskatoon University (Mr. Richards) who has spent a good deal of time in studying the complexities of the drug industry, while he was the Legislative Secretary, in the Department of Public Health. He devoted a great deal of time to look into the whole matter of drug costs. I indeed welcomed his work on the Operation Sunrise Study. In fact, I can say that the Province of Saskatchewan received good value for the work that he has done. He has suggested that we consider looking at foreign markets to buy drugs, he also suggested that consideration should be given to manufacturing of drugs as well.

Mr. Speaker, we want to give the North American manufacturers an opportunity first to demonstrate that they can provide

May 2, 1974

cheaper drugs through a bulk purchasing process. If they fail to do this then indeed we may have to look at foreign markets. However, we will give them a chance first as there is some indication that they will be willing to co-operate. Certainly the hearing aid manufacturers have demonstrated their ability to co-operate and to reduce the cost of hearing aids through the bulk purchase program through the Government.

Mr. Speaker, he also suggested that the proposed experiment with respect to a dispensing fee be carried on, this we propose to do and based on experience at a future date the whole matter will be reviewed.

Mr. Speaker, on the other hand I must say that the criticism of the Opposition is one that is most difficult to understand and indeed is surprising. Particularly the remarks of the Hon. Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) who has just sat down.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to draw to the attention of the Hon. Members some of the speeches that were made when the Liberals were in office. In particular, I wish to refer to the speeches made by the Leader of the Opposition — I wish he were in the House — when he was Minister of Public Health. I have in front of me two news stories, Mr. Speaker, of April of 1966. In the Star-Phoenix this story appeared on April 19, 1966 under the heading, "Drug Insurance Plan Forecasted." It says:

Health Minister D.G. Steuart said, Thursday, that the Government intends to introduce a provincial drug insurance program within two years.

Note that, Mr. Speaker. He said:

As soon as we have the facts, the program will be presented to the Cabinet and then explained to the people in detail. He said that the Government realized that drug costs are still very high and that the program will be introduced within 24 months.

The Hon. Member for Athabasca says, no deterrent fee. Just wait a second. Ten days later another story appeared and this one has a great big headline, "Steuart Predicts Drug Plan in Two Years." This is a North Battleford story, written by Merv. Unger.

MR. GRANT: — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order, is the Hon. Member introducing new material here?

MR. SMISHEK: — I'm afraid you don't like to hear the facts. Mr. Speaker, I want to give them the facts.

It is a story written by Merv. Unger, News Editor, North Battleford dated April 29, 1966.

The Saskatchewan Health Minister, D.G. Steuart, forecasted a drug insurance plan for Saskatchewan within two years (same story). The Health Minister was speaking to the Northwest Regional Health Council meeting in the Oddfellows Hall. Steuart said, the Government is presently doing studies on such an insurance scheme and as soon as the results are known

May 2, 1974

a recommendation will be made to the Cabinet.

And he went on.

Present indications according to the Minister indicate the possibility of a voluntary plan with a deductible clause.

Mr. Speaker, note with a "deductible clause." What does that mean? I suppose he would call it a "utilization fee" or a "patient participation fee", not a "deterrent fee", Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, he carried on.

The Minister told the News Optimist that the pharmacists are working hand in hand with the Government.

And they worked hand in hand. Mr. Speaker, they worked hand in hand in the hot summers of '66 and '67. They worked during the dry fall of 1966 and the cold winter of '67 and on to the fall of '67 and what did we get? Twenty-four months had passed, no drug program, no indication. So an election was coming and what did we get, an election promise that the Liberals if elected will conduct a plebiscite, Mr. Speaker,. That was their drug program. In the meantime a new Health Minister was appointed. And we waited. And we waited in 1967 for that plebiscite and in 1968 and '69 and 1970 and in 1971 the people of Saskatchewan held a plebiscite. Yes the people of Saskatchewan had a plebiscite. A plebiscite on the promises that we made and would implement if elected to government. We didn't say we were going to introduce a free drug plan, we said that we will establish a drug plan which will reduce the cost to the consumer, based on bulk purchasing and a drug formulary.

Mr. Speaker, this Bill goes far beyond the promise that was made by the NDP. The program we propose to establish will mean that the Government will pay for the cost of drugs and the people will pay all or a portion of the prescription or a dispensing fee.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to comment on a few other statements that have been made by the Hon. Members. One of the Members said that this is political medicine. Well, if there is anybody who knows anything about political medicine, it's the Liberals. Let us go back to 1962 when during the introduction of medical care, they made medical care a political issue. They had Senator MacDonald, the then Leader of the Opposition, plus the present Leader of the Opposition, going around this province organizing KOD committees; they led delegations, kicked the doors, they gave the people political medicine. The people of Saskatchewan know and understand Liberal political medicine.

Mr. Speaker, during this debate they have alleged that there is going to be interference with the medical judgement of a medical profession of how to prescribe. There can be nothing further from the truth, Mr. Speaker. They have also stated and let me quote the Hon. Member for Moose Jaw North, who said:

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 population.

May 2, 1974

Mr. Speaker, that is precisely what this Bill proposes to resolve. First of all, it will establish a fair distribution and secondly it will substantially, dramatically in fact, reduce the cost of drugs to those who are most in need of drugs.

The Liberals seem to have difficulty in understanding new health programs simply because they have a real prejudice towards the introduction of new health programs. We know that from past experience.

It is true that the program we propose to introduce, the cost of the drugs on the average will be reduced by at least one-half. It is also a fact that for those who have to purchase expensive drugs, as I have indicated in the Press and other places, the cost will be reduced substantially more for example, for a person who has to buy a drug costing \$20 per prescription, the prescription fee may be \$1.75 or \$2 or \$2.50. I don't know yet, we have not negotiated, but he will pay that portion i.e. the dispensing fee and the cost of the drug will be paid by the Government which may be 90 per cent of the cost. This will be borne out of the public purse, Mr. Speaker.

It is interesting that since we introduced this Bill and since its second reading, my office has had numerous enquiries. We have received hundreds of letters from the people of Saskatchewan, expressing their appreciation that we introduced the drug plan. The CCF Government were first to introduce the hospital plan, the medical care plan, and we are now introducing a drug program for which the people are very grateful. Right across the country there are enquiries coming in. From British Columbia, from Alberta, from Manitoba, Ontario and Quebec. I must express my appreciation to the news media who have indeed played their role in making known to the citizens of Saskatchewan and the people of Canada what we are proposing to do. This morning, in fact, I appeared on Canada AM to explain the drug program to the people of Canada, so to the CTV and to the CBC in particular, I want to express my appreciation of their efforts to make the people of this province and this country familiar with what we are doing.

As I said during second reading, this program will be based on several principles. First of all, bulk purchase, secondly, a drug formulary as established by a technical and scientific committee. The Government will pay for the cost of the drugs, the consumer will pay all or a part of the dispensing fee, to be determined through negotiations with the Pharmaceutical Association. There will be no premiums charged. The plan will be paid for from the general revenues. I also appreciate the co-operation of the Pharmaceutical Association with whom we have had a number of meetings since I first introduced the Bill and just this week we met with the wholesalers. There is every indication that the pharmacists, the wholesalers in Saskatchewan, will co-operate. I am also grateful for the co-operation of the medical profession. Their main concern as expressed to me is that high quality drugs be provided and this is my concern and I want to assure you, Mr. Speaker, and the people of Saskatchewan, that that is what we intend to do, to establish a program which will provide high quality drugs to the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I move second reading, and Mr. Speaker, I think we should have a recorded vote.

