

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**First Session — Sixteenth Legislature**  
**21st Day**

**Thursday, March 14, 1968**

The Assembly met at 2:30 o'clock p.m.

On the Orders of the Day.

**WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**Mr. J.E. Brockelbank: (Saskatoon Mayfair)** — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to take this opportunity to introduce to you and all Members of the Assembly a group of students from Saskatoon Mayfair. They are from Mayfair public school and they are situated in the west gallery immediately behind me. There are 42 students from grade eight and they are accompanied by two of their teachers, Mr. Hawthorn and Mrs. Morris. I realize the two major debates are over with, but I think the students will find some interesting meat for thought here this afternoon and I'm sure we all wish them an entertaining and educational afternoon and a good trip back to Saskatoon Mayfair.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. L.P. Coderre: (Gravelbourg)** — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to draw your attention to a group of students in the Speaker's gallery from Glen Bain. They are accompanied here by their teachers Mrs. Degg and Mr. Heimer and their drivers who have taken the time. I would like to thank them on behalf of the Legislature for having brought them here. There are Messrs. Miller, Kleckner, Semchuck, Senekar, Stafford and Scott. Now that the general debates are over, Mr. Speaker, the deliberations of the Legislature will be doubly interesting because of greater participation. I am sure that the Legislature would like to join with me in wishing them a safe journey home and a very enjoyable stay in the city today.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. W.E. Smishek: (Regina North East)** — Mr. Speaker, on your behalf and on behalf of the Members of the Legislature I would like to extend a warm welcome to a group of 26 students from the St. Thomas school, they are grade eight students. They are seated in the west gallery behind, and are accompanied by their principal and teacher, Mr. Yano. I extend to them a warm welcome and I do hope that their stay this afternoon will be both informative and a pleasant one and will help them in their social studies.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. E.I. Wood: (Swift Current)** — Mr. Speaker, through you and

on behalf of the Legislature I would like to welcome here a group of 27 grade eight. students in the top two rows of the west gallery and also on the steps and the teachers who are standing by the door. These are pupils from Dixon school in Swift Current, some 27 of them. They are accompanied by Mr. Ogland, their principal and Mr. Mike Fulton, the principal assistant as well as Miss Murphy, the nurse. We trust that their stay with us will be educational for them and that they may appreciate their visit with us. On your behalf, Sir, I am very pleased to offer them welcome to the Assembly.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. C.L.B. Estey: (Saskatoon Nutana Centre)** — Mr. Speaker, through you I would like this afternoon to introduce to the House pupils from Buena Vista school in Saskatoon who are here this afternoon with their teacher, Miss Wray. We thank Miss Wray for giving these students the opportunity to visit with us this afternoon and we hope they will find their stay both educational and enjoyable.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. A.E. Blakeney: (Regina Centre)** — Mr. Speaker, I would like through you to extend a warm welcome to a very fine and large group of students from Albert school in the Regina Centre constituency. They are seated in the east gallery in the first four rows, they very nearly fill they gallery. They are some 74 or 75 in number and they are accompanied by their principal, Mr. Guy, their vice-principal, Mr. Sandmeth and one of their teachers, Mrs. Howe. They are as I have said all of the grade eight students from Albert school and they are here as part of their social studies course. They have completed a tour of the building and they are with us in the Chamber this afternoon. I know that I speak for you, Sir, and for all Members of the House in extending to them a warm welcome and in expressing the hope that their stay with us this afternoon will be pleasant and informative and that we will conduct ourselves in a manner which will commend itself to them.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

## QUESTIONS

### BATTEN ROYAL COMMISSION

**Mr. W.G. Davies: (Moose Jaw South)** — Before the Orders of the Day I would like to ask the Premier whether the Government intends to request Federal Consumer Minister Turner to follow-up the work in recommendations of the Batten Royal commission on living costs, especially since Mr. Turner is reported as saying that he is anxious to assist and is presently waiting to hear from Provincial Premiers in this regard.

**March 14, 1968**

**Hon. W.R. Thatcher: (Premier)** — Well, Mr. Speaker, we have been in touch with the Minister of Consumer Affairs in Ottawa. However, before we make any specific request we feel that we must consult with Manitoba and Alberta. After all this was a Joint Prairie Council and before we ask for specific recommendations we want that consultation to take place.

#### **DETERRENT FEES — TREATY INDIANS**

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Public Health (Mr. Grant) or other appropriate Minister. This has to do with the question of deterrent fees and more particularly their application to people of Indian ancestry or perhaps Treaty Indians, people who are Federal responsibilities. This has been a matter of some concern and, as I think Members know, I am wondering whether the Minister is able to make a statement particularly in view of recent statements from Ottawa which have suggested that in the very near future Treaty Indians will not be able to receive medical care through Federal Government sources. I wonder if the Minister can express a view as to how they will fit into the two plans that we have and particularly the application of deterrent fees to these people.

**Hon. G.B. Grant: (Minister of Public Health)** — Mr. Speaker, all I can say at this time is that my Department has been in touch with Ottawa this morning and I haven't had a report on this problem as yet.

#### **HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION PRICE INDEXES**

**Mr. J.E. Brockelbank: (Saskatoon Mayfair)** — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) and in his absence the Treasury benches. Is the Government aware that the Dominion Bureau of Statistics has just published a revised series of Highway Construction Price Indexes, covering the period 1956 to 1966? This Report shows that construction costs rose in the Province of British Columbia . . .

**Hon. D.G. Steuart: (Provincial Treasurer)** — Point of order, Mr. Speaker . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — The Member wishes to ask a question, he can ask a question but he can't make a speech on it.

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am asking the question right at this moment. I am reporting that the British Columbia costs show a 33 per cent increase; Saskatchewan a 63 per cent increase,

and I was wondering if the Government intends to pursue my suggestion that we have an independent investigation of highway construction costs in this Province.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Highways is not here, but that question is so insignificant I suggest you put it on the Order Paper.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order!

#### **ORDERS FOR RETURNS NO. 4 and NO. 5**

**Mr. C.G. Willis: (Melfort-Tisdale)** — Mr. Speaker, last week I asked Provincial Secretary (Mr. Heald) when I could expect Orders for Returns No. 4 and No. 5. He said he promised to look into it and I just wondered whether or not he has any definite information as to when we could expect this vital information.

**Hon. D.V. Heald: (Attorney General)** — As the member will know, I am simply a clearing house. I file them when they come from the Department. I filed three or four today, I didn't keep a record of the number. Maybe the ones you're interested in have been filed today, but I will file them as soon as they come to me.

#### **ANNOUNCEMENT**

#### **REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON HIGHER EDUCATION**

**HON. J.C. McIsaac: (Minister of Education)** — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to table in the Legislature the second interim report of the Joint Committee on Higher Education. I would like to take thirty seconds of the time of the House to summarize a statement on this. The Joint Committee on Higher Education made seven major recommendations designed to meet the educational needs and to ensure co-ordination and inter-relations of all educational programs and institutions in the Province. Most of the recommendations contained in this Report — and I'll have copies brought to my office for Members very shortly — centre on the establishment of a co-ordinated pattern of so-called middle range education, middle range being a term used in the Report to refer to programs between the high school and the university level and including those for many people who have not perhaps completed formal high school education, university transfer courses, vocational technical training and the like.

#### **MOTIONS FOR RETURN**

#### **RETURN NO. 52**

**March 14, 1968**

Hon. W.S. Lloyd: (Leader of the Opposition) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 52 showing:

Copies of all correspondence and other communication received to date by the Premier's Office, the Economic Development Board, or Information Services, requesting copies of the Saskatchewan Economic Review released in April, 1967.

**Hon. W.R. Thatcher: (Premier)** — Mr. Speaker, the Opposition has had four or five or six questions on this particular subject at the current session. I don't know whether there is something sinister about this particular report or not. All their questions have been answered, and I might say that our civil servants have wasted a fair amount of time in the process. Apparently, the Leader of the Opposition is not satisfied with the answers we have given, because today he is asking for copies of all correspondence and other communications received to date by various agencies requesting copies of the Saskatchewan Economic Review released in April, 1967. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition knows that many of these documents are sent to bankers, industrialists, and so on. Apart from that fact there are many requests made verbally, some are made by telephone. Frequently the letters go into the wastepaper basket. So I submit that it is impossible to supply this information. Even if we could, it would take days of effort, and we don't want to waste the taxpayers' money. Many of our civil servants are rather busy doing important things and I am going to move that this question, this Return be dropped.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Remember you can't make a motion that the question be dropped. You can suggest that the question or the motion be withdrawn. Then that will require the leave of the House. The motion is no longer the property of the mover, the motion is the property of the entire House, and if a motion is to be withdrawn it has to be by leave of the House.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — All right I will suggest it be withdrawn then, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Lloyd:** — The cost of answering this particular question is a strange argument for the Premier to use in respect to this particular item. He suggests that we seem to think that there is something sinister about this. I can say that, if anyone looks at what has happened with respect to this particular document, we have every right to think there was something sinister about it.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lloyd:** — He suggests that we are not satisfied with the answers

that have been given to us. I accept that. We are not. Something strange has happened for some strange reason. May I just take a minute, Mr. Speaker, to review the history of this particular publication, The Saskatchewan Economic Review, which was published in April; 1967. This is a publication which is produced from year to year, Mr. Speaker, by the officials of the various branches of the Saskatchewan Government. Ordinarily it is distributed early in each year. In 1966 we had to ask for it, finally we received a copy the last day of the session. In April, 1967, we asked for it and we were unable to get it before the Assembly adjourned. Subsequent to that happening, I asked for it on a number of other occasions. As I reported to the House previously I wrote to the Premier in April in 1967 or perhaps it was May. I still don't have an answer to that letter. On several other occasions, members of my staff made proper requests through the usual channels for copies of this Report. We were not able to get it. As late as the beginning of this session, Mr. Speaker, this report was not available in the Legislative Library for example. Several days after that, inquiries were made at public libraries in the cities of Regina, Saskatoon and Moose Jaw and no copies were there. After some questioning in the House, the Premier agreed to table it. After some further questioning, he supplied me with one copy and the Member for The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) with a copy. Several days afterwards, after some more questioning, with apparent reluctance, copies were distributed to all the Members of the Legislature. The Premier says we aren't satisfied with the answers that are given. We asked how many had been published. We were told 5,000 had been published in April of 1967. 5,000 copies published! The Premier talks about waste of money. The, taxpayers of Saskatchewan paid for the preparation of this material . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — Same number as always.

**Mr. Lloyd:** — . . . They paid for the printing of this material. They paid for its publication and for some strange reason the Premier ordered his Department to sit on this and not distribute it.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lloyd:** — Now is there any wonder that there is suspicion on the part of the Opposition, or on the part of the public? How in the world the Premier can have the gall to talk about wasting public money, after he has spent that much money and then tried to prevent the issue from being distributed, is certainly one of the many wonders of this world.

Furthermore in this series of questions that we asked, after we had determined that there had been 5,000 distributed, after we finally worked out enough copies for the Members of the Legislature, other Members wanted additional copies. When we asked about additional copies, we were told there were no others

**March 14, 1968**

for distribution. Now that point is of interest. I'll admit that it isn't a large amount of money, Mr. Speaker, but there is something else than money involved here. What did the Government do in the space of a relatively few days time with almost 5,000 copies of this pamphlet which they didn't want to get into circulation around the province?

