

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fifth Session — Seventeenth Legislature
24th Day

Monday, March 24, 1975.

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. A. THIBAUT: (Kinistino) Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in introducing to the House 33 high school students from Wakaw High School. They are led here by their teacher, Mr. Charley Holinaty and his wife, the school bus driver, Mr. Bill Luciuk. They started off early this morning and visited the RCMP Barracks and the Legislative Buildings and will be seeing the Museum of Natural History this afternoon. I hope you will all join with me in welcoming them to the Legislature. I hope the afternoon will be an interesting and informative one for these students and I also want to wish them a safe journey home.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. J.A. PEPPER (Weyburn) Mr. Speaker, I believe that this is the eighth consecutive year that students from the Weyburn Junior High School have visited our Legislature. I would say that this indicates that the school considers a visit to the Legislature very important in contributing to the students' knowledge of parliamentary procedures. There are 63 Grade Eight students sitting, Mr. Speaker, in the West gallery. They are accompanied by their teachers, Mr. Jim Nedelcov and Mr. Gary Kruger, as well they have their bus drivers, Mr. Henry Bell and Mr. Joe Glad. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that we, as Members, welcome them and hope that their visit will be beneficial to them and we wish them a safe journey home.

HON. MEMBERS Hear, hear!

ANNOUNCEMENT

WEYBURN BANTAM A HOCKEY TEAM PROVINCIAL CHAMPIONSHIP

MR. PEPPER: Mr. Speaker, while I am on my feet I should like to announce that the Weyburn Bantam A Hockey Team won the Provincial Championship on Friday, March 21st, by defeating the Saskatoon Colonels. This was a total goal series, I believe. There are, I think, two or three members of that team who are with the Grade Eight students here this afternoon. I am, again sure, Mr. Speaker, that all Members join with me in congratulating the Weyburn Bantam Hockey Team and consider them a very worthy representative for our province.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. H.H. ROLFES: (Saskatoon Nutana South) Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Wes Robbins, I should like to take this opportunity to introduce to you and to

March 24, 1975

the House, a group of 38 Grade Seven and Eight students from Bishop Murray School from Saskatoon. I, indeed, find it a pleasure to introduce these students since I once was the principal of that school for three years and I know that it is a fine school and the students are certainly a fine group of young boys and girls. They are accompanied by their teachers, Mr. Noonan and Mr. Blais. I hope that you have a worthwhile afternoon here in the House and also a worthwhile trip. I intend to meet with these students at 3:00 this afternoon.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. M. KWASNICA: (Cut Knife) Mr. Speaker, I should like to join with the Member for Kinistino in welcoming the students from Wakaw. Wakaw has a particular interest to me as I was born and raised in that area. I want to welcome the students from Wakaw High School and I hope they have a good day here today.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

ALLEGATIONS MADE AGAINST THE MINISTER OF SOCIAL SERVICES

MR. G. LANE: (Lumsden) Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to direct a question to the Minister responsible for Social Services.

In Friday's paper of the Leader-Post on the third page some very serious allegations were made against the Minister of the Crown and against the Government opposite. Allegations were made in particular . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: What's your question?

MR. LANE: . . . Mr. Speaker, I am prefacing my question with the allegations that were made and I will be asking for a very specific reply from the Minister. I think the seriousness of the matter should be taken as such. Certain severe allegations were made that particular advertising company influences Government advertising policy by reason of . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I think the Hon. Member should pose his question.

MR. LANE: The second part of my preface, Mr. Speaker, that a particular civil servant was fired because he refused to become involved in the political patronage and I would ask the Minister of Social Services for his statement in this regard.

HON. A. TAYLOR: (Minister of Social Services) Mr. Speaker, the Member who just took his seat said the second part of the question - I never did catch the first. I caught a statement.

I have read the article, however, and I can assure the House that the substance of the article contains no foundation in fact. I don't consider the use of an advertising agency for

the placement of ads as political patronage. The particular agency involved handled the Family Income Plan ads last year and, therefore, had experience in this regard. I can also assure the House that at no time have I requested this ex-employee to prepare political pamphlets

MR. LANE: Is it then your definite statement and positive statement that the allegations made in the Leader-Post of Friday, March 21st, are not true?

MR. TAYLOR: There are a great number of allegations, Mr. Speaker. If one looks at the one where he was hired as an information office, of course, that is true. I said that the substance of the charges were incorrect.

GOVERNMENT APPROVED ADVERTISING AGENCIES

MR. E.C. MALONE: (Regina Lakeview) Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I have a question that I should have liked to address to the Minister of the Treasury Board, he is not here, his predecessor, the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cowley) is not here, so I will address it to the Premier, if I may.

The article that my colleague for Lumsden referred to indicated that all advertising by Government agencies must be done through Government approved advertising companies or agencies.

My question to the Premier is: Who are the Government approved agencies and, secondly, how is the advertising placed with those agencies, that is, is it by tender or contract or just what method is used?

HON. A.E. BLAKENEY: (Premier) Mr. Speaker, the first supposition of the Hon. Member is substantially correct, if by advertising, we mean advertising placed in the major media. Some advertising is placed in some journals not through advertising agencies, but basically the great bulk of Government advertising is placed in the major media - that is the major daily newspapers and the television and radio stations - through advertising agencies. I think that all Members will be familiar with the fact that advertising agencies cost the client nothing, they are paid by the media.

The mechanism is that Information Services of the Executive Council attempts to apportion the advertising which is going to be placed by a Government agency. The advertising agencies that have been used in my recollection, in the last three years have been three- the Dunsky firm, the Foster firm and the Struthers firm.

There may well have been in the early months some to the McLaren firm, but these arrangements were not renewed. There is no effective way to tender these things. I don't know any place where advertising is tendered since the client pays nothing. The commission of about 15 per cent, I believe, is the same for all advertising firms. On occasion we have called for competitive proposals. That was done with, for example, the AWARE advertising program which is a major program. We asked several agencies to make proposals.

March 24, 1975

Accordingly, therefore, the selection of the advertising agency is essentially done by the Government, based either on proposals - if proposals are called for - or simply by Government Judgement as to which agency can perform best in all the circumstances.

MR. MALONE: A supplementary question. Mr. Speaker, the Premier in his reply indicated that a client does not pay any of the cost of the advertising and I should like to know whether this has always been the case under the present Government, that is, has the Government ever paid the advertising agency in question any monies at all - that is Government monies? And, secondly when rates, bids or costs are given by the advertising agencies in question to the Government departments involved, are these rates or costs ever checked with other advertising agencies that may or may not be approved by the Government?

MR. BLAKENEY: I should perhaps clarify my earlier answer. Advertising agencies perform essentially two functions. Their main function is to place advertisements in the electronic or the print media and the client pays for the time or space, as the case may be. A discount is given by the medium to the advertising firm.

There is another function advertising agencies perform and that is, on occasion, to do production work which is over and above the work for which they would be compensated by their commission. We have paid advertising agencies for production work. By no means all of the Government's production work is done by advertising agencies. Some of it is done by Government employees who prepare pamphlets and the like, or layouts for advertisements. Some of the production work is done by advertising agencies from time to time.

So that the answer is then, yes, we have paid for production work at rates charged by the agents or arranged with the advertising agent, and yes, of course, we have paid advertising agencies for the time and space charges in a traditional way.

The other question that he asked, do we ever check these charges with charges available from other agencies. With respect to the AWARE program, the answer is, yes. With respect to other time and space charges, these are spot-checked sometimes. It is not difficult to do because let us say, television station CKOS puts out their charges, we check those against the charges which we are being levied by the agency for putting a spot on CKOS. These are not difficult to check and are checked regularly.

MR. C.P. MacDONALD: (Milestone) Mr. Speaker, I should like to follow up the questions. The Premier has indicated that production charges are occasionally levied by advertising agencies for production services. Can the Premier tell me, have any charges ever been made for production services by any advertising agency after work has been completed or initiated by a Government department itself? In other words, has any Government department done production services or prepared production material and then turned it over to the advertising agency and then been charged for those production services? And, of course, we will put specific requests on the Order Paper

The second question: Most of us had the opportunity of watching the free time television ad of the NDP on Saturday night on which the Premier showed us his bus tour. There were some very beautiful and charming pictures of the Premier travelling around the Province of Saskatchewan. Could the Premier assure the Members of the House that the photographic work done on the bus tour, by the Premier, was not taken by any government official. 2. That none of the equipment and none of the film which was used in producing that particular film - as all of us know that any time you put on a free time political advertisement, it is put on by a political party and not by the Government of Saskatchewan - this is a free time political ad by the NDP.

Can the Premier assure us that that particular film was not done by government employees? 2. Can he assure us that no Government equipment and Government films were used in the production of that particular production of free time television?

MR. BLAKENEY: The Hon. Member asks two basic questions and the first one I can't answer off hand and he has indicated that he would be putting a question on the Order Paper and I shall leave it at that.

The second question dealt with the free time telecasts at which there were film footages of the bus tour with a voice over or a commentary. I think I can give the Hon. Member the assurance he wants. I can tell him that that filming was done by an advertising agency in town, at the expense of the New Democratic Party. I know the people who took it were not Government employees. They had equipment and I have no reason to believe that any equipment was Government equipment and would be astounded to hear that it was. Therefore, to the best of my knowledge and belief, the personnel and equipment that took the film that was used in the telecast were not Government personnel nor did they use Government equipment.

MR. MacDONALD: Would the Premier just to clear up any concern on the part of the public - I don't have to mention to the Premier civil servants in Alberta, civil servants in Saskatchewan, the NDP Council - I don't have to go through the long list, Service Printers, Commonwealth, etc. Could the Premier then table for me the complete list of Government personnel who were on his trip including all the photographic people, any PR people who were there? Would he also be willing to table on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan the specific invoice for that film from the advertising agency to the NDP and could he also table the specific cheque cancelled cheque of the NDP to clear up, once and for all, any suspicion that might be in the minds of the public over this very, very serious allegation.

MR. BLAKENEY: Well, particularly with respect to the Hon. Member's last comment I am not aware of any allegations except the one that he has made. I wasn't aware of any proof that he put forward or even a suggestion that he put forward that there was any irregularity, and I am aware of none. So I think that there is no point in answering, quote, "Serious allegations", which are simply launched by Members opposite on no basis, because I cannot regard those as serious allegations.

March 24, 1975

With respect to the other questions he asked, I really would ask him to put the questions on the Order Paper, with respect to who accompanied me on the bus trip and I would be happy to give him that information. Also what services they performed on the bus trip and there is no problem there.

With respect to the dealings between the New Democratic Party and an advertising agency in this town, I think that is not a proper question for the Hon. Member to put to a Member on the Government benches and I, therefore, must respectfully decline. I will check the facts that he asks me to check to see whether or not I am accurate in saying that the personnel and the equipment was all non-government personnel and non-government equipment. I well know that they were, but never mind, I had better check. And having done so I will then make a statement in the House and he will have to take my word for it unless he has something a little more cogent to lay before the House.

NATURAL GAS PRICES

MR. J.G. RICHARDS: (Saskatoon University) Mr. Speaker, if the House is willing, may I address the fourth question?

Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister in charge of the Power Corporation, the Minister of Mineral Resources, I address this question to the Premier.

It pertains to the submission which the Government has made to the National Energy Board hearing on deliverability of natural gas. In this submission by the Provincial Government is a statement to the effect that the Government expects there to be, in all likelihood, a shortfall within the next few years. So the obvious question which I address to the Premier is, given the Government's prediction of potential shortfall within the next several years of natural gas, has the Provincial Government done any thinking on the question of revising natural gas prices domestically within the Province of Saskatchewan to both industrial and residential consumers, in particular to such very large consumers with very cheap prices, such as Kalium?

MR. BLAKENEY: With respect to Kalium I think I can assure the Hon. Member that the arrangements which previously prevailed have either been changed or are under very active negotiations to be changed. I am not precisely sure when those negotiations are but I believe it is settled and I think they pay more money.

With respect to the other points raised by the Hon. Member, I think statements have been made from time to time that natural gas prices will increase over the next number of months. I am not thinking of two or three but 12 or 25 months. This, I think is almost inevitable judging from the costs that we are having to pay for our natural gas in Alberta. We announced last November that there were increases last November and there will likely be increases before the next heating season. I cannot give the dimension of the increases. I am not sure they are fully worked out. As the Hon. Member will know, we have been attempting to find natural gas both in Saskatchewan and in Alberta and I believe in the last three years the Power Corporation will have spent more than \$20 million in the search for, and the acquisition of, natural gas reserves in the hope of buttressing our reserves. Accordingly then, I think the answer is, we are searching for and acquiring and buying new reserves. We are

expecting prices to go up generally and we are obviously having to home in on and direct our attention to some of the major gas consumers to see whether or not we cannot substitute other fuels. This has already been done to a substantial extent by the Saskatchewan Power Corporation with respect to the generation of electricity and I think that other major consumers will be the subject of some intensive study to see whether or not we couldn't displace some of their consumption with some other fuel.

