

April 26, 1974

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

QUESTIONS

COMMUNICATIONS BETWEEN GOVERNMENT AND MR. LANDEGGER

MR. D.G. STEUART (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, in the absence of the Premier, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Industry (Mr. Thorson).

In view of the Press report that Carl F. Landegger was contacted by phone and stated that he was in fact in the middle of negotiations with the Government concerning an addition to the facilities at the Prince Albert Pulp Mill which ties in with the report that has been tabled in this House by the Member for Saskatoon University (Mr. Richards) and debated in the House, but up to this point denied by the Government, I wonder if the Minister could tell us now the truth: is in fact, the Government or any branch of the Government or any agency of the Government, negotiating with Prince Albert Pulp Mill, with PAPCO, with Mr. Landegger or any of Mr. Landegger's representatives?

HON. K. THORSON (Minister of Industry and Commerce): — Mr. Speaker, I think the Premier indicated the other day in an answer to a series of questions by the Member for Saskatoon University that to make any comment at all just invites further questions and by a process of negation you finally arrive at a conclusion which may or may not be supported by the fact. On that basis I prefer not to make any comment whatever.

I will say in a general way, I am sure there must have been communications between the principals of the Parsons and Whittemore Company, including Mr. Landegger, and various Government agencies over the past several months. Undoubtedly, there will be continuing communications between the two sides over the next several months.

MR. STEUART: — Not only will you not make the next election but you will never even make judge if you keep talking that way.

A supplementary question. To your knowledge is the Government negotiating with Mr. Landegger or the Prince Albert Pulp Company concerning an addition to the Prince Albert Pulp Mill, yes or no?

MR. THORSON: — I am not going to answer that because if I do, then the next question will be: what are the terms of the negotiation? If I decline to comment on that then they will say, are you offering it on this basis or that basis. As you say yes or

no to each question you finally, as I say, arrive at a position where they feel they can draw a conclusion, which may or may not be supported by the facts.

I say that on this whole question, the position of the Government will certainly be announced when it is firmly decided what to do or what not to do about this particular proposal that is being discussed by Members of the Opposition.

MR. STEUART: — If you are negotiating with the man, you said you wouldn't . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! The Member for Saskatoon.

WILL GOVERNMENT ACCOMMODATE HUMAN RIGHTS PETITION

MR. J.G. RICHARDS (Saskatoon University): — Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Attorney General. I presented a petition yesterday to the Legislature, it was received and read today. Would the Attorney General be in a position to state whether his Department is considering seriously whether they can accommodate the request of the petition, namely that human rights and other related legislation be amended to include discrimination on the basis of 'sexual orientation', as an offence?

HON. R. ROMANOW (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the Hon. Member for Saskatoon University that the answer is yes, we are looking at it and we have been looking at it for the last two or three months. This is a relatively new sort of concern which has been expressed. The concern is articulating itself now among groups that are coming out into the open and expressing their anxieties and I think it is about time that we looked at it seriously. I have done so for the last month or two by my Department officials with a view to seeing if appropriate amendments might be considered to the human rights legislation which exists in the Province of Saskatchewan at the present time. Unfortunately I am not in a position to tell the Member whether or not any policy decision has been made. Because simply it hasn't emerged out of my Department yet for any further discussion.

MR. RICHARDS: — I can appreciate that there has not been a final decision made, but I am grateful to have the indication of the Government that they are concerned with the problem and that they are prepared, I hope, to take action in the following session.

DELTA HOLDINGS FIASCO IN SASKATCHEWAN

MR. C.P. MacDONALD (Milestone): — I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Industry (Mr. Thorson). I have in my hands a telegram, I should like to read the telegram:

We were the electrical contractors for the Delta housing and apartments in La Ronge, Saskatchewan. The fact that we are owed \$24,000 and our small business operation is suffering financially, has

prompted us to contact your office. We received no satisfaction from our direct communications with Delta. Fred G. Naeb, Naeb Electric, Limited, Melfort.

Mr. Naeb has indicated that he has been attempting to phone the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan. He has refused to even answer the telephone. Could the Minister of Industry tell me if the Government of Saskatchewan has done an investigation in relation to the number of small businessmen who will suffer financially because of the Delta Holdings fiasco in La Ronge, Saskatchewan?

MR. THORSON: — The answer is no, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MacDONALD: — I should like to ask a supplementary question.

Seeing that the plight of the small businessmen who are involved in Delta Holdings is a direct result of the political patronage of the NDP Government to Delta, I should like to know does this particular individual qualify for the Kim Thorson election fund for the disruptive services? Does this businessman and the other small businessmen that have suffered in Delta Holdings, as a result of that political patronage in that fiasco, will this man qualify for your slush fund, the Kim Thorson election fund?

MR. THORSON: — Mr. Speaker, unfortunately the Member for Milestone wasn't here during the course of consideration of the Estimates of the Department of Industry and Commerce when I pointed out to the House that according to the latest information from Dunn and Bradstreet, while under the Liberal Government the last year they were in office, something like a hundred business failures occurred in the course of a year in Saskatchewan. In 1973 there were only 27 business failures in Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. THORSON: — I think the Member for Milestone has again embarked on a course of a little cheap politics. There is nobody failing in their business because of a situation in Prince Albert or anywhere else. I am sure that there will be all kinds of work for all kinds of people. I am not aware of anybody losing money as a result of any particular problems of any particular company.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! I think that this question was based on a telegram which was out of order and we are getting into a debate and that is also out of order.

HAS DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS REDUCED LOAD LIMITS

MR. J.G. LANE (Lumsden): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Highways. Has the Department of Highways effectively reduced the load limit of farm trucks and put load limit restrictions and has the Department refused to issue permits to increase the load limits to farm vehicles?

