

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fifth Session — Seventeenth Legislature
33rd Day

Monday, April 7, 1975.

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

HON. W.E. SMISHEK: (Regina North East) Mr. Speaker, I should like to introduce to you and to the Members of this Legislature a group of 24 Grade Eight students who are seated in the west gallery. They are from the Haultain School and are accompanied here by their school teacher, Mr. Samways. Haultain School is one of the older schools of Regina. I do extend a warm welcome to the students and express a hope that their visit to the Legislature today will be an exciting experience.

It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that following 3 o'clock that I will be able to meet with the students and the teacher in Room 267.

While I am on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I should like to introduce another group on behalf of the Premier who is absent today. He is in eastern Canada attending to a number of things that are of concern to the people of Saskatchewan. Seated in the Speaker's Gallery are a group of 29 Grade Eight students from Albert School. They are accompanied here by their teacher, Mr. George Achtymichuk. George is well known in the city of Regina for his curling. He was part of the Harvey Mazinke team. Not only is he a teacher, he is a curler, but recently I found out that he was also a well known orchestra leader in the city of Regina.

To the students I extend to them a warm welcome on behalf of the Premier. It is my hope that I will be able to meet with them later this afternoon.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. E.L. TCHORZEWSKI: (Humboldt) I should like to introduce to the House a group of Grade Five students, 19 in number, from Annaheim School in the constituency of Humboldt, who are here visiting in the Legislature and have been visiting various places in the city of Regina. They are accompanied by their teacher, Mr. Orville Theissen and will be here throughout the Question Period. I will be meeting with them later on in the afternoon to answer any questions that they may have.

I should like to have the Members join with me in welcoming these Grade Five students from Annaheim.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

DIFFERENT METHOD OF REPORTING POPULATION FIGURES

MR. E.F. GARDNER: (Moosomin) Before the Orders of the Day, Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Wood). It has come to our attention that there has been a departure from the usual method of reporting population in the 1975 Municipal Directory. I have had some representation from some of any RMs. Is the Minister aware that there is a different method of reporting the population figures for RMs and that in 1975, for example, they have shown quite a substantial increase rather than the decrease that has actually taken place?

HON. E.I. WOOD: (Minister of Municipal Affairs) Mr. Speaker, I am quite aware of this situation. I think probably the Hon. Member was not here during the discussion of my Estimates in the House about the change in regard to the figure; in the Annual Report and in the report put out by the Department of Municipal Affairs. I am sorry I didn't catch any other implications to this that we haven't had before.

MR. GARDNER: Well, I'm wondering if the Minister is aware that it has always been the practice and he has kept it up until 1974, of reporting the population figures as a result of figures sent in to him and he shows it in the front of his report the figures as of that year. In 1975 he has reverted back to the figures as they were in 1971. So, of course, the 1971 figures as shown in the 1975 report are much greater than those shown in 1973 and 1974. I am just wondering if the Minister was aware that this was actually what was going on. In front of the 1975 Report he has shown that he has gone back to using population figures from 1971.

MR. WOOD: Well, I think that this is exactly what we were talking about during the Estimates. I think I explained at that time that it was largely because of our involvement in the Community Capital Fund that we had to have some concrete figures on which we could base the grants to the municipalities. These other figures are not all that accurate. They are not made by a door to door count as are done with the census figures. In establishing the amount of money that is due to the municipalities under the Community Capital Fund we felt that we had to have something that was stable and something we could count on. Now, we have told these municipalities, and this is a matter of policy, that if there is an upward revision during the years by 1976 when the next census is taken, if there is an increase in population we are prepared to recognize that and make retroactive payments to them to take care of that. There is no way in which they can lose monetarily from this. Conversely, if the population does dwindle meanwhile we will still pay them grants on the basis of the 1971 figures. I think that we are going about this in the best way that is the most advantageous to the municipalities and gives us a concrete solid figure from which to operate. If we get into the other area of, if I may use the term, 'guesses' that are made in regard to the population in towns and cities and villages, I think we are on a very poor ground. It is my understanding that when the last census was taken in the city of Regina that it showed some 4,000

April 7, 1975.

difference than what had been estimated earlier and that is rather an error that we just don't care to deal with when we are handling funds of this nature and this magnitude.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. C.P. MacDONALD: (Milestone) Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order, the Minister asked for clarification on the first question. For that reason the Member for Moosomin got up and clarified his first question.

MR. SPEAKER: He clarified in addition to expanding on it, so we have had the supplementary.

STATEMENTS

NATIONAL WILDLIFE WEEK

HON. J.R. KOWALCHUK: (Minister of Tourism & Renewable Resources) Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I wish to take the opportunity to draw to the attention of this Assembly and to the people of Saskatchewan that today marks the official opening of National Wildlife Week. This special week was first launched as a special tribute to a remarkable Canadian naturalist, Jack Miner, whose birthday falls during the week. The week was created 28 years ago by an Act of Parliament and has been sponsored for the past 12 years by the Canadian Wildlife Federation. The observance in Saskatchewan is in conjunction with the Saskatchewan Wildlife Federation.

This year the theme for the week is 'People and Wildlife', with emphasis being placed on the importance of conserving wildlife and the value of recognizing the bond between people and wildlife. Mr. Speaker, in Saskatchewan we are fortunate in having an abundance of wildlife, an unspoiled landscape and clean, healthy air. We usually take these things for granted but this is a practice that we will have to change as we will be the losers if we become careless or thoughtless with respect to our environment.

We hear a lot about the environment in news reports from all over the world. We hear about the water being so polluted people can't drink it, Mr. Speaker; about the air so dirty and filled with smog that people can scarcely breathe. In Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, we don't have this degree of pollution with which to contend but we must work to ensure that this continues to be the situation in the future. We must also work to preserve our resource base and see that it is wisely used. A land without green valleys and green forests and tree-lined lakes and a good variety of animals and birds would be a destitute and a bleak place to live in.

Yes, it has become evident that over the recent years we have watched a slow but steady erosion with respect to habitat areas which are utilized by our wildlife resources. A great deal of natural habitat is slowly being destroyed, some of it is being turned over to agriculture and other uses. If we are not to destroy our habitat and wildlife, as has happened in other areas of the North American continent, we must ensure that our policies very closely reflect the realities and advisability of retaining as much habitat acreage as possible. We must plan

more carefully to ensure that as much emphasis as possible placed on consultation on other jurisdictions to ensure that the best possible use for this land is determined before it is allocated.

We recognize that occasionally some land must be lost the betterment of the province and its citizens, but we must make sure that this is a just cause before allowing this to happen. This Government, Mr. Speaker, is working diligent; to ensure a bright future for our wildlife. Advisory and Wet Land Committees have been established and the Wildlife Development Fund is carefully purchasing wildlife habitat areas where it is most needed. We also employ ecologists and technologists to ensure that wherever humanly possible nothing is done to endanger wildlife or the environment as we know it today.

Mr. Speaker, during National Wildlife Week I hope all of us will take the time to 'study wildlife' and 'think wildlife' so that we are able to learn how we can best serve its interests. We must take the time to care now because if we don't all of this will be lost for the future.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. C.P. MacDONALD: (Milestone) Mr. Speaker, all I want to say is that I am glad to see that John Burton is back from the Alberta election campaign after that very pleasant and enjoyable speech that he wrote for the Minister.

QUESTIONS

DIFFERENT METHOD OF REPORTING POPULATION FIGURES

MR. A.R. GUY: (Athabasca) Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Wood). I should like to follow up on the question that my colleague asked.

Is my understanding correct that the reason for putting out the Saskatchewan Municipal Directory is to bring Members and all people in Saskatchewan up-to-date on any change in reeves or councillors, any change in the day that they close, whether it is on Saturday or Wednesday? Because if that isn't the purpose of the Directory, now what use does it have? It has always been my understanding that the Directory is to bring the situation in each municipality up-to-date. How can you justify, Mr. Minister, in using 1971 population figures in the 1975 Directory, if you are going to follow the principle of keeping it up-to-date?