MR. RICHARDS: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, the Premier is aware that if natural gas were priced at the same price per unit of energy costs as oil, it would mean prices in the order of at least \$2 per thousand cubic feet, which means a threefold increase to residential customers up to a tenfold increase in industrial prices relative to those charged several years ago. Has the Government any policy on whether it wants to try and maintain cheap natural gas from the point of view either subsidizing the residential consumer or industrial development or does it prefer to bring natural gas prices up to, to use the expression, BTU equivalency prices with oil?

MR. BLAKENEY: Well, Mr. Speaker, the current policy of the Government is not to pursue a rapid movement to equivalent prices. Using some rough yardsticks and, speaking from memory now, \$6.50 oil is about \$1.20 per MCF; and \$8.50 oil which is speculated about, is about \$1.60 or maybe \$1.65 per MCF. These equivalencies are not operable anywhere in Canada, neither in Alberta nor in Ontario, nor anywhere. People, as highly placed as the Hon. Donald MacDonald, are quoted from time to time as saying that they believe that equivalence would be a good idea but should be arrived at over a period of five years or so. We, therefore, do not look to bringing about an equivalence in the immediate future much as that might be desirable from the point of view of the long-term conservation of energy. The effects on consumers and particularly householders would be pretty drastic. We therefore expect that the approach to equivalence will take a good deal longer than any suggested period of six months or a year or that type of thing.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

VISITOR FROM OTTAWA

HON. G. MacMURCHY: (Minister of Education) Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to bring two items to your attention and to the Members of the House. One is that we have with us a visitor from Ottawa, the M.P. for Yorkton, Lorne Nystrom. Lorne, this morning, announced he would be a candidate in the leadership contest for the Federal New Democratic Party in Winnipeg . . .

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MacMURCHY: . . . in July. May I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we have with us the next Leader of the New Democratic Party and therefore, the next Prime Minister of Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

March 24, 1975

RAYMORE HOCKEY CLUB

MR. MacMURCHY: Also, Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to your attention and particularly the Members for Cannington and Moosomin, last Friday night in Raymore, the Raymore Rockets defeated the Wawota flyers by a score of 7 to 3, to win the SAHA Intermediate C championship on the round 11 to 8. This is the fifth time the Raymore Rockets have won the Intermediate C championship and they tie Semans with the record of five wins, which they established in the late '50s and early '60s. It is interesting, Mr. Speaker, that in the 20 years of Intermediate C competition, Semans and Raymore have won it ten times and Nokomis and Punnichy two other times, that's 12 out of 20. This indicates it seems to me, the spirit, the competitiveness and the calibre of hockey in that particular area of the constituency of Last Mountain Touchwood.

I am sure all Members will join with me in congratulating the Raymore Rockets and wishing them well for the future.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SECOND READINGS

HON. J.R. KOWALCHUK (Minister of Tourism and Renewable Resources) moved second reading of Bill No. 33 - **An Act to amend The Provincial Parks, Protected Areas, Recreation Sites and Antiquities.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, the amendments we are proposing to the Saskatchewan Parks, Recreation Sites and Antiquities Act will broaden the authority of certain department and Mounted Police Officers who have the responsibility for administering the Act and its regulation.

Our proposed amendment for Section 21, which replaces the word 'constable' with the words 'peace officer', is required. As it now stands under this Section of the Act, Departmental officers involved in the enforcement of the Act have the powers of constables to enforce the Act and its regulation. However, when performing their duties, we believe they should be entitled to the same protection to which peace officers are entitled under the Criminal Code. Peace Officer is a broader term and better defines the intent of this Section of the Act. Though this Section may make reference to Peace Officer, it will not and cannot provide broader powers unless these powers are specifically stated as this Act does.

It will be necessary to incorporate a proposed Section 21A into the Act to provide the necessary authority to ensure a much better conduct in the operation of the park.

The second proposed amendment, Mr. Speaker, provides certain officers of the Department, that is superintendent and the conservation officer, or a member of the RCMP to seize any permit or evidence and arrest without warrant any individual violating provisions of the Act and its regulation.

The proposed Section 21B provides a member of the RCMP the authority just the RCMP the authority, Mr. Speaker, to search without warrant where it is believed evidence may be found

respecting violations. As it now stands, they are unable to do so, even when necessary in order to obtain information pertinent to the case, or to bring a prosecution to a successful conclusion. There is not as yet any authority for the Park Officer or the RCMP to seize any implement or article he sees used during a violation. Under the previous Act all the park employees could do, Mr. Speaker, including the superintendent or conservation officer, was to tell the violators to quit the vandalism or get out of the park. Usually ten minutes later they were back in, or they refused to go at all. The RCMP often weren't there or couldn't be reached or refused to act under the previous Act.

Mr. Speaker, although the demand by park users for law and order within the parks system is ever increasing, there are increasing incidents of rowdyism and vandalism which too, continues to increase. This, in part is due to lack of sufficient authority to gather the necessary information and evidence to press charges against the party or parties responsible. This lack of authority makes it virtually impossible to carry out meaningful action to minimize or correct the situation.

As I stated a moment ago, in the past there has been some real reluctance on the part of the RCMP to enforce any of the ; provisions of the Act and the Regulations. They were of the opinion that they have no jurisdiction under the former Act as there is no reference, only to the authority given that agency to evict persons. In part, this reluctance stems from the lack of authority in the Act to permit arrest, search and subsequent seizure.

The addition of Sections 21A and 21B will help correct an almost impossible public disciplinary problem and will allow a l more reasonable level of enforcement with the hope of reducing the greatly increased incidence of rowdyism and vandalism. Mr. Speaker, the powers will be restricted to permanent staff, such as park superintendents and conservation officers who are trained and qualified enforcement officers. It is not the intent of these amendments to provide our staff with the powers to arrest, search and seize under the Criminal Code, but rather to restrict these powers to administering this particular Act and its regulations when deliberate acts of destruction and vandalism begin.

Thirdly, the proposed amendment to schedule B will add Anderson Island and the Thomas Battersby Wildlife Protected Area as protected areas under the Act. Anderson Island supports an abundance and unusual variety of animal and plant life, and there has been a demand from a number of organizations and individuals to preserve the area for recreation, tourism and educational purposes. Its establishment as a protected area was suggested by staff of the Department of Tourism and Renewable Resources and also suggested by Northern Saskatchewan at DNS, and also my colleague, the Member for Nipawin, and the International Biological Program suggested that it be included, Mr. Speaker.

The legislation would preserve for the first time ever in Saskatchewan examples of several important plant communities. Among these are the Manitoba maple, balsam, poplar and white birch. Beneath the tree cover, which contains exceptionally mature stands of trees, is a dense undergrowth of North American fern, which gives the area a tropical atmosphere. White tailed deer, elk, ruffed grouse, mergansers, kingfishers and cranes,

March 24, 1975

have been observed on the island. That's the total for the Anderson Island, Mr. Speaker.

Next, I personally initiated the establishment of the Thomas Battersby Wildlife Protected Area, in the vicinity of Goodeve. The Battersbys were the first settlers in the Goodeve district coming to homestead in 1892. A lifetime resident of that area, Mr. Thomas Battersby donated this land for a protected area. This piece of land on which the Battersby's homestead sits, along with the half section purchased for the wild life habitat, still has its native grasses, flowers and trees with the exception of about one-quarter of an acre near the house which was used for a garden. Otherwise, Mr. Speaker, none of that section of land has ever been broken by the plow. Around this land for miles the people have broken up this area of the parkland for farming, mostly mixed farming. Some of the pot holes are low lying, marshy areas and have been retained. With a core of this Battersby Wildlife Protected Area as a haven for wildlife, along with a goodly number of acres of land that cannot be tilled, there is assurance that many species of wildlife such as white tailed deer, the coyote, the grouse and others will be sustained and will survive, Mr. Speaker.

I am proud of that land donation for this purpose by Thomas Battersby. In his 70 years of living on this land he had never shot a deer or any wild animal. Indeed it was most appropriate that he leave this land for a wildlife sanctuary for posterity and for the use of future citizens as riding and hiking trails, interpretive centre for students coming to study the flora and fauna of that area, and as recognition of a pioneer family who were the first pioneers in this harsh, but beautiful land. By this example, Mr. Speaker, I hope others will follow by donating land for the preservation of our wild life and preservation of pioneer culture and heritage.

This kind of land, Mr. Speaker, will be providing protection for this area, will preserve natural parkland, provide a refuge for wildlife and provide the people of this province with an opportunity to study the natural and local history of the area.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to move second reading of these proposed amendments.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. E.C. MALONE: (Regina Lakeview) Mr. Speaker, I am rising to enter into the debate on these amendments to oppose them. Not the provision of the Act which refers to Anderson Island and so on but to the earlier provisions of the Act as to powers given to certain law enforcement officers and others who aren't law enforcement officers.

What this amendment in Section 21, 21A, 21B does, Mr. Speaker, is give to policemen and people who are not policemen who are trained in other duties such as park wardens and conservation officers, powers within a provincial park that they don't have outside a provincial park. That is, the right to search without warrant, that right to arrest without warrant, the right to impound vehicles and so on and so forth, are powers that in most cases they don't enjoy, that is, that police officers don't enjoy in the general community. I suggest that the result of this would be that people once they enter a provincial park would be, in effect, giving up certain basic civil

rights that they enjoy outside of that provincial park. I would submit that notwithstanding any problems that the Minister has described as vandalism and destruction that those problems can be solved by existing means through the Criminal Code.

Now I am not sure whether the Attorney General has had an opportunity of looking into this Bill. I am not sure whether this went across his desk in the normal course of events but I urge him to do so because I think that the powers that are being given to policemen and to conservation officers and park superintendents are far too wide and far too sweeping to solve a problem that may be in existence.

How to justify these powers being given, the Minister refers to vandalism and destruction within the provincial parks and I certainly acknowledge that from my information that is indeed a problem, but I would suggest to the Minister and to the Attorney General that the provisions in the Criminal Code dealing with wilful damage and causing disturbances are certainly sufficient in my view to control this type of behavior. There is nothing stopping an RCMP Officer or a private citizen from laying a complaint where such behaviour takes place.

If there is vandalism of park property and the RCMP see it they can go in and arrest the person involved, lay the proper charges and treat it like they would any other case that happens outside the park. If the vandalism or destruction is observed by a private citizen he has certain powers under the Criminal Code to make arrests on his own or he could seek the assistance of the proper peace officers or police officials. And I would suggest that there is an abundant authority in the Criminal Code for them to do so. But it's curious, Mr. Speaker, in reading the Act that this Bill seeks to amend nowhere is there any reference to the sections involved which in the remotest way deal with vandalism and destruction and disturbances with the possible exception of one thing. If I could just refer for a moment, Mr. Speaker, to Section 22 of the existing Act which this Bill before you now seeks to give powers of arrest and so on to enforce. The Section reads as follows:

No person shall within a provincial park, recreational site, historic site, or protected area wilfully
a) do anything that causes pollution or contamination of water, soil or air.

Now I don't see anything there that could be construed as vandalism or disturbing the people or destruction.

b) leave or deposit any glass, poison or other thing or substance in a place where it might cause injury to a person.

Again, no reference to breaches of the peace or wilful damage.

c) destroy or damage any building or other structure or any furnishings or fixtures of any kind.

Of course there that can be construed as wilful damage if anybody breaches that.

d) carry on or permit or suffer to be exercised or carried on any noxious act, art, trade, business or occupation.

March 24, 1975

Well, I'm not quite sure of what is referred to by the word noxious there but it certainly doesn't as I see it refer to vandalism or disturbances.

The only conceivable subsection of Section 22 that could be justified for having rights of arrest and search or impounding private property would be Section 22C. And may I suggest to the Minister that already there is this power contained in the Criminal Code and that this is merely a duplication of provisions in the Criminal Code.

I suggest Mr. Speaker, that this amendment, that is the earlier portion of the amendment is simply not required that the power is already there under the existing statutes for peace officers or others to enforce the law and that there is a great danger of this type of amendment being passed. For instance, if it is passed, it gives the peace officer, which includes somebody such as a conservation officer who is completely untrained in law enforcement the right to arrest anybody for littering which I read the pollution section to include or leaving glass anywhere. Now, while I certainly don't hold any brief for people who litter beaches or our provincial parks, I don't think we require them to be arrested or incarcerated, have their cars impounded, searched, and so on. The matter can be handled very well by issuing a summons and I believe there are already provisions in the Act to have the person evicted from the park if the person involved thinks this is required to keep order.

I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that this section is not required. It gives far too sweeping powers to, firstly, policemen who don't have those powers in other areas and which is more of my concern, to people who are not properly trained in police activities. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the powers contained in Section 21A as amended are even more extensive than the RCMP currently have when they are investigating such serious crimes as charges in the Narcotic Control Act and the food and Drug Act and more serious offences under the Criminal Code.

To justify giving these powers for more or less minor offences to me it just cannot be done.

Mr. Speaker, I may have further words to say about this particular amendment at a later date. I would hope that the Attorney General would look into it and perhaps we'll hear from him on this debate but for the time I would ask leave to adjourn.

Debate adjourned.

HON. R. ROMANOW (Attorney General) moved second reading of Bill No. 37 - **An Act to amend The Vehicles Act (No. 2).**

He said: Mr. Speaker, moving Bill No. 37, which is the Vehicles Act, (No. 2.) These are basically two housekeeping amendments. They deal with one, the authority of the Cabinet in respect to establishment of vehicle registration fees and two, a penalty provision for operating in contravention of the terms of the vehicle registration certificate as established by the registration fee schedule.