**An Hon. Member:** — Oh bunk!

**Mr. Lloyd:** — I submit, no bunk about it! It's all plain in the records of this House and you, Mr. Premier, for some reason or other wanting to hide something of the record of this Government, locked these up in your refrigerator or some other place until after the election was over.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lloyd:** — Mr. Speaker, I can suggest if the Premier wants to continue the discussion, let him give some reasons why he took such active measures to prevent the people from knowing about this publication. It denied the figures that the Government Members were distributing across this Province with respect to growth of population. It showed they'd been giving wrong information to the public in that regard. According to this Report, Mr. Speaker, the population growth in the 12 months up to June last year was 3,000. The Premier was trying to impress people that it was many thousands. It denied his statement that there were 15,000 jobs here for skilled workmen. The Report says there were something like 2,500. It denied the reports which the Members of the Government were trying to give with respect to the increase in livestock production. And how many more ways it denied statements of the Government we won't know until we have looked at it harder. In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, I think we're entitled to say this again. This was produced at public expense. Other years it was always distributed to Members of the Legislature, to libraries and other places. This year it was not distributed, this year it was refused to Members of the Legislature. I asked for it almost a year ago and couldn't get it. Five thousand it finally admitted had been printed. All of a sudden the entire 5,000 except those distributed to the MLAs disappeared. The Premier in his further answer said it went but on the basis of request. This particular question wants to know who requested it? Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the Government disposed of them in ways other than by request, because it wanted to get rid of them and we would like to know the truth of this particular matter.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

The motion was negatived on the following recorded division:

**YEAS — 23**

**Messieurs**

Lloyd	Meakes	Baker
Wooff	Berezowsky	Pepper
Kramer	Romanow	Bowerman
Willis	Smishek	Matsalla
Wood	Thibault	Messer
Blakeney	Whelan	Kwasnica
Davies	Snyder	Kowalchuk
Dewhurst	Brockelbank	

**NAYS — 33**

**Messieurs**

Thatcher	Bjarnason	Mitchell
Howes	MacDonald	Larochelle
McFarlane	Estey	Gardner
Cameron	Hooker	Coupland
Steuart	Gallagher	McPherson
Heald	McLennan	Charlebois
McIsaac	Heggie	Forsyth
Guy	Breker	McIvor
Loken	Leith	Schmeiser
Grant	Radloff	
Coderre	Weatherald	

**RETURN NO. 56**

Mr. E. Whelan: (Regina North East) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 56 showing:

The legal description and street address of any and all land held in the name of the Provincial Government, or any of its agencies, located within the city limits of Regina.

**Hon. A.R. Guy: (Minister of Public Works)** — Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to say that we will be pleased to provide this information to the Hon. Member. This information would have been provided to him the other day if he had asked it in the way that it could have been easily answered. I told him then that we do not keep our records on the basis of constituency boundaries, but on municipal boundaries. I hope also that this will stop the Leader of the Opposition from going up and down the Province telling the people that we will not provide this type of information. We have no hesitation in providing it, provided it is asked for in a proper manner. In fact, Mr. Speaker, we are absolutely pleased to provide it, because it bears out what I have said about the lack of planning and foresight in the Public Works Department prior to us becoming the Government.

**Mr. Lloyd:** — Mr. Speaker, I am speaking



**March 14, 1968**

not on the motion, I admit, but I hope I can be as completely out of order as the Member who is just taking his seat was out of order.

**Mr. Steuart:** — You usually are.

**Mr. Lloyd:** — Not usually I think, not usually. But I want to assure the Hon. Member for Athabasca who is just taking his seat that no amount of comment of that kind is going to stop me from going up and down this province, and pointing out to the people of this province the number of occasions on which this Government has refused to give people information which they ought to have. We've had one more case today, added to four or five or six earlier this year and added to a dozen or so last year. The Member can weasel around, Mr. Speaker, if that is parliamentary, all he likes.

**An Hon. Member:** — I'll take it back.

**Mr. Lloyd:** — The Member can wiggle around all he likes to try to explain these refusals in terms of questions not being properly asked, but he will not nor will his Government escape the consequences of continually denying to the people of this province information which they have a right to know.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Whelan:** — Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased that the Hon. Minister of Public Works is so co-operative and so verbose in providing this information. Actually I had anticipated saving him some work when I asked for the land or property that the Department of Public Works owned just in the constituency. I am extremely disappointed to find out that he didn't know the boundaries of my constituency, but then the boundaries are so badly mixed up and mutilated that I can understand his shortcomings.

Motion agreed to.

#### **RETURN NO. 65**

Mr. R.H. Wooff: (Turtleford) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 65 showing:

Copies of submissions or representations made by the Government of Saskatchewan to the hearings of the Railway Transport Committee held on January 10, 1968 and February 5, 1968.

**Hon. J.C. McIsaac: (Minister of Education)** — I want to comment briefly before we pass this or proceed on. I could point out to the Hon. Member that there was no

formal submission presented at either the January 10th or February 5th meeting, nor were any requested, as far as that goes at these two meetings. The Province was represented there. We have been very actively involved with all the hearings and all pre-hearing conferences. I will be glad to show him, as best we can, or summarize the representations that were made at those two conferences. There was no formal presentation but we will try and summarize the discussions that were held and the points of view put forward by our Province at that time.

**Mr. Wooff:** — All I wish to say, Mr. Speaker, is that I would certainly like any of the information that came out of the meeting last January.

Motion agreed to.

### RETURN NO. 69

Mr. W.J. Berezowsky: (Prince Albert East-Cumberland) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 69 showing:

Prior to the sale of the Prince Albert Box Factory, (a) the name of the person who had the lease option; (b) the terms of the lease option; (c) whether any part of the premises was subleased, and, if so, by whom; and (d) the terms of the sublease.

**Hon. D.G. Stuart: (Provincial Treasurer)** — Mr. Speaker, I would move, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Thatcher, that Return No. 69 be amended as follows: That all the words after the word “option” where it appears for the second time, in the second line be deleted and the following be substituted therefore:

(c) whether the lease option restricted the right of the lessee to sublease or required the lessee to inform the lessor of the sublease of all or any portion of the building, and if so,

(d) the details of any such assignment from the lessee.

**Mr. W.S. Lloyd: (Leader of the Opposition)** — Mr. Speaker, would it be too much cost to the Civil Service if we could have a copy of such amendments prepared and made available to us when they are moved, as they are rather complicated and hard to follow.

As we have just only now seen a copy of the amendment since it has been changed at least once since the Provincial Treasurer moved it, since on a quick reading it appears as if the change

**March 14, 1968**

in section (c) is designed to prevent the Member from-getting the information which he is looking for in the original motion. It needs more study so I would ask leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

### **RETURN NO. 70**

Mr. W.J. Berezowsky: (Prince Albert East) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return No. 70 showing:

- (1) The original book value of (a) the Prince Albert Box Factory; and (b) the land use in conjunction with the Box Factory.
- (2) The amount the Government received for sale of the Box Factory and land.
- (3) The number of acres of land included in the sale.
- (4) The terms of the Agreement of Sale.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Mr. Speaker, I would move seconded by the Hon. Mr. Thatcher, that Return No. 70 be amended as follows: That all the words after the word “showing” be deleted and the following substituted therefore:

- (1) The date on which the former Prince Albert Box Factory building was acquired by the Saskatchewan Timber Board; the circumstances under which it was acquired; and the amount of the book value assigned to the said building as at that date.
- (2) Whether the said building contributed sufficiently to the operation of the Saskatchewan Timber Board in each subsequent year to justify its retention by the Corporation.
- (3) The estimated or appraised market value of the said building in 1967.
- (4) The amount of the purchase bid accepted by the Saskatchewan Timber Board for the said building and land, and whether it was the highest of several bids received.
- (5) The number of acres of land included in the sale.
- (6) The payment terms provided in the sale agreement.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Mr. Speaker, I don't think I'll get the information that I really wanted to get and I would like to adjourn the

debate.

Debate adjourned.

**RETURN NO. 76**

Mr. R.H. Wooff: (Turtle ford) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 76 showing:

- (1) The number of official openings, receptions, banquets, & like occasions, sponsored by the Government of Saskatchewan or any of its Crown corporations, boards, commissions, or other agencies, in the calendar years 1964; 1965; 1966. 1967; and to February 15, 1968.
- (2) The date, the occasion marked, and the location of each such affair in each of these years.
- (3) (a) At which of these affairs alcoholic beverages were served and the cost in each case, to the Government of Saskatchewan or any of its. Crown corporations, boards, commissions, or other agencies; (b) The total cost of alcoholic beverages served on these occasions during each of the said years.

**Hon. A.C. Cameron: (Minister of Mineral Resources)** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment on this Motion for Return. You will notice if you will check the motion that it asks for the number of official openings, the number of receptions, the number of banquets, and like occasions, which were sponsored by any Department of the Government, or any of its Crown corporations, or any of its boards, or commissions, or any other agencies, during the course of a four-year period from 1964, 1965, 1966, 1967 and even including the opening of the House and the formal ball on February 15, 1968. What information is he asking in connection with these? He wants the date, the occasion marked, the location of each such affair in each of these four years. Now he is asking every Department of Government, every Crown corporation, every board, every commission and every agency, to dig out their vouchers back over a four-year period, for any banquet held, or a reception, and when it was held, where it was held and the location it was held. Then you go back for four years and find out on every one of these occasions where a banquet or reception, or an opening was held. And receptions, I take it, would be broad enough according to the dictionary, to receive one or more people. There is no limit on the reception number. Now, I say, when you moved to every board and every commission, we would have to ask according to the directory here, 11 Crown corporations, get 23 boards and commissions to undertake this. We would have to go across to England, to the Agent General, and ask him to search his vouchers too for the past four years, to reveal any official opening, any banquet, any reception, which he conducted during that four-year period. What does he want this

**March 14, 1968**

information for, Mr. Speaker? Does he want it to judge the cost of the banquet, or the reception, or the official opening? Does he want an estimate of the cost to see whether it is modest or whether it was extravagant? Is this the information he is seeking? No! No! What information is he seeking? Number three (a) — at which of these affairs alcoholic beverages were served and the cost in case to the Government of Saskatchewan or any Crown corporation, boards, commissions, or other agencies, the total cost of alcoholic beverages served. That's the only information that he is interested in. Nothing about the cost, the sums that were spent, just whether alcoholic beverages were served and if so, what was the cost. Now I would imagine if you were going to attempt to be accurate, even to get that, you would have to deduct from the bill certain costs. I imagine you would have to deduct the mix, the soft drinks, the pop, the ginger ale. You would have to deduct the ice and you would have to deduct for every guest that may have been there who didn't take alcoholic beverages but had a tomato juice, or had a lemonade or had a seven-up. You would have to go through and break all of this down to see what the cost of that alcoholic beverage was. This is what he wants them to do. I did some preliminary work and this will be interesting to the Leader of the Opposition when he cries that we refused to give him information. I went to some of the departments and I asked them for a rough estimate, of how many man hours it would take to gather this information, and they tell me, 'Mr. Speaker, that it would take from 35,000 to 50,000 man hours to get the information.