MR. WOOD: There is a principle of keeping the Directory up-to-date which I think we do endeavor to fulfil. In fact there are amendments to that Directory put out and I believe they are forwarded to MLAs throughout the year to try to keep the Directory as up-to-date as possible. But there is also such a thing as confusion of which I think the Hon. Member opposite maybe has a fairly good idea. If we did put out one figure in this and put out another figure in the blue book and use another figure for Community Capital Fund grants, we would have really turmoil throughout the province. We are using the 1971 figure

April 7, 1975.

for this year and next year in these books on that basis. I think that we are splitting the difference there, we are giving up-to-date information as well as we can of what we are aware of and what we are not sure of we are not making a guess at and thus adding confusion to the situation regarding population figures in Saskatchewan.

MR. GUY: A supplementary question to the Minister. Then, if he is so concerned about not having any confusion this year which happens to be an election year, why wasn't he concerned in 1972 and '73 and '74, when he used an entirely different set of figures. He never used the '71 figures in those three years. You don't want to show the people of Saskatchewan that the population went down last year in rural Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOOD: I like to have my questions answered for me that way, it really helps out. Mr. Speaker, the principle, I think, of the Question Period is to bring forward questions that are of importance for the day. These were all answered a week ago when I was here before.

In regard to why we are using these now in 1975 and we didn't use them in 1972 and 1973, is because in '72 and '73 we were carrying on with a system of grants that had been established by the previous government. We brought in a new set of grants in 1974 and we had to make these changes in order to implement them. We are doing something worthwhile and we had to do something to back it up.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SURVEY ON FARM LAND IN SASKATCHEWAN

MR. J. WIEBE: (Morse) Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer).

It is my understanding that the Saskatchewan Farm Ownership Board has just completed a survey of all the RM Secretaries, all the RM offices in the province, in regard to the amount of farm land that is presently owned by people in Saskatchewan. Is the Minister of Agriculture aware that the survey is completed and would he be prepared to make that survey public and if not would he make it available to Members on this side of the House?

HON. J.R. MESSER: (Minister of Agriculture) Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the Saskatchewan Farm Ownership Board undertaking a survey, it is the first that I have heard that the survey is in fact completed or near completion. I have had some discussions with the Farm Ownership Board and they are quite concerned about how accurate and how comprehensive the final results of that survey will be. After I have had delivered to me the findings of that survey I would be more than happy to give consideration to making the information available to not only the Members of this Legislative Assembly but the general public. But I think I will have to discuss with them their views in regard to how factually accurate and sound the results of that survey are when it is

completed before I will be able to make that decision.

MR. WIEBE: Just a supplementary question. It is my understanding that the survey was completed sometime in the month of February. Letters of congratulations and thanks have already gone out to the RM Secretaries. It has now been over a month and one-half since the survey has been completed and the results known. I was wondering as well if the Minister, as a supplementary question, could tell us what was the purpose of that survey?

MR. MESSER: It may well be that the Member for Morse is correct in assuming that the information that was requested by the Farm Ownership Board was sent in in February but I think he will be well aware of the fact that it takes some time to compile that information. I had a meeting with the Farm Ownership Board only two weeks ago, less than two weeks ago, and at that time we discussed the survey and they indicated to me at that time that it was yet to be finalized. So I think it is till accurate to say that the survey has not yet been finished and if it has it has only been in the last several days. It is difficult for me to be able to assume that the survey is in fact completed at this time.

If he wants me to respond to what the purpose of the survey is, I think it is obvious that the Farm Ownership Board believes that they have to have some better information in regard to absentee ownership, foreign ownership of land in Saskatchewan before they can undertake to carry out their duties in a legitimate and proper manner.

CONSUMER AFFAIRS' PAMPHLET

MR. G.B. GRANT: (Regina Whitmore Park) Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Consumer Affairs (Mr. Tchorzewski).

I know the Minister on many occasions has voiced his support of anything that would avoid discrimination. I notice in the first section under his picture in the new consumers' pamphlet that he is guilty of discrimination and I am wondering how he justifies it. He says: "What do we as consumers find when we are shopping?". And the first one listed is: "Unfamiliar salesmen." I don't think very many people have problems with unfamiliar salesmen, it is the familiar ones that cause the problem. My problem is with unfamiliar saleswomen, and I am just wondering why the Minister has discriminated against unfamiliar saleswomen?

HON. E.L. TCHORZEWSKI: (Minister of Consumer Affairs) Mr. Speaker, there has been a long debate over the use of specific words in what one means. I think it has always been generally known and generally understood that when one refers to salesmen it refers to everyone, whether it is salesman or saleswoman. Mr. Speaker, it may have very well been wiser to use the word salesperson, I don't question that, if the Member is trying to bring that to my attention I certainly accept it for that.

MR. GRANT: A supplementary question

April 7, 1975.

then, Mr. Speaker, I presume that the Minister is ready to support the elimination of the insistence by the Government of using the expression salesmen, because it is against the law as I understand it. The newspaper won't allow you to use it, they are prosecuted if they do use it. I would suggest Mr. Speaker, that the Minister is setting a very poor example.

ANNOUNCEMENT

SWIFT CURRENT BRONCOS WIN PROVINCIAL JUNIOR A CHAMPIONSHIP

HON. E.I. WOOD: (Swift Current) Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I should like to bring to the attention of the House, the fact that last night the Swift Current Broncos' hockey team defeated the Prince Albert Raiders . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOOD: . . . who were the defending champions of the Provincial Junior A Hockey title. I am sorry that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is not in his seat so I cannot give him condolences. I believe the Hon. Member for Prince Albert East (Mr. Feschuk) is here. I do extend to him my very sincere condolences on this happening. I am sure that people around Swift Current are not unhappy about this event. They will be playing next Friday the winners of either the Selkirk Steelers or the West Caledonian North Stars in Manitoba. I am sure that the House wishes them well in carrying on this competition beyond the borders of Saskatchewan.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HOUSE RECESS RE DR. ALDRIN

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed today, we have as most Members are aware, some distinguished visitors in our Chamber. I am going to ask the Member for Regina North West (Mr. Whelan) to introduce them. And then it may be that the House Leader or someone on behalf of the Opposition may wish to add a few words after he has introduced them.

I believe I will ask the House if they agree with me that we should adjourn the House for a few moments so that we can call on one of our distinguished guests to speak to our Chamber this afternoon on some of his wide experiences. Is that agreed?

Agreed.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

DR. EDWIN E. ALDRIN JR. SECOND MAN ON MOON

MR. E.C. WHELAN: (Regina North West) Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Through you I should like to introduce to all Members a very distinguished gentleman. This province and this Legislature is honored to have a visitor today who is not only a citizen of the United States but a key citizen of this planet because of a unique accomplishment.

Students of my generation dreamed about the possibility of

going to the moon. We marvelled at the courage of people like Christopher Columbus who sailed across the ocean to discover America. Today we acknowledge that voyage of 1492 because of the precariousness of the undertaking. But one can scarcely compare such an undertaking with the trip through thousands of miles of space to the moon. The people who made this trip possible and the man who was one of the first to land on the moon, was thoroughly trained and had many accomplishments to his credit before he undertook the task. Now a businessman from the United States Air Force, Dr. Edwin E. Aldrin, Jr., who is with us here today, has a lengthy list of achievements, as a writer, as a scientist, as a fighter pilot, as an aerospace pilot, as a director of his church and finally as a crusader for mental health.

My association with him comes about because I have been asked to represent the Government at the 25th annual meeting of the Saskatchewan Mental Health Association tonight where Dr. Aldrin will be the guest speaker.

By a coincidence the Canadian Mental Health Officer, who with Beverly Van Zile are accompanying Dr. Aldrin here today, is a good friend of mine, my next door neighbor and a sergeant of the Regina City Police, Roland Stoneham. These two people are seated with Dr. Aldrin.