HON. E. KRAMER (Minister of Highways): — Not to my knowledge.

MR. LANE: — I am advised by the Department, as of this morning, that no permits have been issued to farmers for the hauling of wheat and that load limits in effect have been reduced. This is contrary to what the Minister advised the House the other day that farmers would not be restricted from hauling wheat. In fact, they are. It is a very sorry situation that the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! We can't have debates on questions.

ANNOUNCEMENT

LONG LAKE UNIT BAND PRODUCES RECORD

MR. D.L. FARIS (Arm River): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I should like to draw to the attention of the House something that will be of interest to all those who attended the Premier's Ball at the Legislative opening this year. The Members will recall that the music was provided by the Long Lake Unit Band. This band has now produced a record called, "Sounds from Long Lake." I am sure that all the Members would like to congratulate the director, the unit board and the 72 members of that band. Copies of this record will be available from that unit board office in Watrous.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ADJOURNED DEBATES

RESOLUTIONS

RESOLUTION NO. 13 - NATIONALIZATION OF PROVINCIAL OIL AND GAS INDUSTRY

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution by Mr. J.G. Richards (Saskatoon University):

That this Assembly urgently calls upon the Saskatchewan Government to consider nationalization of the provincial oil and gas industry.

MR. A.R. GUY (Athabasca): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few words on this Resolution since the Minister of Mineral Resources is not here this morning. He finally got around, as the only Member of the Government, to speak on this oil nationalization Bill. But it is unique that while he was speaking he never got to the real intent of the Resolution that had been moved by the Member for Saskatoon University. In fact, he spent more time talking about why Members of the Government side of the House should not second motions of the Member for Saskatoon University which was not relative. The fact is in this particular case one of the NDP Members did second this motion. It is not surprising because it is part of the NDP platform to nationalize the oil industry.

The Member spent a great deal of time talking about the National Energy Board. A great deal of time talking about

provincial policy and Bill 42 but he never got around to talking about the content matter of the Resolution which is calling upon the Government to nationalize the oil industry.

I am going to make a few remarks this morning of course to show that really the intent of the Government is not required to be made known at this time because they have already made it known. They have taken several steps which for all intents and purposes has already nationalized the oil industry in the Province of Saskatchewan.

The Government refuses to speak on this Resolution, not because they oppose it, Mr. Speaker, but because they support it, but they are afraid to support it publicly.

This is not a Waffle resolution as Members opposite would like to have the people of Saskatchewan believe. This is policy of the NDP, passed at a Party convention. And it was seconded by the NDP, we don't want to forget that. One of the Members of the Government seconded the motion to nationalize the oil industry in Saskatchewan. So I don't know why they hesitate to stand up and speak on the Resolution, and in favor of it. They know very well that it is their intention to nationalize the oil industry. It has been passed at all NDP conventions. It has always been a part of the Regina Manifesto, the Winnipeg Declaration and the New Deal for People. They have advertised the length and breadth of this province that they intend to nationalize all the natural resources and they are going to control the means of production and distribution of all the natural resources. Why are they so hesitant today to stand up in support of this Resolution moved by the Member for Saskatoon University? I suggest that they haven't got the courage that Mr. Richards has to acknowledge that they intend or that they believe in the nationalization of the oil industry. Instead they go about doing it by bits and pieces in the hope that the general public will not know that this is really what they are up to.

The Saskatchewan oil legislation was the first step in the nationalization of the oil industry; control of the industry from the oil field to the gas pump. And of course this organization is not doing very well. We have had the Minister admit that they are having difficulty getting personnel and I suspect that when we meet here again in the next session he will have a very sorry tale to tell about the work of Saskoil during the summer of 1974.

Bill 42 - The Oil and Gas Conservation Act, etc., was the second step towards the nationalization of the oil industry. They expropriated the oil rights of individuals and companies throughout the southern part of this province.

These two pieces of legislation, I suggest provide the legislative authority to nationalize and destroy the oil industry and the Government is in the process of methodically doing it.

Control and expropriation are the two ingredients necessary for nationalization of any industry.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the same plan is going to be followed for the potash, the mining and the forest industry. The potash industry will inevitably be next because they are starting to get back in a profit-showing picture again.

Let there be no doubt in any one's mind that if the NDP win the next election, they will start dismantling the potash industry in the same way that they have dismantled the oil industry. Then it will be the forest industry and then it will be the hard rock mining industry. There will be nothing sacred in the resource field as long as the NDP Government sit on the Treasury benches.

The NDP philosophy is to carry this out and they are doing a very good job of it. Let no one be fooled that this is not their intention.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that Members opposite should stand up and be counted on this Resolution because it is their intention to nationalize the oil industry and I wish they would have the courage to stand up and tell the public of Saskatchewan exactly what they are about.

HON. K. THORSON (Minister of Industry and Commerce): — Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether the Member who just took his seat is so uninformed or whether he made a slip of the tongue, or whether he intended to misinform people about what happened under The Oil and Gas Stabilization Bill that was passed in this Session as Bill 42. He just said, and I noted it carefully, that under that legislation the Government had expropriated the oil rights of individuals and companies. He cannot name a single individual whose oil rights were expropriated under that legislation. That is an absolutely untrue statement. He made it either, as I say, either because he is uninformed or because he wished to misinform other people.

There was not a single individual who lost any oil rights whatever under that legislation. I think the Member, if he is speaking for the Liberal Party, should make it clear to the public that he didn't intend to misinform anyone about the legislation. Not a single individual anywhere in Saskatchewan, let alone in the southeast, lost his oil rights under that legislation. There was not a single individual who lost any oil rights under that legislation. And for the Member for Athabasca to say so indicates that either he is ignorant and uninformed or that he intends to misinform people he hopes are as ignorant as he is.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. THORSON: — The truth is, Mr. Speaker, that under that legislation the title to the producing oil zones of some 25 companies was taken into public ownership but the right to collect the royalties from the production in those producing zones remained with each company. They had exactly the same rights and the same benefits to the oil production after the legislation as they had before the legislation.