May 2, 1974

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

YEAS — 48

Messieurs

| | | |
|-------------|-------------|-----------------------|
| Blakeney | Cody | Flasch |
| Meakes | Robbins | Steuart |
| Smishek | Tchorzewski | Coupland |
| Romanow | Cowley | Loken |
| Messer | Taylor | Guy |
| Snyder | Matsalla | Boldt |
| Thibault | Faris | Grant |
| Larson | Mostoway | MacDonald (Milestone) |
| Brockelbank | Gross | McIsaac |
| MacMurchy | Feduniak | Gardner |
| Pepper | Comer | Weatherald |
| Michayluk | Rolfes | MacLeod |
| Byers | Lange | Lane |
| Thorson | Hanson | Wiebe |
| Whelan | Feschuk | Malone |
| Kwasnica | Kaeding | Richards |

NAYS — 0

Messieurs

Nil

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 Services in Saskatchewan** be now read a second time.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I'll be very brief in rebuttal, simply to say that I don't believe the communities share the concern that has been voiced by the Leader of the Opposition with respect to the controls, so called, by this Police Commission. I say that is the case because as Members will know, to a very large extent the Department of the Attorney General has always had and now has a great deal of influence on the operation of the police forces and police standards, strictly on a political level if you want to put it on that basis. What this Bill will do is remove that from the hands of the Department of the Attorney General and put it into the hands of what I hope will be a blue ribbon police commission.

We look forward to a nomination panel of three people who will be absolutely representative of Saskatchewan and knowledgeable and interested in this area. I can't help but notice that the Regina Leader-Post ran an editorial in yesterday's Leader-Post in effect commending the Bill. I'm not going to cite it at any length, but just one paragraph simply says:

It's a good idea and if the commission is properly established it should be viewed as a positive step towards standardization of good police servicing across Saskatchewan, not as some kind of threat to the authority of local police chiefs and commissions.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that to be the thrust of this Bill. I

May 2, 1974

believe it to be in fact a positive step forward for the standardization of good policing in the Province of Saskatchewan. I believe like the editorialist does, that it is not to be viewed as a threat to the authority of local police commissions and police chiefs and I don't believe the local police commissions view it in that light. I certainly know that the chiefs don't view it in that way. I think it will be a positive step forward to the policing of the Province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, that is all I have to say in rebuttal to second reading of Bill 118 of the Police Act.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Cowley that Bill No. 129 — **An Act to amend The Mineral Taxation Act** be now read a second time.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a very few words about some of the remarks made by the Leader of the Opposition with respect to this particular Bill.

The Leader of the Opposition indicated that he felt this Bill would do more harm to investment in this province than anything else ever brought forward by this Government.

Mr. Speaker, I want to assure the Members of the House and the people of Saskatchewan that that is not what I or the Members of this side of the House feel will be the result of this particular Bill.

Mr. Speaker, he went on to deal with the question of the provisions which have to do with the mineral acreage tax and the provisions which are put into the legislation which restrict people in moving about acreage in certain ways to avoid the payment of the tax.

The Member said that this would work to the disadvantage of the farmers of Saskatchewan. I want to point out that there is an exemption in the Bill for transfers to surface right holders. And there are provisions if the clause is too restrictive for the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council to make such regulations as are necessary in order to broaden the scope of the exemptions in this particular piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, he then went on to deal at some length with the potash companies and how they had been welcomed in by the former CCF and by Tommy Douglas and how they had been welcomed by the Liberal Party. And how they had lost money at first, as they indeed did, and how there were no thanks or no considerations being given to the potash companies for what they have done in the past and what risks they have taken and so on.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't think it is the Government's intention as I said in moving the Bill, not to recognize a rate of return which is commensurate with the risks involved and the investment involved. But it is not the intention of this Government, and I repeat, not the intention of the Government, to allow our resources to be exploited without a fair share of that resource returning to the people of Saskatchewan, either in the form of the product itself, or in the form of an adequate rate of taxation.

May 2, 1974

Mr. Speaker, he went on to talk about broken faith and broken words and broken contracts, and that no one will come here and invest and accused us of a lack of morals and a great many other terms which the Leader of the Opposition chooses to apply to the Government.

Mr. Speaker, . . . yes, the Leader of the Opposition is a broken record, that is right. We have sat down and discussed our proposals with the industry and we propose to continue those discussions. In due course, we shall have to make the necessary decisions with respect to the rates and the methods of applying the tax etc. and at some point in time the Government will make the decision. And as I said in moving this legislation, Mr. Speaker, it is essentially enabling legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I don't believe and I am sure the people of Saskatchewan won't accept the stalwart defence of the Leader of the Opposition of the potash companies and their right to extremely high returns. And what he was saying was in effect inferring that the people of Saskatchewan were not entitled to a greater share of the returns of our potash resources.

I don't think, Mr. Speaker, that the people in 1975 are going to agree with the Leader of the Opposition as they didn't agree with him in 1971 when he was touting around this province the same particular philosophy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

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

YEAS — 33

Messieurs

| | | |
|-------------|-------------|----------|
| Blakeney | Michayluk | Mostoway |
| Meakes | Byers | Gross |
| Smishek | Thorson | Feduniak |
| Romanow | Whelan | Comer |
| Messer | Cody | Rolfes |
| Snyder | Robbins | Lange |
| Thibault | Tchorzewski | Hanson |
| Larson | Cowley | Feschuk |
| Brockelbank | Taylor | Kaeding |
| MacMurchy | Matsalla | Flasch |
| Pepper | Faris | Richards |

NAYS — 13

Messieurs

| | | |
|----------|-----------------------|---------|
| Steuart | Grant | MacLeod |
| Coupland | MacDonald (Milestone) | Lane |
| Loken | McIsaac | Wiebe |
| Guy | Weatherald | Malone |
| Boldt | | |

**ADJOURNED DEBATES
GOVERNMENT MOTIONS**

CONSTITUENCY BOUNDARIES COMMISSION

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution moved by the Hon. Mr. Blakeney (Premier):

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

(i) lying south of the dividing line as defined in section 14 of the said Act, be divided into 59 constituencies, and

(ii) lying north of the dividing line as defined in section 14 of the said Act be divided into two constituencies,

be hereby approved and adopted by this Assembly; That the descriptions of each of the constituencies as recommended by the said final report, except the description of the boundaries of the constituency of Saskatoon Mayfair, be approved and adopted by this Assembly; and

That the final report of the Commission be altered by deleting the description of the constituency of Saskatoon Mayfair, and substituting therefor the description as set out in the schedule which was attached to the final report, and that the final report of the commission as so altered be approved and adopted by this Assembly.

MR. A.R. GUY (Athabasca): — Mr. Speaker, I was out watching the meetings outside the Legislature, they seem to be more interesting perhaps than what is going on in here this afternoon. However, perhaps I can liven it up a little.

I should like to say a few words on the Constituency Boundaries Commission. First of all I want to say that I have absolutely no complaint with the work of the Independent Boundaries Commission. I think that they did a reasonable job within the guidelines which this Legislature or which really boils down to what the Government set for them. I am not sure that the guidelines regarding the rural and urban populations should have been as they were, but that has nothing to do with the Commission as they carried out their work in that regard.