'Buzz' Aldrin, as he is affectionately known the world-over, was born at Montclair, New Jersey on January 20, 1930. He graduated from high school, received his Bachelor of Science degree from West Point in 1951; his pilot's wings, United States Air Force, in 1952. He flew F-86 Jets in Korea on some 66 combat missions and destroyed two MIG fighter aircraft. He is married and has three children, two sons and a daughter.

Following his tour of duty in Korea he instructed aerial gunnery, took a squadron officer's course, flew F-100 Jets as Flight Commander with the 36th Tactical Fighter Wing, at Bitburg, Germany. He attended the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and wrote his doctoral thesis on "Guidance for Manned Orbital Rendezvous." He was assigned to the Gemini Target Office at Los Angeles following his graduation from MIT. After further training with the Air Force at the Manned Space Craft Centre, he and James Lovell were launched into space on November 11, 1966 for a four day successful flight. Buzz Aldrin spent five and one-half hours outside the aircraft while all the world watched. Gemini 12 returned to earth safely, splashed down in the Atlantic two and one-half miles from the USS Wasp. Buzz Aldrin was assigned as back-up command module pilot for Apollo 8, man's first flight to orbit the moon. On July 16, 1969 with astronauts Michael Collins and Neil Armstrong, Buzz Aldrin set out for the moon. After successfully manoeuvring so that the lunar module ship "Eagle" disconnected from the "Columbia", and while the "Columbia" orbited the moon with Collins in control, the visitor we have with us today and Neil Armstrong landed on the moon in the modular craft "Eagle."

At 10:56 p.m. July 20, 1969 Neil Armstrong put his left foot on the moon and uttered the historical words, "That's one small step for a man, one giant leap for mankind." A few minutes later at approximately 11:12 p.m. Buzz Aldrin stood on the moon, the second man to do so.

His own country and many other countries of the world have

April 7, 1975.

presented Buzz Aldrin with their highest awards. For example, the Presidential Medal for Freedom and an honorary life membership in the International Association of Machinists and Aeronautical Space Workers. This list is probably the longest and most impressive ever credited to one individual.

This is Dr. Aldrin's second visit to our province. In 1972 we were honored to have him visit the Moose Jaw air show.

The people of Canada, of Saskatchewan, applaud. I say to Dr. Aldrin we applaud your achievements, your courage, ability and training in preparation for your flight to the moon which illustrates the depths of your character. As do people around the world, we recognize your accomplishments. But your work for the mental health of others speaks clearly of your concern for mankind.

We salute you as one of the world's leading citizens and we welcome you here on behalf of the Members of this Legislature. Mr. Speaker, I'm honored to introduce Dr. Edwin Aldrin, Beverly Van Zile and Roland Stoneham. They are seated on this side of the House. Will you stand please.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. J.R. MESSER: (Minister of Agriculture) Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Premier it's indeed a pleasure for me to recognize on behalf of the Government and other Members of this Legislative Assembly, Dr. Buzz Aldrin and the company who are visiting the Legislative Assembly with him. I had the opportunity of very briefly meeting Dr. Aldrin or a short time earlier this morning at the studios of CKCK where he was on an open line show.

I was sitting here thinking while the introductions were being made pertaining to Dr. Aldrin that perhaps it is most appropriate that the Minister of Agriculture has the opportunity to welcome Buzz Aldrin to this Legislature being responsible for the Land Bank operations and our problem of expansion in the Province of Saskatchewan, it may be he could pass on some words in regard to the fertility of the surface of the moon and we could therefore explore it in a more meaningful way.

Mr. Speaker, I know that some Members of this Legislature will agree with me that the general public sometimes think that the Members and the conduct of this Assembly are sometimes in orbit or perhaps more appropriately out of orbit in the conduct of the province's business. I don't know whether we would want to find ourselves in some different environment, the kind of environment that certainly Buzz Aldrin probably can feel much more comfortable than we can in, but I do want to extend a welcome from the Government of Saskatchewan and the Members of this Legislature and convey to you that we recognize the significant achievements that you have contributed to the world in broadening man's knowledge in regard to space.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. C.P. MacDONALD: (Milestone) Mr. Speaker, I want to join on behalf of the Members of the Opposition in expressing our very warmest welcome to Dr. Aldrin this afternoon.

I remember well the achievement or that particular occasion when Dr. Aldrin and Neil Armstrong landed on the moon and I'm sure that the majority of the people of Saskatchewan watched with excitement and with all the thrills in the very exciting experience that you performed. The only time that we ever lift off the ground is occasionally the Government Members get up on Cloud 9 but every once in a while, like yourself, we manage to come back and return to safety.

I do want to say to you Dr. Aldrin that we do welcome you very sincerely to Saskatchewan. I'm not sure what you may think of the Saskatchewan winter that you are experiencing here, perhaps your trip to the moon was even more pleasant than coming up and facing the cold blasts of our April winter but in reality Saskatchewan at this time of the year is normally much more pleasant.

I also want to say that we do appreciate your achievements and your accomplishments. Many of us now are talking about the fact that the globe in which we live is becoming a very, very small place and through jet travel and all the new modern conveniences of transportation, the world itself has become a very, very small place. That's a very wonderful thing. We're watching the Vietnamese orphans come across the ocean now to North America. But you, Sir, and people like you are also beginning to tell us that space is something that is not very large either.

May I also take the opportunity of thanking you for your leadership in the field of mental health. We, in the Province of Saskatchewan, have always been very vitally concerned in mental health. The Province of Saskatchewan has taken a great deal of leadership in the past and I know that we will continue to play our role in attempting to make as valid a contribution as possible in research and experimentation in that field. We do know, Sir, that your coming and journeying all the way to Saskatchewan will make our efforts in that regard much more worthwhile and much more interesting.

DR. ALDRIN: Mr. Speaker, Hon. Members of the House, Ladies and Gentlemen, students, eighth grade and fifth grade and teachers, it is indeed an honor for me to be here. If I may I should like to sit down. I hope the Premier does not return to the Chambers while we are here because we are in his parking place.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

DR. ALDRIN: I also would like to acknowledge the great sense of humor that I have seen exhibited in the different manner of applauding.

I am not sure how many of you people are aware that many portions of Canadian aerospace contributed greatly to the expedition that I was fortunate enough to take part in. In particular, I think it was in the vicinity of Toronto or Montreal, the foot pad, it's about three feet across, was made in Canada or parts of the landing gear were.

As I look back over my career and I was reminded by Mr. Whelan, I did have a tour in Germany and I very much learned to respect the Canadian Sabre Mark V1, and I commend,

April 7, 1975.

even though it came from the F-86, I commend the versatility of the pilots. We had great fun tangling with each other in the skies over Germany and France.

The reason that I am here in Saskatchewan this time is not to take part in an air show but is as a result of a book that I wrote three years ago now called, "Return to Earth," which prompted the National Association for Mental Health in Washington to ask me to be their national chairman for Mental Health for the year 1974. Without going into great details, I will explain to you that during the three or four years following my flight I experienced a gradual deterioration of my motivation which led eventually to a depression which led eventually to my hospitalization and psychiatric treatment. As a result of that treatment I made several decisions in any life, one of which was that whereas I had returned to the Air Force to see if I could find a goal objective to pursue there — I felt very proud of being the only astronaut to ever return to the parent service from which he came that somehow that wasn't the objective that I wanted to continue to pursue. So I decided to retire from the Air Force and look for some other objective. I haven't found it yet. If anything I am doing many different, smaller objectives that I have in mind. And with the economy of our country the way it is, I can't say that I am succeeding in an enormous way but there is always tomorrow and maybe things will get better.

As a result of writing that book which disclosed to the people who were able to read it the experiences that I had, I was asked to be the national chairman, and as such took on an obligation to travel around to various organizations within the United States and meet with the people in the Chapters, Divisions, to speak to as many people as I could at these visits through the various versions of the media, television, interviews in newspapers and magazines. But also to pat the people on the back that were doing the real guts work in mental health.