For the Liberal Party to suggest that it is otherwise, means that they must make false statements in order to gain some political credit. That is rather typical. That is the only way in fact they can attempt to gain political credit in this whole area of oil legislation, to make false statements of the type that the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) just made in this Legislature this morning. Mr. Speaker, I have more to say on that and I, therefore, beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

MOTIONS FOR RETURN

RETURN NO. 180

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. D.W. Michayluk (Redberry) for Return No. 180 showing:

(1) Whether the following are employed by the Government of Saskatchewan: Don McMillan, Iona Hartwell, Erna M. Stirner, E.A. Anka, L.D. Oszcewski, Valerie Rose, Jerry F. Bigham, K.E. Mackie, R.C. McMahon, Ian Potter, Sylvia Baker, Irene Banks, E.J. Reed, David G. Abbey, B.A. Hindel, Kenneth Pontikes, R. Meldrum, W.H. Horner, V. Cicholls, G.J. Darychuk and A. Svetkov. (2) if so, (a) those employed in the Premier's Office; (b) if not employed in the Premier's Office, the capacity in which they are employed by the Government of Saskatchewan.

MR. K.R. MacLEOD (Regina Albert Park): — Mr. Speaker, I just have a word or two on this Motion. It is obvious from the remarks made by the Hon. Member who moved the Motion that he was not, in fact, asking for the information that appears on the Order Paper at all, but he made it rather clear and did so rather well, that he wanted some entirely different information and was putting this on the Order Paper for a purpose entirely different than what appeared. I would accuse him of a lack of sincerity on it except that he was so frank and so full in his remarks that it is quite obvious that he had no intention of looking for the information that actually is apparently being sought by the question.

In response to the Member's obvious suggestion that the Liberal Party is using funds for its own purposes, I would suggest to him that the amount of postage that we are using is, quite frankly, a drop in the bucket when compared to the money which is being used by the Government for its own political purposes and for its own private party political purposes, each and every year in this province.

We have already referred to the exclusive media centre. The job of the media centre is quite frankly to supply media outlets in the NDP constituencies with Press releases, voice clips and so on, during the course of a session. But it is a supply service for the New Democratic Party only, paid for by public funds.

There is a suggestion by Mr. Kinzel that, of course, the radio stations don't have to use this material. Well, of course, they don't have to use this but they are getting some pretty good mileage out of it because the Government is sending out thousands of these pieces of information and, of course, some of them are going to be used and to the extent that they are being used the party in power is getting political advantage out of it, at the expense of the people.

The comment of Mr. Kinzel is very enlightening. He said that he would sooner have the radio stations and news media provide this service for themselves, rather than have the Government or the caucus involved in trying to get information out. I am not sure if that implies any criticism of the news media

but it is interesting to note that the man who made the statement clearly confuses the Government caucus with government. And he says, 'the Government or the caucus involved.' There is no confusion in his mind when it comes to the use of money, no question at all that the money that is being spent for the media centre is the money of the people of Saskatchewan. There is equally no question about it, there is no confusion in his mind, that benefit being derived is a direct narrow political benefit being derived by the party in power.

That remark, I think, is supported by another quote by Mr. Kinzel. He says:

The total control over what information is put out rests entirely with the politicians.

It is a totally political service supplied by the people of Saskatchewan, without their consent, for the purposes of the New Democratic Party. I suggest that this is a misuse of public funds and I suggest, also, that the New Democratic Party should be charged with an election expense . . .

HON. J.E. BROCKELBANK (Minister of Government Services): — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Privilege. The Member was quoting from some document. I wonder if he could just specify what it is.

MR. MacLEOD: — I would be quite pleased, not only to do that, but I am prepared to send a copy of this over to the Hon. Minister when I take my seat. So I ask the Page to make a copy of this and I shall be pleased to supply a copy to the Minister.

MR. SPEAKER: — Would the Member answer as to what he was quoting from?

MR. MacLEOD: — I was quoting from a newspaper article, quoting Mr. Kinzel.

MR. BROCKELBANK: — Mr. Speaker, I think it is highly irregular that the Member says that he will table it and then instead of tabling it he hands it to the Page. I asked the Member to cite from what document he was quoting from and I should like to know that.

MR. SPEAKER: — A copy of that is tabled. He has promised to table a copy.

MR. MacLEOD: — I don't recall that I promised to table one, but I certainly will in any event. I will be quite pleased to do so, Mr. Speaker.

The only comment that I make is that the amount of money being spent daily by the Government for its own political purposes must be astronomical. I doubt that we will ever measure the amount; I doubt the Government will ever permit us to measure the amount. It is certainly going into phenomenal figures.

I suggest that when this thing is fully ironed out that the Government should be charged with, the New Democratic Party, should be charged with the amount of money spent by the news media centre as part of its election expenses in the next election and deducted from the amount it is allowed to spend.

Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, the time has come for us to start charging them with the moneys which are being spent. I think we should start that now and, of course, as to the Motion obviously I neither support or oppose it, because the information which can be easily made available to the Member and, quite frankly, he doesn't want that information.

HON. A.E. BLAKENEY (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the Member for Albert Park concedes the fact that information which is sought can be readily made available. I suspect that it is already available to Members opposite, and I regret that they did not see fit to include the correct information in the literature which they were distributing across the province.