But I have listened with considerable interest to the pious statements made by Members opposite. One would have thought that they had invented the Independent Boundaries Commission to hear the statements which have been made. This, of course, is not true as the Independent Boundaries Commission was probably first used in Canada by the Federal Liberal Government. I think other jurisdictions have used it since. But what Members opposite refuse to forget is that if they were so set on an Independent Boundaries Commission and they criticized the Liberals for seven

May 2, 1974

years for not doing it, what were they doing in 1960? What were they doing in 1956 and 1952 and 1948? Why, if the Independent Boundaries solution to setting the boundaries for constituencies is so valid in 1974, why shouldn't it have been also valid in 1960 or 1956? I think that the statements being made by Members opposite are not according to the facts. They got caught in opposition with a promise that they made that if elected they would set up an Independent Boundaries Commission. They had no alternative but to do so. At the time they made that promise I don't think they had the feeling that they were going to be the Government. But let that be as it may, I do not criticize the former government for failing to set up an Independent Boundaries Commission, when the NDP Government had 20 years to establish such a Commission and refused to do so.

We have heard Members opposite say that representation by population is a great thing. And they said when the Liberals were in office, we didn't have representation by population because some of the constituencies were larger than others. I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, we never had a situation in the seven years that we were the Government where one individual had five votes and another individual a mile away had only one vote. That was the system that the NDP Government used to work under. They liked to have the people in Saskatoon have five votes and the people in Regina I think had four or five votes. And yet the people in Rosthern, in Hanley and Milestone they had one vote. And they call that fair representation by population. And Member after Member stood up here in this Legislature in the last few days talking about the fair way in which the NDP operated. Well, if it is fair, it's only going to come into force in the next election because there have never been fair boundaries under the NDP since 1944. There has never to this day been a fair boundary under the NDP. There has never been representation by population by the people who sit opposite. Not once in the 20 years that they went to the people of Saskatchewan did they have fair representation by population. They stand up here today and they criticize us. We had at least one vote for one person. And they had five votes for one person. When things got a little difficult in the city of Regina, what did they do? They said, well, we will give one part of the city one vote, but we will give another part of the city two votes. And the Premier himself was part of this. He was part of a two-vote constituency. He calls that fair. You call that fair, Mr. Premier that one person in Regina votes for two people and a person across the track voted for one? Do you think that is a fair representation by population. I tell you the people of Regina didn't think it was very fair when their time came to go to the polls. So that is really all I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that never once for 20 years that the NDP or the CCF sat in those seats did we have fair representation by populations. Now today they are all in favor of representation by population. Thankfully, they are going to bring it in, at least we hope they will. I guess maybe the Bill will be coming in after this Resolution is done away with.

I have one other further complaint. Why was it if the Independent Boundaries Commission had the authority and were good enough and honorable enough to set the boundaries for southern Saskatchewan, why weren't they allowed to set the boundaries for northern Saskatchewan? Why was half of the province taken out of the hands of the Independent Boundaries Commission and put in the hands of the Attorney General? Why was that done? The reason it was done is that they can't keep

May 2, 1974

fingers off northern Saskatchewan. They set up a bureaucracy up there, now they intend to interfere with the voting patterns of the people in northern Saskatchewan.

They wouldn't trust the Commission to set up the boundaries in the North. I must say that the Commission did the only thing possible when they drew the line. They did it the only possible way when you consider the size and the location of the towns and the villages and the municipalities up there. They had no choice as to where that line was drawn. It was clear from the beginning that they had to draw the line exactly where they did in order to get equal population in the two constituencies.

The Government calls that fair. The Attorney General calls it fair. They talk about an Independent Boundaries Commission. They say an Independent Boundaries Commission for the South but an Attorney General's Commission for the North. And they call that fair. That is what I object to. I object very strenuously. They showed no concern for the transportation patterns of northern Saskatchewan. They showed no concern for the racial backgrounds and there are several different ones throughout the region that they have divided it into the two constituencies, they showed no concern for the different economic developments that were taking place; and they showed no concern for the proximity of one community to another. In fact, Mr. Speaker, what they did by establishing two constituencies in the manner which they have been established was to make it far more difficult for an MLA to communicate with his constituents than it is under the present system.

A person in Uranium City who wants to communicate with people in La Loche which is in the same constituency has to go to La Ronge and then to Prince Albert and then across to Meadow Lake and then up to La Loche. They have made the lines of communication hundreds of miles longer than they were before. The same is true when you look at the eastern constituency. I think that this could have been avoided if the Independent Boundaries Commission had determined where those constituencies should have run and on what basis they should have been. Instead of setting the guidelines and then telling them that this is what you have to do.

I support the principle of an Independent Commission but I am unalterably opposed to the manner in which the Attorney General used his high-handed position to set the boundaries for half of the province when he wouldn't let the northern people have the same Independent Boundaries Commission that the southern people had.

MR. ROMANOW: — Would the Hon. Member permit a question?

MR. GUY: — Anytime.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Hon. Member would tell the House whether he agrees with the statements made by his colleague for Moosomin (Mr. Gardner) in this Legislature on April 10, 1974, that, quote:

We could cover the province completely and show beyond any doubt how boundary changes were carefully designed to accommodate the NDP.

May 2, 1974

Does the Hon. Member concur in that statement made by his colleague?

MR. GUY: — That is a question that doesn't refer to any comments that I made in this debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. GUY: — I don't know, I wasn't in the House when the Member made the statement. I am prepared — Mr. Speaker, I have been asked if I would answer a question in regard to something I said, I thought that he was listening but unfortunately he wasn't.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. M. FEDUNIAK (Turtleford): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to introduce to you and through you to the Members of this House some 28 Grade Eight students from the Turtleford school. They are seated in the west gallery and are accompanied by their teacher, Mr. Struble and two parents, Mr..s. Gingrich and Mr..s. Richardson, also their bus driver, John Thunderchild.

I hope they have enjoyed their tour so far and trust they are finding their visit most educational and interesting. I am looking forward to meeting them briefly before they leave after which I wish them a safe journey home.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. J.E. BROCKELBANK (Saskatoon Mayfair): — Mr. Speaker, I noticed the students have arrived from Westmount School in Saskatoon. I want to take this opportunity through you, Mr. Speaker, to welcome them to the Legislative Chamber this afternoon. They are Grade Seven students as I understand it and they are accompanied today by Mr. Cowan, Mr. Sutherland and Mr..s. Bowie.

I want to say something about Westmount School in Saskatoon. Both of my sons have had the opportunity to attend Westmount School. My oldest son for his Grade One to Eight and my younger son for a lesser period of time. I found it to be a very good school with very good teachers. There are some very illustrious alumni from Westmount School. One of them whom I could mention, Mr. Speaker, would be the Attorney General who sits here with us today. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that all Members of the House will join me in welcoming the students from Westmount School and wish them a safe journey back to Saskatoon.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: — I believe there's a group of students in the west gallery from Delisle, represented by the Hon. Member, the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cowley), whom I should like to introduce to the Members.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

May 2, 1974

The Assembly resumed the interrupted debate on the Constituency Boundaries Commission.

MR. L. LARSON (Pelly): — Mr. Speaker, I want to make a few comments on the motion before us. I was quite amused by the remarks of the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy). As usual when he has a weak argument he makes a lot of loud noises and if the weakness of his argument was an example of the noises he was making it certainly is very weak.