In discussing a little earlier with my escort, he tells me — well I asked him — how has the Legislature been treating you people? He has no complaints at all. I am amazed to hear that. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, just before I came in here you were quite quick to point out how proud you are of the support that the province has given and feels in a way that you have paved or are the leaders in the support of mental health. I highly commend you for this. I am looking forward to meeting with the members of the Association later on this afternoon and to have an opportunity to speak to them tonight.

To talk about the moon before this august body, I wouldn't know where to start. I might answer a question or two if the Hon. Members might see fit to ask me any prophetic advice as to how far away it is or anything like that. That would be in order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Aldrin was wondering if anyone had any specific questions he would like to direct to him? Just feel free because the House is really recessed right now so we don't have to be too tight in our schedule.

MR. D.H. LANGE: (Assiniboia-Bengough) Dr. Aldrin I would be particularly interested in your philosophical thoughts regarding the amount of technical,

financial and intellectual resources that governments should be placing, in the future, toward space travel and other endeavors in space

DR. ALDRIN: That's a very hot question that you ask. I think it's a changing one, as time changes we find that our priorities change. Why we did something in 1963 that led us on a course that let us land on the moon in 1969, the reasons why we did it then may not be valid in 1975, but we are not given the opportunity to go back and redo things, unfortunately, in this life. We have to live with the decisions that we have made. I feel that, obviously from my standpoint, that we got more than our money's worth and perhaps considering the magnitude of the undertaking perhaps for the first time or one of the very few times, we accomplished our long-range objective of an immense program on schedule, very much within the budget limitations that we had set forth many, many years before and with results that were far more effective in what we actually learned by carrying out that mission and the subsequent landings after my flight, far more than we have ever learned we would before we embarked on the trip. So I think our country more than got its money's worth. I think we are a little bit too close now, it is hardly six years since the lunar landing took place, and it's just a little over ten years from the time that we made up our minds to do this. If you remember it was not necessarily an engineering decision, it was not necessarily a scientific decision to go to explore the moon, it was highly involved with politics and whether we could in fact do something that would demonstrate to the world that we were not a second rate country in the technical arena, after suffering, as we might have viewed it, set backs when Sputnik was launched. I think there were some other prestige matters that were in the President's mind when he made his decision and the decision was his to make to embark on that course.

To judge the effectiveness or to judge the outcome, the reasons, well, we, in our country use the term spin-offs, the benefits that have been derived from a particular venture in expenditure when that venture took place only six years ago, I think is a little bit premature. When we look back at some of the other explorations that have taken place, Columbus' voyage certainly six years later was not understood, when he went where he went he didn't know where he was going. When he got there he didn't know where he was and when he got back he didn't know where he had been. Certainly in 1927 when Lindberg flew across the Atlantic, six years after that I feel quite certain that no way did we envision that in a few short years we would be flying across the Atlantic at speeds in the neighborhood of three hours for a crossing.

So it is very easy for us to make snap judgements and say whether a particular expenditure was worthwhile, whether we got our money's worth, whether we should have concentrated more on socio-economical arenas. I think our democratic process allows each and every segment of society to speak for itself through their elected representatives as yours does up here. Everybody has a chance to try and sell his program through your elected representatives. It takes a while many times for government programs to be approved or disapproved. Certainly in contrast to previous centuries we can no longer afford to do anything that comes to our minds. Hundreds of years ago whatever we felt we could do, we had the money, the resources to be able to do that but no longer can we do these things so we must

April 7, 1975.

very carefully judge where we expend our money and that is the job of the gentlemen right here representing the constituents of Saskatchewan and that is the job of our legislative bodies to do. We, the people, elect you to carry out your responsibilities on our behalf. We hope that you can make the right decisions. Ultimately, it is the American citizen who doesn't make his decisions and the citizens of Saskatchewan through you make fine decisions of where their money is going to be spent and on what. We no longer can buy everything everywhere as I am sure you people have found out in your deliberations over dispensing funds. You just don't have enough money.

I again would like to congratulate you on the way that you have chosen to support the cause of mental health.

Is there another question?

HON. J.E. BROCKELBANK: (Minister of Government Services) Dr. Aldrin, I along with many other people watched with interest and excitement the first manned landing on the moon. A couple of years ago I had the opportunity to go to Cape Kennedy to watch the first successful launching of a commercial satellite by the United States agency on behalf of Canada. This was Anik I, which now is in stationary orbit over Canada and is used for communication purposes. During that successful launching my thoughts at that time were of people who went on trips to the moon and elsewhere such as around the earth. I wonder, if, because of your training and experience of having been to the moon, if you are able to take a detached view of the very subject you are here for at this time, the topic of mental health? I wonder if you are able to take a different view than we might be expected to take about how mental health should be treated. From your own experience do you believe that the manner in which your people in the United States or Canadians treat mental health that there is a "light at the end of the tunnel" with regard to the treatment of mental health?

DR. ALDRIN: I thank you very much for asking me that question. Obviously I have two answers in a way. One of them is based upon my own experience, my own case is a very personal one. Pardon the expression, it is hell to be in a depressed mood and people who have not been there I find have great difficulty in understanding just how sordid a situation can become when they think in terms of, well, I had a bad day yesterday or last week wasn't very productive. But when this continues on for a period of years, it is no longer a blue Monday and people who have not experienced this have a hard time understanding just what it means to be in that type of situation or for other mental disturbances. In a way I look at it as perhaps our last frontier, we know so much about the other parts of the human body in terms of medicine. We have made great strides in replacing organs. We are learning more and more about what goes on up inside, why we think the thoughts that we do but we are far from understanding the exact inner workings of our minds. We understand the physical world around us, we understand the living world around us, how to make modifications to benefit mankind. We know how to take electrons and put them together and form computers. We know about lasers, we know about astronomy, subatomic particles, we know how to graft limbs together. This to me is an exciting field because I think we

will see more and more people looking to the reasons why humans feel the way they do, why they think the way they do and what is the purpose of our being here, why we're put here on the earth. I think we will see a lot more discussions and, hopefully, some very interesting things will come out of these types of discussions.

HON. W.F. SMISHEK: (Minister of Health) Dr. Aldrin's party have an appointment at 3:30 and they have asked me to see whether we can get them moving. On behalf of the Government I would like to thank you very much for coming and particularly as Minister of Health. The whole psychiatric program in Saskatchewan is under my jurisdiction and I am indeed happy that you did find the time to come to speak at mental health associations in Saskatchewan. We have made some tremendous progress in Saskatchewan and perhaps, if time permits as you are on the way out I can really relate some of the things that we are doing and are attempting to do. Saskatchewan has been known as the leader in North America in the field of mental illness. Thank you very much for coming and assisting us in this very important program.

MR. SPEAKER: As Speaker, I wish on behalf of all Members of the Legislature to thank Dr. Aldrin for having appeared here. I think that it has been a highlight for our Legislature to have so distinguished a world citizen here today. As a little memento, as a token of your visit here, on behalf of the Legislature, I am going to ask Catherine to hand this flag to you. It is a Saskatchewan flag so that when you go back you will have a flag of the Province of Saskatchewan.

May your journey be a pleasant one and may you return again at some later date, Dr. Aldrin. Thank you very much for coming.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SECOND READINGS

HON. E.I. WOOD (Minister of Municipal Affairs) moved second reading of Bill No. 51 — **An Act to amend The Urban Municipality Act, 1970.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to move this Act to amend The Urban Municipality Act, 1970. As with most amendments to the Municipal Act there are a good many facets to this Bill and it is very difficult to speak on any particular phase.

The first amendment that I should like to refer to allows an insurance agent who is a member of council to write insurance for the municipality so long as it is the only insurance agency in that municipality and all the members present at council and eligible to vote, vote in favor of the contract.