I think they well know that, of all those people who are listed and said in the literature circulated by the Liberal Party to be working in the Premier's office, several were not working in the Premier's office at the time that the leaflet was sent out. In point of fact, for the most part, except for one or two exceptions many of those listed have never worked in the Premier's office. These people are well known to the Members opposite.

Mr. Harold Horner, it is well known, has never darkened the door of the Premier's office from the point of view of working in it; he is performing functions for the Department of Agriculture with respect to rail line abandonment.

MR. MacDONALD (Milestone): — Isn't that directly related to you?

MR. BLAKENEY: — No, it is not. He reports to the Minister of Agriculture. This is true of Mr. Darychuk, who when he was hired was on the staff of the Executive Council briefly until he was transferred to the Department of Municipal Affairs. For a couple of years Members opposite have been receiving on their desk material signed by Mr. Darychuk coming from the Department of Municipal Affairs, dealing with the Winter Works Programs. As they know well, he was not in the Premier's office and they have known that for this entire period. This has not stopped them in any way from circulating the story that he was in the Premier's office.

With respect to Mr. Svetkov, once again, when he was hired he was briefly put into the Executive Council until he moved to his various jobs which he has held, including the Research Officer for the Small Business Committee. His duties there were well known to Members opposite. They well knew that he wasn't in the Premier's office, and yet they circulated the leaflet saying that he was in the Premier's office. They know now and they knew at the time that the leaflet was being circulated that he was an employee of the Department of Industry and Commerce. Mr. Svetkov was at all material times, when he was supposed to have been working in the Premier's office, according to the

leaflet, employed by the Department of Industry and Commerce.

I could just keep going down this list. There is Mr. R. Meldrum; they well know Mr. Meldrum. True, he was said to be a constitutional advisor to the Premier up until about six months ago. He has since that time been reporting to the Attorney General and . . .

MR. MacDONALD: — Not according to the Estimate book. March 31st.

MR. BLAKENEY: — The Estimate book makes clear that on April 1st he is not intended to be reporting to the Premier and, in fact, if you wish to check your facts you would find that during the course of the year he was transferred to the responsibility of the Attorney General. But in any case, he is performing the sort of services which he used to perform before, under the Thatcher Government. The fact that he may be listed under Executive Council, instead of under Attorney General, in no way means that the Premier's office has any more services. It is a straight distortion of fact to suggest that Mr. Roy Meldrum is doing anything different by way of legal services for me than he did for Mr. Thatcher. The fact that he may be paid by one agency or another in no way, no way, supports the proposition that my office has more services than Mr. Thatcher's office. They well know that, and yet they continue to circulate those particular stories.

I could go down this list but I simply won't bore this House anymore. I will mention Mr. Don McMillan, who was alleged to be working in my office in March, and has been at Dalhousie University since September in steady attendance there. As far as I know he has not been back in Saskatchewan since September, although he may have been back at Christmas for all I know. He clearly was not working in the Premier's office in March as the Liberals asserted in their leaflet. As I say, I won't bore the House with further details at this time, since I will want to look at further material which they are continuing to circulate — in constituencies which they don't represent, by the way. This is true not only in the case of this leaflet. The member for Albert Park is busy distributing materials into Mr. Grant's, the Member for the Whitmore constituency, on the ground that the Member for Whitmore is unable to keep in touch with his constituents. I would have thought that unfortunate, but it may be true.

At any rate, that is what is happening. I will want to have an opportunity to see some additional material, some more of the lurid prose, and accordingly I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

MR. MacLEOD: — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Hon. Premier would answer one question?

It relates back to your remarks to who was where in the Government and we do have some difficulty, Mr. Premier and I wonder if you can give me some explanation or answer to a question which I asked some time ago. It is about Mr. Barrett Halderman. I believe that it was about April 8th when the answer came down. The question was: does Mr. Barrett Halderman work for the Government? The answer was: no, he works for the Government Finance Office. Is that an error? I just don't

understand the answer.

MR. BLAKENEY: — This deals with the question of whether the word 'government' includes Crown corporations, agencies, etc. If you ask whether someone works for the Government, whether an employee of the Power Corporation works for the Government, we say, no, he works for the Power Corporation. That is an attempt to say that, no, he is not a member of the Public Service, but he works for a Crown corporation and then the Crown corporation is named.

The Government Finance Office is a Crown corporation established pursuant to The Crown Corporation's Act, being about Chapter 38 of the revised statutes of Saskatchewan 1965, and Mr. Barrett Halderman is an employee of that Crown corporation. We simply wanted to say, as clearly as we could, for the Member, that Mr. Halderman was not an employee of the Government, meaning the Public Service per se, but that he was an employee of that Crown corporation known as the Government Finance office. We don't want to play games with the Member, but we wanted to give him as much information as we could.

Debate adjourned.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

PROGRESS REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON HIGHWAY TRAFFIC AND SAFETY

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. A. Thibault (Kinistino) that: **The Progress Report of the Special Committee on Highway Traffic and Safety** be now concurred in.

HON. R. ROMANOW (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to rise for just a few minutes to take part in this debate. I would simply say that my Department and myself, I suppose, as one of the Ministers involved in the matter of highway safety, are watching very carefully the interim recommendations and we are eagerly awaiting the final recommendations of the Special Committee on Traffic Safety.

May I say, and I don't mean this in any sort of patronizing sense, that this has been one of the most productive Committees that I have witnessed in the past several years in this Legislature. The Members are working in a non-partisan manner which benefits the subject matter that they are studying.

There is a great problem with respect to traffic safety and the considerations of traffic safety by legislators. Quite frankly speaking, one of the difficulties to my way of thinking, is that a lot of research has already been done into many of the issues that we study from time to time. Take, for example, the matter of compulsory seat belts. This is something which has been studied by the experts on traffic safety and the legislators in various jurisdictions to a great extent.