I want first of all to congratulate the Government and the Commission for the very objective approach that was taken to the boundary mess that we inherited from the Liberal Government. To say that it was a mess is being altogether too kind. It would be more fitting to say that we inherited the most blatant and unheard of gerrymander in the history of any political party. It was a gerrymander that has no equal, it has no precedent. It was so blatantly obvious that even hard nosed Liberals found it hard to accept and to try to justify. The principle of representation by population was totally ignored and scuttled. It was thrown out the window to recoin a favorite Liberal cliché. Old constituency boundaries were ignored and any resemblance to common sense and reasonable conditions were equally ignored. In its place boundaries were drawn on totally political grounds and voting patterns. Any other concept is just not acceptable. It would be most interesting to see the behind-the-scenes activities that must have taken place before the final decisions were made. I am sure that there must have been some very interesting and enlightening discussions, Mr. Speaker, that took place. I am sure that there were some candidates as they were being sacrificed and cut off to strengthen others who were not very happy. It would be most interesting to know who masterminded the plan and made the decisions as to who should be sacrificed and who should be enhanced. As I have said even the most hardnosed Liberals found the approach most reprehensible.

When I inquired from the returning officer in my constituency he was almost ashamed to say and to admit the kind of gerrymander that he was called on to invoke on the voters. Yes, Mr. Speaker, we inherited the most scandalous gerrymander mess that has ever been perpetrated on any democratic society. To correct this blatant mess this Government has, as was promised during the election, implemented the Independent Boundaries Commission and the motion we are debating now is the result of their work. The terms of reference and the criteria were specifically outlined and the specific criterion was representation by population.

I am in full accord with the actions, the terms of reference as well as the result of the work and the Report of the Commission.

I want now to say a word about the Commission, Mr. Speaker, and the work they did. The calibre of the Commission was in my opinion one of the very highest and most responsible men obtainable. They adhered strictly to the terms of reference as laid down by this Legislature. They adhered strictly to the principle of representation by population. The hearings and overall work by them is above reproach and above criticism. They looked at the mess confronting them and I am sure realized the monumental task that they were being called on to solve. I am equally sure they were aware that the principle they were being

May 2, 1974

called on to fulfil would be watched and looked at not only in Saskatchewan but elsewhere. They knew, Mr. Speaker, that their job was an important one and they were determined to do a good job.

I, therefore, Mr. Speaker, congratulate the Members of the Independent Commission for the job they have done and the report that they have presented.

I turn now, Mr. Speaker, to the reaction of the Members opposite. The Member for Moosomin (Mr. Gardner) the other day turned in a most incredible performance. His performance in my opinion described as accurately as I have ever heard the true character of the Liberal Party. It is very obvious that there is no level that he or his Party will not stoop to if they feel it is to their advantage or if they feel there is some confusion or misunderstanding or some political advantage to be gained by their actions. I can live with the political shenanigans of the Liberals as it has been proven many times over and over again that their actions are totally incredible, totally irresponsible, totally irrelevant to the principles of democracy and fair play. What I find difficult to live with, Mr. Speaker, is the attack on the members of the Commission to say, as Members opposite, particularly the Member for Moosomin has been saying that the Commission was politically biased, was under political pressure from the Government is just not acceptable. I say this is an attack on the very integrity of the members of the Commission. It is a direct slur on some of the most respected men in the province. I would never have believed, Mr. Speaker, that I would ever have heard an attack of this kind in this House.

Let me remind Members of this House what the Leader of the Liberal Party said when he spoke in this House on April 5, 1972 and I quote, after having said a lot of other things, he said:

But seriously we do welcome the idea that you will bring in a nonpartisan and an Independent Boundaries Commission, and they will, we are confident, bring in an independent report that will set up boundaries in a fair and reasonable manner.

He said further:

The key to it of course is the Commission. If the Commission is fair and reasonable then the resulting report will be fair and reasonable. I presume, in fact I am sure, that the legislation that follows will be fair and reasonable. And it can be a new step and it can be a watershed as the Attorney General said, in politics of this province.

The Leader of the Opposition continued, Mr. Speaker, and again I quote:

Population as a basis I think is a sound basis with some consideration under certain conditions.

And I find that the Member for Athabasca doesn't apparently agree with the Leader of the Opposition. He went on to say:

I am confident that the Chief Justice will face the responsibility and will choose someone from his Court

May 2, 1974

or from the Queen's Bench Court and that individual, whoever he may be, will not put his stamp on anything that is not fair and equitable. And again I come back and say the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly, the former Clerk of this Assembly were fair and reasonable men and we would have confidence in them.

This, Mr. Speaker, is what the Leader of the Opposition had to say when he spoke in this Legislature in 1972 when the Commission was being established. His concluding remarks were even more incredible and I quote:

I don't think there are very many political eunuchs in the province but still there are people in this province who though they may have a political bias one way or another would feel very proud and be prepared to set aside that political bias and face a challenge like this, and face the responsibility and do a good and reasonable job.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the Government for bringing in this motion and the Bill that will follow. I think it can be the basis for a fair and equitable redistribution. We will support and welcome it.

Thus spoke the Leader of the Liberal Party in 1972. Now in 1974 I can only assume that he did not mean and the Liberal Party did not mean what they said. If your statements were sincere and genuine in 1972, they should be more so in 1974 because in 1974 we see the results of the work of the Commission. In 1974 I can only conclude that by some mysterious whim that afflicts the Liberal Party it has assumed that it is now good politics to make slurring allegations and charges against the very people whom the Leader of the Opposition praised in such glowing terms. This again illustrates the unbelievable incredibility of the Opposition. It illustrates your total incompetence and your total disarray. It illustrates that you have only one objective in this House and that is to confuse and distort and use any tactics to promote yourselves in the vain hope that somehow you will become the Government. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the Liberal attack on the integrity and sincerity of the Commission will not go unnoticed. I am sure that you will pay a price for your unbelievable performance. For my part I want to express full confidence in the integrity and the work of the Commission and to congratulate them for a job very well done.

I want to add that I firmly believe that the Commission rose above political bias. That it adhered to the terms and reference that were handed to it and that they at the same time were attuned to the sensitivities of the voting public. I would very much, Mr. Speaker, appreciate some Members opposite standing up and stating whether or not they concur with the statements of the Member for Moosomin, whether they agree with what he said. Very obviously I will be supporting the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

May 2, 1974

MR. K.R. MacLEOD (Regina Albert Park): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to put on record at this time that I have the highest regard for the people who were the Commission as designated by the Bill — Mr. Justice Maguire, Mr. Barnhart and Mr. Archer. In my view I could not have chosen better and I quite frankly appreciate their efforts to produce a good geographic and population distribution, fairly as directed by the Bill.

Having said that, I want to suggest that anyone who does look at the Bill to establish the Commission, and the results, might come to the conclusion that we had seen the end of gerrymander in Saskatchewan. The whole approach to this particular Resolution is to give the appearance of fairness in the next election, and that is supported by the speeches of the Hon. Members opposite, particularly the rather well-done speech of the Hon. Member for Weyburn (Mr. Pepper). But I want to say that fairness must be judged by all the actions of the Government, including another Bill before this House, to which I propose to speak, and I want to suggest that the Government has decided that there is a new kind of gerrymander which is far better than the old. There is a new kind of gerrymander as befits the more sophisticated and electronic age, that is, they have replaced a population and geographic gerrymander with an electronic and media gerrymander.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MacLEOD: — The gerrymander of 1971 was in the grand old tradition of the NDP, CCF, Liberal and Conservative governments throughout Saskatchewan's history. This new gerrymander is a new kind of gerrymander. It has nothing to do with the Commission. In the days of mass communication and particularly of TV and with TV sets in every home in Saskatchewan, the NDP look upon that geographic and population gerrymander as rather crude and old fashioned. To them there is a far better way in the battle for people's minds. They have made up their minds that there is a far better gerrymander and they have set about it and have accomplished it in the Province of Saskatchewan. And they have in fact gerrymandered the political process in this province. They have gerrymandered the ways in which we may get our message to the people. The New Democrats learned the value of the mass media particularly in the last election. They did not tell the truth about the farm income stabilization fund and they got away with it. They did not tell the truth about the pulp mills and they got away with it. They learned that geography was by far the least in today's important factors in the electoral process. Geography and population are certainly not a match for the perfected technique of the electronic media gerrymander.