The second aspect is a little more detailed. It has to do with the Conflict of Interest legislation that was brought in last winter at the last session of the Legislature in 1974. As Hon. Members will be aware back in January of 1973 the annual convention of SUMA approved the idea that they pass a resolution

April 7, 1975.

asking that the Act be amended to make it compulsory that all municipal councillors, officials and members of boards and commissions should disclose their land holdings before taking a seat on the council or taking an office. Well, those that had already been in office couldn't do it before they took office but they would all be required to declare their land holdings and have their statements with the Clerk of the town. The executive of SUMA approached me in this regard in the later part of 1973 and asked that this legislation be put on the Statutes of the Province of Saskatchewan. We sat down with them and worked this out in great detail. There was a good deal of consultation on it and the members of the SUMA executive all felt at the time that this was good legislation. I proceeded to have it worked out and it was brought into the House last winter.

I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, that I wasn't here when it was brought in but I certainly was in on the drafting of it and the draft that was brought forward to the Legislative was one that had been approved by myself and the executive of SUMA.

However, when we did put it into effect they found that there were quite a few 'bugs', if I may use the term, in this legislation. In the first place they found a good deal of opposition especially from the smaller villages and towns. They said that everybody knew everybody's business in town any way and it really wasn't necessary to go through this procedure of having the land holdings of the municipal councillors declared before the Secretary. And also there just weren't that many people available to stand for council that we should sift out those that found it distasteful to do this and not allow them to stand for council. We also found that it really wasn't all that desirable that some boards be required to disclose their holdings. Some, we felt, were good, that this was good legislation in regard to planning commissions and district planning commissions and was quite important that they disclose their holdings as it was for municipal councillors, but there were some boards — library boards, hospital boards, various types of board where it really seemed to serve no purpose that they should be compelled, holus-bolus, to comply with this legislation.

So the SUMA people came to see me last summer and wanted to know if we could make some changes in this. There was a good deal of disquietude throughout the province because of the legislation and they admitted very freely to me that they had been as much a part of it, of bringing in this legislation as I had been or the Government had been or the Legislature but they felt that collectively we had made errors.

I was inclined to agree with them. After discussing it with them and my colleagues, I was able to give them the commitment that I personally would bring to the Legislature at this Session, amendments to the Urban Municipality Act that would remove from the towns and villages the necessity of applying this legislation. We would make it voluntary for towns and villages to use this legislation and we also would leave it as voluntary with the city councils as to what boards and commissions that may be required to declare their land holdings and this was felt to be agreeable by the SUMA people at that time. It was also felt, though that there could be a good deal of difficulty because this legislation was on the Statute Books and that as long as it was there, there was a possibility of

court cases being brought out, entered into, prosecuting councillors who are sitting on council who hadn't complied with the legislation so there are a good many of them in the province. So I also made the commitment to the urban people that if it were necessary, I would ask that this legislation be made retrospective to last spring, a year ago, when the legislation was first proclaimed so that it would remove the ground for any prosecution under the Act.

Up until a very short time ago, Mr. Speaker, it did not appear that this retroactive legislation was going to be necessary, but about a month or so ago one of the towns in the province had some difficulty. The town clerk resigned and there was bad feeling between him and the council and he proceeded to lay charges against the Council under this Act. Council assured me that they had had no knowledge of the situation and the clerk had never told them about it. At any rate I asked the Attorney General to step in and they did withhold the action under the Act to postpone the time of the sitting until some time this month, Mr. Speaker, but it thus became necessary that we do include in the Act retroactive procedures. Now I'm not very much in favor of retroactive legislation and I had hoped this would not be necessary in this case but it has turned out that it would be. So we have included retroactive legislation in this Act.

Now since this time I have to say that I think it would be unfair to the House if I did not tell them that at the last SUMA convention it was asked that this Section of the Act be made voluntary for all the urban municipalities in the province, the cities as well as the towns and villages. We have looked at this but we really do feel that basically this is good legislation in principle as it has been amended. We have removed what we felt to be the worst difficulties in it and we've given regard to larger governments such as the cities, that we should apply this principle and instead of retreating from it that we should maintain it so we are not at this time removing this section from application to the cities.

I'd like to speak about another amendment to this Act in regard to annual meetings. There have been people in the province who have come to me from time to time saying that they wish to have the old annual meetings of urban municipalities restored. There are a good many people who say there is absolutely no necessity of having them. I believe a year or so ago we put in the Act that annual meetings could be restored, the same as any other meeting, that if a petition is taken up with a certain number of signatures that a public meeting could be held. We said that all these people had to do who wanted to have an annual meeting is to have a petition taken up and a plebiscite held, but the same people who wanted the annual meeting came to me and said, "This is ridiculous, we want an annual meeting but we don't want to have to go through this rigmarole of taking up a petition every year and having a plebiscite in order to have an annual meeting."

So this legislation before us today says that where an annual meeting has been approved by a vote of the electors of the municipality that that meeting will be held and that the bylaw establishing that meeting will remain in effect until it is done away with by a vote of the electors of the municipality. I think this is a very good solution to the problem that where annual meetings are not really desired by the

April 7, 1975.

people of the community they don't have to have them. But if they are desired by the people of the community and a vote of the community illustrates that they are requested, they will have their annual meeting and they will continue to have the annual meetings without going through the procedure of having to take a vote until such time as it is decided that they don't care to have them any more and then by taking a vote they can do away with the annual meetings. I think this is a good solution to that problem and people on both sides of the argument should be quite well satisfied with this solution, I would hope.

We have also allowed municipalities to pass bylaws in regard to abatement, prohibition or elimination of noise.

We have in the Act at the present time permission for the Local Government Board to allow an urban council to utilize the funds that are established by excess of the interest accumulation on their sinking fund accounts under certain "abnormal economic conditions", are the words used in the Act. This has been taken as a reason in many cases for not allowing the municipalities to use this money. We are taking those words out allowing the Local Government Board to establish their own policy as to what situations in which the municipality should be allowed to use these funds which are excess accumulations of the sinking fund of interest and other earnings.

They also have a section here that will allow the superannuation benefits to be worked out for the employees of the Regina General Hospital. I understand that when this hospital was taken over by the Government a year ago there were certain conditions there that under the existing Acts could not be dealt with. The amendments that we have to the Urban Municipal Act at this time will allow the setting up of a superannuation plan, or the continuation of the present superannuation plan for the Regina General Hospital.

We also are allowing for permissive legislation where the municipal council may pass a bylaw for superannuation benefits for members of the council. This is not compulsory but it will allow, within certain limits that you will find set out in this proposed amendment, municipal councils to set up a superannuation plan for members of council.

They also have allowed, in this Act, the increase of the tax penalty that may be levied on overdue taxes. At the present time the Act says it shall be five per cent and allows the municipality to increase this by bylaw to seven per cent. Municipalities have said that this interest rate is too low, that it encourages people to not pay their taxes because this is the cheapest money that they can borrow at seven per cent from the municipality. They asked us to increase it to 12 per cent but that was some months ago before the interest rates dropped as they have at the present time. This amendment increases the allowable interest rate that can be charged. We don't say that the municipality must charge this but they are allowed to charge up to nine per cent, which I think is fairly reasonable and I think they make a good case that people should not be enticed not to pay their taxes by a reason of a low penalty tax rate.

Mr. Speaker, that is all the remarks I have to make at this time on this Bill and I would thus like to move second reading.

MR. J.G. LANE: (Lumsden) Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that the Minister had to come before the House with legislation to correct some frankly bad errors that were made last time and some very poorly thought out legislation. Now we realize that the Minister was not in the House due to illness but, for example, in clause two the matter of insurance was raised by the Opposition and we made it clear to the House that there would be problems in this regard, we made it clear at the time that the legislation proposed would create problems on the matter of insurance and, of course, we were given the assurance at the time that there wouldn't be any problem, that you discussed it with SUMA, SARM and everybody else and there wouldn't be any problem. And in fact there is a problem.