Now, to speak to both of those two amendments. The first is mainly the authority of Cabinet in respect to the establishment of vehicle registration fees. As Members will know through an Order-in-Council passed earlier, Saskatchewan now has basically a two rate system with respect to vehicle weight regulations permitting the use of some larger trucks - trailer combinations on a very limited network in the province. Now this has established the two rate system. It has, therefore, necessitated a revision of the registration fee schedule for the trucks, requiring those trucks which are to be operated at the higher weight limits to be registered at higher fees than those which will continue to be operated at lower weight limits.

The amendment which has been proposed, therefore, Mr. Speaker, to this Act is required to effect and to enforce this is required registration and licence fee schedule.

Now, on the second matter the vehicle registration fees. Mr. Speaker, historically the determination of registration fees for trucks has been related to vehicle use and vehicle size as determined by gross vehicle weight. For the new two way system a registration fee schedule has been established which, in addition to these two variables, also takes into account axle weight registered in the determination of the registration fees. Vehicles registered for use of the higher allowable axle weight will be assessed a surcharge on their normal registration fee as determined by vehicle use and gross vehicle weight.

Mr. Speaker, Section 1(i) of the Vehicles Act presently authorizes Cabinet to prescribe the fees charged payable to the Highway Traffic Board. With the revision of the weight regulations, and subsequent registration fee schedule must be clarified. This amendment will give the Cabinet clear authority to make fees payable regulations respecting vehicles in terms of vehicle use, design, operating characteristics, such as wheel base, gross weight, axle weight, passenger capacity. This authority, while it may be there, perhaps is not as clearly established as it should be.

Mr. Speaker, I have noted that the registration fees for those vehicles registered to take full advantage of the increased weights permitted on the primer system are higher than those payable for vehicles which continue to operate at the lower limit. Section 203 of the Act presently limits an offence to operating in contravention of the authorized GVW, established for a vehicle through the registration and fee paying process. It will now additionally be an offence to operate in contravention of the Registered Vehicle Act weight. Because of the addition of axle weights variable in determining fees and because of the historic practice of using other vehicle design characteristics in defining fees it is therefore necessary to widen the scope of the existing Section 203.

That's all very technical but basically it allows us to make the necessary provisions in fees for registration as a result of the two way two system high gross vehicle weights and the lower gross vehicle weights which is the result of the Western Economic Opportunities Conference agreement. That's all the amendment is to.

I move second reading of Bill No. 37.

March 24, 1975

MR. G.B. GRANT: (Regina Whitmore Park) Mr. Speaker, one of our Members is absent today who wants to comment on this Bill and so I would ask leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

HON. R. ROMANOW (Attorney General) moved second reading of Bill No. 38 – **An Act to amend the Queen's Bench Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 38 is an Act to amend the Queen's Bench Act.

The Queen's Bench Act amendment, by adding paragraph 23 to Section 45, will permit people who enter into registered retirement savings plans under the Income Tax Act of Canada with trust companies or investment corporations to designate the beneficiaries to receive any payment to be made under the plan in the event of the plan holder's death.

The effect of this amendment is that it will provide greater freedom for members of the public and their use of registered retirement savings plans which, as Members will know, is increasingly becoming a popular method of providing income upon retirement. This amendment enables an annuitant to the plan issued by a trust company or other investment corporation the right to designate a beneficiary under the plan as may an annuitant in a plan of an insurance company by virtue of the Saskatchewan Insurance Act. And it further permits the beneficiary to claim the same benefits under the Income Tax Act of Canada as now can be claimed by beneficiaries of other types of registered retirement savings plans.

I move Bill No 38.

MR. GRANT: Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General will close debate on this. I'd appreciate if he would answer what has been done to handle these cases up to the present because I gather all this really does is add registered retirement plans to already existing retirement plans because it gives permission to name a beneficiary but what's happened in the interval because these plans have been in existence for some time?

MR. ROMANOW: Mr. Speaker, I will try to be better informed at the time of the clause by clause study of this Bill. But I'm advised that basically the problem here has related to this particular type of company involvement in registered retirement savings plan and basically what's happened is that the plan is simply payable to the estate without the designation of a specific beneficiary and it's been handled that way. But in order to be absolutely sure at questioning time during the clause by clause, I hope to have an official who will give me a more specific answer on that.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

HON. R. ROMANOW (Attorney General moved second reading of Bill No. 39 - **An Act respecting The Family Court.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, Bill 39 is the Family Court Act, 1975.

Mr. Speaker, I consider this legislation to be one of the major pieces of legislation which is before the consideration of the House at this particular Session. This Bill proposes to establish a court of record in Saskatchewan to be called the Family Court of Saskatchewan. As the name indicates, this court will be a court for family law matters and will consist of one or more judges appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council from among the judges of the Magistrates' Courts.

The Family Court, when established, will also be a juvenile court within the meaning of the Juvenile Delinquents Act, and therefore, children charged with delinquencies under that Act may also be dealt with by the judge of the Family Court.

The jurisdiction proposed for the judges of the Family Court is set out in Section 7 and 8 of the printed Bill. The judges of the Family Court will be given jurisdiction to grant maintenance to deserted wives or deserted children under the Deserted Wives and Children's Maintenance Act. In addition, the judges will have jurisdiction to make affiliation orders under the Children of Unmarried Parents Act, and also to determine when children are in need of protection under the Family Services Act. Custody of infant children will be within the jurisdiction of judges of this court and these judges will also have the power to dispense with the giving of parental consent for the marriage of minors and will have jurisdiction to make orders under the Parents Maintenance Act.

An important area of jurisdiction is that proposed by Section 8 of the printed Bill. Under this section of the Bill a judge of the Family Court will be given jurisdiction to try certain summary conviction offences or certain classes of summary conviction offences against Provincial Statutes. It's proposed that these offences would be those in which children were involved or in which family matters were directly involved. Example being perhaps common assault which is a summary conviction matter, common assault allegation involving one spouse versus another spouse.

By Section 9 of the Bill a person who is entitled to alimony or maintenance under an order for judgement of the Court of Queen's Bench may have that order enforced through the Family Court by filing simply a copy of the order or judgement of that Court. The judgement or order is enforced in the same way as an order under the Deserted Wives and Children's Maintenance Act is presently enforced. These orders may be enforced under the Deserted Wives and Children's Maintenance Act by being registered against the lands of the person against whom the judgement or order was made or the person against whom the order or judgement was made is liable to be summonsed into court to show cause why he has defaulted and if satisfactory explanation is not given, that person may be committed to a term of imprisonment, basically the present procedure under the Deserted Wives Act.

Section 10 is also an important part of this Bill. Section 10 is a section which authorizes the judge of the Family Court to require parties before the court to secure counselling or a

March 24, 1975

form of family mediation services from professional social workers. It's hoped by such an attempt that in this way certain disputes before the Family Court can be resolved other than a adjudication by the court. I might say that arrangements have now been made to establish a close working relationship between the Department of Social Services and the Family Court as proposed to ensure that the services of the social workers are available to the court both with respect to persons coming to the court for relief as well as for such services to be provided when, during the hearing of the matter, a judge of the Court is of the opinion that such services would be beneficial.

The judges of the Family Court are empowered to hold hearings in private, where, because of the nature of the matter the judges feel that would be the best course to follow.

Now, Mr. Speaker, frequently parties engaged in matrimonial disputes make, I think this is a good way to describe it, a nuisance of themselves to the other party by way of telephone calls and the like.

Under Section 12 of the Bill a judge of the Family Court may, where he is satisfied that a party of the action is making a nuisance of himself or herself by invading the privacy of the other party to the action or proceeding that judge may make an order prohibiting the person from carrying out the course of conduct which is creating the difficulty and set this out in the order. In this way the judge of the Family Court will be able to prohibit a person from such actions as attempts to contact the other or attempts to make a nuisance by being present at places where the other party is himself or herself present.

The remaining provisions of the Bill, Mr. Speaker, set out the administrative matters necessary for the establishment and functioning of a family court and parallel to a very large extent the existing provisions of the judges of the Magistrates Courts and the various acts that apply.

Mr. Speaker, the establishment of a Family Court of Saskatchewan to deal with family law matters was recommended by the Hon. Mr. Justice Emmett M. Hall QC CC in his report covering the overall court structure in Saskatchewan and its functioning. The establishment of a unified family court within a province to deal exclusively with family law matters has been recommended and adopted in other jurisdictions as well, notably the provinces of Alberta, Manitoba, Ontario and British Columbia. In Saskatchewan at present the jurisdiction to deal with matters which determine family law matters rests in the three court structures of the province, that is the Court of Queen's Bench, if I could start at the senior court level, and then the District Court level, working down to the judges of the Magistrates Court level. Quite obviously this results in a fragmentation of jurisdiction. It requires persons who seek relief to approach the different levels of the courts of the province. A deserted spouse, for instance, when seeking maintenance from a deserting spouse is required to make an application for that maintenance through a judge of the District Court or, alternatively, to a judge of the Magistrates court. She may apply for herself on behalf of her deserted children as well. In addition, the deserted spouse may wish other relief such as access to the children of the spouse. In such a case the spouse would be required to go presently to two different courts. This would be done away with under the proposed Bill. Under this proposed

Bill the spouse could get the relief she sought from the one court, namely the court that we are establishing here, the Family Court of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I said that this Bill will be a major piece of legislation for this Session and I believe that to be the case. The establishment of a unified family court for the province has been recommended by a number of organizations and interested people in the province for some time. In addition, throughout other provinces recommendations for such a court have been made and we are in effect, experimenting in our own way with the establishment of such a unified court.

Mr. Speaker, just a word or two from the text with respect to this matter.

This is still in the category of an experimental project as far as the Government is concerned. It is experimental and we hope subject to adequate financing being arranged with the Federal authorities and the Federal Law Reform Commission in particular to establish the first experimental court at Saskatoon, and have the one court operate there for, say, a one-year period to see how it works. We are in negotiations with the Federal authorities for a three-year 50-50 funding approach to this family court concept.

Members will know that a number of approaches are being tried in other jurisdictions. In Manitoba, for example, they have collected all of these family law matters and put them under one roof, the District Court roof, or the County Court roof. We, in Saskatchewan, are not following that approach. In Saskatchewan it will still be a two-tiered level; basically all of the family law matters which fall within the province, or within any of the provincial jurisdictions will fall under the Family Law Court which is established. But there will be another tier which relates to divorce, which will have to go the ordinary route by way of Queen's Bench. The problem is constitutionally the province cannot deal with the court structure itself on the question of divorce. This is a federal matter and, therefore, must be dealt with by a Federal Court. So you can see some of the reasoning behind the Province of Manitoba putting it into the district court. Here they will have all of the functions in one place, from the divorce right to the other family problems.

In British Columbia they are still maintaining their three-tier system as we have here presently, namely, Magistrate's County Court, Queen's Bench. But their experimentation is taking another form. Their experimentation is to house all three of these courts in one physical building, with a social services support staff. We are watching both of the experiments in Manitoba and British Columbia to see how they work out. We rejected both of them for a number of reasons. We think the British Columbia one has the disadvantage of still being too cumbersome with three courts; we think the Manitoba one has the disadvantage of being removed from the Provincial Court. I am sure the Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) will agree with me having been the former Minister of Social Services, many of the family problems relating to Social Services really can be best dealt with at a provincial level, with a provincial magistrate. Thus, our approach. However, this leaves the necessary gap that we have to go into another court if, and when, a divorce situation comes into the problem.

March 24, 1975

One final word, and that is the court will have, once the budget is approved, a bit of a bureaucracy to it which will be, I hope, very small. It will basically have one or two social workers who are primarily trained and concerned with family law problems attached to it to counsel the parties, whether they are husband and wife or whether they are children, or children and mother and father, wherever the tension happens to be. In addition, there will be a lawyer who will be attached to the court as really an officer of the court. Every lawyer is, in a sense, an officer of the court, but the concept here is that this would be a person who would advise both parties and would be sort of an agent of the judge, of the family law court, to act in the best interests of all of these who are concerned.

We are some way away yet, several weeks away from finalizing the financing and until we finalize the financing we can't do anything about hiring personnel. We need the legislation, however, in place in order to get the concept under way, the experiment under way and that's precisely what this particular Bill No. 39 does.

Mr. Speaker, with those words in second reading outlining the principle and some of the provisions of the Bill and the concepts, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to move second reading of Bill 39, The Family Court Act of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. C.P. MacDONALD: (Milestone) Mr. Speaker, I only want to say a few words before my colleague for Regina Lakeview (Mr. Malone) says a few words.

First of all, I am pleased that eventually the Province of Saskatchewan is getting into the family court concept. I know a few years ago we initiated some studies on it with the hope of eventually getting into it. Certainly other areas of Canada have indicated that this particular concept in dealing with families and marital break-up and children seems to be much more appropriate. Most of the judges have legal minds and as a result have been more concerned with the legal technicalities of the Criminal Code and so forth. Whereas, in family court situations in other provinces very often social workers and people who are not necessarily from the legal profession have been appointed judges and have had a much broader knowledge of family circumstances.