So, too, many advances have been made on the problem of safety of vehicles and on the design of highways. These are all topics in one form or another which get very carefully reviewed. Accordingly, the task of the Committee in studying this problem becomes all the more difficult. The task becomes difficult in

avoiding the situation that there is nothing more than a mere duplication of existing completed research effort.

I agree with very many of the interim suggestions, I shall call them, but the Interim Report tabled by the Special Committee. One of the difficulties that I see in the Interim Report that I should like the Committee to deal with is the mechanism for the delivery of the various issues that have been raised and will be raised finally by the Committee. There is a need to develop a body to co-ordinate road safety work. The key is the exact nature and form and structure of such a body.

The Committee will have to devise a program and recommendations for us which will ensure the involvement of all the governments and all the agencies, with effective guidelines and directives, for that co-ordinating body. In short, what I am saying is that it is not simply good enough for any of us to recommend a co-ordinating body, to which we agree, without a specific recommendation as to the mechanism and the means of that co-ordinating body in order to achieve these objectives.

Take for example, the interim suggestion with respect to training and licensing of drivers. Here, too, I found the ideas to be exceptionally worthy, but in my opinion, the form of consideration now required must be much more detailed. I would hope that this would be the case in the Final Report. There must be much more detail and of a much more technical nature. For example, we must be able to assess what would periodic driver retesting cost? What will be the cost? What would be the results that we could hope to achieve? We need this type of detailed consideration, rather than a consideration of the general concept, for this has been studied over and over.

If I may make a passing reference to the matter of suspended drivers. I might add that I am not yet clear in my own mind what my own position is vis-a-vis the Committee Report. I think we have to carefully assess the degree that we feel the public wants to crack-down on the problem of the drinking driver. I believe the degree of public discontent must be specifically, or as specifically as it will allow, delineated by the Committee. How much will the public accept, for example, a crack-down on suspended drivers. This is what I should like to see the Committee make a recommendation on. And again I repeat, with details. How is the suspension mechanism to be applied? Should there be some form of clemency? What is the mechanism for clemency? What will be the public response to this area?

I want to make one other comment with respect to the court system. I think this has been one of the most radical and interesting aspects of the Committee's interim suggestions. I am sure that any one of us who has had anything to do with the court system, and in particular the traffic court system, will know that it tends to be a bit of a supermarket, as has been described by my colleague, the Chairman, the Member for Melfort-Kinistino. I can also tell the Members of the Committee that there may be resistance from the legal profession and from the judiciary to change from the traditional methods of dispensing of justice. I guess we are biased. We think that it has been a pretty good system and therefore should be retained.

Now the effectiveness of this new idea with respect to the traffic court, the concepts that we have talked about, the

effectiveness of the new idea really depends on detailed answers to detailed questions about the court system. On the surface the ideas are attractive but I say to the Members of this House that they are attractive only on the surface. They require detailed analysis as to feasibility. How will this court system work into the general system? What are the rights of appeal? What are the costs? What kind of men should constitute the judges. Should they be trained lawyers or lay people who have expertise in this area? What kind of follow-up mechanism is needed? What kind of a bureaucratic structure will we have to implement? The detail of this is important. And again I would urge the Committee in its continued deliberations to consider these detailed questions to make sure that the attractiveness of the idea on the surface can in fact be brought to fruition.

Mr. Speaker, quite obviously my role this morning has been, if anything, to throw even more difficulties and obstacles into the way of this very difficult question. I just simply want to conclude by saying that the activities of the Committee, if they are going to be meaningful to all of us must grapple with the details as I have outlined on these and the many other issues which are reported on in the interim report. I want to tell you that as far as I am concerned this Government is committed, and I don't mean this as a simple political statement, committed to the implementation of new laws and new programs, anything which will reduce the slaughter and the injuries on the highways. This report will not be tabled for in order for the report to be meaningful it must be specific. I can assure you that when this report gets completed with the details, with the analysis, as I am urging the Committee to so do, this Government will act as quickly as is possible to gear up for the implementation of the recommendations of the Committee.

I want to express my thanks to the Member for Melfort-Kinistino (Mr. Thibault) who has I think done an excellent job as Chairman of the Committee, who carries on this particularly difficult job with diplomacy and yet with determination. And to the Members of the Opposition and all Members for really making this one of the excellent committees of this Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, I await with eagerness the final report of this special Highway Traffic Committee and I support the motion that is before us.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. A. THIBAUT (Melfort-Kinistino): — Mr. Speaker, I must say that I am very pleased that every Member of the Committee has spoken to this motion and I am more than pleased when I certainly feel that this work will not be in vain and that something will be done about it. I think we've got to look at the question of traffic safety just like the flood at Lumsden, every effort has to be put into it. We must look at every angle and we must look at the courts, whether the courts are doing the job. I know when you teach defensive driving you are taught to do everything possible to avoid an accident. I think most of our accidents are on account of attitude and I think that we must look very seriously at our courts because they are a part of the mechanism that creates the attitude in the person who appears in court.

I have witnessed the court room of Cook County in the state of Illinois, which left the people that were charged in the mood that they applauded the officer when they left the courtroom. We know that if we applauded our judges here in the courtroom that we would wind up in the crowbar hotel. I think we must have a serious look at that. I know that when you try to change things it can become very difficult but I think we must take a serious look at it.

I am looking forward to the work this summer in completing the report. The interim report was merely to indicate the direction that the Committee was going so that the people who read this report will come forward and tell us how they feel. And that goes for all the Members of the Legislature, I hope you will come before the Committee and tell us what your ideas are and how you feel about it. We will welcome the judges before us to discuss the matters of the court. I think that we should study any pilot project that we know of that is carried on in the world, especially the United States, which has several of them at the present time. We should make a study of them and benefit from the experiences that they have had.