**An Hon. Member:** — That would drive you to drink.

**Mr. Cameron:** — That is equivalent to a cost of \$150,000 to \$200,000, to seek the answer to this question, so that the Member knows whether or not an alcoholic beverage was served at a banquet, or take \$150,000 of the taxpayers' money, to see if any beverage was served by any Crown corporation, any agencies, or the Government, over a four-year period. Mr. Speaker, the cost of answering this question is more than it would cost to build a six-room school. When they are talking about economy, he is prepared to ask the Government to commit itself to an expenditure of \$150,000 to \$200,000 to find out if liquor was served on any occasion by any Crown corporation, boards, commissions and so forth. I presume that would include the Saskatchewan Arts Board. If they had an adjudicator come up, if they had a few drama critics, then according to the reception, whether they took them out to lunch and one of them suggested that he would like a glass of champagne, the cost of that glass of champagne would have to be separated. Likewise the Saskatchewan Research Council. All of these boards and commissions would have to search their records to see if there was such an occasion.

Why is he asking if liquor was served? Mr. Speaker, I don't think this House would be justified in asking the people of

Saskatchewan to spend \$150,000 to find out whether some agency bought liquor and served it, when you can have the answer for nothing, it is free. The answer is Yes, liquor has been served at some of these banquets and I can tell you it is not a new policy. You know when I went around to the departments to get an estimate of what this would cost, I ran onto some interesting information. The opening of the Squaw Rapids power station was held in 1963, just before the election was coming up. After the total costs of the Squaw Rapids and all the installation of it, do you know what it cost to put on the banquet? \$30,000: Do you know what it cost them for refreshments? \$1,900. When they went to Prince Albert to turn on the gas, a banquet was held and alcoholic beverages were served. But you know, Mr. Speaker, it is interesting the manner in which these alcoholic beverages were acquired and served. They were acquired by an organization which they paid, and the organization would bring the liquor in the back door.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Cameron:** — But they had it. The Member from The Battlefords asked if liquor was served at the opening of Direct Distance Dialing at North Battleford. Goodness, he was there! He was there so he shouldn't ask me.

**An Hon. Member:** — The first to the bar and the last to leave.

**Mr. Cameron:** — And I can tell you that he enjoyed them too.

**Mr. E. Kramer: (The Battlefords)** — Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the Minister. He has suggested that he was keeping track of what I was doing. I suggest to him has he any record? Has he got a record of each individual that takes a drink? I suggest to him that I didn't partake in this.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order! Now, we are not going to have these unseemingly interjections in the middle of a debate. If the Member wants to deny that which was said by another Member, he can wait until the Member has finished speaking, unless the Member wishes to give way.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Mr. Speaker, we had a few alcoholic beverages available for those who chose to have an alcoholic beverage. We had tomato juice available. We had pop and ginger ale. We also served a lovely luncheon and the guests sat down to that. We were more than generous, and perhaps we could be criticized for this, in that we thought it would be a good thing, and appreciated by the people of North Battleford, if we should set around

**March 14, 1968**

the room, eight telephones and give them free long-distance calling anywhere in the American continent for two hours. And I can tell you that the Member for The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) took his booze and he enjoyed these free telephone calls.

**Mr. Kramer:** — I am going to say that you are a liar!

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order! And that means the whole lot of you. Now we aren't going to have this word "liar" batted around this place. You are not going to drag this Legislature down into the gutter. And I ask you to withdraw it right now and apologize for it.

**Mr. Kramer:** — I'll withdraw, Mr. Speaker. But the Member did not tell the truth. I did not make a phone call and if he has a record . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order! I am asking the Member for The Battlefords to withdraw the word "liar" and to apologize.

**Mr. Kramer:** — I have already done that!

**Mr. Speaker:** — If you wish to speak — you haven't spoken yet — you will have all the opportunity in the world to speak in this debate and I'll see that you get it too.

**Mr. Cameron:** — If the Member for The Battlefords doesn't drink alcoholic beverages, he doesn't eat, he doesn't place telephone calls — I wonder what his purpose in coming was?

**Mr. Kramer:** — To keep an eye on you!

**Mr. Cameron:** — We invited the local MLAs of the areas. In most cases they turned out, and I was happy to see that they participated in the banquet and in the free telephone calls, and some of the beverages that were served. Now I looked in my own Department in Sask Tel to see what this effect was. I put my staff to work to go back through 1965. I said let's just pick one year at random and let's pick 1965. We did. They checked the vouchers and I don't know how many days it took them. Do you know what they came up with? On one occasion, in 1965?

**Mr. Kramer:** — 48 barrels.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Mr. Speaker, would you ask that big baboon to keep quiet over there, please?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order! I don't think that the word "baboon" is a very good word either, and I ask the Member to withdraw it.

**Mr. Cameron:** — I withdraw the word as it is the action I was referring to. I looked in 1965, yes, we served some beverages on two occasions. Do you know what the total cost of beverages served by Sask Tel in 1965 was? I'll tell you. \$89.43. Out of operating expenses of \$26 1/2 million, \$89. It wasn't even a fly speck. It wouldn't even cause an irritant in your eye. And you ask the people to spend \$150,000 to see if Sask Tel or the Agent General, in England at any occasion served his guest some champagne or a glass of wine, or a glass of beer. Therefore, I would urge this House in spite of the lectures from the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd), to reject this motion. This is the type of information that they are asking the taxpayers to put up the money for. I would plead with everyone in this House to turn this motion down because it is so irresponsible.

**Mr. C.G. Willis: (Melfort Tisdale)** — Will the Member permit a question before he sits down please? The question is what did it cost you to get the information from Sask Tel for 1965?

**Mr. Cameron:** — It cost a considerable number of man-hours. We had to take our staff off other important work and assign several of our staff to this one thing alone to check in 1965. If you put that in every Crown corporation, in every Department, in every commission, in every board, it would come from 35,000 to 50,000 man hours to gather that information.

**Mr. Willis:** — Would you be more specific, Mr. Minister? What did it cost Sask Tel to get that information? Was it \$10 or was it \$5.00? I don't understand.

**Mr. A.E. Blakeney: (Regina Centre)** — Mr. Speaker, I am sure we are all entertained by the Member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) as we always are. He has a reputation with full measure today. But he really outdid himself in hyperbole today when he was talking about some ridiculous figure, \$150,000, I think the figure was, or \$200,000. You know when we look back at the records of this House and see the Orders for Return that Members opposite used to ask for, information which went back to 1944 and 1950 and 1960, periods of 10 or 15 years, and now they are complaining about four or five years, one wonders why the Government which used to sit on the Treasury benches could offer this information back for 15 years without very much cost, and now that Government over there is so inefficient that it takes them 50,000 man hours to dig out some information going back five years. I think the people of Saskatchewan will think it rather remarkable that the Government opposite has so many banquets and so many receptions that it can't even catalogue them in less than 50,000 man hours. It



**March 14, 1968**

can't even estimate, it can't even total up the amount of money it spent on alcoholic beverages in less than 50,000 man hours.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Just as an example of one of the motions it asked for, I have one here, in 1964. The fees, licences, royalties charged by each Department, bureau, commission or other activity of the Crown on (a) May 1st, 1944, (b) January 1st, 1963, and the services, privileges or benefits received in consideration of such fees, licences and royalties. This goes to dozens and hundreds. Then it asks for all correspondence, any and all correspondence between 1958 and 1963, a long period of time. And there are others which asked for advertisements placed since 1944, all payments made to The Commonwealth, for example, by the Government or any of its agencies, or any Crown corporations from 1944 to 1963. That sort of thing was managed without any great difficulty or without 50,000 man hours or indeed 5,000 man hours being spent. People were able under the previous Government to get information without spending 50,000 man hours getting it. And if, Mr. Speaker, the Government was anxious to give the information and was merely troubled by the amount of work involved, it would be easy enough to amend the motion. The Government has a great facility for amendment. It has shown that this afternoon. There would have been no difficulty in the Member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) making an amendment limiting the motion to receptions where 10 or more were present, or banquets where 10 or more were present. If he was troubled by the cost of the ice cubes he could have amended this to refer to the cost of serving alcoholic beverages, and this would have covered the ice cubes. He could have handled that without any difficulty. He could even have gone to the Attorney General (Mr. Heald) and got some assistance in drafting or perhaps the Member for Nutana Centre (Mr. Forsyth). He could have got the assistance in drafting a motion so that preparing an answer would not take 50,000 man hours or 5,000 man hours or even 500 man hours. But he wasn't interested in doing this. He was only interested in getting a bit of information to make a sanctimonious speech, and he has made that. We admire him, he really has a great facility for standing up and talking about something other than the issue involved and doing it with great skill.

**An Hon. Member:** — Academy award.

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Academy award, he is certainly our only likely nominee for an Oscar. But I wonder, Mr. Speaker, whether it wouldn't have been possible for the Government to have framed this in a way which would have allowed the information asked by the Hon. Member to be given. Surely the information is reasonable enough. There has been a change of Government policy. We are not necessarily suggesting that the new Government policy is being objected to. The Members here simply want to know the cost of the new policy and I would have thought

this was a thoroughly reasonable and proper thing. I know that the Member for Maple Creek for example referred to refreshments. He implied of course that these were alcoholic beverages, but he didn't say so and he didn't say so because it isn't true. But never mind he uses the word "refreshments" in a way which conveys that impression and which in fact was a false impression. So I think, Mr. Speaker, that we can take what the Member for Maple Creek said with the grain of salt or perhaps the sack of salt which it ought to be flavored with.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Would you like the vouchers?

**Mr. Blakeney:** — I would like the vouchers, surely, but if these vouchers can be provided, I want them all. I don't want the Minister to pick and choose among the vouchers, I want him to give us all the vouchers. This is what this House is asking for, the vouchers, and if he has the vouchers, then let's have the vouchers. If he is able to dig out this voucher and that voucher from one agency over several years, he can certainly do it for all the agencies of the Crown. If in fact the Member is disturbed about the office of its Agent General, this agency can be excluded. I want Mr. Speaker to note the fact that the Member moving the motion was not concerned about the Agent General and the Research Council. Therefore a motion which excluded the Agent General and the Research Council would be acceptable. This apparently is the basis for most of the objections of the Members opposite. I simply want to say again, Mr. Speaker, that it is perfectly clear that, in a very short number of days, the Minister was able to cull through the records, not only of Sask Tel but also the Treasury Department with respect to some agencies and of Saskatchewan Power with respect to Squaw Rapids, and of Saskatchewan Power with respect to a gas opening at Prince Albert, all with ease and facility, all this was easily found in 48 hours. We would suggest that he use the same skill and diligence in other agencies of the Government and get the information for which the Hon. Member asks.

**Hon. C.P. MacDonald: (Milestone)** — Mr. Speaker, I only want to make one comment.

**Mr. Willis:** — Good.

**Mr. MacDonald:** — Be quiet over there, George, sit and listen and you might learn something. It's a very difficult thing for you to appreciate anything. I know it takes a lot to sink in but shut up for one minute and see if you can get this.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order! Just let's try and be a little bit more dignified. We've had the Throne Speech debate and the Budget debate and generally speaking everybody has had a rollicking good time. Now let's see if we can't leave the personalities, the snide remarks.