Now whether we have a fair electoral process must be considered with reference to the conduct of the Government, the use of public funds for its own purposes, the restrictions that it is putting upon the Opposition, the closed-door policy which this Government has adopted with respect to information to the people and to the Opposition. It has to be considered in connection with the effect of the joint operations of NDP Governments and the election Task Forces which each New Democratic Government is assembling to move back and forth across this nation, as elections occur in Canada. You have to have it and consider the fairness of the electoral process in connection

May 2, 1974

with the political advertising at public expense, the amount of money given to the office of the Opposition.

Now I would be very glad, Mr. Speaker, if the whole process had been referred to this Commission to produce a fair and reasonable electoral process. Unfortunately in voting for this, and I might say that I intend to support the motion, it is regrettable that we are only looking at the tip of the iceberg. What we do not see is far bigger and far more important than what we do see.

I will vote for it, but I would vote for it with a good deal more enthusiasm if in fact the Commission had been charged with examining the entire electoral processes and the abuses of the Government of Saskatchewan in that electoral process. Consequently, Mr. Speaker, I'll say nothing more about this. I understand that the next item being called is the Bill to deal with The Election Act, 1971 and I will put the rest of my remarks under that heading.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — Would the Hon. Member permit a question before he takes his seat?

MR. MacLEOD: — Since I am about to speak to the next matter, if the Hon. Member waited until after I spoke to The Elections Act, 1971, I would be very delighted then to answer his question, if I don't already answer it in my coming remarks.

MR. ROMANOW: — Is the answer 'no'?

MR. T.L. HANSON (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley): — Mr. Speaker, just a few comments on this Bill.

I should like to congratulate the members of the Independent Boundaries Commission on doing an excellent and responsible job in preparing the new boundaries. While I disagree with some of the boundaries that they chose, and particularly those of my own constituency, I do not find any evidence that there were any boundaries proposed that were not fully justified by sound reasoning and fully within the criteria laid out by the legislation of this House. My objection, which I expressed to one of the members of the Commission, was basically, the problem of placing five of the six Indian reserves in the southeast corner of the province in one constituency. And I felt at that time, as I do at the present moment, that the four Indian reserves lying along the Qu'Appelle north of Broadview, should have been split into two. This probably would have provided the people of these Indian bands at least one voice on the Government side, and would have guaranteed them at least two voices in the Legislature of this province. I regret that they did not choose to accept my opinions on this matter, but I do congratulate them on preparing a good map of the whole province guaranteeing people democratic representation.

My other regret is that my home now lies some 15 miles outside the borders of my constituency, but I am convinced that the people of the new Indian Head-Wolseley constituency will recognize that although I am 15 miles outside of the constituency I

May 2, 1974

will quite capably serve them as compared to what another Member may be able to do living in the upper-mortgage heights of the capital city.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. C.P. MacDONALD (Milestone): — Well, I want to tell the Member who just sat down that I'll be most happy to represent all five of those Indian reserves. All five of them. Not only that, I'll make sure that I will tell them and pass on the thoughts that you have in that regard.

Mr. Speaker, I only have these few brief comments to make on this Bill and I'm not going to get into the political aspects or the relationship, except to say that I think it's a bad Bill. I think it's a bad Bill. It's bad for Saskatchewan and in this way I am not in any way challenging the members of the Commission, because the members of the Commission did their job in accordance with the instructions of the NDP Government. Make no mistake about it. They had no alternative. The terms of reference were set out by this Legislature and the majority on that side of the Legislature. Therefore, the Commission had to act in strict accordance with the rules and terms set down by the NDP Government, without any question.

I should like to tell you the reason why it's a bad Bill. The Province of Saskatchewan is a rural province. The Province of Saskatchewan is an agricultural province. Agriculture is the heart and the soul of this province and by turning around and making a strict representation by population, without taking into account that there is such a thing as rural depopulation going on in Saskatchewan, at an unprecedented rate and that by setting up the terms of this Electoral Boundaries Commission, that all future representation will be done by a strict ratio of population is going to do one thing and one thing only. It is going to result in that the urban centres of the Province of Saskatchewan are going to dominate the political life and the political thinking and the political acts of this province. Despite the fact that the prosperity of the Province of Saskatchewan is directly related to our farm economy and the success or failure of that agricultural diversification or agricultural economy. And because of that it's a bad Bill. Regardless of whether any Member in this House wants to stand up and say it's a good Bill, I say it's a bad Bill.

MR. SNYDER: — Are you going to support it?

MR. MacDONALD: — Yes I am. I'm going to support it because it's at least a step, but I'm going to say it's a bad Bill. It is a bad Bill. Because if we look at the cities there is no sparsity factor even though they had the 30 per cent, the 15 per cent above of the 15 per cent below, I find it very unusual. All the areas of the province or the majority of areas that are under the 15,000 are in the urban centres. And those that are over the 15,000 the majority are in rural Saskatchewan. For example, if my memory serves me correctly, there are two constituencies in Regina that don't even hit the 15,000 but just about all the constituencies in southern Saskatchewan that are rural are over 15,000. What we are going to have in the Province of Saskatchewan in a few years is a very small number of huge rural constituencies, with a very large number of urban constituencies.

May 2, 1974

Let me tell you whether the Premier or the Attorney General recognize this or not, it is not the same problem to serve a hundred square miles of rural Saskatchewan as it is to serve 20 blocks in the city of Regina, filled with high rise apartments. It's not the same problem. And if we are going to be a rural thing, I say this is not the fault of the Commission. It's the fault of the terms of reference. The NDP have traditionally in Saskatchewan achieved their vote from the urban constituencies since 1944. Therefore the gerrymander really began before it ever reached the Commission, when the Bill was being drafted and before the terms of reference were even handed to the Commission itself.

But I am concerned and I wish to register my protest, and it is a sincere protest. I know that there are a lot of rural Members over on that side of the House. This Bill will mean one thing and one thing only, that the electoral process in the Province of Saskatchewan will be dominated by urban constituencies and urban Members despite the fact that Saskatchewan is an agricultural province. Agriculture is the heart and soul of our economy, it's the bread and butter of the prosperity of this province in the years ahead and yet the farmers and the people of rural Saskatchewan are going to have less and less of a voice in the electoral process of this province. For that reason, I wish to register a sincere protest, and not at the Commission, but at the people who drew the boundaries of the terms of reference of that gerrymander before it even began.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. A.E. BLAKENEY (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I really don't intend to add very much at this time to what I said in opening this debate.

I do want to mention one or two things. I noted that the Member for Milestone indicated that rural depopulation was going on at an unprecedented rate. Certainly not unprecedented. He should look at the figures for 1969 and 1970 and 1971, when he was on the Treasury Benches. Those were the days when rural depopulation was going on at an unprecedented rate. Those were the days when this province was losing 30,000 people in one year. In fact, rural depopulation, while still continuing, has been very sharply curtailed. Very sharply curtailed as is known by anyone who looks at the figures. So I'm not as concerned about the application of the guidelines as is the Member for Milestone.

But in any case I want to know why I am any more responsible for those guidelines, I, voting for them, than is the Member for Milestone who equally voted for those guidelines.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — If he felt there was something wrong with the guidelines two years ago it would have been a good time to say so.