I was reading last night an article in the paper about how tough Finland was, with the result that they are unable to cope with the drunken driver even with very stiff jail penalties.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we have to start at the cradle. We have to start in the homes and in our churches, our schools, because the rubber wheel came into our society when we were not ready for it and it got ahead of us. I think we have to learn in our education system how to use the animal, the automobile. I am sure that in that area we will find the results. If we can build a good attitude in our people and that is a job for the school, the courts and you name it and this is the area we are working towards and we want to know how to do it, so we want all the people to take part in it so that we can come up with the kind of program that the Attorney General is very worried about. Will society accept it? I am sure that the Committee is going to come up with the kind of program that we feel society will accept.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say it has been a pleasure to work with the members of the Committee and that includes the Members of the Opposition who devoted themselves real well. Therefore, I close the debate on that tone. Let's all go out and do what we can. Let us know our roads, let us know our cars and let us know ourselves and I think that is where the key of the whole thing lies.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

RESOLUTION NO. 26 — GUARANTEED MONTHLY INCOME FOR SENIOR CITIZENS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. J.G. Richards (Saskatoon University):

That this Assembly calls for immediate government consideration of guaranteeing minimum monthly income

levels for senior citizens of \$350 per individual and \$500 per couple, as recommended in the Report by the Senior Citizens Commission.

HON. A. TAYLOR (Minister of Social Services): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to say first of all that I have been both surprised and shocked at the way in which the Opposition has been playing petty party politics with the lives and feelings of the senior citizens of this province.

These are the people, Mr. Speaker, who have been our pioneers, and who have built this province and given to most of us what we have. It seems to me rather shocking that any Members of the House would attempt to use them for their own political end. Let us look, Mr. Speaker, at the Liberal record for senior citizens, without going into the details of dollars and cents.

The Federal Government just previous to the last election was resisting any changes, the Federal Liberal Government was resisting any changes or increases in old age security for Canadians. Of course, following the election when the New Democratic Party Members of the House of Commons notified the Liberals that this would have to be or they would lose total support, then the pensions were increased. This was at the insistence of the New Democratic Party. In our provincial scene we had last year the Members of the Opposition voting against a resolution calling for increased pensions for senior citizens, \$225 a month for single people, \$375 a month for married couples.

Then an item that is even more interesting, Mr. Speaker, in 1963-64, a Commission had been established under, I believe, Dr. Heald from Moose Jaw, to investigate the needs of senior citizens in Saskatchewan. That Commission is referred to in the Senior Citizens' Commission Report which was very carefully read from by a couple of Members of the House, extensively read from, the Aged and Long-Term Illness Committee of 1963. It says, 'little came of that report with the exception of dust'. Mr. Speaker, a start was made on that report because one of its recommendations was the establishment of a division within the Department of Social Services to be concerned with the aged. An Order-in-Council was passed by the CCF Government of the day establishing such a division for the care of the elderly. Unfortunately, for the people of Saskatchewan, shortly following that time a mistake must have been made at the polls and the wrong government was elected.

Shortly after the election when the Liberal Government came to power one of their first acts was to abolish the division for senior citizens within the Department of Social Services. This indicates, Mr. Speaker, some of the real concerns of the Members opposite. They abolished the division and they created one position in the office of the Provincial Co-ordinator of Rehabilitation, a long way from the recommended division that had come back from that original committee on Aging and Long-term Illness.

The Members opposite have made something of nursing homes and means tests that must be applied to senior citizens for assistance. Let me point out that under the Liberal Government a couple has to use up all of their savings before the one who

was in the nursing home could get any assistance. Under our Government those receiving the Guaranteed Income Supplement find their assets divided when one enters the nursing home, so that the savings do not have to be totally used up for that person's care. I am not suggesting that this is going far enough. I think this has to be reviewed, but it's a long step from the position in which the Liberals had placed them.

And then we see further how they placed with our senior citizens in a new article from both the News Optimist and the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix. This is on April 29, 1966, a promise by the now Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) and the then Minister of Health, that a drug plan would be coming out. Amazing, Mr. Speaker, 1966, not long before an election. He goes on to say:

Some of the most serious health costs have been taken care of by medicare but there are tremendous drug costs for some unfortunate families and this plan will be designed to help these people.

Well, the Leader of the Opposition may have thought the plan would save these people but the problem was they never developed the plan. And the people, of course, who make the greatest use of drugs, of medicine, are our senior citizens and rightly so. But again, it was an election gimmick intended to gain votes.

Members have previously indicated the difference in financing, the difference in money available between the previous Liberal administration and ourselves. The imposition of Liberal administration of medical care and deterrent fees which hit harder the senior citizens of this province, the people who need the most medical care; and the argument being used was that people were calling on their doctors unnecessarily and that this had to be stopped. They weren't calling unnecessarily, sometimes it is true what they needed was reassurance but that was just as severe a need as any medicine that could have been handed out.

It is unfortunate that people still use senior citizens for political purposes. During their time in office, Mr. Speaker, a motion was also put regarding senior citizens in 1966 and increasing the allowances for senior citizens, and the amendment that was placed on the Order Paper by the present Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) was to the effect that the income of senior citizens was the responsibility of the Federal Government and not of the province. The Member for Milestone, at that point, recognized it as a Federal responsibility. Suddenly he appears to have changed his tune.

I don't think, Mr. Speaker, that the Members opposite really believe in the motion that is before the House. I think quite possibly that they have been hoodwinked by the Member for Saskatoon University (Mr. Richards). In a very clever manner they have been fooled, because, Mr. Speaker, I should like you to look at what it says in this Senior Citizens' Commission Report. And we know that the Liberal Opposition does not support that.