One thing I do want to say, and the only thing that I want to point out? I am disappointed that there is the two-tier approach. I find it very difficult to see how a family court, which cannot deal with the problem of divorce, can really do the adequate job. I know it comes from the county idea of moving into the district level that divorces come under the federal jurisdiction. However, it might have been wise to put the family court up in the federal jurisdiction because, after all, when we come to deal with the children, the problems of break-up of marriage, it would seem that that is where the family court could be strongest. Certainly when you come to deal with divorces you have to start to deal with the children and what happens to the children, and my only comment is that I am disappointed in the fact that it is a two-tier approach, that divorces will be separated from the jurisdiction of the family court. I think it would have been much wiser had we moved to the district level where one court and one official

body could have dealt with the entire problems of marriage, or families, right from the idea of the care of children and what happens to the children and what happens to the finances, what happens to the assets of the family, the problems of counselling, etc., and also at the same time dealt with the concept of divorces. That's the only comment I would make. I would say that I am pleased to see us moving into the Family Court concept. The Minister indicates that it is a bit of an experiment. We will all be watching it very, very closely in the future and I, certainly for one, want to wish it every success, even though I do feel that this is one weakness in the Bill.

MR. E.C. MALONE: (Regina Lakeview) Mr. Speaker, many of the things I was going to say have already been said by my colleague, the Member for Milestone. However, I should like to say that I will support the Bill. In fact, I could make a suggestion to the Attorney General that after June he may find himself to be in position to take the first job as the first Family Court judge in Saskatchewan. I am sure he would do an admirable job in that position.

However, I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that while the Bill is a good thing, in fact, it is almost astonishing that it has taken us this long to realize how archaic our legal system was in connection with family matters. The Attorney General has adequately described the numerous courts that had to be attended upon to seek any relief for a family dispute. One wonders why it has taken these many years to have something like this brought about.

But in saying that, Mr. Speaker, I do think the Bill has certain inadequacies which were touched on by the Member for Milestone, indeed, were touched on by the Attorney General himself. That is, that it doesn't go far enough. What this Bill really does is to take the existing jurisdiction that magistrates enjoy for (if I can use the word) minor marital offences, or marital matters, and throws them into the magistrate's court. It really doesn't get to the more serious matters which, I think, all of us as legislators realize are fundamental in most marital disputes. I think that most marital disputes or family disputes will involve eventually, if not initially, four things the matter of divorce; the matter of property settlement; the matter of custody of the children after the divorce; and the matter of access to those children by the party who doesn't have custody of them. And this Bill before us does not assist us in any way in coming to a quick conclusion and a just conclusion of these problems. Because, once again, it will mean if the marriage starts to go on the rocks we'll have the first matter come before the family court judge and then later at further expense and further delay when it gets to the Queen's Bench level.

We, of course, have on the Order Paper the Bill dealing with family property. That, hopefully, will result in some improvement of the existing situation, but again, the Bill before us with respect to the family court will not assist that in one way or another. It will, of course, allow a woman to obtain support from her husband, but it has nothing to do with who has the family home, who gets the furniture and so on and so forth. The Act doesn't help us in this way.

The Attorney General, in his remarks, also indicated that he felt that this court could make orders in connection with

March 24, 1975

custody. As I read the Act I don't believe that to be the case, and I should like to look into that a little more. But I do not believe that this court would have the power to grant custody in a marital dispute, which is, of course, one of its failings.

Personally, I am concerned about the juvenile delinquency proceedings being before this court. In my own experience once a young person becomes involved with provisions or proceedings under The Juvenile Delinquent's Act, that he has passed the stage where a family court or his family can help him and is really needing counselling by proper officials, or in some cases, regrettably, a period of incarceration. Frankly I would not, if it were up to me, put the juvenile delinquency proceedings in this particular Act.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, there is one other section where the Act refers to the rules that the proceedings will be as informal as possible. By this I assume from the Attorney General that the rules of evidence will not apply to proceedings under this Act. If that's the case I don't think it is a good thing, but perhaps the Attorney General, when closing debate, can clarify that position for me. In my view the rules of evidence are there to help all the parties, not to hinder them. They have been gathered through hundreds of years of British jurisprudence. In many cases they are lacking but by and large, in most cases, they are there to protect everybody involved.

I am also curious as to whether or not the Family Court judges will be appointed from the existing staff of magistrates in this province or whether the Attorney General intends on appointing new judges from the legal profession. Hopefully he will deal with that when closing the debate.

Mr. Speaker, I welcome the Act in some respects. In other respects I feel that it definitely does not go far enough. I think that the procedure in Manitoba is more desirable than the procedure that we have before us. Anything is an improvement over the existing situation. I think perhaps once the further provisions of the report of Mr. Justice Hall, in connection with the court structure are considered and that the Government may change its mind and hopefully will allow the Family Court to be a court from the District Court, rather than from the Magistrate's Court. However, that remains to be seen. I will have some further remarks to make in connection with this Bill, Mr. Speaker, and I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

HON. E. TCHORZEWSKI (Provincial Secretary) moved second reading of Bill No. 41 - **An Act to amend The Companies Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, Bill 41 is a Bill to amend The Companies Act. This Bill will make it possible for a company incorporated under The Companies Act of Saskatchewan to apply for continuation as a Dominion company under The Canada Business Corporations Act, as if it were a company incorporated under that Act. Application may be made by a company for continuation of a Dominion company only if it has been authorized to do so by a special resolution of the shareholders. A special resolution

requires a three-fourths majority of the votes cast at a general meeting of which not less than 14 days notice thereof has been given to the shareholders specifying the intention to propose the resolution.

The provision contained in this Bill complements a provision which is contained in the new Canada Business Corporations Act, known as Bill C-29. Although Bill C-29 has been passed by the House of Commons it must still be passed by the Senate and be given Royal Assent before becoming law. After passage the Bill will not come into force until proclaimed and similarly the Bill before us does not come into force until it has been proclaimed.

Provisions allowing what is commonly referred to as inter-jurisdictional transfers are new to The Federal Corporations Act and theretofore companies seeking for one reason or another to continue its business as a Dominion company had to incorporate a new company under the federal Act. The new company would then enter into an agreement with the provincial company whereby it would take over all the assets and assume all of the liabilities of the provincial company, which would then allow itself to die. Under the revised federal Act provision is made whereby an existing company may simply be continued as a Dominion company. One of the requirements, however, for a company to proceed in this manner is that it be authorized to do so by the laws of the jurisdiction in which it is incorporated, and hence the need for the Bill which is before us today.

Similar legislation was passed in 1974 by an amendment to The Saskatchewan Insurance Act, enabling a provincial insurer to apply for letters patent under The Canadian and British Insurance Companies Act and thereby be continued as if it were a company incorporated under an Act of the Parliament of Canada. This legislation was of particular benefit to Pioneer Life Insurance Company, which, as you may know, started out as a Saskatchewan company but is now a Dominion company. Dominion registration was required when the company extended its operations into the Province of Manitoba.

I might add that a committee is working on a new Companies Act for Saskatchewan and that it will be considering the desirability of extending inter-jurisdictional transfers to a manner similar to that contained in Bill C-29. Bill C-29 allows for both the import and the export of companies from and to other jurisdictions. A provision of this kind offers benefits particularly to small private companies whose shareholders incorporate in one province and subsequently take up residence in another province.

Although the company no longer carries on business in the jurisdiction in which it was incorporated, it must, nevertheless, report to that jurisdiction in order to keep the company in existence. Some safeguards may be required. For example, the company seeking to transfer from one jurisdiction to another may have to satisfy the registrar that its proposed continuance in the other jurisdiction will not adversely affect creditors, or in some cases, shareholders of the company.

The new Saskatchewan Companies Act, besides updating corporate law in Saskatchewan should provide a greater measure of protection to shareholders, particularly minority or dissenting shareholders, as well as to creditors, not only in the case of inter-jurisdictional transfers, if permitted, but in other cases as well.

March 24, 1975

Several groups and organizations have expressed an interest in the new Companies Act and have offered assistance in the preparation of the legislation. I refer to such bodies as the Saskatchewan section of the Canadian Bar Association, the Institute of Chartered Accountants, the College of Law, University of Saskatchewan and others. Consultation with these and other groups will be most helpful in the preparation of a new act, which will fill the needs of shareholders, creditors and the public generally.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the Bill before us is one small step toward inter-jurisdictional transfers. It merely allows a Saskatchewan company to become a Dominion company. A stated consideration is being given for extending this provision in the new Act.

With those words, I, at this time, move second reading of this Bill.

MR. E.C. MALONE: (Regina Lakeview) Mr. Speaker, I assume from the long remarks of the Minister, which we have become accustomed to over the last few days, that this amendment is really enabling legislation to facilitate the federal legislation, but there are a number of matters that I should like to look into before speaking further on it, Mr. Speaker, and I would ask accordingly, that the debate be adjourned at this time.

Debate adjourned.

HON. J.R. KOWALCHUK (Minister of Tourism and Renewable Resources) moved second reading of Bill No. 43 - **An Act to Provide for the Preservation, Promotion and Development of the Heritage of Saskatchewan.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, it is a great privilege for me to have this opportunity to rise in this Legislature and introduce second reading debate on Bill No. 42, The Saskatchewan Heritage Act.

Mr. Speaker, in general terms the intent of this legislation is to ensure that preservation of our archaeological, historical and cultural resources in Saskatchewan for the people of Saskatchewan. This will involve the investigation, preservation, study and interpretation of heritage resources.

When we use the term heritage resources we view these as real properties or artefacts which are interpreted as significant in terms of Saskatchewan's unique archaeology, history, society, culture and geography. That, in general terms, describes what this Act sets out to achieve. It might be a fair question to ask if the need has been identified? Is legislation necessary? Is there public concern?

Mr. Speaker, it has become very clear over the last couple of years that there is, indeed, a real need for legislative action and I am confident that the Bill you have before you today will satisfy the vast majority of concerns which have arisen, and will ensure that our historical and heritage resources are, indeed, preserved for the future of our province.

The support for action has come from many quarters, Mr. Speaker. The Saskatchewan Archaeological Association, the

Saskatchewan Environmental Society, and the Natural History Society of Saskatchewan are to mention but a few.

My colleague, the Minister of Culture and Youth has also received the same type of representations and in fact, it was his department which first prepared the initial draft of what you see in the proposed legislation here today.

Public support for such an Act has also been streaming in with many letters from individuals and groups concerned about the protection, the restoration and the preservation of our historical resources.

Mr. Speaker, before commenting on the specifics contained in this legislation I wish to spend a few moments providing you with some additional thoughts with regard to the advisability and the public acceptability of proceeding with such an act at this particular time.

In general terms, the Act relates quite closely to other legislation currently found on books in British Columbia, Alberta, Manitoba and Quebec. Ontario is in the process of introducing similar legislation and it is our understanding that the Federal Government is also working on a similar act of national significance. The Saskatchewan Act will cover the designation, preservation, study and interpretation of our heritage resources.

Mr. Speaker, all of us are immigrants to this land. That includes everyone from the first Indians, hundreds or thousands of years ago down to the latest arrival. In part, each immigrant group is distinct, bringing special values, beliefs and faiths. In part, through this land, we have a common bond of past experiences, a common heritage.

However, in this swiftly changing society, we are in danger of losing our identity. Urbanization, the mass media, coupled with tremendous technological advances have all contributed to the imposition of 'imposed or artificial values' which are threatening not only our individuality, but also our uniqueness.

In the past, a number of constraints have presented themselves. However, the more alarming aspect in relationship to protecting our historical resources is found in three areas which contribute to the increasing erosion. Stated simply, these forces are (1) Deliberate destruction; (2) unintentional destruction; (3) the loss of heritage resources from Saskatchewan and from Canada. This is either bought or just taken out.

Mr. Speaker, objects leave the province and are lost forever. Valuable resources are intentionally or otherwise destroyed and they, too, are lost forever. Artefacts are taken from Saskatchewan indiscriminately and are hidden in private collections - denied to the public. All in all, memories of our illustrious past fade as the years come and go and the new generations emerge rootless. Buildings are destroyed or altered so greatly that they no longer hold memories. This is a common loss and each of us suffer. Vandalism, negligence and exportation of heritage resources are erasing our culture and as I said before, Mr. Speaker, our identity. Repeating again, urban sprawl, redevelopment, road construction, the antique market and sheer neglect, are helping to destroy the pleasant reminders of the past. Maybe some are not so pleasant but nevertheless they are reminders of the past.

March 24, 1975

The need for legislation as one measure, Mr. Speaker, to guard our heritage and our resources is immediate. We have not created the need nor do I think that we have over reacted to a situation which is clearly evident.

To show what can happen if nothing is done, I refer to just one clipping dated October 1974 which appeared in the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix entitled "National Heritage Dug Up and Sold by Businessmen".

A national heritage of fossilized animals and plants is being dug from the earth and sold at an alarming rate by businessmen who are developing new and highly profitable markets for prehistoric remains as are objects, jewellery and materials for decorations.