MR. MacDONALD: — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order, I'd like to tell the Premier, I did say so at the time.

MR. BLAKENEY: — And voted for the Bill and did not move any change in the guidelines. There is no use for Members opposite now trying

May 2, 1974

to say, oh yes, I added a little caveat but I voted for the Bill in principle and I did not move any amendments in Committee. I stand four square as does the Member for Milestone in favor of these guidelines. But once they are applied he says, "Oh they're all bad, they're all bad."

I know that Members opposite wish to work both sides of the street but it's not every Member who tries to go down the middle as well.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MacDONALD: — Mr. Speaker, on another Point of Order, I should like to point out to the Premier that I will be making some amendments when the Bill comes up for third reading.

MR. BLAKENEY: — And he certainly won't be making any amendments in the guidelines because there aren't any guidelines in the Bill which will come before us. The Bill which will come before us is a simple Bill to set the boundaries.

Now, I have listened to Members opposite complain about the boundaries. I heard the Member for Moosomin complain about this boundary and that boundary. And I asked some people, well what was wrong with this process. It seemed to me that the Commission held two sets of hearings and that Members opposite who find all these errors in the boundaries now, made their presentations to the Commission. And when I asked what do I find? I found that in many cases the Members who are now criticizing the boundaries and the very boundaries which were in the interim report, didn't bother to come before the Commission and lay their complaints at that time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — They didn't have any basis for complaint. They didn't want to argue before a commission that there was something wrong with those boundaries. They said, oh no, I can't defend my proposals before a commission; rather I'll seek the forum of the Legislature where I'm not supposed to be able to have any logical arguments, all I need to do is cast an innuendo on the party in power and the Commission. And that's what they've done.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — Take the Member for Athabasca.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Take him away.

MR. BLAKENEY: — We heard him today complain about the boundaries saying that it leads to a long communications gap, a difficult communications problem between Uranium City and La Loche. I wonder what he proposed to the Boundaries Commission?

AN HON. MEMBER: — He did.

MR. BLAKENEY: — And did you propose a different set of boundaries for the North?

May 2, 1974

MR. GUY: — I proposed they should have been set by the Boundaries Commission.

MR. BLAKENEY: — Ahhhh. When he was faced with trying to draw a better boundary, he draws back. Of course there is a problem with any boundary. There is a problem with any boundary. But he could not find a better boundary than the Boundaries Commission drew and if he could have he would have.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order!

MR. BLAKENEY: — I come now to another point mentioned by the Member for Athabasca. One which obviously he and I don't agree on. He thinks that if 10,000 people have a vote for one Member and 20,000 people have a vote for two Members, it is unfair. I don't know whom it is unfair to. I don't know whether it is unfair to the 10,000 who elect one Member or to the 20,000 who elect two. I am sure he will work both sides of the street on that. I say to him and I say to the Member for Whitmore Park, that when the '64 boundaries were drawn and when the Member for Whitmore Park as a result thereof was elected as the Member for Regina South and as a result there were two two Member ridings and two single Member ridings, there was not more than a spread of 10 or 15 per cent between the value of any elector's vote. That's in '64 in Regina. But in 1967 I well remember the drafting of that little bit of gerrymandering. And I remember the comment of the Member for Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart), perhaps as a courtesy I will not repeat it. I will just go on to 1970.

MR. STEUART: — Go back to 1956 when you were elected.

MR. BLAKENEY: — Well, the Member for Prince Albert West is giving me credit for four more years than I have. In fact, I was elected in 1960 . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — Wrong again. Let's come up to 1970 — in that gerrymander, when the boundaries were drawn with the — Daveymander. Let's not forget the Daveymander, when we saw representatives from rotten boroughs like Albert Park send representatives to this House who represent less than one-quarter the number of electors represented by the Member for Regina Centre.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, the Liberal candidate in Regina Centre got less than 30 per cent of the vote. The Liberal candidate in Regina Centre in the last election got less than 30 per cent of the vote.

MR. STEUART: — We won't run him again.

MR. BLAKENEY: — The Member for Prince Albert

May 2, 1974

West shouldn't disparage that man. Because he got more votes than any Member sitting opposite except the Leader of the Opposition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — With his total of less than 30 per cent of the vote he had more than the Member for Wilkie, more than the Member for Milestone, more than the Member for Rosthern and yet you won't run him again. He did pretty well.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I think we can see what was wrong with that particular effort at drawing constituency boundaries.

I thought in 1972 when we introduced the Bill to set up an Independent Boundaries Commission and saw it generally adopted by all Members of this House with a caveat from the Member for Athabasca that we were on the way to having independent boundaries drawn by independent people and accepted with all the details by all Members of this House. Instead what do we have? We have Members opposite wishing to at one and the same time, say, yes, we sort of agree with those boundaries but we want to reserve our right to latch upon every possible criticism in the public mind of those boundaries and say we were against this, we were against that.

We saw this remarkable presentation by the member for Moosomin, who has a bad intelligence service from Saskatoon, painting the picture of the Independent Boundaries Commission deliberately tacking on a piece to the Mayfair constituency to include the former home of the current Member for Mayfair. And as it happened Members opposite got their intelligence wrong and the current Member for Mayfair had already indicated his intention not to run in Mayfair but in Westmount. He has already been nominated.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — The Independent Boundaries Commission, if, in fact, they were under the direction of the NDP, which I am sure all will honestly admit they were not, if they were they would have done quite the reverse of what they did in Saskatoon. They appeared to have added a bump to Mayfair, which far from assisting the current Member for Mayfair, Mr. Brockelbank, had the perhaps unfortunate effect of putting his former residence in the constituency in which he didn't intend to run.

I think that this is an application of the work of the Independent Boundaries Commission with the luck of the draw going against the Members on this side of the House. And the luck of the draw sometimes went with the Members opposite, sometimes went with us. But I think there is not any single person in this House who doesn't think that that Independent Boundaries Commission did as careful a job as could have been done under the circumstances.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

May 2, 1974

MR. BLAKENEY: — There is not a single Member in this House who doesn't honestly believe that the report of that Boundaries Commission should not be adopted and I think that when faced with the vote, I think and I hope there is not a single Member who will vote against the Resolutions which I now have the pleasure to commend in closing this debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division.

YEAS — 45

Messieurs

| | | |
|-------------|-------------|--------------------------|
| Blakeney | Thorson | Lange |
| Dyck | Whelan | Hanson |
| Meakes | Kwasnica | Feschuk |
| Smishek | Cody | Kaeding |
| Romanow | Robbins | Flasch |
| Messer | Tchorzewski | Steuart |
| Snyder | Cowley | Loken |
| Thibault | Taylor | Grant |
| Larson | Matsalla | MacDonald |
| Baker | Faris | McIsaac |
| Brockelbank | Mostoway | MacLeod |
| MacMurchy | Gross | MacDonald (Moose Jaw N.) |
| Pepper | Feduniak | Wiebe |
| Michayluk | Comer | Malone |
| Byers | Rolfes | Richards |

NAYS — 0

Messieurs

Nil

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

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. K.R. MacLEOD (Regina Albert Park): — Mr. Speaker, many people, including myself, looked forward to an Election Expenses Bill, but I find that the people have been tricked and I have been tricked. The Government is pulling an end run with this bill. It has produced an Election Expenses Bill which is applicable to everyone except the Government. Not one Government Member will be slowed by this Bill so much as half a step.