**March 14, 1968**

**Mr. MacDonald:** — Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition and the Member for Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) have stood up here for the last half hour and tried to suggest that this Government is withholding information. You know people that live in glass houses shouldn't throw stones. I just happened to pick up one of the old sessional journals, Saskatchewan Legislature, 1957. I opened it at "Returns Not Brought Down", and it is rather interesting the one Return that I noticed and happened to come across. First of all, foreclosures and cancellations allowed each year and so forth, the number of oil leases, number of foreclosures on mortgages and liens, mileage black-topped since 1945, reconditions, rebuilt. I don't know why they wouldn't resent this information. But the next one is the one that was interesting, Mr. Speaker. Total spent on banquets, teas etc. by all branches and Crown corporations. It was interesting that they would ask this Government in 1968 to provide this information but they refused to provide it themselves in 1957. And if you go back — it doesn't make any difference in what year — Mr. Speaker, year after year, after year they refused to provide information to this House. There is also a list of amendments they could change to suit their own purpose. Mr. Speaker, I would also like to say that if they want to pursue this business of liquor, I think it can be pursued to their own embarrassment. You know what they did, Mr. Speaker, they didn't have the guts or the courage to go out and buy it themselves and serve it in their own name. What they did, they went to the Chamber of Commerce and they gave them \$10,000 or \$5,000 and told them to put on the reception and buy the liquor. And then they invited the people. Mr. Speaker, if they want to pursue this, I think they will pursue at their own risk and surely, Mr. Speaker, surely to heavens if that Government gave grants and direct grants to put on receptions where liquor was served, then they are the ones responsible and nobody else, because that money, given to those organizations for a specific purpose of putting on a specific reception in which liquor and alcoholic beverages were served, is their responsibility and their desire. It was also arranged, Mr. Speaker, that the invitation card were printed by their Crown corporation. The Public Relations organizations within those Crown corporations arranged the banquet, arranged the reception and made the arrangements with the Chamber of Commerce. Now what kind of hypocrisy is that? Mr. Speaker, I certainly will vote against this motion and hope that it will be defeated, and I hope that this garbage is thrown out of this Assembly.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a word, I noted with interest that the Hon. Member from Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) in listing some of the questions that we asked when we were the Opposition, some of the Returns mentioned about the payments to The Commonwealth. I have here the Journals for the fifth session of the Fourteenth Legislature, 1963. "Returns Not Brought Down, No. 44, Commonwealth Payments made by the Government. In 1962 they never answered that. Payments to Mr. W.J. Berezowsky, this is just a side issue and I hate to bring it up really. Mr.

Speaker, we sat over on the other side and we've got memories. We recall when we would ask questions. Maybe some of them might have been frivolous, some of them might have cost too much money but they would turn them down so I think we are perfectly justified in taking this stand at this time.

**Mr. R. Romanow: (Saskatoon Riversdale)** — Mr. Speaker, I am rather hesitant to enter into this debate but there is one recurring theme that is really quite a concern to the young Members of this side of the House, and that this. The Hon. Minister of Social Welfare (Mr. MacDonald), the Treasurer (Mr. Steuart), the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron), every person who has taken part in this debate and every other debate seems to know more about what went on prior to 1964 than what has gone on since 1964.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Romanow** — The Government knows more, Mr. Speaker, about the years when we were the Government than about the years when it is the Government right now. All I am asking as a young Member of this Legislature is this, I am not interested in the history of 1964 and on. You are the Government, govern. When the Legislature asks a question it is the duty of the Government to answer, not give speeches and arguments about 1957 and the like. I would like to know exactly how much time it took the Hon. Minister of Minerals Resources (Mr. Cameron) to find out all the information that he did, and I dare say, that in the same amount of time that it took him to find out about 1964 and 1963, he could have found out about 1964 and onwards. But the Members opposite are afraid. All I can say is this, that I am afraid that the people of Saskatchewan may infer quite reasonably that this Government is trying to hide something.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. F.A. Dewhurst: (Wadena)** — Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Social Welfare (Mr. MacDonald) and the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) have just recently turned to two Journals and proved what they are trying to tell this Legislature is not correct. They are saying that in previous years that information was denied this Legislature. They have quoted Orders for Returns which were not brought down. Every session — and I sat in this Legislature for a long time — there has never been a session yet when there haven't been some Orders for Returns that weren't brought down at the end of that session, because it depends on the time the Order for Return was passed, unless an election intervenes. Then we all realize, Mr. Speaker, that at that time Orders for Returns die with the prorogation. But regarding the one that the Minister of Social Welfare mentioned, in 1957, that one was ordered by this Legislature and was produced in the session of 1958. It wasn't necessarily a year late. We have seen in the past Legislature that when we have asked for Orders for Return, that were passed

**March 14, 1968**

by this House, we get 50 per cent of the truth of the Order for Return. We are seeing them even refusing now to allow an Order for Return to be passed. As I raised on the Orders of the Day yesterday, 61 Orders for Return have been passed in this House, 44 of those in February, and so far only four of what were passed in February have been brought down. Now some of them were just a question which was turned into an Order for Return. The same thing applies to the Order for Return that the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) mentioned. When the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) was waxing so eloquently, when he talked about the refreshments served at Squaw Rapids, I was there, but I don't remember seeing him there. He was invited but he didn't have the courtesy to show up at that opening. The only one that showed up at that opening, from what was then the Opposition side of the House was the then Member for Weyburn, Mr. Stavely, and to the best of my recollection there was a very good refreshment served there. There was a good barbecue pit and a caterer that served some very good food and it was not liquid refreshments, which was the impression that the Minister tried to leave in this House and the impression that he was trying to leave with the Members or people who may be listening. It was not the correct impression.

I am sure that amendments could be moved to this as the Member for Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) pointed out, if it wishes to produce any of the information, but once again it is a matter of; we've got the majority, we are going to steam roller through anything we want, and they can't have the information because we don't want to give it.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. E.I. Wood: (Swift Current)** — Mr. Speaker, in regard to what has been said by the Hon. Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald) regarding a certain Return that was refused to this House in 1957, I would like to point to the records in that regard from the Journals of 1957 and 1958. Apparently the Hon. Member, although able to obtain some information for us, wasn't able to obtain it all. Possibly he didn't spend enough money or time on this. I notice on page 81 of the Journals for 1957, On March 12th, moved by Mr. Klein:

That an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 33 showing:

- (1) the total amount of money spent on all banquets, teas and social functions by all branches of the Government and Crown Corporations for the years 1951, 1952, 1955 and 1956.
- (2) The total amount of the above expenditure spent on alcoholic beverages.

A debate arising, in amendment thereto, it was moved by the Hon. Mr. Fines, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:

that the words “years, 1951, 1952, 1955 and 1956” in the last line of part (1) be deleted and the following substituted therefore

“fiscal, years ending 1951, 1952, 1955 and 1956.”

This motion was amended but it appears to me, Mr. Speaker, this was a reasonable amendment that would greatly facilitate its answering and in fact otherwise it would be practically impossible to answer this question. It was amended in such a way that the Government could answer it.

“The question being put on the proposed amendment it was agreed to.” We didn’t say we wouldn’t answer the question, we said we would answer the question, and the motion was passed. This was on March 12th. The answer was not brought down that session, but if the Hon. Member had bothered to look into the session of 1958 he would find that, not on the first day of the session because as you all know on the first day of the session it is simply a matter of having the Speech from the Throne read and subsequent festivities, the lunch and the tea in the reception room, and so on, but the very next day on February 14th, Friday, this was brought down as Sessional Paper No. 16.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Wood:** —

The Return for an Order of the Assembly on Motion of Mr. Klein dated March 12th, 1957 showing:

(1) the total amount of money spent on all banquets, teas and social functions by all branches of the Government and Crown Corporations for the fiscal years ending in 1951, 1952, 1955 and 1956.

(2) the total amount of the above expenditures spent on alcoholic beverages.

This was Order, for Return No. 33, 1957 and it was Sessional Paper No. 16 in 1958. The question was asked by the Opposition at that time, it was amended by the Government to make it in such a form that it could be answered and the answer was not refused, it was brought down the very first opportunity the following year.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. W.G. Davies: (Moose Jaw South)** — Mr. Speaker, I have only a few words to add to what has already been said by my colleagues but to me the response that we have got to this motion this afternoon from the Members on the Government side is a very disagreeable performance indeed. We have been treated to an exhibition of wiggling, evasion, diversionary tactics and personal, abusive comments. In my opinion, these have been used in an effort to escape the

**March 14, 1968**

consequences of this question. What does the question ask? It asks, not to read the whole motion, that the Government give an account of itself so far as its expenditures are concerned in affairs and receptions where alcoholic beverages were served. And when I hear the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron), tell us that it would take 50,000 man hours to produce this information I stand absolutely appalled. He is saying that it is going to take 5,000 employees a total of 10 hours each to produce the simple information that is asked and I simply don't believe it. If I got that kind of information from an employee of government I would suspend him forthwith. However, if the Minister of Mineral Resources insists on sticking to those kind of figures then the public at large, when they hear of this debate in this House this afternoon, are going to conjure up images and visions of Liberal Government expenses on liquor that will make Nero's banquets look like tea parties. The kind of information that the Opposition is seeking here is perfectly legitimate. Every Member in the Government benches knows that it is legitimate. They are the party that in Opposition could never make a speech without talking about waste and extravagance. Now many people consider that expenditures on alcoholic refreshments at receptions constitutes waste and extravagance. Well, here is an opportunity for the Members of the Government to vindicate themselves. I am not going to pass any comments on whether I think there should never be occasions where alcoholic beverages are served at Government affairs, I don't think that is the point. The point is here that we are entitled to this information and so are the public, I say, and I am going to repeat it again, what we have been treated to here this afternoon is a disagreeable performance from the Government benches.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. E. Kramer: (The Battlefords)** — Mr. Speaker, I don't particularly want to make any reply to the abuse that was directed at me. I would simply like to ask you, Sir, or this House and the Minister why the Members opposite seem to be so touchy, why they can't advance, as other Speakers have said, as much information about their activities as they seem to be able to do about the former Government which was not under their jurisdiction. I am not particularly objecting to a Government or a Department serving refreshments under certain conditions. I believe that it has happened before. For instance I remember at the reception for the Queen here in Regina wine was served. But what I do object to, Sir, and I make no apologies for this — is for every little jerk-water function that comes up for a Government to serve liquor, and I will refer to one, an example that I know of when a roadside picnic site with three outhouses and some picnic tables at North Battleford at the junction of Nos. 40 and No. 5 Highways was completed. We appreciate this picnic site albeit they hid it from the view of the North Saskatchewan valley. It would be nothing but a Liberal Government that would contrive to do that; to have some of the most beautiful scenery in Western Canada available and then build the picnic site in behind the hill to hide it all from view. No one but the Liberals could contrive this. But then they had the

official opening and the Minister blossomed forth in all his glory out there on the windy plain, after bringing full-sized trees down and transplanting them there, when a mile away on Government and city property there were total groves of trees. This Government plants trees at tremendous costs to deck this new camp site immediately before an election. Mr. Speaker, I think this is the height of extravagance, and I think, too, Mr. Speaker, that it is somewhat ridiculous. The band played for the Minister and there were 25 people there to listen to them, and the Minister and me, too, incidentally. I want to thank him for the invitation to be present. This was a courtesy that was rather not extended too often by Ministers, and I think every Member here, other Members here will back me up on this. The local MLA was not invited too often to appear at these official openings. In fact, this was the exception to prove the rule. I thoroughly enjoyed the band, and Davie, Mr. Speaker. And after the band had played to the 25 people and about 30 odd civil servants that attended because they knew very well their neck would be in for it if they didn't attend. There had been some beautiful invitation cards sent out — it must have been on a selective basis — some 500 or so, I imagine there were because about 200 people showed up and that is a pretty good average for coming to a Liberal function at the Civic Centre which costs them, I imagine, \$100 or \$150 for the day. There was a reception, a smorgasbord, and the bar, and all the liquor anyone wanted to drink. The Minister of Natural Resources was there and thoroughly enjoying himself. Now I suppose he had an executive assistant keeping tabs on who took what, and everyone who took a drink like the Minister of Telephones has indicated he has done. I often wondered what all these executive assistants were for, but now we know. Now we know, Mr. Speaker, that they follow the Minister around to these receptions and they keep track of the people who take a drink and how much. The people of Saskatchewan are going to be surprised at the generosity and good manners of their hosts. I suppose before too long we'll have, as someone suggested from this side, so many drinks for Liberals and so many for the Bolsheviks and so on. Now, Mr. Speaker, I say what my colleague is asking for is in the public interest. I suggest that this Government does not want to reveal this because in this year they had all these things set, official openings of many of the things that were started by former Governments, incidentally; official openings for everything possible and all the time they were planning a snap election. Here they were buying these so-called refreshments to enhance their image as to what good fellows they were, at the same time knowing full well that the Treasury was empty. This Government that can't afford to pass on that extra \$1.50 to the old age pensioners can afford untold amounts for liquor that they won't even account for.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kramer:** — They can afford untold amounts of money when they can't even afford cocoa for the crippled boys. Mr. Speaker, I object to this withholding of information and I think the people



**March 14, 1968**

opposite are going to ignore this request at their peril. They've told us that they can't answer it. This question will appear on the Order Paper again in another form; if my colleague doesn't ask it, I will. The people of Saskatchewan have a right to know.