Now, on the matter of the Conflict of Interest legislation. Again, at the time the Conflict of Interest legislation was in, we were assured in the Chamber that this was vital legislation, that great principle was involved and I think that we heard the speeches and I think on the matter of Conflict of Interest legislation we heard speeches by the Attorney General on this White Paper on Conflict of Interest and I think we've had it clear from Members opposite as to how great a principle this was and now it should apply to all elected public officials and what should be done about it. Again we find out now that the principle now applies to cities, it isn't going to apply to towns and villages. Now surely there's something wrong with the principle if that's the case. I think, Mr. Minister, that the proper procedure would be that the principle should apply to all governments and in those circumstances where it becomes unreasonable or not feasible to apply it for some obvious reasons, then I think we should have exceptions to the rule set up. But to apply the principle in one case to urban government and not apply it to another, I think the Minister himself will admit is not the proper way to bring in legislation of supposed principle.

I haven't had, frankly, the assurance from SUMA or the admission from SUMA that they were part and parcel of the wrong legislation that was introduced in the first place or the legislation introduced in error. As a matter of fact they weren't taking credit for it, their reaction immediately thereafter was negative to those areas where the legislation did not work. They were not concerned, they were not concerned about the principle, they were concerned, however, in those areas where obviously the principle was going to work in unreasonable hardships. And they were making it clear at the time the legislation was brought into the House.

I think that the comment that we're only making the changes:

1. Because SUMA is taking part of the responsibility. I don't think is accurate and
2. The only reason that the principle of Conflict of Interest legislation doesn't apply to towns and villages is because everybody knows everybody else's business. I think it is a very, very weak argument to say the least, in trying to remove a principle that will apply to some urban governments and not to the others. I think that it's fairly obvious to the Minister that not everybody does know everybody's business and I think the argument is probably the weakest one he can possibly find. They may know some obvious things, the person may have shares in a company, could be a major shareholder in a company that's operating, could do it through family ties, any one of a number

April 7, 1975.

of ways, I don't think the argument holds any water or has any validity.

I think the Opposition feel, of course, that the matter of the annual meetings is fair, frankly it's innocuous, it's minor legislation. I think we will want an assurance from the House or from the Government that those employee, who are affected by the transfer of the pension funds will not be worse off because some employees, members of the union, have approached me and said they feel they will be worse off by having this fund transferred to the government pension plan or Public Service Employees Pension Plan as opposed to the Civic Employees Superannuation Pension Plan. Perhaps that was hastily drawn and I would hope that the Minister would be prepared to assure this House that these employees of the Regina General Hospital will, in fact, not be worse off, will not have their positions jeopardized by reason of this legislation.

I think the Minister should make an effort to assure himself of that position because I've had some representation and frankly they've made it clear they weren't sure whether they were going to. So I would hope that that would be clarified.

The main part that the Minister has tried to defend is this flip-flop approach to the principle of Conflict of Interest legislation. Legislation will apply to the Parliament of Canada and will apply to Members of this Chamber and will apply to cities but because of this amendment, and I don't say it's a minor amendment as the Minister tries to give the impression, it won't apply to towns and villages. I think what happened was that the proposals that were brought into the House in the first place were poorly thought out and the problems were not considered, that in fact the Minister can't stand the heat. He got so much flak that rather than sit down and come up with maintenance of the principle but with those obvious exceptions that will be necessary, he just removed the principle from two tiers of government and left it on other municipal governments, the cities. We think that's wrong. We'll have more to say on this. I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

HON. R. ROMANOW (Attorney General) moved second reading of Bill No. 54 — **An Act to amend The Surface Rights Acquisition and Compensation Act, 1968.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, I move an amendment to The Surface Rights Acquisition and Compensation Act, 1968. The Act presently provides for an appeal to the District Court by way of trial de novo and from there to the Court of Appeal. It has been brought to the attention of the Department the fact that a great number of appeals are being taken and the additional fact that in assessing compensation courts are using principles different from those used by The Surface Rights Acquisition and Compensation Board.

The Board, as the Members will know, is made up of persons chosen for their expertise in this area and because this is so the proposed amendment would limit the right of appeal to questions of law or questions of jurisdiction of the Board and leave the questions of fact to the Board. Since questions of fact will no longer be heard on appeal there seems to be no point in having the appeal heard by way of trial de novo in the

District Court and the most expeditious manner of handling the appeals appears to go directly to the Court of Appeal. Requiring leave of the Court of Appeal to launch an appeal will help to ensure that only appeals involving a bona fide question of law or jurisdiction will be heard.

The time within which an appeal must be commenced is 30 days as it is under the existing legislation and the rules of procedure are almost identical to those governing an appeal to the Court of Appeal from the decision of a Queen's Bench judge but changes in procedure have been made and are made with a view to ensuring that the appeal will be proceeded with as quickly as possible. For instance Section 53, subsection (2), paragraph (c) will require the appellant to serve the notice of appeal within 15 days of being granted the leave. Section 54 will provide for a stay of proceedings until all the appeals have been disposed of. Section 3 of the Bill provides that the existing legislation will continue to apply to any matters on which an appeal has been properly launched at the time this legislation comes into force. So that if a person has launched an appeal to the District Court at the time this legislation comes into force that appeal will continue and in fact the power under the existing Bill to appeal from the District Court to the Court of Appeal will still be available. Since the time limit for launching an appeal has not changed no one is going to lose any right to appeal although the form for hearing the appeal and the procedure for having it heard will be changed.

Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 54.

MR. C.P. MacDONALD: (Milestone) Mr. Speaker, the Member for Cannington has a few remarks to say on this Bill and there is a mix-up in the procedure here. They were going to wait until the Member for Cannington arrived, he is stuck on the road and so therefore for that reason I should like to beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

MR. ROMANOW (Attorney General) moved second reading of Bill No. 56 — **An Act to amend The Magistrates' Courts Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, this is an amendment to The Magistrates' Courts Act.

Section 2 of the Bill, the second section of this Bill adds a new subsection (4) to Section 34 of The Magistrates' Courts Act. This is a new provision and provides that where a widow of a judge is 20 years or more younger than a deceased judge the annuity payable to the widow under Section 34 of the Act is to be reduced by the same amount as it would if payable under The Public Service Superannuation Act.

Section 29 of the later Act provides for the allowance being reduced by such amount as the Public Superannuation Board may by regulation prescribe. The Regulation dealing with this is Section 40 of the Regulations under The Public Service Superannuation Act ordered back under date of December 17, 1968 which reads in part as follows:

Where the age of a contributor exceeds the age of his wife by 20 years or more the allowance to which she as

April 7, 1975.

the widow of the contributor may be entitled under the Act shall be reduced so that the ratio of the reduced allowance is equal to the ratio of the present value of a life annuity of \$1 per annum to a female aged 20 years less than the contributor at the date of his death to the present value of the life annuity of \$1 per annum to a female of the age of the widow at that date.

Subsection (2) reads:

For the purposes of subsection (1) the present value of the life annuity of \$1 per annum shall be calculated in accordance with the standard mortality tables for 1973 together with the interest at the rate of three per cent per annum.

Mr. Speaker, similar provisions are contained in the Liquor Board Superannuation Act, The Power Corporation Superannuation Act, Telecommunications Superannuation Act and Workmen's Compensation Board Superannuation Act.

This amendment is being made because it is considered that the same provision should apply to annuities payable to superannuated judges under The Magistrates' Courts Act. Provision is being made in the Bill for an annuity being paid to a former judge and in his case his wife is over 20 years younger than he is. While the exact amount of the reduction cannot be determined until death the calculation made on the assumption that he lives for a period equal to his present life expectancy would result in her half pension of \$2,450 being reduced to \$1,893.69.

Section 3 of the Bill. This Section enacts a new Section 35(A) providing for those receiving annuities under this Act receiving the same supplementary allowances as those being provided for superannuates, widows and children under the four superannuation Bills already mentioned. These allowances are provided for in Section 7(f) being enacted by the Bill to amend The Superannuation Supplementary Provisions Act which is now before the House, Bill 57, Section 4, yet to be read. This Section is intended to offset the increase in the cost of living. It provides for a judge receiving \$12 additional allowance for each year of service and for a widow receiving \$6 for each year of service of the deceased judge. This amendment has been introduced as a result of representations made by persons now receiving annuities under the Act and by the judges of the Magistrates' Court on their behalf. Under this Section one of the superannuated judges served for 23 years and will accordingly receive a supplementary allowance of \$276 per annum.