This article goes on to state:

In many cases, fossils potentially invaluable to understanding the evolution of life before man's existence are being looted from public lands in the West, in violation of federal and state laws. In the process scientists fear pages of the earth's prebook history are being ripped away and will be lost forever.

This article, Mr. Speaker, relates to American vandalism in the State of Colorado and it well could apply to Saskatchewan, our Qu'Appelle Valley, the Churchill River and others.

Mr. Speaker, this is a frightening prospect. Obviously no law or regulation is going to stop completely the erosion and destruction of our historical resources. We all know that a process of public education has to be part of that overall program. However, this Act will go a long way in improving and ensuring the retention of much of our historical past as is humanly possible. The need for this legislation we have before us today, as I stated earlier, is immediate and yes, long overdue.

This government believes that it is our responsibility to provide the people of Saskatchewan with the opportunity to appreciate their unique heritage. Bill 42, among other things, brings about the appointment of a Saskatchewan Heritage Advisory Board to advise and make recommendations pertaining to the conservation, protection and preservation of the heritage of our province. Mr. Speaker, there is a need to identify and preserve endangered heritage sites. There is a need to control and regulate archaeological investigations. There is a need to classify, preserve, index and catalogue heritage property. There is a need to support education or research programs for the purposes of the legislation. There is a need to provide professional and technical services to museums and other similar institutions for the purpose of this Act. Mr. Speaker, the Saskatchewan Heritage Act will do all these things. Penalties for damages to designated resources are set out. Compensation for loss as a result of designation is also provided.

At this time in history we find ourselves at the crossroads in relationship to our historical resources. Yes, inaction in the past has resulted in the loss forever of some of our resources which might have been saved had legislation been in place, however, as we prepare to go down a new road, and head into a new direction I feel we shall be able to utilize the

articles found within this legislation to minimize the current threats by guaranteeing the future of our invaluable historic resource base.

Man and his activities at this moment are destroying objects and sites that deserve protection and preservation. A bulldozer or grader can destroy resources in minutes that can never be replaced. As a province, Saskatchewan is now 70 years old, Mr. Speaker. In terms of human history, her past extends back over 17,000 years. This past has been steadily disappearing. Memories are fading. Cultural heritage has been ignored.

However, many people are now becoming aware of this loss and many people are now starting to question the ideas that something new is inherently better, that the past has nothing to teach us. Mr. Speaker, we must preserve and protect that which ties us to the earlier generations and the earlier times.

We must do our part to ensure that our children and their children have the right, and the opportunity, to reflect positively on their heritage, and this legislation will go a long way in ensuring that this right is not jeopardized.

Earlier my department introduced an historic site preservation program, which was announced approximately three weeks ago. The program encourages the preservation of local heritage and provides financial assistance through grants to assist in the preservation of historic buildings, items or objects.

The first agreement under this program was concluded last Thursday, Mr. Speaker, when I signed an agreement with the president of the Craik Prairie Pioneer Museum Association at Craik. The five year agreement calls for expenditures of over 14,000 and provides for the repair and moving of a pioneer home built in 1904 to the present museum complex in that community. Mr. Speaker, the involvement by members of that Association and the many volunteers in this project is indicative of the extreme interest in their community and their appreciation of the local heritage.

This appreciation and interest is something which is commonplace around the province today and I am confident that this legislation, Bill 42, will further assist groups and individuals positively to build up the historical resources of this province.

Through the process of this legislation, Mr. Speaker, we shall not only be able to make the public more aware of the value of this Saskatchewan heritage resources but also we will be providing the necessary provision for the protection and preservation of this resource.

Mr. Speaker, I now want to offer a few more specific observations with regard to the said legislation. I have already backgrounded the need for this Act and the aim of the legislation and I feel I should comment on the legislative powers which are vested in the Minister along with the Heritage Board. Together the Minister and the Board may:

1. Purchase or acquire by other means (lease, rental exchange, donation) a heritage resource.
2. May designate any object or area as 'protected' in order to preserve or salvage a heritage resource.

3. May revoke the designation or sell or divest the government of the property as they see fit.
4. Encourage the:
 - a) interpretation and/or classification of heritage resources
 - b) display of the heritage resources, and,
 - c) restoration of the heritage resource.
5. Will also be able to support:
 - a) educational or research programs, and
 - b) museums or similar institutions and
6. Have the responsibility and power to enact regulations with regard to use and protection, admissions, maintenance and management of sites and displays, issuance of permits for archaeological excavations and, in the event of personal loss, Mr. Speaker, compensation to those persons who are in any way injured by the Act or the subsequent regulations.

Mr. Speaker, I want to comment briefly on the advisory board. The Saskatchewan Heritage Board would be established as a public and professional group by the Minister and would advise the Minister on the acquisition of land and its declaration as protected property in order to preserve or salvage a heritage resource. The Board would also offer guidance and direction with respect to the protection of a heritage resource and the means of preservation that could be employed. It is my feeling and commitment to have this Board composed of individuals and representatives of groups and agencies with a high degree of understanding and commitment.

The Board will be vested with the responsibility to contribute favorably towards the administration of this Act and it is my anticipation that it will have a vital role to play in the future.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to the destruction of materials or the modification of a site, the legislation provides for severe penalties for any destruction, disfiguration or whatever, in relationship to a designated resource. Deterrents and the prospect of punishment should dramatically reduce the high incidence of vandalism.

If the damage or alteration is so great that it is impossible to restore the site or the artefact, the person is liable not only for the fine but the Crown may recover damages as well.

If the Minister feels that any heritage resource is in danger due to construction or other activity, he can 'freeze' the site until a thorough investigation is carried out.

With regard to compensation, the Minister has the power to authorize compensation to any person suffering loss as a result of this Act, or, as I said before, its subsequent regulations.

Mr. Speaker, in the last few minutes I have attempted to provide you with the background of this legislation and also provide the people of Saskatchewan with insight to respect the need for this legislation and the advisability of putting it into effect. I feel it will contribute favorably to the

protection and preservation of our heritage resources and I am confident the provisions contained herein will receive wide and general support of not only this Assembly but also the people Saskatchewan and Canada.

Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me to move second reading Bill 42, The Saskatchewan Heritage Act.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. T.M. WEATHERALD: (Cannington) Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a few brief remarks to this Bill. First of all we will be supporting the Bill because we feel that it is a move that will be supported by the vast majority of the people of Saskatchewan and has been asked by the various societies the Minister has mentioned.

However, there are two points that I should like to make in regard to the Bill. The first one is that as I would understand this Act does give the government considerable power over persons involved with their own private property and I use an example for the Minister which he may wish to comment on in his closing remarks, but most certainly the power he's vested in the government regarding building sites or other pieces of property, that the government may freeze those sites, may freeze that property, although at the same time that particular property is owned by an individual. Let me take just for an example, an historical house, if I may use that as an example. That historical house may well be sitting on a person's private land and may have been there for the past number of years. It could well be a quarter of a mile or more, depending on closeness, to a road allowance and yet the Minister would have the power under this Act to say that that is a historical site and that the government would have a claim on it which would limit the private owner's use of the building and the private owner's access and the upkeep of the building.

So I do want to make the point to the Minister that while we support the principle of the preservation of these historical sites and other historical parts of the province, the law will have to be extremely careful in being applied so that we don't infringe on what are other people's rights because much of these historical sites, etc., in Saskatchewan are still in the hands of the people as private property.

The second point that I should like to make, Mr. Speaker, is that much of the validity of this Bill, or much of the impact of this Bill, will be determined to a large extent by the amount of money the government is willing to put forward to carry out the purposes of this Bill. I say that because in many cases the historical items that are available in Saskatchewan, whether they be buildings, artefacts, etc., that many of these historical items do have some value as private property and if they are to be preserved I think the only way of guaranteeing their preservation is that at some point in the future they become government property. So I would suggest to the Minister that if the Bill is going to have any substantial impact, the government is going to have to provide a certain amount of funds and at the same time making as good a deal with individual owners as possible so that over the longer term the government does become the owner of most of these historical sites and other historical background data that we have throughout the province.

March 24, 1975

With those two comments, Mr. Speaker, the one involving private property which I think the government will have to treat with extreme care, while at the same time preserving the historical sites, we are certainly going to have to recognize that many of these are held under private ownership; and secondly, the matter of setting up the special fund that would acquire historical items throughout Saskatchewan, those are the only two particular comments that I should like to make at this time. With those two comments the Opposition will be supporting the Bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. J.G. RICHARDS: (Saskatoon University) Mr. Speaker, I, too, should like to speak to this Bill, which I certainly support in principle. I trust, and the Minister's comments have somewhat allayed my fears, that this Bill is not similar to the Clean Environment Authority Act, which was passed by this Legislature in the dying days of the Thatcher regime, as a sop to environmental interests as legislation upon which the Government had no intention to act seriously.

There are a number, however, of important questions that I should like to address myself to in dealing with the Bill as it exists. The first question is why has the government chosen to make the Minister of Tourism and Renewable Resources responsible for this piece of legislation when already that is large and heavy department? This is a logical piece of legislation to be administered by the Department of Culture and Youth, inasmuch as it deals with the cultural heritage of the Province of Saskatchewan. Why not have this Bill introduced by the Minister of Culture and Youth?

A more basic and important problem of this Bill is that it is an ideal program to be administered by a commission with considerable independence from the Minister, whereas the structure of the legislation gives all powers to the Minister. The advisory board specified in Section 5 - to begin with, the Minister may set it up, there is no specification that he shall set it up - it has no powers except to advise. Given that the Minister, and I think he is quite right in stating this point, given that the Minister has discussed the number of groups which are intently interested in this area, I think it would have been ideal to choose some of the people from around the province interested in cultural preservation, embody them in a commission with considerable powers and authority. I should like to propose when we deal with this Bill, clause by clause, that we strengthen substantially, via House amendment, Section 5 in order to give the advisory board substantive powers.

Consider Section 6. The Minister can, in Subsection (1) designate a property to be a heritage property and in Subsection (2) he can immediately turn around and withdraw that designation. The Bill makes no requirement as to any procedure for public hearings, for public involvement, in the decisions of the Minister in both the process of designation and the process of withdrawing that designation. To take a concrete example from my constituency in Saskatoon, the government is planning a new, large office complex on a property which could involve the destruction of the Norfolk Trust Building. Obviously conflict of interest could arise as to whether the Norfolk Trust

Building is to be designated as a heritage property. According to the legislation as it exists now there is no requirement that there be any public input in the making of the decision as to whether the Norfolk Trust Building is to be preserved and incorporated in any new government office building. The Bill as it exists now is considerably weaker than earlier versions. There are no specific powers granted to the advisory board that require the Minister to have public input in the making of decisions.

However, I support the Bill and I shall vote for it in second reading, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. G.B. GRANT: (Regina Whitmore Park) Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the Minister for bringing this Bill in. It is an area in which I have been interested for about 20 years. After a long struggle with my own Cabinet back in about 1969, I was successful in having Saskatchewan House designated as a property of historical significance. I was making some progress with the Premier and others when in 1971 things suddenly changed.

Speaking along the lines suggested by an earlier speaker, the gentlemen I have dealt with since then consisted of the Minister of Public Works, the Premier, the Minister of Health and the Minister in charge of Wascana Authority, the Minister of Culture and Youth and latterly the Minister of Tourism and Renewable Resources. I can tell you this represents about ten years of frustration because governments have a habit of paying lip service to this type of thing and as the Member for Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) said, legislation is one thing but putting money up for the execution of the legislation is equally or more important.

I think this Bill is about 30 years, well I won't say too late because it certainly isn't too late, but it is regrettable that it didn't appear before this House about 30 years ago when all the furnishings of Government House were sold off at public auction and that building went through many, many years of aches and pains. It now looks like it may be the subject of preservation in years to come. I doubt whether we will ever get very much of those early furnishings back.

Probably another building that has suffered even more so are the Territorial Government Buildings on Dewdney Avenue here a major portion of that group of buildings fell to the wreckers' axe and hammers not too many years ago. What is left of it is in very bad shape. Vandals got in it and just completely wrecked the interior of the building. The last I saw of it the furnace was standing in about 18 inches of water.

I was interested in the Minister's use of the word 'salvage' in referring to the Bill. Believe me there is a lot of salvage involved in the restoration of these buildings and I would hope that the Government opposite would take serious note of an article on the editorial page of the Leader-Post on Friday, written by Mrs. Ruth Hunt, in connection with Saskatchewan House and that before too long an alternate home can be found for the educational activities that are going on in ere and work could start on that building.

March 24, 1975

I was disappointed that, while there was money in the budget last year for a start on the Territorial Government Buildings, it wasn't found possible to get at it and I hope also that building will be restored before it deteriorates any more.

I am glad the Minister of Highways (Mr. Kramer) came in because I was to make reference to his department when he was head of the Department of Natural Resources. To give you an idea of what happened - and I am not blaming the Minister because it could have happened regardless of who was head of that department. I brought to the attention of the government and the department at that time the availability of a quarter section of land northwest of Regina on which the major pile of bones was located and is considered to be the site from which Regina got its early name, Pile of Bones. This land had been in the hands of one family for about 50 years or maybe more and was available because of the age of the owner. It could have very easily been purchased, there were three-quarter sections of land involved and two-quarters of it could have been sold off and the other quarter, where this particular site was, could have been farmed except for a very small area, but because of the lack of this type of legislation, nothing happened. There are many, many instances of this.