**Hon. D.V. Heald: (Attorney General)** — Mr. Speaker, this is a very interesting discussion this afternoon and the Member for Saskatoon Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) says he would like to start in 1964. Well, I can appreciate that he probably would like to start in 1964. However, that's not the way life is and I think it's quite within our rights and we would not be doing our duty to the people of Saskatchewan if we didn't remind the Members of this Legislature of some of the things that happened when the Hon. Gentlemen who sit to your left were the Government of the day. I know that this is touchy and I know that you don't like to be reminded of the things you did when you were the Government, but I am going to remind you anyway of a few things that you did, particularly because of the statements of the Member for Wadena (Mr. Dewhurst). He said that there are always a few returns left over from one year to the next. And that's quite right, there are. You did it and we've done it. I wasn't here prior to 1964, I don't know whether the Members of my party got up everyday and continually whined about Returns that were maybe two weeks, three weeks, and four weeks old, but let me remind you, Mr. Speaker, and remind the Hon. Members opposite of the number of Returns that they never did answer while they were the Government. These are the Returns that died with each election.

In 1948, when you went to the people there were 42 Returns that you never answered, never were answered; in 1952 there were 21; in 1956 there were 18; in 1960 there were 25; in 1964 there were 6 and when we went to the people there were 25 in 1967. But don't come in here and be so sanctimonious and say that you didn't leave Returns. Now let's look at some of the Returns that you left — very interesting.

**Mr. A.E. Blakeney: (Regina Centre)** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I don't think any of us want to interfere with the flow of oratory from the Attorney General on the appropriate occasion and I think that there is no particular reason why he should . . . I didn't see the irrelevance of the fact that Orders were left but I simply didn't want to interrupt because it appeared to be answering some statements made by the Member from Wadena (Mr. Dewhurst). But when the Attorney General takes the position that he now can deal with each of the items that are in the Orders apparently, then I think we are getting a long way from the Motion which after all is that an Order that the Assembly do issue in respect of banquets, etc. and I suggest that his comments are out of order.

**Mr. Heald:** — I submit, Sir, that the relevance of what I had intended to go into details about and I'm not going to go into a lot of details, it will only take two or three minutes. But the Member for The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) spoke a few minutes

ago. He talked about these banquets and so on and nobody interrupted him. He said that the people were entitled to this information because it was an expenditure of monies. This is the Motion and I'm seeking to show Hon. Members that the kind of Orders which the Hon. Gentlemen when they were the Government of the day refused to or neglected to lay on the table. And this is the same kind of information and I would like to just remind you about this little bit. I submit that I am answering, what I'm saying is germane to the points that were made by the Member for Wadena (Mr. Dewhurst). For example, expenses, government-owned planes and this type of thing. I think this is information too and I know that the Member for Saskatoon Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) would like to wipe the record clean as of 1964, but I think these matters are matters, the same kind of information which the Hon. Members opposite refused when they were the Government. And that's my point.

**Mr. W.S. Lloyd: (Leader of the Opposition)** — Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General has now extended the terms of the debate, of course, very considerably. This is the problem my colleague was trying to get at. If he's allowed to make these kind of statements, then statements in reply, I presume, must be answered. This must be acceptable as well. But I would suggest to him that he was wise when he said he wasn't going to give too many details to the House. I submit to him, if he had given all the details, then the picture would have been quite different from that if he looks at those Orders which were not brought down and the date on which they were passed by the House and the amount of work involved in getting them ready, then there was justification for the fact that they weren't brought down by the end of that session. This is a far different situation from that which has been practised on several occasions, when the Government actually had the answers in its hands and has refused to bring them down as it did last year.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order! I'm a little bit confused as to whether the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) rose on a point of order. He was on the point of order so I presume the Attorney General has the floor if he wishes to take it. And I presume the Leader of the Opposition made a speech, I can't tell you which way this goes.

**Mr. Lloyd:** — Mr. Speaker, if you want to call it a speech, it's okay with me.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I thought you were on a point of order, to tell you the truth.

**Mr. Heald:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I know that they are quite sensitive

**March 14, 1968**

about some of these Orders that they ignored . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order!

**Mr. Lloyd:** — I just wanted to clarify my own position . . .but the Attorney General had sat down as I thought.

**Mr. Heald:** — On the point of order.

**Mr. Speaker:** — No, no. Order, order! The Attorney General rose on a point of order and he has a right to re-enter the debate, if he wishes to. I thought the Leader of the Opposition was on the same point of order and I'll give him the same courtesy later on if he wishes to get into the debate.

**Mr. Heald:** — Mr. Speaker, for the record, I do now desire to resume the debate. I'd just like to mention a few, I don't want to unduly ruffle the feathers and the sensitivities of the Hon. Members opposite, but these are the kind of Orders that they saw fit not to answer: copies of Cabinet Ministers' expenses and transportation accounts for April, May, and June, 1947; some reference to Dr. Schumiatcher when he was employed by the Government; other than Dr. Schumiatcher employees who have membership fees paid in professional organizations by the Government. Here's a good one: Government-owned planes used by Ministers, charge for use of. Never answered. Amounts paid as expenses during 1945-46, 1946-47, 1947-48, for certain trips by certain Ministers. Now I haven't gone into details of that but that's the kind of thing they have left out. Here's a good one and the Deputy Premier referred to this: Total amount paid in 1946-47 to Saskatchewan Commonwealth and Publishers, CCF Publishing and Printing Company Limited for advertising by departments, boards, agencies, offices and so on. That's an interesting one. Service Printing Company, total amount paid in 1951-52. Autos, jeeps, trucks owned by Government or Crown corporations in 1944 and 1951 and some information about Mrs. Bryden; amounts paid to Mrs. Cooper for services of Mrs. J.E. Cooper; employment by Government of P.G. Makaroff; employment by Government of J. Bentley; very interesting Returns for which the information never came down. Here's one: Number of copies printed (this is interesting today in light of the discussions earlier this afternoon) and the distribution of pamphlets, "More Abundant Living." Remember that one?

**Mr. Dewhurst:** — May I ask the Minister a question?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order!

**Mr. Heald:** — Saskatchewan Securities Commission, names of members of; the amount paid by Government to Bothwell Advertising Company Limited and so on.

**An Hon. Member:** — What year was that?

**Mr. Heald:** — I don't know, several years.

**Mr. Dewhurst:** — Will the Minister permit question?

**Mr. Heald:** — Yes, as soon as I'm through and I'm nearly through. The only point I wish to make, Mr. Speaker, is that the Government in its judgement or otherwise makes a judgement to whether or not it is prepared to answer the question. The Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) has told the Members of the Legislature that the information you want will cost in the neighborhood of \$150,000 and it's the position of the Government that at this cost it is not in the public interest to answer the question.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Member from Wadena (Mr. Dewhurst) asking a question.

**Mr. Dewhurst:** — What you refer to, were they Returns passed by the House or the motions that were refused by the House. I believe they were all passed by the House.

**Mr. Heald:** — No, I think they were passed by the House, but they weren't answered before the election and then they died with the subsequent election.

**Mr. W.E. Smishek: (Regina North East)** — Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a few short observations. I'm surprised at the Government's sensitivity in trying to answer this question and the inflated figures that they have used. I'm sure the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) really did not want to leave the impression that it would take 50,000 hours of work to obtain the information, as the Hon. Member from Moose Jaw South (Mr. Davies) has pointed out that this would involve 10 hours of work by each Government employee that is employed by the Civil Service. If that is the case, I hope that we can now quote the Minister of Mineral Resources and this Government that they have been buying so much booze in the last four years that it would take the total Civil Service two days to calculate the amounts they have spent.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Smishek:** — Mr. Speaker, I was very surprised that the Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald) entered into this debate to place a defence for this Government's extravagance, when today our Social Welfare people are getting a miserable \$26.50 a month for food. Mr. Speaker, if the Government is buying its liquor through the usual sources, through the Liquor Board, and paying the Liquor

**March 14, 1968**

Board prices, as I understand it is, it is necessary to get a permit from the Liquor Board in order to be able to serve liquor at a social function. Well, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that it would be a simple proposition to ask the Liquor Board how many functions were held or how many times the Government ordered liquor for Government functions. Now surely the Liquor Board has got that record, unless it is paying prices over and beyond what normally is paid in liquor stores. If that's the case, then this House is entitled to that answer as well, Mr. Speaker. On the whole argument about not having Orders returned, the record of this Government is not very good either. Mr. Speaker, I reminded this House yesterday that this Government has had answers to questions that were posed last year, six months ago, and it still refuses to file them. Surely, Mr. Speaker, this is a simple question, it would not involve that amount of work, I think this House is entitled to have the answer but if it fails to give us the answer, if it fails to amend the question as the Hon. Member from Regina Centre has proposed for simplicity, then from here on I am going to quote in my constituency and anywhere I go that this Government has spent so much money on booze it would take the total Civil Service two days to estimate the amounts it has spent.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. W.J. Berezowsky: (Prince Albert East-Cumberland)** — Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to make a speech, but I will say this. Just a year ago while sitting in a committee we found out that at the Chaplin Plant — and the Premier admitted it — he had hand-out bonuses to the tune of \$10,000 and it happened the year before as well. And when we asked him if there was liquor served, he said, "Yes, refreshments." Now I'd like to know what is happening to the taxes of the people of Saskatchewan, particularly at a time when we have to raise taxes and pay deterrent fees and so forth. I'm not criticizing the Government, if the amounts are reasonable, as was pointed out they must have some records that are easy to get at, let's have these records. This is a good question and let's have the answer to it instead of spending all the time bickering.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. R.H. Wooff: (Turtle ford)** — Mr. Speaker, it is often the case that if one only sits back long enough everything that could be said about a subject has been said. I can't help repeating a little anecdote that my father used to tell about the policeman that was following a chap around the village because he wanted to make a case of him and prove that he was under the influence. He finally followed him into the livery stable where he was putting the saddle on his horse to go home. He had it on the wrong way around and the policeman said, "Man, you're drunk, you've got your saddle on the wrong way around." And he' turned around to the policeman and said, "How do you know which way I want to go?"