This Bill completes the Government program to eliminate free and fair elections in the Province of Saskatchewan. The first step taken by the Government was to merge the Government of Saskatchewan with the election machinery of the New Democratic

May 2, 1974

Party and with the New Democratic election machinery of other parties in Canada.

Saskatchewan has now established a reservoir of campaign managers, candidates and workers for use in elections in Saskatchewan and all across Canada. The Government has these people squirreled away in all parts of the Government. For example — and these are examples only — Murray Koski, employed by the Government of Saskatchewan defeated candidate in Regina South West in 1967, now a candidate again in Quill Lake, Saskatchewan, as a matter of fact in the seat that one might have expected the Hon. Mr. Speaker to take; Barrett Halderman, defeated candidate from Nova Scotia; John Burton former MP, defeated candidate in 1972 and the next candidate for the New Democratic Party apparently in Regina East; Mr. Ned Shillington, defeated candidate in Moosomin; Mr. Jim Eaton, defeated candidate in Cannington; Mr. Frank Buck, defeated in the last federal election for the NDP; Mr. Clair Powell, long time party worker; Brian Coulter, steady and continuous party worker.

This is only a part of the Task Force of people kept and maintained by this Government and available as candidates, workers and managers, whenever there is an election. And whenever there is an election they swing into action. They observe the barest of formalities. Leave of absence is granted for brief periods merely to keep up appearances. This bank or reservoir of campaign workers, have a comfortable home base in Saskatchewan, high salaries and entirely at the expense of the people of Saskatchewan.

I want to read a little bit, for example:

Brian Coulter — Discovered in the Public Accounts Committee that Mr. Brian Coulter was given leave of absence on September 6, 1972 and to October 31, 1972. He was involved in that last federal election which was over on October 31, 1972.

And who else for precisely the same period of time, none other than Mr. Claire Powell, reported to have left the Government September 6, 1972, returned October 31, 1972. Those periods of time exactly corresponding to the time of the last federal election. They are kept on the Government of Saskatchewan payroll until they are needed for election purposes. They are released until the election is over and then they are rehired. Brian Coulter — Claire Powell — is that not the same Claire Powell who worked against the Hon. Member who is now elected for Lakeview? Yes, indeed, it is.

I should like to read to the Members another example. I have here a copy of The Commonwealth, April 24, 1974 and on page 4 there is a down east column by Jerry Meackerman, the New Democratic Leader in Nova Scotia. And in the boldest print, near the bottom, he says the following:

The Nova Scotia Party received excellent help and co-operation from other provincial sections, Saskatchewan chief among them. The work of Jim Murdock and Ted Glover, in two of the winning ridings was outstanding and will long be remembered.

While the job done by Brian Coulter, as the leader's tour co-ordinator, and advance man, was faultless. To our Saskatchewan friends I can only say that we owe a tremendous debt of gratitude and heartfelt thanks

May 2, 1974

for the support we received.

So what is happening is that the New Democratic Government has created these squadrons of people for use in elections all across Canada, and this is part of a joint program with other New Democratic Party provinces, and every NDP Government does the same thing. So these squadrons of people, these Task Forces, are available to fight elections anywhere in Canada, whenever they occur. And in the meantime, while they are resting between elections, they are comfortably resting in Regina at the expense of the people of Saskatchewan, on very high salaries. But make no mistake about it these people are not employed for the benefit of the people of Saskatchewan, they are employed solely and entirely for the benefit of the New Democratic Party.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MacLEOD: — Secondly, the New Democratic Government of Saskatchewan has converted the public purse into a slush fund for the private use of the Party.

Bruce Lawson — \$17,000 a year, employed in the Public Relations area so that his attractive and talented wife can work either for no money or at bargain rates for The Commonwealth.

Service Printing — we have gone over that time and time again, the thousands of dollars being poured into Service Printing by this Government.

I have a picture here that tells more than a thousand words. This picture is a picture of 1630 Quebec Street and we have this big building, this big fancy new building, I fancy that it is new since 1971 or probably so, I don't know how old it is. But look at the two big posters there, the two big signs. One says "Service Printing" and the other one says "Saskatchewan Section, New Democratic Party" and they are, in fact, one and the same thing. There are 100 common shares which control — if you don't believe this look at the material on file in the Legislative Building, Regina, on the third floor, go and get the official government records and you will discover that the 100 common shares own and control that company; 95 of them are owned exclusively by the New Democratic Party Saskatchewan Section, and there are 5 additional shares — qualifying shares — one of which is owned by a gentleman named John H. Brockelbank. I should like to file this picture of Service Printing and the Saskatchewan Section of the New Democratic Party so that future political scientists, future people who study at the University and who are trying to find a lack of democracy and the loss of it in Saskatchewan will be able to see how this Government has so perverted the electoral process. I should like to file this with the House.

I must say that the Government has not overlooked any bets at all. We had the opportunity again in the Public Accounts Committee before the Government Members started shutting us down to look at what they were doing in addition. We received an account from J.A.C. Struthers and Associates Limited, and this is for advertising by the Public Service Commission. The pages start March 31st, 1972 but they go back earlier. The Public Service Commission of Saskatchewan advertised, for example, on February 19, 1972 in the Moose Jaw Times Herald, The Prince Albert Herald, the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix, and the Regina

May 2, 1974

Leader-Post; these are the four newspapers which in effect, blanket Saskatchewan. Those are the only four that received advertising from the Public Service Commission during that week. The same is true of subsequent weeks, until suddenly somebody realized that they were missing a bet. There were public funds which could be diverted to the use of the New Democratic Party if only some of this advertising were given to The Commonwealth. And so for the first time we observe on April 22, 1972 . . .

MR. BROCKELBANK: — On a Point of Order, Mr. Speaker. I have been listening carefully to the Member for Albert Park discuss this topic in the last few minutes. His remarks have been directed exclusively to what went on in the Public Accounts committee. My understanding of the rules Mr. Speaker, the Public Accounts Committee debate will continue tomorrow, in the Legislature and all Members will have an opportunity to discuss the Public Accounts at that time, and to respond accordingly. I just wonder if the Member is out of order. Because all of his references have been directly to the Public Accounts Committee.

MR. SPEAKER: — I don't think the Point of Order is too well taken. The Member is referring to information he gained previously but he is using the information in connection with this Bill.

MR. MacLEOD: — So, Mr. Speaker, I want to point out to the Member who is very, very touchy and for very good reason, that on the 22nd of April, the Government started diverting funds to The Commonwealth. On that date, not four but five newspapers received advertising from the Government of Saskatchewan, The Commonwealth April 26, \$142.52; the next highest was the Leader-Post for \$137.70; the next highest was Moose Jaw Times Herald \$93; Saskatoon Star-Phoenix \$82 and Prince Albert Herald \$80. The largest amount of money paid was to The Commonwealth, not to the other large daily newspapers that operate in the Province of Saskatchewan.

What were the rates paid to this newspaper, to The Commonwealth? To the Moose Jaw Times Herald, 17 cents per line; the Prince Albert Herald, 16 cents per line; the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix, 27 cents per line, The Commonwealth, 28 cents per line! Not only are they diverting huge amounts of money to this Party organ, they are paying it exorbitant amounts of money for what they are getting out of it. Only the Leader-Post at 30 cents was a bare 2 cents per line above The Commonwealth.