Members opposite know of my association with the Plains Historical Museum and a collection of 15,000 items that are in storage on Dewdney Avenue at the present time. It is a crying shame really that we cannot find a home for this collection because the building it is in is not of fire proof construction, no humidity control, in fact, it is probably the hottest building in Regina in the summer and the coldest in the winter. These items are typical of early prairie development and very valuable. I dare say if turned over to private interests they would realize \$150,000 to \$200,000. The Plains Historical Museum has \$100,000 in the bank which is not sufficient to provide a building but is more than sufficient to provide all the equipment, cupboards and cabinets and everything else that would be required.

I want to express my appreciation to the Minister of Tourism and Renewable Resources for the interest that he has shown and the efforts that he has extended in trying to provide a home for this museum and I hope, and I know he does too, that we will be successful within the next 12 months. I feel that it is a good tourist addition or attraction for the city, even located in one of the government areas close to Regina and would, I think, augment that area as a interesting spot for tourists.

I think it is important that the house at Craik, for instance, be preserved, if it's a typical house of that vintage and I presume it is, 1904, but I feel, Mr. Speaker, that it is probably even more important to preserve buildings such as Saskatchewan House and Government House and I would certainly endorse the Bill and hope that the Minister has the full support of his Cabinet colleagues and Treasury Board in the provision of funds because the passage of this Bill is not going to preserve very much unless there is money available to do it. I would strongly urge the Member for Regina North East (Mr. Smishek), particularly as a Cabinet Member to further express his support and the Premier I know is sympathetic toward this thing. I am referring now to my interest in the Plains Historical Museum. To give you some idea what's involved and then I

will close my remarks; I know the locomotive on Elphinstone Street provides a lot of interest to younger people particularly. This is owned by the Plains Historical Museum, it's not typical of what we were preserving. I got involved in that myself, in fact I owned the locomotive at one time and I was afraid I was going to be stuck with it. But I think it is important that that type of thing be preserved to let our younger people see what types of power we used on our trains in the early days. The school house on the Regina Exhibition Grounds is also preserved by the Plains Historic Museum. That school house was built in 1890, it was the Reynoldson School north of Regina and we have all the records, the school board records back from those days. I am not saying that too many of those buildings can be preserved because it does become very costly but I strongly urge the Government opposite to continue its interest and expand it in the preservation of such items as the Plains Historical Museum has done. I can assure the Minister that he has my full and loyal support in anything he does in this regard.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KOWALCHUK: Mr. Speaker, it certainly is a pleasure to hear that we are going to get the total support from all sides of the House in regard to this Bill, the Heritage Act of Saskatchewan. I fully agree with Mr. Grant, the Member for Whitmore Park that it is probably 10 or 20 years too late. In many cases many of the artefacts and many of the historic buildings have been destroyed but I think that what is going to happen is that when this gets moving - and this isn't going to be the end result, hopefully, - it is going to have to receive the endorsement of all good people. An Act put on the Statute Books is not in itself going to make a thing successful. I think it is going to have to get the co-operation from a lot of people, the Archaeological Society, the environmental people and other people who have shown their concern indeed, Mr. Speaker. I agree that to protect some of the buildings we must show more than just a casual interest in structures like Government house and the Territorial Buildings. I think in answering that one I will also answer a question that was asked by the Member for Cannington about the input of money. That is correct, I think, that in this type of program that some of the buildings there is no question in my mind and the mind of this government some of these buildings are eventually going to have to be bought, restored, preserved and cared for by the government. In many cases it is going to have to be done by the people themselves who are going to have an input.

The program that I had announced about three weeks ago, the Historic Sites Preservation Program and the grants that go with it, I think is another good step in that regard. I think that we are really on the right road in the historic preservation not only of historic buildings and sites but also the many other artefacts and probably some good Saskatchewan paintings that are in existence right here in Saskatchewan. I think this is all going to contribute to the preservation and restoration of many of our cultural things and heritage. In reply to the Member for Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) about strict application of the Act, the Minister and the advisory committee, naturally, are going to have to exercise their decisions with extreme care, Mr. Speaker, I certainly agree with that.

In regard to the question that was posed by the Member for Saskatoon University about where in one case you designate either

March 24, 1975

a site or whatever it is, possibly a historical artefact and in the second part of that section you make provision for its deletion, I think that is a very important item because there is no question at all, in my mind, that you have to make provisions for designation, research items designated quickly, study them and then, of course, to get them back, if they are not suitable for historic preservation, you will have to take it off the designated list and therefore you need that section.

Mr. Speaker, I think in the clause by clause reading we can get at a number of the other questions that were asked. I am very pleased that the Opposition Members have agreed that we are in the process of moving in a direction of preserving our cultural heritage, something that we should have done long ago, that they will be supporting it.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

INTRODUCTION OF AIR CADETS

MR. A. OLIVER: (Shaunavon) Mr. Speaker, may I interrupt proceedings to introduce to you and through you to this House a group of some 22 Cadets from the Shaunavon Air Cadet Squadron, seated in the west gallery. I hope that your visit here today will be informative and you will have a safe trip home.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SECOND READINGS

HON. E I. WOOD: (Minister of Municipal Affairs) moved second reading of Bill No. 44 - **An Act to amend The Local Improvements Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, I should like to rise at this time to speak in regard to Bill No. 44.

The Local Improvements Act presently permits a municipality to construct surface street works as local improvements and charge all or part of the cost against the property abutting on the work. Where the work is constructed along the side or flank on a block at the same time that it is constructed along the front, or frontage of the property, the total cost may be charged against the frontage of the block. Some municipalities, particularly the cities of Regina and Saskatoon, have areas where the work or the improvement was not undertaken along the flank, when the work was completed on the front.

Mr. Speaker, we have received requests from these cities requesting permission to complete the work along the flank and to undertake it as a local improvement, with the authority to levy part or all of the cost against the half of the frontage of the block, which is adjacent to the flank. We believe that this request is based on a sincere desire of the municipalities to provide their residents with services which are considered essential under our current standard of living.

In this amendment we are providing where the work is a sidewalk or curbing that the cost may be levied against one half of the frontage in that block, which is adjacent to the flank on which the work was constructed. Where the work is

paving, we are providing that the costs be levied against one-half of the frontage adjacent to both sides of the flank on which the work was constructed.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment provides permissive authority to municipalities to undertake the work as a local improvement and it also makes provision for the owners of the property affected to petition against the construction of the work if they are not willing to underwrite the costs.

Mr. Speaker, we believe that this is desirable legislation and that it contains adequate safeguards for the interests of the owners of property which may be liable for the cost of undertaking the improvements.

I move second reading of Bill No. 44.

MR. G. LANE (Lumsden) Mr. Speaker, I am not quite as satisfied as the Minister that there are adequate safeguards to the costs to the parties who will be subjected to a higher cost as a result of this. I am wondering if, perhaps the Minister could supply me with an estimate of the increased costs that will result as a result of the proposed amendments, and I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

HON. J.R. MESSER (Minister of Agriculture) moved second reading of Bill No. 40 - **An Act to amend The Agricultural Incentives Act, 1973.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, it is with a good deal of satisfaction that I speak to this Bill to amend The Agricultural Incentives Act, 1973.

The outstanding success of the FarmStart Program, which was established by The Agricultural Incentives Act has had to make necessary the amendments due to the borrowing limitations that are included in that legislation.

My satisfaction is based upon the fact that a program of this nature was promised prior to this government's election in 1971. After our election program was carefully planned and implemented we now find that in less than four years since that election, that it has been widely accepted by rural Saskatchewan and has provided low cost credit to more than 2,000 farmers in Saskatchewan.

As proof that this program represents a fulfilled promise, I should like, Mr. Speaker, to quote briefly from the New Deal for People, in which the New Democratic Party published its election platform in February of 1971. The first page of that document dealt with provincial agricultural policies and I quote:

The continuing degradation of Saskatchewan agriculture and the related decline of our rural communities are the most critical issues for the people of this province. The primary objective of the New Democratic Party and its program will be to create the conditions which will promote the maximum number of viable family farms in Saskatchewan.

March 24, 1975

It goes on to say, Mr. Speaker:

As first steps the New Democratic Government will provide capital credit to farmers on terms at least as favorable as those offered to industry, specifically to enact an Agricultural Incentives Act, which will make available low-cost credit with loan forgiveness features similar to those provided to industry, for young farmers entering agriculture or farmers making major shifts in production and for undercapitalized farming enterprises.

The current FarmStart Program is comprehensive in nature providing credit, grants, counselling services and management training. It is designed to assist Saskatchewan farmers in developing profitable livestock enterprises and thus diversifying the farming industry in this province.

Since livestock production is labor intensive, it requires a much smaller land base for a viable operation than does straight grain production. As such it provides an alternative to the trend of increasing the profitability of farming units through expansion of only the land base. This trend has had a devastating effect on rural populations and must be stopped. It must be stopped, Mr. Speaker, if rural Saskatchewan is to retain a population of sufficient size to make it a healthy and dynamic province.

The FarmStart Program has been in operation for less than two years and already its impact on diversification has been felt. As I mentioned earlier in this House, more than \$51 million in loans have been provided to more than 2,000 farmers and these have been for an average value of approximately \$26,000. By far the largest portion of these loans, in fact, over 75 per cent of them, have been used to establish or expand beef production operations. However, more than 200 hog production units and approximately 175 dairy producers have also been assisted.

In addition, a number of loans have been provided to producers specializing in sheep, pregnant mares' urine, and poultry, operations. While these statistics, I think, give a good indication of FarmStart success, I believe a closer examination of the loan recipient's characteristics provides further proof of the future benefits FarmStart will have for rural Saskatchewan and its people.

The average age, Mr. Speaker, of all FarmStart clients is 28 years. Since over 37 per cent of our province's farmers are over 54 years of age and the overall average age is about 50 years, there is certainly a need for these young farmers to become established and FarmStart is helping to do that.

At the present time about 28 per cent of approved loans have gone to individuals who had not managed their own farms prior to receiving FarmStart loans. They are, in effect, new farmers. In the Swift Current area and the agricultural extension region in that area, which includes the entire southwest area of Saskatchewan, the portions of loans in this category were 45 per cent. In the province as a whole another 28 per cent of all loans have gone to farmers who have managed their own farming operations for two or fewer years. Many of these individuals were at a critical point in their farming careers and if FarmStart had not provided them with grants and access

to credit at low interest rates, they would have been forced, in my mind, to enter other occupations.

In total, more than 56 per cent of all loans have gone either to beginning or very recently established farmers. The average age of these new farmers is less than 24 years of age.

As I mentioned earlier, Mr. Speaker, FarmStart is a comprehensive program which does more than provide grants and loans. The priorities of the Department of Agriculture have been set to provide maximum assistance to new farmers. The agricultural representatives are acting as resource people for FarmStart clients. Farm development specialists have been placed in each agricultural extension region to provide assistance on all matters related to the development of successful farming operations.

In addition, other professional staff have provided a wide range of agricultural services out of the regional and subregional offices in each of the province's agricultural extension regions.

Mr. Speaker, I have no doubts concerning the wide-spread positive impact, which FarmStart is having and will continue to have on rural Saskatchewan. Yet, I have heard criticisms suggesting that Saskatchewan should not be pressing for diversification through increased livestock production in these times of generally depressed livestock prices. And fortunately most of the criticism emanates from the Members who sit to your left, Mr. Speaker.

I suggest such statements indicate very little vision for the future of Saskatchewan agriculture. They also reflect a lack of knowledge concerning this province's position in the North American livestock market and in particular the cattle market.

During 1974 Saskatchewan's cattle herd represented only 19 per cent of the cattle herd in Canada and less than two per cent of the cattle population in North America. Our hog marketing was 11 per cent of the Canadian total and just 1.3 per cent of the North American marketing in total.

This province's livestock marketing in the world context is almost as negligible. Livestock producers in the province do not operate in an isolated market, but rather in a continental and world market where prices are determined by the supply and demand situation over very large producing and consuming areas.

It is therefore, Mr. Speaker, inconceivable to think that if Saskatchewan cuts its livestock production by 50 per cent, producers might expect beef prices to rise to \$60 per hundredweight in the province while they might also be only \$45 per hundredweight elsewhere, for example, Calgary, Toronto or Chicago. By the same logic our farmers should not be forced to forego the benefits of diversification and livestock production in an attempt to alter livestock supplies and prices over which they have little, in fact in most instances, virtually no control.

The implications of the inadequate prices for livestock is not for Saskatchewan to aim at only grain production, but rather, Mr. Speaker, to press for the development of meaningful stabilization

March 24, 1975

programs that will carry producers through such market fluctuations. If current trends continue the Federal Beef Stabilization Plan introduced on August 11, 1974, may have no benefit whatsoever for Saskatchewan producers. The stabilization price is set at \$45.42 per hundredweight, but the national average beef price as calculated by the Plan up to the end of January, 1975, was approximately \$49 per hundredweight. Over the same period of time prices in Saskatchewan for all grades of beef averaged about \$43.75 per hundredweight. However, as a result of the discriminatory manner in which the Plan operates, Saskatchewan producers would not be eligible for any payments even at this low price level.