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Wooff:** — As I have listened to the Minister of Mineral Resources, to the Minister of Social Welfare, to the Hon. Attorney General, I just don't know what direction they really want to go. To me the questions have been worthwhile from many angles. First it was worthwhile in introducing one of the Hon. Minister of Mineral Resources' annual shows. I was amazed though at the Minister of Social Welfare (Mr. MacDonald) getting into the discussion and the debate. To me it shows one thing, the length that this Government is prepared to go to cover certain information especially on this particular subject. The whole debate has made me want answers to this question more than ever. Personally I'd have been prepared to withdraw it at the start, but now I would like to pursue it to its conclusion. I am very sure that there are shorter cuts to answering this question than the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) was trying to tell us. I'm sure that there must be bills for liquor, before it got mixed up with ice cubes and soft drinks and 7-Up and meals and what have you. I don't think it has to be sorted out from all these different commodities and so far as I'm concerned, Mr. Speaker, as I've said from the start I'm more convinced than ever that this House should have the information.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Speaker:** — This is one debate that can never be described as dry.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

Motion was negatived on the following recorded division:

**YEAS — 23**

**Messieurs**

Lloyd	Meakes	Baker
Wooff	Berezowsky	Pepper
Kramer	Romanow	Bowerman
Willis	Smishek	Matsalla
Wood	Thibault	Messer
Blakeney	Whelan	Kwasnica
Davies	Snyder	Kowalchuk
Dewhurst	Brockelbank	

**NAYS — 31**

**Messieurs**

Thatcher	Coderre	Weatherald
Howes	Bjarnason	Mitchell
McFarlane	MacDonald	Larochelle
Boldt	Estey	Gardner
Cameron	Hooker	Coupland
Steuart	Gallagher	McPherson
Heald	McLennan	Charlebois

March 14, 1968

McIsaac  
Guy  
Loken  
Grant

Heggie  
Breker  
Leith  
Radloff

Forsyth  
McIvor

**RETURN NO. 79**

Mr. R.H. Wooff: (Turtleford) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 79 showing:

The amount paid by the Government of Saskatchewan or any of its crown corporations, boards, commissions; or other agencies for the purchase of alcoholic beverages in the calendar year, 1964; 1965; 1966; 1967; and the current year to February 15, 1968.

**Hon. A.G. CAMERON: (Minister of Mineral Resources)** — Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to you that this Motion is out of order. It is substantially the same if not almost identically the same as No. 79 which the House has already dealt with, and once dealt with, an issue, like Return No. 76, the House having made the decision once, I don't see how we could continue to debate on Return No. 79. In my view it is out of order and I'd ask you to rule on it, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Dewhurst: (Wadena)** — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the first Motion, Return No. 76, which was rejected by this House asked for information which the one before us now does not. While by implication the information that is in Return No. 79 could also have been obtained under Return No. 76, there is other information in Return No. 76. Had the motion for Return No. 76 passed, then I would say this one was out of order, but as Return No. 76 has been refused, this one doesn't ask for all the information. It is only a portion of it and therefore we would like to know whether this is the portion they want to refuse or the portion of which was ever greater. So I say that this one is in order, Mr. Speaker, — this is my thinking.

**Mr. Speaker:** — A point of order has been raised by the Hon. Minister of Mineral Resources to the effect that Motion for Return No. 79 moved by the Member for Turtleford (Mr. Wooff) is out of order on the grounds that it is similar in form and content to Motion for Return No. 76, also moved by the Member for Turtleford, upon which the House has already reached a decision.

Motion No. 76 asks for a Return showing the total cost to the Government or any of its agencies or Crown Corporations of alcoholic beverages served at certain functions during a given period of time. Motion No. 79 asks for a Return showing, the amount paid by the Government or any of its agencies or Crown corporations for alcoholic beverages during a given period of time.

The time periods and the subject are similar, but the questions are different, one being concerned with the cost of alcoholic beverages served, the other with the cost of alcoholic beverages bought. One could purchase any amount of alcoholic beverages and not serve any of them, therefore, the cost of the quantities of alcoholic beverages actually served and the cost of the quantity of alcoholic beverages actually purchased could be two very different figures. If one purchased \$100 worth of alcoholic beverages and used only \$50 worth there would be a very definite mathematical difference. I believe that the Motion is, therefore, in order.

Motion negatived.

## RESOLUTIONS

### RESOLUTION NO. 3 — ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES COMMISSION

Mr. J.R. Brockelbank (Saskatoon Mayfair) moved, seconded by Mr. A. Matsalla (Canora):

That this Assembly recommends to the consideration of the government the introduction of legislation to establish an independent electoral boundaries commission charged with the responsibility of drawing Saskatchewan's electoral boundaries based primarily on the principle of representation by population.

He said: Mr. Speaker, Gentlemen, I address you all as gentlemen anticipating your co-operation in the consideration of this Resolution. The Resolution recommends the introduction of legislation to establish an independent electoral boundaries commission charged with the responsibility of drawing Saskatchewan's electoral boundaries based primarily on the principle of representation by population. Statistics show that inequities do exist from city to city, from rural area to rural area. I would like to put forward an example, Mr. Speaker, to show support to the statement that I have made. For example, take the four constituencies in the southwest corner of the province, near the United States border, beginning with Shaunavon, Maple Creek, Kerrobert-Kindersley, and Wilkie — incidentally these are all held by Liberal Members of the Legislature. Take the four constituencies in the southeast corner of the province beginning at Souris-Estevan, Cannington, Moosomin, and Saltcoats, which are all held by Liberal Members. The total number of voters in the four constituencies at the Alberta border are 30,975. The total number of voters in the four constituencies at the Manitoba border are 40,950. The average number of voters in each of those four constituencies at the Alberta boundary is 7,743. The average at the Manitoba border is 10,237. The conclusion to be drawn here, Mr. Speaker, is that if you subtract the 30,975 voters in those four constituencies at the Alberta border from the four constituencies at the Manitoba border, you have a difference of 9,975 or 2,493 more constituents per MLA at the Manitoba border.



**March 14, 1968**

I would like to present another example to show the difference that arises between one city and another city. I take, for example, the cities of Saskatoon and Regina. The city of Saskatoon City Park-University — 16,917; Saskatoon Mayfair — 16,199; Nutana Centre — 15,824; Riversdale — 12,258; Nutana South — 12,392; for a total of 73,590. We do the same with the Regina constituencies and total them up and it comes to 77,905. Now if we were to subtract one from the other and find the average voters per constituency in each of these areas, we would find that Saskatoon City has an average number of voters per constituency, of 14,718, whereas the average number of voters in each Regina constituency is 12,984. The conclusion to be drawn from this, Mr. Speaker, is that on the average each Saskatoon MLA has to represent 1,734 constituents more than each Regina MLA.

Statistics also show a wide variation between rural and urban constituencies. Traditionally rural constituencies have enjoyed a representation in the Legislature not in proportion to urban constituency-voting population. There are several reasons for this situation occurring and continuing to exist. The most obvious reasons involve population density, farm mechanization, and urban industrialization. Mr. Speaker, I can understand the reason for a differential existing between a rural constituency and the urban constituency's voting population. Consequently, I am in favor of preserving a differential, but the differential should be within limits more cognizant of the principle of representation by population.

For comparison sake, compare the average number of voters in the four previously mentioned constituencies located at the Manitoba-Saskatchewan border to the average of the six Regina constituencies. Members should keep in mind that the four rural constituencies used in the example are larger than average, for rural constituencies. We find that the Regina constituency average is 26.5 per cent higher than the four rural constituency averages. Again, compare the same rural constituency averages to the city of Saskatoon. The Saskatoon average constituency is 43.5 per cent larger than the rural constituency average. Mr. Speaker, the variations that I have shown are so severe that they cry out for recognition and correction.

The Province of Manitoba had an independent Commission appointed in 1956. Since their first adjustment of electoral boundaries in 1957, there has been a large population shift. It would appear now that a great deal of pressure will be exerted to abandon a traditional method of reckoning rural-urban representation. This year, the Manitoba independent Commission will present a revision of electoral boundaries which, it is anticipated, will give the city of Winnipeg and other urban areas at least five additional seats, according to a report in the Financial Post, dated February 24, 1968.

All types of political reform should be an urgent desire for citizens of all western democracies. Reform of political structures is happening in different places in Canada, Manitoba,

Quebec, Ottawa, to name some of the more obvious. As Canadians we have chosen the democratic system, not for its efficiency, not for its simplicity, not for its economy, but because we believe it most adequately blends a desirable degree of public order with individual participation. At a time when emerging nations, many in our Commonwealth of Nations, are experimenting with democracy, albeit guided democracy, we as a nation and a province should make all deliberate speed toward refining and perfecting our democratic form of government, keeping in mind two facts of modern living, fast transportation and instant communication. Our people and/or our governments are subjects of constant examination by foreign students, foreign business people, foreign visitors, and foreign governments. Consequently, if we are to convincingly advance the argument in favor of a democratic system, we must show that it is the best of all possible systems.

Equity must be the basis of our system if it is to appeal to emerging nations that have, for too long, Mr. Speaker, been tortured by the thorn of inequity. We, as a civilization, have advanced to the point where matters such as the division of our province into electoral areas can be handed over to an Independent Commission. In the past, done by politicians, the process has been partisan, complex and agonizing. In the final analysis the blame has always been assigned to some group. In the future, the division of the province by an Independent Commission, into electoral districts, could be an elementary, fundamental exercise. In this case, though, the credit rather than the blame could be assigned to each and every Member of this Legislature for making possible the alternate method.

As you can see, Mr. Speaker, I am not looking for a verbal Donnybrook or a standoff draw. Each party has brought in redistributions and has kept in mind and used partisan political advantage. The rule that I beg each Member debating this Resolution to apply to himself is, let the one who has done no wrong cast the first stone. If the Assembly on both sides agrees to observe that rule, we can take a step of which we will all be proud and for which we will all deserve credit. My statistics were obtained from the office of the Chief Returning Officer of Saskatchewan. Further information regarding the Independent Commission of Manitoba can be acquired from the Statutes of Manitoba, 1957, Chapter 18, Section 8, which deals with membership of the Commission and Section 10 deals with the terms of reference. The Statutes of Canada 1964, Chapter 31, contains information about the Federal Independent Commission.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. A. Matsalla: (Canora)** — Mr. Speaker, I at this time beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

March 14, 1968

#### RESOLUTION NO. 4 — AMENDMENTS TO THE VEHICLES ACT

Mr. R. Romanow (Saskatoon Riversdale) moved, seconded by Mr. A. Thibault (Kinistino):

That this Legislature urge the government to make such amendments to the Vehicles Act as are necessary in order that the Highway Traffic Board of Saskatchewan be empowered to, firstly, suspend an operator's licence for a period of one year where an operator of a motor vehicle has displayed a breathalyzer reading of .08 per cent blood alcohol content and, secondly, suspend an operator's licence for a period of one year where an operator of a motor vehicle has refused to submit a breathalyzer test having been so requested by a peace officer in the lawful execution of his duty.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in giving my remarks on this Resolution before the House, I thought that there would be no better passage to lead off the debate as it were than a quotation from the Special Committee on Highway Traffic and Safety of Saskatchewan, dated December, 1966. I wasn't then a Member of this Legislature, Mr. Speaker, but I have had the opportunity of perusing very carefully the recommendations contained therein. I would like to direct to your attention, Mr. Speaker, the second recommendation and part of the quotation, which I think sets the mood and the tone of this whole debate. The quotation is as follows:

In the examples of traffic accidents presented to the Committee it was apparent that alcohol was frequently present. In some-of the most serious accidents one at least of the drivers was according to his blood alcohol level intoxicated.