It calls for the establishment of incomes of \$350 per month for individuals and \$250 per month for each, meaning \$500 for the couple. But on the same page it says, "We urge the province

to continue its efforts federally towards the establishment of a guaranteed annual income program for all people."

And that is what it is all about. The Motion on the Blues says: "As recommended in the report by the Senior Citizens' Commission." Well, I am going to be very interested in seeing the Members of the Liberal Opposition supporting, as it is in the Senior Citizens' Commission, the concept of a guaranteed annual income of \$500 for every couple in Canada, because that is what the report is all about. I don't really think they recognized this when they spoke in favor of it, because they have often enough spoken against the concept of a guaranteed annual income.

One Member of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, last year in the debates, made it very clear that he was not going to support increases in the old age security and said, rather bluntly, that he hoped that there would be no further increases for senior citizens or for anyone unless it was on the basis of a means test.

I am not really surprised, in a sense, that the Liberals would support this kind of motion because they see it as getting their federal friends off the hook. They see a pending federal election and they are afraid that, once again, their federal cohorts, the Liberal Party in Ottawa, is going to be faced with the question of raising senior citizens' pensions. And if they can somehow substitute the Provincial Government then they believe that they can save some of these friends.

But historically, Mr. Speaker, the province has been responsible for the provision of services and that is the way that I think it ought to be. I am not suggesting that we are doing nearly enough in this field of provision of services. We have increased our budget for community services and I think we have to do a lot more. But this has been the role of the provincial governments. The Federal Government has been responsible for the direct payments to senior citizens. Indeed, Members may remember that it is not very many years ago that on their income tax form there was a section which said four per cent for old age security. They taxed the people to pay for this old age security and now they are trying to suggest that the Provincial Government should be paying it.

I am told that there was also a four per cent federal sales tax assigned and 5 per cent of corporation tax. Now these are no longer listed on the forms, but the money is still being collected. I want to suggest that this being the case, it is very clearly a federal responsibility to look after the senior citizens of this country so that there is equality from coast to coast.

Now I want to say just very briefly, and say very clearly, that Ottawa will not cost-share an increase such as the motion recommends for senior citizens. They will cost-share only on a means test basis, which means in effect that all assistance allowances would have to be increased to that level and a means test applied. So that whether the person was 20 years of age or 70 years of age the income would have to be the same.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to reiterate that I think the Member for Saskatoon University (Mr. Richards) has effectively

used the Liberal Opposition for his own purposes and ends. They have been trapped by someone a little quicker witted and more intelligent than themselves. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if they really recognize yet what the motion says.

"As recommended by the Senior Citizens' Commission, a guaranteed annual income for all Canadians as a federal responsibility." Because that in effect is what the motion says.

Mr. Speaker, to make that abundantly clear I should like to move an amendment to the Motion. The Members opposite seem to have difficulty in comprehension when they read. It starts on page 15.

We believe a majority of Saskatchewan people over 65 years of age are living in a condition of poverty. This situation is not unique to older people. Poverty cuts across every age. Many people are remarkably sensitive to the real facts of poverty in Saskatchewan, in Canada, or in any nation.

We urge the province to continue its efforts federally towards the establishment of a guaranteed annual income program for all people.

We believe that \$350 for individuals and \$250 for each person of a couple are the minimum acceptable monthly levels of guarantee for the aged in Canada.

It is abundantly clear from reading the report that they are pressing for this as a guaranteed annual income for all Canadians. And to make this abundantly clear, Mr. Speaker, I am moving an amendment, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Brockelbank, that Resolution No. 26 be amended:

By striking all words following the word "calls" in the first line thereof and substituting the following: On the Federal Government to give consideration of guaranteeing minimum monthly income levels for senior citizens of \$350 per individual and \$500 per couple, as recommended in the Report of the Senior Citizens' Commission.

SOME HON. MEMBERS Hear, hear!

MR. J.G. LANE (Lumsden): — Mr. Speaker, a few comments on the amendment and the Resolution., it is rather despicable on the part of the Government opposite to attempt to blame Ottawa again for its failure to act with regard to senior citizens in the Province of Saskatchewan.

We have untold wealth as a result of the international oil policy, in the moneys and the resources that have now come into the hands of the Province of Saskatchewan and I think it is shameful that the Province of Saskatchewan put such a low priority on senior citizens that all it has done to date is to have a Senior Citizens' Commission, the resulting report, and has done nothing to act on it.

There is probably no higher priority for the use of oil revenues in the Province of Saskatchewan than using these

revenues for the senior citizens of this great province.

Now, why the Government opposite would say with all our resources and all our great income and all our windfall profits, that we don't intend to spend a cent on the senior citizens, is beyond the comprehension of the people of Saskatchewan and is certainly beyond the comprehension of the senior citizens of Saskatchewan, who feel, and feel rightly, that they should share in the windfall profits, the resources of this province.

And yet the Government opposite, by this amendment, is making it quite clear that they do not intend to spend any of the windfall profits, the natural resource profits, on the senior citizens of this province. Again, they want to blame Ottawa for their failure to act. It is a shameful act on the part of the province. It is a very, very sorry sight when this Government, this supposedly New Deal for People, leaves out senior citizens when they talk about people and the people to be helped.

If there is a high priority, if there is one group of people who deserve a direct share of the windfall profits from natural resources, it is the senior citizens of this province, and you may go down in history as the only party that refuses to spend a cent of the windfall profits on the senior citizens. There is no doubt that with the windfall profits you have you could, right now, give a guaranteed income of the figure set out in that Commission to the senior citizens of Saskatchewan and give them their just reward and their just share of the profits, the windfall profits.