Further, Mr. Speaker, the Federal Stabilization Plan for slaughtered cows, which is to run from November 16, 1974 to April 30, 1975, has the same discriminatory drawbacks. In the case of slaughtered cows prices have been so low that a pay out will almost certainly be forthcoming when the Plan concludes, if current trends continue. However, the national average price for sales to date has been more than \$1 per hundredweight above the Saskatchewan price.

Since the Plan stipulates that all producers will receive the same stabilization payment per hundredweight, regardless of initial prices received, this province's farmers could receive total returns for animals which are substantially less than those received by other Canadian producers. The livestock industry needs to complement FarmStart by a realistic stabilization program that will allow producers to cover costs during periods of low returns. What it certainly does not need is ill-informed advisers, who shout, "Sell your livestock" every time there is a downturn of prices on the marketplace.

Our government has been pressing the Federal Government for realistic programs ever since livestock prices started their current decline. We believe the stabilization of such commodities should be a federal responsibility since costs for our provincial program would be a heavy burden on the Provincial Government and benefits from a provincial program will accrue to many individuals living outside of the province and that applies to Saskatchewan more so than any other province.

Last fall when we were faced with Federal Government inaction in spite of the desperate plea by prairie cow-calf operators, the Provincial Government decided to offer advances to assist those producers. The cow-calf cash advance program provided 12,388 producers with a total of almost \$35 million and an average advance of just over \$2,800 per producer. Since this program was funded through FarmStart it has created additional need to amend Section 29 of the Agricultural Incentives Act, 1973.

A primary reason for the introduction of the cash advance program was to even out the marketing of calves last fall. The announcement of the program in mid-October provided many producers with the alternative of holding their calves off the market and this certainly helped to keep calf prices above the level that they would have otherwise fallen to if there was no such program.

The success of this program in meeting this objective is indicated by the fact that calf marketing in Saskatchewan during November and December of 1974 was only 72 per cent of the

level in 1973 and just under 68 per cent of the 1972 level for the same months.

Another reason for the program is that the future prospects for the beef industry are better than current circumstances would indicate. The advances helped to decrease the number of producers who were forced to make drastic reductions in their breeding herd numbers in order to meet operating expenses. Thus, although the program certainly did not solve all of the producers' problems, it was not intended to. It has had a number of significant benefits though. Producers who decided to hold their calves through the winter still have a number of alternatives open to them. They can sell their calves as light feeders or put them on a finishing ration and market them as finished cattle. They may also decide to put feeders on pasture for summer and market them as heavy feeders. This last option will allow them to take advantage of the price differential which exists between light and heavy feeder cattle. The alternative they choose will have to depend on the availability of feed, pasture labor and financing in their own situation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, up to this point I have dealt only with the government's effort to assist in diversification through programs designed to encourage livestock production. However, our livestock programs are not intended to stand alone or deal with all the problems encountered by rural Saskatchewan. And it is recognized that we can only develop a healthy agricultural industry with a combination of developmental programs. The Saskatchewan Land Bank Commission was developed with this in mind and it aimed at helping beginning or small farmers to acquire an adequate land base. And I should like to again refer to the New Deal for People published in 1971 and it states and I quote:

As first steps, the New Democratic Government will establish a land bank commission which could purchase land offered voluntarily on the market at competitive prices.

And I want you to note, Mr. Speaker,

And lease this land guaranteeing tenure on the basis of need, with the option to buy with the objective of promoting the maximum number of viable family farms in Saskatchewan.

All of the characteristics promised were incorporated into the Land Bank legislation, including the farmers option to buy the land, although the existence of this option has been denied by critics, such a denial can not alter the Act which does in fact, provide for an option.

The acceptance of the Land Bank program has been enthusiastic. More than 10,000 farmers attended public meetings to learn about the program and to offer suggestions as to its operation. 1,055 leases have been issued to farmers on land purchased during the first two years of the program's operation. It is expected that about 300 more farmers will receive leases on land purchased in 1974. The demand for leases has been astonishing and Land Bank offices have been besieged with applicants. Some agriculture representative offices received as many as 40 inquiries at 9:00 a.m. on the day land was advertised.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the response to this program is a

March 24, 1975

true indication of the need for the continuation of such a program, yet there are those who categorically reject the land bank concept in spite of its success and its popularity. I believe that sort of thinking cannot have the best interests of rural Saskatchewan and its people at heart.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, to Land Bank and to FarmStart there have been many other additional programs, the establishment of new programs and redirection of existing programs. Such programs as the Farm Cost Reduction Program, manufacturing milk facility construction grants, supplemental hog stabilization plan and the Hog Marketing Commission come immediately to mind. They were all designed with the common objective of creating a sound agricultural industry in this province. It is my belief that the FarmStart Program complemented by the Land Bank and other activities of the Department of Agriculture are providing the most comprehensive agricultural development program that can be found anywhere in this country.

The increase in the borrowing limits of FarmStart from \$100 million to \$150 million is necessary, Mr. Speaker, to continue the outstanding success of an integral part of this development program. The initial limit, \$100 million established by the Agricultural Incentives Act in 1973 was sufficient to allow FarmStart to become firmly established. However, in the context of present day credit needs for this province's agriculture producers the figure is relatively small. The demand for FarmStart loans is greater than originally anticipated. And as I mentioned earlier the Calf-Cash Program was funded through FarmStart. For these reasons the amendment to Section 29 of the Agricultural Incentives Act, 1973 is required and, Mr. Speaker, my colleagues and I are extremely proud of the FarmStart Program and I invite every Member of the Legislature to support this needed and necessary amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. E.F. GARDNER: (Moosomin) Mr. Speaker, I don't think anyone can argue with the high sounding motives of the Bill but I don't know where the Minister has been for the last several months. Listening to him in his speech he certainly hasn't been out in the country. He should know that these loans that were given to young farmers for diversification have been a real disaster for most of them. There was very little discretion used by the advisors of FarmStart. They encouraged purchasers, young purchasers to buy breeding stock at very high prices and they've got them in real trouble and I'm sure the Minister knows this. Tremendously high prices for cows and heifers as a result of advice they got from the counsellors from the Department of Agriculture and now they are in real trouble. It's always amazing that some of these experts from the Department of Agriculture could give such bad advice and bad counselling to these young farmers. The Minister should go out to some of the auction markets around the province and sit there for the afternoon and talk to some of these people and he would get a better idea of the true picture. He must know that many of these young fellows bought cows for \$400 to \$500 apiece with money from FarmStart. They raised the calf and now they're selling the calf for \$75 and are losing a tremendous amount of money. Many of them wish they had never seen the FarmStart Program or had FarmStart advice.

He mentioned the fact that they had lent money for 200 hog units and we see an item in the paper a few days ago where the pig population fell in the last 12 months by 28 per cent. So if this is such a great program and is supposed to be increasing the hog population, the cattle population, getting people into these industries, this is obviously an indication of the fact that it is simply not a success when 28 per cent drop in hog population in one year.

You know there are a good number of people and you talk to the farmers, they are convinced that you should just do the opposite to what the experts from the Department of Agriculture tell you to do and their experience with the FarmStart Program has been an excellent example of this. Many of them are convinced that if they had done exactly opposite they'd be much better off.

I'm surprised that the Minister would mention the Cash Advance Program. You know there are quite a few farmers, young farmers who were considering selling their steer calves last fall for 35 cents to 42 cents per pound. Some did, some were encouraged by the Minister's words, the Minister's advisors and the fact that they could get an advance to keep these calves and of course it has been a disaster for them. They fed them high priced oats and hay all winter. Now they can, maybe, get 30 cents a pound for them, maybe 25 cents a pound and if they keep them when their loan becomes due, they have to pay it or the Minister is going to charge them 14 per cent interest. I'm sure all of you have seen the Order-in-Council that indicated that if this young fellow doesn't pay the loan back when it's due, he's going to be charged 14 per cent interest.

You know the Minister should tell these young farmers exactly what he wants them to do. He waffled on this, he said, well maybe they should keep them, put them on pasture if they have pasture, maybe they should sell them now. I think he should tell them exactly what to do and then they could do the opposite and they'd have a pretty good chance of being right. I wish the Minister would do this.

The Minister, also likes to bring in the Land Bank on each of these occasions, even though it doesn't even pertain to this particular Bill and he mentioned the great demand for leases. He seemed to be concerned about the reason for this and I'd like to tell him the reason. There's a terrific demand for leases particularly since we announced our policy in the Land Bank because the farmers know that after next June they'll be able to buy this land. They are very anxious to get it and get a lease on it now so they'll have a chance to buy it when the government changes and this is really the reason for the big demand for leases.

Mr. Speaker, because of the remarks of the Minister we'd like to consider this further, I'd like at this time to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

HON. G. MacMURCHY (Minister of Education) moved second reading of Bill No. 45 - **An Act respecting The Saskatchewan Science Council.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege and the pleasure of

March 24, 1975

moving second reading of Bill No. 45, an Act to establish The Saskatchewan Science Council.

The Speech from the Throne delivered last fall in this House made reference to science policy. It said:

The rapid growth of scientific knowledge and new technologies is vital to every field of human endeavor. You will be asked to consider the establishment of a new science council to advise on science policy and to help apply the fruits of research to the development of our province.

Mr. Speaker, this is an important piece of legislation, which could hold considerable significance for the future of the province. It is good legislation. It has been developed partly on the basis of advice from one of Canada's leading scientists, Dr. Leon Katz, head of the Department of Physics and Director of the Linear Accelerator at the University of Saskatchewan. Dr. Katz has been a long time advisor on scientific matters to successive governments of Canada. With the right kind of people working through the science policy advisory organization which it creates, the results, I am sure, would be very good for the province.

By "science policy", Mr. Speaker, I mean "the injection of scientific and technological information into the decision-making process". There can be no question that science policy is becoming an important part of the implementation of public policy and I say that because of the role of science and technology in today's world. Following this line of thinking, science policy means having individuals with scientific background contribute to such decisions or an organization in which the expertise of such individuals can be utilized. As demands on the provincial government requiring formation of policies with long range implications increase, the requirement to set up machinery and obtain the best possible advice will become more and more evident.

In recent years, Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable public debate on science policy in this country. The debate questioned the value of practical research expenditures made by both the public and private agencies alike. Many persons have argued for increased expenditures on mission-oriented research while at the same time cutting back on the basic research. But this debate has since been set aside because of the realization of the importance of science and technology to the maintenance of civilized life as we know it today. The hard facts of increasing levels in world population, facts of resource consumption and depletion, environmental pollution, and in the demand for food and shelter have brought a realism to human needs. The challenges that lie ahead will, no doubt, lead to increased emphasis and reliance on the problem-solving of our scientific and -technological capacities, especially as they apply to meet basic human requirements.

There has been, Mr. Speaker, an increased concern with conservation, increased concern with producing and providing for basic needs - food, energy, shelter and a clean healthy environment. The combined effect of people's numbers and expectations that people have for more freedom, for better living conditions now begin to suggest that there are effective limits and dangers to any process of uncontrolled and unplanned growth.

It stands to reason that if we want to continue to enjoy our freedoms and we want to continue to improve living conditions as well as extend their availability to those less fortunate than ourselves, we must plan for increased investment, increased production, distribution, employment creation and waste utilization. Now this, Mr. Speaker, is no mean task. The major responsibility for this task doesn't lie with Saskatchewan and Saskatchewan alone but since Saskatchewan is part of the world, since Saskatchewan is endowed with a most fortunate mix of resources and human talents, part of that responsibility does, in fact, fall to us.

There are many tasks that lie ahead involving scientific and technological inputs. The Government of Saskatchewan has, through the years, built up resources to provide such inputs in its areas of continuing responsibility. Through this Bill the Government is seeking to create advisory capacity to complement its already existing resources. In his recommendations to the Government, Dr. Katz has pointed out that such advice could contribute to decisions concerning the exploration, the use of our natural resources, the development of transportation to move goods and to move people, the harnessing of new communication and information processing, the application of fundamental science to vastly increase our capacity in food production, the provision of housing at prices our citizens can afford and most important the extraction, processing, conversion and distribution of provincial energy resources.

It is clear that we are asking science to contribute more and more to the development of our economic and social growths. The vital dependence of all people on a knowledge of nature and its application is substantial, is increasing. Properly applied science can still give most of the hoped for benefits. But Dr. Katz warns that to avoid or even minimize the disadvantages, however, rules governing its use will have to be legislated by governments with proper technical advice. It will be the function of the Saskatchewan Science Council and its support staff to acquire, generate and organize this information for the consideration of not only the Government but by the public as well.

Perhaps our major responsibility as a province within Canada lies in the production and processing of food, the extraction of those energy and mineral resources which are necessary for food production. It is a fact that the greater part of our income is earned in the production of food, potash and petroleum energy. The machines required to perform the work of growing food use considerable quantities of petroleum fuels, and this is especially true of agricultural machinery. Direct farm expenditure on petroleum alone represents 14 to 18 per cent of the running costs of a Saskatchewan farm.