Now the, quotation continues and discusses the relative merits and recommends, in fact, ultimately that a .08 per cent alcohol reading be incorporated. I think this quotation by an all-party committee of this Legislature, Mr. Speaker, places the role of motor vehicle accidents in Saskatchewan in proper perspective. I think it is an awesome statement When the Committee finds that of the most serious accidents one at least of the drivers was according to his blood alcohol level, intoxicated. Now in the first part of my remarks, I simply want to emphasize what I consider to be a simple fact and that is, that there are now sufficient studies in Canada and the United States, and on the basis of the Special Committee's report of 1966, to show that there is in fact a direct correlation between the incidence of motor vehicle accidents and the consumption of alcohol. The studies show that, depending on how much alcohol one wants to measure, the presence of it in accidents occurs in about 30 to 85 per cent of all of the mishaps on the highways. This varies, of course, depending on the study that one has examined, and I have said it depends also on the quantum of alcohol that you want to use as a guide-line. And there are some difficulties, Mr. Speaker, in determining exactly what this percentage really

is. The reasons for the difficulties are quite obvious. Often after a serious accident, there is insufficient time or insufficient resource personnel to measure the presence of alcohol in the people hurt. Also, about the only time that one can really determine the presence of alcohol, is after a person has been detected and detained and investigated by a police officer. In such cases, usually accidents have not yet occurred and the result is that the statistics lack somewhat in over-all impact in this regard. And also, another reason is, in cases studied, that a patient in hospital will often not admit to having consumed alcohol before the accident, or if that person does admit that, Mr. Speaker, the amount often stated is somewhat less than the amount actually consumed.

Nevertheless despite these problems, the most authoritative study has proven a definite link between motor vehicle accidents major or minor, and the consumption of alcohol. I am not going take up the time of this House in quoting statistics. I think, Mr. Speaker, there are two authoritative works on the matter. One is entitled "Alcohol and Traffic Safety" which contains a comprehensive review and discussion on this matter and is printed by the United States Government Printing Department. It contains a study of the Americans' statistics and findings. More particularly, I direct your attention and the Hon. Members' to chapter two on drinking-driving mortality and morbidity statistics. The other authoritative work is the volume of the proceedings of the third international conference in London in 1962, entitled "Alcohol and Road Traffic." This deals primarily with the statistics as have been recorded in the United Kingdom as well as in other parts of England and Europe. Both of these documents, Mr. Speaker, support the contention and the first proposition that I wish to submit to this House, and that is, that accidents in many cases, far too many cases, are directly related to the consumption of alcohol.

Now it goes without saying that the vehicle has become a very major means of transportation in Canada, Saskatchewan, North America and everywhere. I suppose that one could go as far as to say that it is the most prevalent and prominent means of transportation.

Now in assessing this question a person is then required to ask the following question: how much alcohol is required before normal driving skill is actually impaired? I am going to be the first one to admit that there are certain inherent dangers, Mr. Speaker, in saying that there is presently in existence a test which win absolutely measure normal driving-skill and how it is impaired by the use of alcohol. But what can be measured and what has been measured are behavioral patterns which can be reasonably related to driving skill. There have been numerous studies made on the question of such things as reaction time, visual and perceptual abilities. In fact, Mr. Speaker, as all Hon. Members of the House are aware, such minute and intrinsically complex things to assess as the physiological phenomenon of risk taking, attitudes, and judgements of a particular driver of the motor vehicle can now be measured. Fortunately

**March 14, 1968**

modern science has progressed to the point where we do not now have to answer the question of how much alcohol is required for impairment of normal driving skill. I am going to refer to this a little later, Mr. Speaker, in my remarks. The one thing that is clear is this. All medical authorities, all legal authorities who have written on this matter, I would submit, concede and agree on this fact, that any discernible amount of alcohol in the blood will be accompanied by a decrease in the competence of the operation of a motor vehicle.

And so, Sir, while I am acknowledging to this House that it is often difficult to state in precise terms what exact percentage of blood alcohol level will mean impairment, I am saying, nevertheless, that any amount that is at all discernible will cause impairment to such an extent that the safety of others on the road is in danger. And to that extent, Mr. Speaker, some Members of this House might take issue with the figure of .08 per cent blood alcohol content as referred to in this Resolution. However, as I am sure the Hon. Attorney General (Mr. Heald) and all Members of this House will appreciate there has to be from time to time definition in the laws and there must be a definition on this law of impairment. Somewhere, we as the Legislators of the Province of Saskatchewan have to draw a line arbitrarily. As I said, fortunately, it does not matter whether that line is much below .08. The important thing is that there is a lowering of skills and judgement in the operation of a vehicle at that level, most definitely. And again, there are many quotations on the .08 percentage. I am not going to take up the time again of the Hon. Members in this regard. I want to merely cite as authority backing this proposition the finding of the Select Committee in this House in 1966. It recommended that .08 be the arbitrary line. In the United Kingdom, present legislation which has been incorporated embodies the principle of the .08 per cent alcohol, and this was endorsed by the British Medical Association. Also, in the book that I referred to the Hon. Members earlier, "Alcohol and Traffic Safety", page 39, there is there, too, approval of the principle that .08 seems to be a reasonably fair and accurate assessment of this level of impairment. In fact, Mr. Speaker, there are many writers, medical and legal, who say that the reading of .08 per cent is far too high at that.

Now as a third argument advanced, I submit that the public of Saskatchewan is now no longer prepared to sacrifice anything short of absolute road safety. If I may digress, we, as the Legislators of the Province of Saskatchewan, not only have the duty and the responsibility to concern ourselves with the impaired driving as much as we can within our jurisdiction and framework, we've also got to make the roads safer, the vehicles safer. We have to have better and more stringent laws, in which not to sacrifice absolute road safety.

Since, in this Resolution, we are only dealing with the question of driving while under the influence of alcohol, may I just digress, Mr. Speaker, to paint what I consider to be part of the social framework that we now find ourselves in. And that is this. Anywhere you go, in any jurisdiction in North America

and most parts of Europe, driving while under the influence of alcohol is outlawed. And apart from the recent British legislation, which I am going to discuss later, the definition of the exact illegal act itself has never been defined by parliamentarians. It has been left up to the law courts to decide. It is not surprising, therefore, I would submit, to find an evasion of the definition which measures in some concrete terms what is meant by impaired intoxicated driving. The definition in fact, Mr. Speaker, has been far too often made by an arresting police officer, who makes the definition of impaired driving by virtue of the observations and judgment that he subjectively makes on the person who is arrested or the person on whom he seeks to carry out an investigation. It is a difficult thing to define. It is a task, Mr. Speaker, that I would submit to the Hon. Attorney General (Mr. Heald) and to Members of this House, that most judges of the courts of Saskatchewan abhor. Up until now, our society was willing to pay for not having absolute road safety. But I feel sincerely, Mr. Speaker, that this is no longer the case.

In the past, with individuals and some organizations, there has been some intellectual acceptance of the .08 concept, but that is about as far as it has gone. But now I would submit that organized groups of Saskatchewan society at any rate are protesting any further delay in defining for the courts and for the public what the level of impairment is going to be.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Romanow:** — I feel, sincerely, Mr. Speaker, that the .08 figure, having already made my preliminary remarks about some of the inherent dangers, is a good figure because it does compromise on the point of the minimum amount of alcohol that one will be allowed to consume and still legally operate a motor vehicle, with the obvious social need and the social fact that we must curtail and control the drinking driver. I think that people have seen the tragic consequences of drinking and driving. I want to direct attention of the Hon. Members to a recent letter directed to the Hon. Attorney General (Mr. Heald) of this Government by a group of 86 doctors and some 120 registered nurses. In that letter they urge compulsory breath and blood tests and upon a certain level being attained, life-time suspension with respect to driving privileges. The letter is a very interesting one, Mr. Speaker, but one part of it, I think, really talks about and best exemplifies the fact that members of our society are no longer prepared to accept and receive the tragic consequences of driving and drinking. And that quotation that best emphasizes this, Mr. Speaker, says according to newspaper reports:

In our practices we see the dead and we also see the vastly greater number of injured resulting from traffic accidents. We see the maimed, the sick, the sorrowing, and the bereaved.

And on it goes. Those of us who are of the legal profession

**March 14, 1968**

also see the heartache of ruinous and costly legal cases, both civilly and criminally. In the city of Saskatoon, the police chief, Chief Kettles has indicated his opposition and also his support for immediate remedial action by this Legislature now.

I am receiving many letters, Mr. Speaker, from church groups and other individuals, who are now openly urging us, the Legislators of this Province, to take immediate action on the institution of .08. I have several letters from various church organizations representing hundreds of people of Saskatchewan pleading with this House to take up the cudgel against abusive driving privileges when they relate to drinking. So therefore I want to impress on the Hon. Members of both sides that this is a problem that the public will no longer wait for us to do and act on.

Now in the fourth proposition, Mr. Speaker, I feel that some very brief analysis must be made of the existing legislation in Canada and Saskatchewan. In doing so, may I say that it is my respectful conclusion that the legislation in the Province of Saskatchewan and the legislation of the Dominion of Canada is totally ineffective to curb the social problem. As Members know, the House of Commons has the jurisdiction to set out the Criminal Code offences, and in the Criminal Code there is the offence of having the care and control of driving a motor vehicle while impaired or intoxicated. But that is as far as legislation goes. It does not go that one step further that I talked about in defining what is meant by impairment or intoxication. Of course there are cases from which the judges and lawyers, when they argue before the courts, may draw on as some guide-line. A judge for example may look at the gait or the speech or the manner of dress or the conduct of the person involved or the subjective judgement of a police officer the type of thing I've talked about, but there is no satisfactory definition in the Federal legislation of impairment or intoxication. I think that there is some validity to the argument that these are subjective judgements, only because what is one man's impaired gait may really be another man's arthritic or crippled leg. It is a subjective analysis. The new Federal amendment to the Criminal Code proposed by the Minister of Justice would define impairment at .1 per cent blood alcohol, so there has been some moving away, Mr. Speaker, from leaving this area undefined. But there is no provision in the old legislation nor in the new, as far as I know it — I stand to be corrected by the Hon. Attorney General (Mr. Heald) — that compels an individual to take such a breath or blood test as may be necessary, to determine whether or not in fact that person has a .10 blood alcohol content. From that standpoint the legislation proposed and the old legislation are totally ineffective.