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

STATEMENT

COMPENSATION FOR FLOOD VICTIMS

HON. D.W. CODY (Minister of Co-operation): — Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a statement regarding the plans of the Government relating to the assessment of flood damage and the compensation of people who have been evacuated from their homes and stores, or who have suffered loss or damage because of the widespread floods in Saskatchewan.

I have been designated as Minister responsible for assessment of flood damage and compensation.

I want to make some announcements which will give all people affected by the flood, some idea of what compensation they can expect, how soon they can expect it and the procedures to be followed.

A task force consisting of senior officials from every Government Department involved in any aspect of flood compensation and relief has been meeting under my chairmanship for a number of days. We expect to be able to announce next week the details in the way that flood damage will be assessed and claims will be processed.

I might add that as part of this procedure we hope to be able to organize a system of partial advanced payments for individuals or small businesses, so that essential repairs and replacements can go ahead as soon as possible, without having to wait for a final settlement to be reached.

In the meantime the Government has decided to provide, on an interim basis, emergency cash payments to individuals or families, who have been forced to leave their homes because of the floods. These flood victim dislocation payments will be available from next Monday morning in areas where people have been forced to evacuate their homes. The payment will be at the rate of \$7 per day, per person, for each individual or family member who has been evacuated for more than 48 hours from their homes. They will continue until it is possible for each recipient to reoccupy his home. The purpose of the payments will be to partially alleviate the extra costs incurred by flood victims for food, clothing and shelter during the period of their evacuation. The payments will be made only to people who have evacuated their homes from areas designated by the local municipality and approved by the province as flooded or threatened with flooding. The grants will be paid to all eligible applicants regardless of their financial position.

I want to emphasize that people receiving relief from the flood victim dislocation fund will in no way jeopardize their claims for compensation for flood damage. The flood victim dislocation grants have nothing to do with compensation payments. Dislocation grants are designed to help people forced to evacuate their homes to meet an immediate problem of providing food, clothing and shelter. The grants will provide hard cash for that purpose and will not affect later claims for compensation for flood damage to property or for flood prevention measures.

The flood victim dislocation grants will be administered by the municipalities. The municipalities will pay applicants directly and may claim the money back from the Provincial Government. Municipalities may also obtain advanced funds on an accountable basis for the purpose of paying flood victim dislocation grants.

I repeat that further announcement will be made next week concerning the assessment of flood losses and damage and the procedures for payment.

I expect that at that time the Government will also be able to announce details of a program to pay partial advances for essential repairs and replacements for individuals and small businesses.

Before making this announcement today a number of municipal officials were consulted including Mayor Taylor of Moose Jaw and the presidents of the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities and the Saskatchewan Association of Urban Municipalities.

I also expect to be able to announce next week, the location of a special office to deal with all aspects of flood compensation.

Mr. Speaker, let me summarize: Flood victim dislocation payments will be available through municipal offices on Monday,

for all people who have evacuated their homes for more than 48 hours, from a designated flood area. These grants will be paid at the rate of \$7 per day, per person, and will in no way affect claims for compensation for flood damage to property.

Other procedures to assess and pay flood compensation will be announced, including a program for partial advance payments to individuals and businesses for essential repairs and replacements.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. J.G. LANE (Lumsden): — Mr. Speaker, I think the strongest assurance that we have had from Members opposite, the Government, is the fact that for the first time since the Government was elected, we are going to have quick action and compensation.

As the Government opposite is well aware there are still delays in applications and no compensation for the Qu'Appelle Valley development association. They went on for some time and they have just about given up hope and I hope that the announcement today indicates that the Government is serious about supplying immediate compensation.

The amount of \$7 a day, we don't know frankly, whether that is going to be adequate or not. There are immediate costs involved that everybody who was forced to evacuate suffered; some of them had to have plumbers in to do it and they are going to have immediate costs thereafter and I would hope that those figures would be taken into account. They should be ready for immediate payment.

We have also urged, and will continue to urge, that any businesses that are threatened by flooding take an immediate inventory so that they will have a definite criterion for applying and being able to prove compensation. Businessmen that have not taken a relatively recent inventory may have some difficulty in coming up with evidence to substantiate their claim for compensation and we have urged, and we have urged particularly in the town of Lumsden and in the town of Fort Qu'Appelle, that the business community immediately do this.

Again, we hope that the Government is sincere in its urgent payments because these should not be delayed. We would hope that in the processing they would lean in favor of the applicant and not take a very hard approach on the matter.

MR. CODY: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I can certainly assure the Member for Lumsden that we are serious.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. B.M. DYCK (Chairman): — The Member has the right to make a comment.

AN HON. MEMBER: — No, he doesn't.

ANNOUNCEMENT

PASSING OF DR. DON MOORE

HON. W.E. SMISHEK (Minister of Health): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to announce to the Members of the Assembly the passing today of the former Dean of the College of Medicine, Dr. Don Moore.

Dr. Moore ably served the people of this province for over 30 years. He first worked in Regina as a young pathologist from eastern Canada and subsequently rose to the position of Professor of Pathology at the University of Saskatchewan. He was Dean of the College of Medicine in the late 1960s and early 1970s. Dr. Moore's advice was frequently sought by senior officials of the Department of Health and in his own quiet way he contributed a great deal to the health and well-being of the people of the Province of Saskatchewan.

I am sure that the Members of the Assembly would want me to express sympathy to the members of the bereaved family.

MR. G.B. GRANT (Regina Whitmore Park): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to join with the Hon. Minister in expressing the sympathy of the Members on our side of the House. I don't think I can add much to what the Minister has said. I certainly enjoyed my association with Dr. Moore and I am sure that not only his friends, but his profession and associates will certainly miss him.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:32 o'clock p.m.