Now let me look at the following pages in this. How about May 2nd, The Commonwealth; here we have again on May 10th The Commonwealth received an advertisement for \$156.80; the Moose Jaw Times Herald \$96 and so on, the only one that was in the same league, was the Leader-Post which received the same amount. Carrying on, this thing continued, Mr. Speaker, time and time again throughout the reports. It was sporadic to begin with, and more continuous and more consistent as time went on. Now it is virtually a weekly affair. On August 22nd in that year, for example, the amount was \$39 paid to The Commonwealth and it is very interesting to note that it took until August before the Government started to pay a fairer rate at least to The Commonwealth, the line rate was 15 cents as compared to the former rate that had been charged up to that time, 28 cents per line.

May 2, 1974

What is happening, Mr. Speaker, that in addition to paying huge amounts of money directly to Service Printing the Government of Saskatchewan is now pouring huge amounts of money into The Commonwealth which in effect is pouring huge amounts of public funds directly into the hands of the New Democratic Party. We have already mentioned the exclusive media centre, perhaps \$15,000 to \$20,000 and some people have estimated as high as \$30,000 a year if you take the whole overhead of the cost is directed from public funds to the New Democratic Party people through the use of the exclusive media centre.

How about the advertising of Cabinet? We have some pictures here and it is very interesting to notice. For example this advertisement appeared in Saskatchewan: "Your Government wants to hear from you, Province of Saskatchewan." And we have two pictures, one of them is to meet the Hon. W.A. Robbins, April 18th. There is a picture of the Hon. W.A. Robbins, appearing at public expense in the Saskatoon newspaper. You can't tell me that that isn't intended deliberately to assist the individual Cabinet Minister to get re-elected.

AN HON. MEMBER: — W.A. Robbins?

MR. MacLEOD: — W.A. Robbins, the Hon. Minister of Finance.

And that goes on over and over again. Useless government advertising. What about the advertising we saw the other day? Here solely for the purpose of advertising for the benefit of the Government. I have here in front of me an advertisement which says, "Help, We Need Answers," and "You Have Been Asking us Questions." There are five questions asked, Mr. Speaker, "When you Apply for your New Licence for your Automobile," and it says: — in benefitting the New Democratic Party — "The five questions we are asking are related to the vehicle you drive. They can easily be answered by contacting the AAIA Department at SGIO or the licence issuer." If they are telling us that they know the answers, why in the world are they asking us questions?

Mr. Speaker, we have already shown how the Government hires contract workers, such as Ralph Danchilla for purposes solely of going around and working in elections for the New Democratic Party. We have already gone through that. The Government of Saskatchewan in the first full year of its operation issued 500,000 individual pieces of news releases. That is an almost unprecedented snow storm of news releases.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what else does this Election Expenses Bill do? It purports to treat people fairly. But is only part of an overall program which today is intended to help the Government and to hurt everyone else. Part of that program is the strangulation of the Opposition.

During the last year that Ross Thatcher was the Premier of Saskatchewan, the amount of money paid to the Leader of the Opposition was 20 per cent of the amount paid to the Premier's personal staff, 20 per cent. All you have to do is look at the 1971 Estimates and you will discover that that is a fact, 20 per cent was given to the Opposition. Today 20 per cent isn't \$24,000 as is presently budgeted for, not \$34,000, not \$40,000 but would amount to \$54,000 if the same proportion of money was paid to the Leader of the Opposition as is paid to the Premier's

May 2, 1974

staff in the last year of the Ross Thatcher Government. The Government of Saskatchewan should pay to the Leader of the Opposition \$54,000 to operate his staff. The fact of the matter is that the Government of Saskatchewan has every intention of strangling the Leader of the Opposition's budget — not the Leader.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MacLEOD: — I thought it might be interesting, Mr. Speaker, to examine how the New Democratic Party candidates obeyed the present regulations.

Up until now, both federally and provincially there have been requirements on the reporting of election expenditures. I have some very interesting notes here and you might be interested in knowing that in 1968 the then Hon. Mr. John Burton who ran and became the NDP Member for Regina East, filed his return. During the election he had at least two or three mailouts to the constituents — to some 28,000 households in the constituency. What happened was this. He filed a return stating the amount of postage that he had spent and the amount he stated was \$15. What did he do the following election? Well, he was defeated and rightly so in 1972. I have it here, John Burton — postage — how much did he spend for some 28,000 households — more than 50,000 votes, \$18.15. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that the New Democrats pass laws but they don't intend to obey the laws. They have made a mockery of this reporting of election expenses. \$15 in 1968 and \$18.15 in 1972. That is how the New Democratic Party has obeyed the election expenses reporting requirements.

The fact of the matter is this, Mr. Speaker, this Bill we have before us today is intended and directly intended to complete the program of eliminating democracy from Saskatchewan. I am interested in the words made by the Hon. Member for Weyburn (Mr. Pepper). Here is what he said when he spoke recently.

Mr. Speaker, the upcoming provincial election in Saskatchewan will mark the first time ever that all candidates for public office will enter the arena on an equal footing.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that never again, if this Bill is passed and enforced, will the people of Saskatchewan go into an election on as equal a footing as they did in 1971. This Bill applies to everybody except the Government. The Government is spending unlimited amounts of money; they are setting the rules; they are doing exactly what they want to do while imposing serious restrictions upon the Opposition.

I just ask the Members: Is this Bill before us the result of a joint discussion between the parties in this House? It is not! Is this Bill the result of an Independent Commission? It is not! The fact of the matter is this that the Government has no intention of putting this kind of thing before any Independent Commission because it wouldn't dare.

Mr. Speaker, we have had the last free election that we have had in Saskatchewan, if this Bill is passed. Now, as far as I am concerned the only way that we can treat this matter fairly is if, we are to charge the party — and in this case the New Democratic Party — with the following expenses.

May 2, 1974

They should be charged with these expenses in the next election. First of all expenses of the Media Centre. Secondly, they should be charged with the services of their own people in that reservoir of campaign workers, managers and candidates who are kept on the Government payroll. The salaries of every one of them should be charged to the Party in power because they are used by the Party in power, and if they do not charge them it means that they have an unlimited access to campaign funds which is denied to the Opposition. Thirdly, the New Democratic Party extending courtesies to New Democratic Parties all across Canada, including Nova Scotia, are going to receive a return of that favor. I say that the Party should be charged with the services of campaign managers, workers and assistants as part of the task forces which each government supplies to us and each NDP supplies to us, the amount of their services should be charged as an expense to this Government.

Fourthly, 20 per cent of all moneys paid by the Government of Saskatchewan or the Crown corporations or their agencies, to Service Printing or to The Commonwealth should be charged to the NDP. And next, the cost of all pictures of Cabinet Ministers and Members of the Legislature, put out at Government expense, in the newspapers of Saskatchewan should be charged to the candidate.

What has happened, Mr. Speaker, is that unless something like that happens we cannot possibly have a fair election in Saskatchewan. The costs which are being spent by this Government around The Election Act should be charged to the New Democratic Party.

Mr. Speaker, one further comment. There has been the suggestion that this Act in the House today is similar to federal legislation. Mr. Speaker, it is not! First of all the federal legislation is not retroactive. As a matter of fact there is a bring-in period and the federal legislation does not even take effect until July 15th despite the fact that it has already been passed by the House of Commons.

Secondly, it does not restrict the operation of the Parties between elections. It is not restrictive of the freedoms of the people between elections to express their views as to political parties and political parties are not charged with that expense.

The fact of the matter is this, this Bill before us today does not follow the federal Bill. It is in no way to be compared to the federal Bill because in the significant areas it departs materially from the federal Bill.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that any person who supports the activities of this Government, and the passage of this Bill, and the way they have operated, in fact, supports the elimination of democracy from Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I hope to review these things and I hope to have a few more remarks when this is next called before the House and I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 10:20 o'clock p.m.