Potash mines, of which 95 per cent of the production is destined for chemical fertilizer used in food production elsewhere in the world, consume approximately 15 per cent of all electrical energy that's generated in the province. To vastly increase agricultural and potash production to meet the demands of agriculture will require careful planning because development will have a significant impact on the demand for energy and increasing generating plant capacity.

Mr. Speaker, we have been extremely fortunate in the province in having a capable and an imaginative civil service. It has played a central role in improving the living conditions

March 24, 1975

of all provincial citizens. But Dr. Katz believes strongly that it must now be strengthened in the science and technology area. Substantially the unique challenges ahead now call for a science advisory organization with a broader mandate to expand the returns which development can bring to our citizens.

The Provincial Government is engaged in co-operative policies and programs with other governments on a number of different levels. We recognize the need for action on pressing national, regional and provincial problems. It is easier to reach agreement if everyone is fully informed, if everyone understands the real needs at each level.

It is for these reasons, Mr. Speaker, that I submit this Bill for consideration by this Legislature. By establishing a Science Council with advisory capacities such as proposed in this Bill our government hopes to ensure that the kind of things which I have been talking about are always carefully considered in future decision making. By identifying problems, opportunities, options and alternatives, The Saskatchewan Science Council can make an effective contribution to the province. I have from time to time, Mr. Speaker, mentioned the recommendations of Dr. Leon Katz to the Government in the area of science policy. Shortly put, his recommendations were to establish an internal science policy secretariat, this secretariat being part of the Executive Council staff, reporting to the Cabinet Planning Committee. His recommendations suggested that thought be given to an external or public body only after the secretariat is fully established and its influence is fully operational. His reasoning is that the internal body could do intensive short term, in-depth studies related to immediate development. He believes also that the council should be entirely confidential.

The Act before us, Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 45 does not follow completely the recommendations of Dr. Katz. It provides for a external body or council relating to the Government through a Cabinet Minister. It provides for a secretariat serving that public body or council but also reporting to the Minister so that it can provide confidential advice, if that is deemed required. It provides that the Minister responsible will answer to the Legislature for the activities of the secretariat just as any Cabinet Minister is responsible for his department operations.

Our decision, Mr. Speaker, to provide for a public body as well as the secretariat is because we believe in public input and public debate and public discussion. We believe that the private sector in this province can benefit from scientific and technological information as well as the government and its agencies. This applies particularly in this province because of its size, its population and because it is known for its cooperative approach. We believe that the responsibility of a minister provides for the kind of accountability that the public and the Legislature deserve. In creating a Saskatchewan Science Council we believe that the council secretariat combination provides for the kind of short range and long range coverage which will be of the greatest benefit to everyone in the province.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to move second reading of Bill 45, An Act to Establish The Saskatchewan Science Council.

MR. C.P. MacDONALD: (Milestone) Mr. Speaker, I only want to make a few comments at this time and then I want to ask the House for permission to adjourn debate because I want to consider again the comments of the Minister.

First of all I should like to say to the Members of the House that I am going to support this Bill. I am going to support it for the reason that Saskatchewan has lagged behind in scientific research in relation to other provinces in Canada, and particularly to those industrial provinces in Canada. I'm thinking of Ontario, Quebec, Alberta and British Columbia. I suppose one of the reasons that Saskatchewan has lagged behind in the scientific research is the fact that most of the industrial capacity of the Dominion of Canada, particularly in manufacturing has not been located in Saskatchewan. Also, we have not been a centre of head offices where the majority of scientific research is done with any national company or corporation in Canada. As a result of that there is a need for the Province Saskatchewan to take another look at what areas and what types of encouragement can be given, because as the Minister has indicated, certainly in the Province of Saskatchewan, there are areas where we can provide leadership in scientific research which will benefit not only the Province of Saskatchewan but certainly the Dominion of Canada and those countries abroad with which we deal. I am thinking of those specific areas where Saskatchewan is a producer of primary products that are located almost extensively in Saskatchewan. I am thinking, for example, of potash. Certainly a great deal of research can be done in the methods of mining of potash, we only have one solution mining process in Saskatchewan at the present time, other experimental programs have been attempted without too much success. Certainly a great deal of our potash reserves cannot be mined by the conventional method.

I think of the heavy oil in Lloydminster area, where the extraction process is a very expensive one, and private industry has done a great deal of research on the steam combustion and other methods.

The Minister has also mentioned agricultural processing and certainly there is a great deal we can do in this regard, certainly in the field of energy.

Saskatchewan has a contribution to make in the field of scientific research. Saskatchewan also has a need to establish and to encourage scientific research. I think if we begin with that premise we should then look at the Bill. I hope that this is not an attempt for the Government to become actively involved in scientific research itself, that the establishment of this science council will be an advisory board which will point out those areas where Saskatchewan has a contribution to make in the potential of research in the primary products that we produce, but that it will encourage industry itself to take the leadership role in the actual scientific research itself. Most of us are aware that scientific research is an extremely expensive process. It can cost millions and millions of dollars and sometimes with only very limited success or in long range success. Industry has always taken a leadership role in this regard and I think this science council should do everything possible to encourage it to do so.

I also hope, the third thing, is that in any attempt to actively involve the Government of Saskatchewan in research,

March 24, 1975

that we do not forget that it is the university that should take the role of providing this kind of research. We now have two universities in Saskatchewan, each of them with a very strong research capability and this is where any research scholars should be directed as far as public participation is concerned and I would hope that the government will recognize this. I hope that the Government will recognize that in establishing this particular science council that it should be an advisory board, it should indicate the direction that research should take in Saskatchewan, it should establish some priorities. For example, as I indicated, I think the priority in heavy oil in the Lloydminster area is an excellent example. With the energy shortage the depletion of Saskatchewan's reserves, that here is an area.

So, Mr. Speaker, I will say only this; (1) We will support the Bill because there is a role in Saskatchewan for scientific research; (2) We would hope that the direction of this Scientific Advisory Board would be to encourage private industry to make the heavy investment and not the Government of Saskatchewan in a very high risk with sometimes only long range benefits; and (3) That in any research that is public, participation be directed to the universities in Saskatchewan and not another body of bureaucracy within the province.

With those few comments, Mr. Speaker, I should like to examine again the Minister's remarks and I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion my the Hon. Mr. Messer that Bill No. 24 - **An Act respecting Payments to Farmers who use Fuel Petroleum Products in their Farming Operations** be now read a second time.

MR. E.F. GARDNER: (Moosomin) Mr. Speaker, I have a very few and brief remarks to say on this Bill. We are concerned that there is no relief for the farmers or other people in rural Saskatchewan who have no choice but to use heating oil or propane to heat their houses. When the fuel went up nine cents last spring, largely due to government royalties, there was a suggestion at that time that there would be a rebate for farmers for fuel used in their operations of tractors but nothing for the people who are suffering by this same increase for heating their houses. Farmers and people in small towns have no choice. They don't have the option in many cases of using natural gas, as many other people have done. The natural gas price has gone up a small amount, but relatively small compared to heating oil. Heating oil has gone up over 50 per cent in the last two years under the NDP and propane used for heating for a great number of these farmers has doubled, it's gone up 100 per cent and heat, of course, is a basic necessity. These people are stuck with this increase and have no alternative but to pay it. There is no protection for the consumer, no relief for these people. It is my opinion that some of the oil revenues should be used to protect our own consumers in rural Saskatchewan who have to pay this extra amount.

The small amount that the Minister is returning to the farmer is, of course, welcome. The total oil revenues to the province is going to approach \$200 million. The rebate that the Minister is suggesting will be about \$11 million. So, in getting \$200 million from the oil industry, he is rebating about \$11 million at this time.

The farmers realize that the price of their fuel in the last two years has gone up at least 14 cents a gallon for both diesel fuel and gasoline. The Minister is giving them about half of this back or seven cents. It's obvious that there would be a much simpler way of doing this, simply to reduce the price of gasoline and diesel fuel for farm operations to the farmer at the time he purchases this. This could very easily be shown right on the invoice and the transaction completed at that time. But of course, the Minister wants to get a cheque in the hands of every farmer prior to this coming election, so he is using this very complicated, very expensive way of going about the rebate program. It's obviously politically motivated, the method he's using. He sent two letters to every farmer and a package containing a supposedly farm cost reduction or some such name of the program. The most effective way to do this would be simply, as I said, to give the farmer a credit of this amount when he buys the fuel and the adjustment could easily be made at that time.

Our suggestion would be that the fuel would be reduced by at least ten cents a gallon because it has certainly gone up over 14 in the last two years, under the NDP and that the rebate also apply to heating oil because these people have no choice but to use it.

The government has taken from the farmer in the last two years far more than the rebate will amount to. We're not going to oppose the Bill because even returning some of this money is better than the Government keeping it all and our suggestion would simply be that instead of doing it as a political rebate that they change the method and allow a discount when the farmer purchases his fuel.

HON. J.R. MESSER: (Minister of Agriculture) Mr. Speaker, I am happy to hear that the Members opposite will be supporting the Bill. It is very seldom that we have them support anything even though it is constructive in nature and also attempts to provide relief for producers.

It's somewhat difficult to sit here and digest the remarks made by the Member for Moosomin (Mr. Gardner) in regard to their concern in the fact that the fuel refund is either limited or has no real effect in easing the problem that farmers are confronted with in Saskatchewan at this time. I say that, Mr. Speaker, because I sat as a Member for four years in the Opposition from '67 to '71 when the economy of Saskatchewan farmers probably had never been worse in the history of this province and when they sat as a Government of Saskatchewan, brought forward absolutely nothing. Nothing, Mr. Speaker, in regard to relief. What they brought forward, Mr. Speaker, was support to federal programs such as Otto Lang's LIFT program where there was no choice, no choice for Saskatchewan farmers as to how they could resolve the crisis that they were confronted with. For them to sit opposite now and be critical of the endeavors of the present Provincial Government in Saskatchewan, will just not be accepted by farmers in this province

March 24, 1975

because their actions speak louder than any words that they will enunciate at this particular time, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: And it's not, Mr. Speaker, it's not really accurate for, the Member for Moosomin to say that the increases in relation to prices of fuel consumed in Saskatchewan emanates from increased royalty charges by the Provincial Government. It could not be further from that, Mr. Speaker. The fact is that those prices would have gone up in relation to world prices for energy, for oil and gasoline and the royalties that the Provincial Government charge have nothing to do with those increased costs.

Certainly we're concerned, Mr. Speaker, about other people in the province, other people who are subject to increased costs for energy. But I think that those people, at least the residents, the populace of Saskatchewan will realize that the Provincial Government cannot correct all or subsidize substantially all of the increased costs as far as fuel is concerned. We went further than the Province of Alberta which certainly has far greater revenues, far greater revenues from energy than does the Province of Saskatchewan, yet they rebate farmers not seven cents per gallon for their fuel, but five cents, Mr. Speaker, considerably less than does the Province of Saskatchewan.

I want to remind the Member for Moosomin (Mr. Gardner) when he tries to mislead, not only this Legislature but the people of Saskatchewan that it is the fault of the Saskatchewan Government, that he should also say something about the \$6.70 export tax that is applied to every barrel of oil that leaves Saskatchewan, that goes directly to the Federal Government to ease the costs of fuel for all Canadians. He says, Mr. Speaker, that our increased revenues through higher royalty charges is \$200 million, I convey to him that the federal export tax takes in excess of \$400 million potential revenue from the Province of Saskatchewan. I am not saying that that is totally illegitimate, but then the Federal Government should recognize some of its responsibility in trying to ease the costs of energy to all Canadians, not simply extract \$400 million from the province and then turn and say that it is up to the Provincial Government to subsidize any increase in energy costs to its population.

But they don't want to talk about that, Mr. Speaker, because they know that they follow the recommendation and policy of the Federal Government and dare not interfere with them.

So, Mr. Speaker, I simply want to say that I appreciate the support that the Members opposite are going to give, but I do not want this House misled in regard to who is responsible for these increases. It is certainly not the Province of Saskatchewan. If there are two parties who are responsible it would be the oil industry themselves and the Federal Government of Canada. I also want to say, Mr. Speaker, secondly, that it is beyond the means of the province to capture or to compensate the total increase in energy. And this province has gone further than any other province in Canada in trying to do that.

One other remark, Mr. Speaker, that pertains to the Member's recommendation that we deduct at source. He knows full well the reasons for the province not being able to deduct at

source and that is a large segment of a large portion of non-taxable fuels – purple gasoline and diesel fuel – are used by the construction industry and for industrial use and there is no way of really defining when gas is sold from retail outlets as to whether it is going to go to a farming enterprise or to some industrial use. And there is a considerable volume of gas that is used in that sector and the only real way that we have of being able to make certain that the reduction is given to the people who we feel legitimately deserve it, is to have them apply for a refund.

Certainly there are some hardships as far as industrial use is concerned with increasing prices of fuel, but they are able to pass that increase on by way of tenders for jobs that, generally speaking, the province pays for. So that the increase is adjusted in relation to the total gross costs that they assess for doing work for the province or for the construction industry in the province.

So I want, for clarification, to remind the Member and his colleagues that that is one of the problems that we have and in order to provide the refund to those people who are most deserving it has to be via the means that we now have in place.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

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