Section 4 of the Bill. The effect of this Section is that one magistrate will receive an annuity under this Section equal to half the salary which is being paid to him as a judge of the Magistrates' Court at the time his appointment was terminated. He did not receive an annuity under the Act for the reason that he was over 70 years of age when he was appointed in July, 1958 although otherwise qualified. This particular judge served as a Crown solicitor in the Department of the Attorney General from 1915 to 1947 and was Deputy Attorney General from 1947 to 1958 when he became first a Provincial Magistrate and then a judge of the Magistrates' Court. The individual commenced receiving a superannuation allowance under The Public Service Superannuation Act of \$2,600 on his retirement at which time his salary as a judge was \$16,000. But for the age requirement

that he be less than 70 on January 1, 1964 he would have been entitled to receive a pension of \$7,500 but instead was limited to \$2,600.

The effect of this proposed Section 4 is that the age requirement is removed as it is applied to him and the Section will result in an annuity being paid to him of \$4,900 which with the \$2,600 originally payable under The Public Superannuation Act, totals \$7,500 which he would be entitled to receive if he was retiring as a Magistrate today and didn't have the age qualifications on him.

Subsection (2) of Section 4 makes it clear that the provisions of Section 34 of the Act, including the new subsection 4 applied to the annuity which will become payable to the widow after his death, as I have indicated in this case the wife is over 20 years younger than the individual in question.

Subsection (3) of the Bill provides that the supplementary allowance being provided for in Section 3 will not apply to the annuities provided for in Section 4.

Subsection (4) of Section 4 of the Bill is necessary in order that the individual may continue to receive his superannuation allowance under The Public Service Superannuation Act, as without it Section 71 of The Public Service Superannuation Act would apply and the allowances payable under that Act would cease. The intention is that he should continue to receive these allowances to the maximum of \$7,500.

Those basically are the principles of this Bill, Mr. Speaker, and accordingly I move second reading of Bill No. 56.

MR. LANE: I suppose one could call this a Mr. Justice Douglas amendment, the Judge of the Supreme Court of the United States of America, who married a young lady some 30 or 40 years his junior. I realize that in the United States the Republican Party and in particular President Nixon was trying to get rid of Mr. Justice Douglas. I gather from this amendment we are not letting the problem arise here because it certainly is a deterrent for a judge to marry someone quite a bit younger than himself.

We have no objections to the Bill, Mr. Speaker, and we will support the amendment.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

HON. G. MacMURCHY (Minister of Education) moved second reading of Bill No. 58 — **An Act to amend The Teacher Collective Bargaining Act, 1973.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, Bill 58 contains three major amendments which the experience of the last two years has shown to be desirable for effective negotiation under The Teacher Collective Bargaining Act.

When the Act was introduced in 1973 during second reading and in winding up debate I said it was a strong piece of legislation. I said then that it would be a vast improvement over the Liberal system of area bargaining and the years since the

April 7, 1975.

Liberal reign have borne this out. Today the relationship between teacher and trustee, between the school and the community is much more harmonious than it was in 1968, '69, '70 under area bargaining. I think the proof of this is shown in the conferences that were held in both the fall of '73 and '74, the conventions which I have been attending of the trustees and the teachers and of the effective work that is going on with trustees and teachers in the curriculum committees that we have established.

I think there are two reasons, Mr. Speaker, for this better relationship. It is due in part to the removal of the six per cent guideline and the pupil-teacher ratio grant formula. These instruments did more harm to the cause of education, to lower morale and create bitterness than any other Act that was legislated between 1964 and 1971. The guideline and the pupil-teacher ratio reflected not just the attitude of the Liberals to education but I say that it reflected the attitude of the Liberals toward teachers as a group. For seven years, particularly between 1968 and 1971 it seemed to me that the Liberal Government deliberately set out to exploit teachers for political benefit, to turn the public against them in the hope that the Liberal attitude could be blamed, their attitude on education could be blamed, on the teachers of Saskatchewan.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, the results of the election in 1971 showed that this kind of policy doesn't work in this province. The people said No to the Liberal Party and since then we have removed the wage guidelines, we have replaced the pupil-teacher ratio formula with a new grant formula which provides unconditional grants to our school boards.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Party in government not only placed rigid controls on education but they also held a tight fist over the level of school grants. I can recall the statements of the Leader of the Opposition about the so-called frills in education. He considered most money spent on schools a drain on the Provincial Treasury. He tried to hold down the amount for education. Because of this attitude school boards were forced to raise mill rates at a time when farm income was down, when employment was in decline. People were hard pressed during those years 1968 to 1971 to pay their taxes. When the Liberals blamed the tax increases on teachers' salaries, a great deal of bitterness and bad feeling was created between the teachers and the community. The prestige and the public confidence in our education system fell to an all time low.

Everyone agrees in this Legislature and in Saskatchewan that the property tax is a regressive tax. It is a poor way to pay for any large part of educational costs. As a general rule the New Democratic Party Government has attempted to limit the use of property taxes to services to property. As a result we have almost doubled the amount of money for school grants — \$77 million in 1971 to a total of \$145 million in 1975. Provincial grants will pay 58 per cent of basic school costs this year compared to 47 per cent in 1971. And over and above the doubling of grants, Mr. Speaker, our Government has also more than tripled the Property Improvement Grant. This year the grants will rebate the equivalent of 17 mills of school taxes to the ratepayers. So all told the share of school costs being paid or rebated out of the provincial revenue in 1975 will be 75 per cent. In short where the local taxpayer had to carry over half the burden for educational expenses four years ago today he

pays only one quarter. Mr. Speaker, I believe this large reduction in the proportion of school costs paid through the mill rate has done a great deal to ease the tensions and the stresses created between taxpayers and teachers by the Members opposite when they were the Government.

The New Democratic Government approach to teacher contract bargaining has also gone a long way to relieve the pressure on our school system. We have done away with area bargaining. We have brought to the bargaining table all the parties to the decisions and that, of course, includes the Government, which provides the large bulk of the money. We stopped the practice of hiding behind school boards and I think this has and will continue to contribute to much more effective negotiation procedure.

The Teacher Collective Bargaining Act today, Mr. Speaker, is accepted as a necessary and a useful structure for bargaining. I, today, challenge the Opposition. Particularly I challenge the Opposition education critic to stand up and say whether he and his party still prefer area bargaining. I think it is time for the Liberals and their spokesman to come clean on this particular issue. Here is a major political question they must face and take a stand on. If the education critic does not then I think it is up to some of his colleagues to perhaps set him straight. In 1973 I promised that our Government would consider amendments in the light of experience. Bill 58 represents three such amendments.

Under the Act as it stands, provincial contracts must cover a two year period. This provision was included because it allows for budgeting ahead, because after the controversy caused by area bargaining, teachers, trustees and indeed the public, needed a break from the annual pattern of conflicts. Since the 1974-75 agreement was signed the rate of inflation has taken its toll. However, the agreement provided the first cost of living escalator in any teacher contract so that the 11.8 per cent this year will match the consumer price index. The contract consists of a number of clauses which taken together form a total package settlement. In bargaining various proposals are put forward and the objective is to make tradeoffs, to give here and take there, until an acceptable composite agreement is reached. All I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is that in short, no single item like wages or pensions or hours can be considered in isolation. The contract can only be considered as a package.

Since 1973 the cost of living has increased certainly faster than anyone expected. Salary levels have been under pressure to keep pace. But on the other hand, Mr. Speaker, the pension package clauses, and I say clauses, in the current agreement make our teachers superannuation scheme by far the best in Canada. It is the envy of occupational groups right across the country, it is the envy of other occupational groups within the province.

Even though not one of these groups is able to bargain for its pension plans, the Government is receiving briefs from them asking for the same pension plan that the teachers have won.

What does the Government do when it is faced with several large groups each negotiating its own contract but all of them seeking the best clauses from the others' agreements. Cost of living clauses are becoming common in most contracts. In view

April 7, 1975.

of the inflation rate last year, they are certainly justifiable, if only at least to maintain balance within the contract packages. The government has therefore provided cost of living allowances for civil servants in a rough proportion to the escalator that was written into the teacher agreement one year ago.

While we have given very serious consideration to teacher requests for more salary, and civil service requests for better pensions we are taking the position that a contract should be honored and that whip-sawing between groups should be prevented except at the time of actual negotiations. This does not mean, Mr. Speaker, that civil servants can't have pension changes or teachers can't make up for inflation losses and settlements elsewhere. In fact the Minister of Finance has introduced legislation on some aspects of Government pensions. We are prepared to negotiate a higher salary settlement and a stronger cost of living factor in the upcoming teacher agreement.

Mr. Speaker, the Executive of the Saskatchewan Teachers Federation has asked that the mandatory two-year term be removed, that the length of the contract be negotiable to allow more flexibility in matching the cost of living. This request has to be considered in the context of other agreements. We have not opened the teacher contract to renegotiate wages because it already included a cost of living escalator agreed upon before signing. However, we have given other groups such as the civil servants a cost of living increase similar to what the teachers have negotiated. These groups do not have a fixed term agreement and I believe it makes sense to put teachers on the very same footing. This Bill, Bill 58 proposes to do that.

Bill 58 will also make sick leave negotiable in the provincial agreement. This is proposed to permit portability of credits, to give universality and allow integration of various plans into one over-all scheme. It follows the principle that significant dollar items should be bargained provincially. I understand a joint committee of Saskatchewan Teachers Federation and the School Trustees Association are studying this situation and I understand they have reached a consensus in favor of this new approach.

The third important change has come to us upon a recommendation of Education Relations Board, through their chairman, Mr. Barclay. This change will allow the chairman of the Education Relations Board to name a mediator in disputes where in his judgement mediation could be useful. There are times when both sides want help but are not in a position to ask for it because of their strategies at the bargaining table. In these situations the chairman will now be able to act to attempt to get negotiations moving by sending a mediator in on his own initiative.

Bill 58, Mr. Speaker, includes several other smaller changes such as placing a time limit on the time for conciliation reports to be submitted, making mediation expenses payable by the province so no one will be inhibited from seeking help because of costs.

I am very pleased, Mr. Speaker, to move second reading of Bill 58.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. C.P. MacDONALD: (Milestone) Mr. Speaker, first of all it is very nice to hear the Minister stand up and give us his campaign address. I wasn't sure if he was going to come to the Bill or not. When he talked about the tremendous improvement over relations between trustees and teachers, I wonder if he would bother asking the Regina teachers or the Canora teachers; would he look back over this year 1974-75 and the collective bargaining that has gone on and it is the worst year in the history of Saskatchewan teacher-trustee relations for work stoppages that has ever gone on in the Province of Saskatchewan.

I wonder if he has read, Mr. Speaker, the headline in the paper today: "More Changes Wanted in Teachers' Act by the Saskatchewan Teachers Federation President." I am going to tell the Minister that I am going to support this particular amendment. But I am going to tell you that he is evading the real issue of teacher-trustee relations and the issue of The Collective Bargaining Act in the Province of Saskatchewan. The real issue is Section 3, that is the difficulty in Canora, that is the difficulty in Regina, that is the difficulty in all the other areas of local negotiation in the Province of Saskatchewan and the Minister knows this. Until somewhere along the line trustees and teachers can evaluate the scope of the agreement in Section 8, there will be no peace between trustees and teachers in the Province of Saskatchewan, and the Minister knows it.

Getting back to the specific amendments, first of all if the Minister will recall three years ago I told him there were three areas of confrontation in The Teachers' Bargaining Act. One is restriction of negotiations to a two-year contract. I pointed out to the Minister that this was the only agreement that I knew of in the Province of Saskatchewan where a two-year agreement was mandatory. And it is important that teachers and trustees have the opportunity to negotiate this and I am glad to see that the Minister is finally coming to the conclusion that teachers and trustees should have an opportunity to negotiate the terms of an agreement, the length of the agreement particularly with inflation rising as it is. Sometimes if the teachers and trustees want a two-year agreement or a three-year agreement or one-year agreement that should certainly be up to them.

I want to direct the majority of my remarks to the second aspect, to the second amendment of this particular Bill and that is the removal of sick leave from local negotiation and transferring it to the provincial scene. I want to tell the Minister that I am not opposed to this, nor do I think really our trustees or teachers are opposed to this particular thing with some very serious reservations.

I would like to make recommendation to the Minister, that he immediately call teachers and trustees and Members of the Government together and establish a provincial sickness and accident insurance fund for teachers and trustees in the Province of Saskatchewan. The Minister is aware of the problems of portability. Let me enumerate a couple of them. The purpose of establishing a provincial sickness and accident insurance fund is to spread the liability for sickness benefits through all the school units in the Province of Saskatchewan and the Government of Saskatchewan at the provincial level. You

April 7, 1975.

and I know that in portability the first thing that could happen is a teacher who has 20 years experience would not be hired by a small school unit. The reason being that if he should become sick that school unit would have to pick up the totality of that particular accumulated sick leave. A small school unit like a consolidated school unit at Wolseley or Wilcox or you name it around the Province of Saskatchewan, if they had a car accident and two or three teachers were seriously injured, it could break that particular school unit. The minute you discuss portability and the transference of accumulated sick leave from one school unit to the other school unit, there is a real danger that the liability of one school unit would be picked up by another. Therefore the minute you move sick leave to a provincial basis it is important to establish an insurance fund where that liability is spread through all the school units of the province and that the Provincial Government make a very important contribution.

I know that trustees in the province will view the moving of sick leave from the local agreement to the provincial agreement with a certain amount of trepidation. They will be concerned about the fact that they may have to pick up the liability of senior teachers, other school units and other jurisdictions. I would suggest to the Minister that if trustees and school units from all over the province contributed to one central fund and the Province of Saskatchewan made a major share of that contribution, so that it was operated on an insurance basis, that in that way then I think it would be greeted and welcomed by school trustees and teachers alike.

I should also like to suggest that it is important to define sickness. When we start talking about sick leave, what are we talking about? The school term? Are we talking about the term between agreements? Are we talking about the school holiday period of July and August? Are we talking about the fact that a teacher as long as he is continually in the classroom should have adequate protection.

I think it is important now that the Government just not say we are going to transfer sick leave to the provincial basis, that they give the assurance to school units and trustees across the province that there is going to be adequate allowance for a definition of sickness and for the spreading of the liability.

Therefore, Mr. Minister, I urge you to consider immediately the establishment of a provincial sickness and accident insurance fund which would be contributory, by first of all the Provincial Government and all the school units in the province. Yes, any sickness and accident fund where it is going to cover universally all teachers in the Province of Saskatchewan it is important that all school units share that liability.

The second thing, Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about is the fact that I am concerned about the lack of consultation about these amendments. Two years ago we watched the Minister of Education come in and try to ram amendments to the Area Bargaining Agreement through this Legislature. You and I watched the reaction of trustees across the province. I am afraid that there hasn't been consultation in relation to the changes that have been introduced today.

I also want to talk about some of the minor changes in the Act. First of all I don't think that I have any objections to

the Educational Relations Board naming a mediator when it is not asked for by either parties. I think any opportunity to streamline or to eliminate problems at the bargaining table by means of mediation or conciliation should be pursued and I think in this particular case it will be welcomed by both parties. Also the housekeeping changes relating to the commencement of bargaining in notice given, I see no particular area of concern with that particular one either. I am going to repeat, Mr. Minister, these amendments evade the real issue of the problem of collective bargaining between teachers and trustees in the Province of Saskatchewan. If you are going to transfer sickness leave to a provincial basis for goodness sake set up a provincial sickness and accident insurance fund on a contributory basis.

Mr. Speaker, I have other things to say about this Bill, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 9:32 o'clock p.m.