Now in Saskatchewan there is a Vehicles Act and Hon. Members know that among other things, The Vehicles Act of the Province of Saskatchewan defines driving privileges. Now there is one section in that Act which permits the Highway Traffic Board to suspend an operator's licence upon refusal to obtain a breath test. The important thing to note here, I feel, is that that power given to the Board is discretionary and I feel totally

inadequate in terms of effectively enforcing the amount of time for which a person is to be suspended, if he refuses to take a breath test, or having taken a breath test having had a certain impaired or blood alcohol reading.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, to my mind legislation existing and proposed Federally is totally ineffective. Firstly, the proposed definition of impairment of .1 per cent, Federally, is far too liberal. It goes against the best medical and legal authorities in this area. Secondly, also, it's ineffective because it does not provide the police officers and enforcement agencies with the necessary teeth in which to carry out the investigating procedure. Now it must be recognized that our society will have to set a level to ensure that people with higher tolerance of alcohol are not dealt with unjustly. I would respectfully submit the suggested figure of .08 takes this factor into account. Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons argued against .08 percent is that the payment that we as legislators and members of .society are going to pay is some reduction in civil liberties. Some Hon. Members may want to peruse carefully the Resolution that is before the House and immediately argue that this is going to amount to a curtailment of civil liberties. I think there is some merit in this argument. It states that, when a person is forced to testify against himself when he is compelled to give a breath or a blood test, as he would be if the import of this Resolution was adopted by this House and implemented by the Government, his civil liberties would be taken away somewhat in this area. I say this, Mr. Speaker, that each Member will have to make up his own mind; wrestle with his own conscience as to whether or not he will come down in favor of increased stricter road safety regulations and requirements and therefore more compulsive areas and laws in this field, or whether he will come down in favor of the argument against any diminution of his civil rights and civil liberties. In other words it's a public policy decision. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that society has now chosen the former. There is no diminution of the rights of a person, if that person sees fit to, get behind a 2,000-pound-or-more vehicle, while he is incapacitated to operate that vehicle by blood alcohol content.

In the Criminal Code of Canada, we now force people not to carry offensive weapons. Society has decreed that the .interests of the community in this area are paramount to those of an individual who wishes to have his individual civil right and liberty to carry a lethal weapon. Regretfully, our society has not yet said to the same individual, who operates a weapon in many cases much more lethal than anything contemplated by the Criminal Code of Canada, when you are driving and when you are drinking, you are not allowed on the highways. If one accepts my argument, one must conclude that the present and the proposed legislation Federally is ineffective. May I also add in conclusion that the Canadian Bar Association and the Canadian Medical Association have wrestled over this problem medically and also from the civil rights standpoint, and to my understanding, both organizations have said that the implementation of .08 per cent compulsory reading really in the overall balance of society's need and



**March 14, 1968**

demand is not going to be a diminution of civil liberties.

Now in concluding this fourth proposition, may I make some passing reference to existing legislation in one other province in the Dominion of Canada, and that is British Columbia. Members will know that in British Columbia there is what is called the twenty-four-hour, the so-called twenty-four-hour legislation. I want to make it abundantly clear that I think this legislation has some merit and if the Hon. Attorney General in his statements of a few days ago, referring to this legislation as possibly the basis for legislation to be introduced in this House, I don't think we on this side would oppose it. But respectfully, Mr. Speaker, it does not go far enough. It is not wide enough. It is not strong enough, for British Columbia legislation permits society, I feel, to falsely assume that only those who may have casually slipped behind the wheel and having had too much to drink on one occasion and having been removed for a 24-hour period, that the danger has slipped away as that person has been removed from the vehicle for the 24-hour period. It is a lulling, I feel, of society's sensitivity to the overall pressing problem that's before us now, an overall pressing problem, Mr. Speaker, that I submit can only be resolved by stronger and more effective remedial action than the 24-hour suspension period proposed by British Columbia legislation.

Fifthly, Mr. Speaker, if we have come to the point now where in our analysis of the laws of Saskatchewan and Canada we say that these laws are ineffective in this area, Hon. Members will obviously ask the question: well are there any jurisdictions that have in fact adequate laws in this regard? All Members will know the best example which is the most recent also that of the British legislation. I have a copy of the said legislation here. It is a rather long Act, but briefly stated, The Road Safety Act of 1967 empowers a uniform police officer to take a breath test of a person if he suspects that person has consumed alcohol or has reasonable grounds to assume or suspect that the driver has committed a traffic offence or was involved in a motor vehicle accident. And if that person, having been so compelled by a uniformed police officer registers a blood alcohol reading of .08 per cent, there is a fine or imprisonment or both and a suspension of the operator's licence, for what I would submit, Mr. Speaker, is a meaningful term.

Now, I've written to Officials of the Transport Office and Home Office in the United Kingdom on the question of statistics as to how effective this new legislation is. It was only introduced in October last. Unfortunately I have not received any return from the United Kingdom. But preliminary newspaper reports and other evidence that has been amassed thus far are overwhelmingly, Mr. Speaker, in favor of a very stiff strict law against drinking drivers. I want to direct Hon. Members to the attention of one article in the Financial Post, dated as early as January 14, 1968. I have a photocopy of the article. May I quote, Mr. Speaker, from the editorial which headlines, "Sobering Facts", says this:

Opponents of compulsory breathalyzer tests for motorists would do well to study the early results from Britain.

October was the first full month in which British bobbies had the right to insist that a driver take the breath test and during that month, road fatalities, and serious injuries were down 14 per cent from a year earlier.

Significantly, as the-Manchester Guardian Weekly points out during the evening drinking hours, the figures were down by 16 per cent between eight and ten, by 38 per cent between 10 p.m. and midnight, and 57 per cent between midnight and 4 a.m.

Mr. Speaker, the editorial continues:

More dramatic are the figures for the five-day Christmas holiday when road deaths in Britain fell 40 per cent from the year before. There were 98 deaths compared with 158. Traffic injuries were down 30 per cent, Mr. Speaker, to 3,931 from some over 5,900.

I'm going to conclude quoting this article by saying this:

These two examples, of course, can't provide total statistical proof that the breathalyzer keeps drinkers off the road. There may have been specific circumstances in weather. Certainly the publicity surrounding the introduction of the breathalyzer would have made drivers particularly cautious about drinking.

Another very authoritative report on this matter is in the Highway Safety News of January, 1968. I am referring to the English Legislation that says this and I quote:

On last October 9, breathalysers were put into use in Britain under stiff new laws. One month later police were able to state with accuracy that the fatal and injury accident rate in greater London had dropped by 42 per cent from the same period in 1966. In addition, the number of people killed in the same period dropped by, Mr: Speaker, 34 per cent, from 82 to 54.

In other words the preliminary newspaper reports and statistics seem to indicate the new laws are working and they're working, Mr. Speaker, because they're enforceable. They're working because society through their legislators has said as a matter of public policy that we can no longer tolerate the slaughter on our highways by drinking drivers.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Romanow:** — Now the instrument used is one commonly referred to as the breathalyzer. It's an instrument that has been approved of judicially every day. It happens in defense of impaired

**March 14, 1968**

driving cases. It's been approved by the Canadian Medical Association and has been approved by the Canadian Bar Association in discussions as well. The mechanism, Mr. Speaker, is a perfectly sound and valid mechanism on which to measure blood alcohol content, and I only mention that reference to put at ease any argument that may be advanced. But how do I know that a machine of this nature is going to accurately assess the reading? It is, I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, a thoroughly scientifically proven valid machine to document blood alcohol reading.

Well now other newspapers have reported these preliminary and very positive and good results from Britain. The important thing here to note, Mr. Speaker, is that 34 per cent of fatalities decreased. What then, Sir, would such a reduction of fatalities mean to Saskatchewan and Canada, if it corresponded here. Surveys have indicated from the highway traffic counts and the like that we could expect a similar reduction in figures in Saskatchewan and Canada. 34 per cent. If you want to translate it another way, Mr. Speaker, 34 per cent less of the total traffic fatalities in Canada means 1,787 alive today, that have been killed by drinking drivers. 1,787 lives in one year. Those are the lives that have gone! Those are the lives we can save in the future, Sir. Now the economics of good drinking and driving legislation that is stiff stands for itself, and I am not going to elaborate on that, on the question of health and man hours that are lost due to injuries and the like.

There is also a very moral and hardened principal position I think we ought to take here, and that is this, that in a highly sophisticated, highly automated and a rapidly technological-changing world, a highly civilized world, we surely must progress to the point where our legislation embodies the moral principle that with driving a motor vehicle, a potentially lethal weapon such as that, there must be responsibility and responsibility that is fixed by statute.

This Resolution embodies the principle of .08 per cent concept. I interpret the Resolution as it's worded to be one, if you will, of a compulsory nature, it's there for the Members to peruse. If a driver, having blown or used the mechanism of the breathalyzer, records a reading of .08 per cent, the Highway Traffic Board must suspend that operator's licence for a period of one year and alternatively if a uniformed police officer has requested a person to use the breathalyzer or such similar object but has refused to do so, he too shall be suspended for one year. There is to be no discretion allowed of the Highway Traffic Board.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot legislate for the Parliament of Canada, but we can here in the Province of Saskatchewan set down terms and conditions for the licensing of our drivers. I plead with you, Sir, and the Government and the Hon. Attorney General that, if we make good drinking habits a condition precedent to motor vehicle licences, we can, I am sure, embody the best features of the British legislation which has proven so successful thus far. We can do that without any diminution or

reconciliation of our basic civil liberties. That, Mr. Speaker, simply the effect of the motion and the Resolution that Hon. Members will be asked to pass on.

May I in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, call on this House, the Attorney General and the Government to do the following things: firstly of course, to adopt the Resolution; secondly, I would respectfully ask the Attorney General to make every possible strong representation to Ottawa that they lower their limit from .10 per cent to .08 per cent, I think it is far too liberal at 10; thirdly, I know there is a program in effect, but I would urge the Government of the day to institute a larger more wholesale comprehensive program of driver education at all levels, educating the public at large and the future drivers of tomorrow on the inherent dangers of getting behind a motor vehicle while having consumed alcohol. I think the recommendation of the Special Committee may be implemented here. Breathalyzer demonstrations in the courses of adult education and other education may be of some merit. And fourthly, Mr. Speaker, although it's strictly on topic of this Resolution, I would urge the Hon. Attorney General and the Government to pick the recommendation of the Special Standing Committee which says to this Government, "Set up a Select Standing Committee on road safety in the Province of Saskatchewan." I urge that that Select Standing Committee be set up now, bi-partisan, non-political, with power to hire such professionals as may be needed from time to time, to make sure that the road standards, the safety standards of our automobiles and drinking legislation are up-to-date and in force. If we adopt this position and those four points, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that citizens of Saskatchewan will have said, whatever else they may say about this Legislature this session, that Saskatchewan will have been positive and progressive and a leader. As far as Canada is concerned in this regard, I would respectfully urge, Mr. Speaker, that all Members adopt this Resolution, and the Government implement early action on .08.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly recessed until 7:30 o'clock p.m.

## ADJOURNED DEBATES

### MOTION FOR RETURN NO. 41

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. W.G. Davies (Moose Jaw South) for Return No. 41 and the proposed amendment thereto by Mr. L.P. Coderre (Minister of Labour):

**Mr. Smishek: (Regina North East)** — Mr. Speaker, the amendment proposed by the Minister is certainly not going to answer the question requested. We are concerned here about the Government providing us with the



## ADJOURNED DEBATES

### MOTION FOR RETURN NO. 30

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. W.S. Lloyd (Leader of the opposition) for Return No. 30 showing and the amendment thereto by the Hon. Mr. McIsaac (Minister of Education):

**Mr. M. Kwasnica: (Cutknife)** — Mr. Speaker, in order that we get the correct information to this question, I'd like to move an amendment to the amendment, seconded by my colleague from Melville (Mr. Kowalchuk) that the following be added to the, amendment:

“listing separately: (a) those loans made under the Canada Student Loan Plan; (b) those loans made under the Student Aid Fund Act, Saskatchewan; and (c) other Loans identified by type.”

**Hon. J.C. McIsaac: (Minister of Education)** — Mr. Speaker, the subamendment is certainly okay as far as I am concerned. This is the information that I had intended to provide in the original amendment except I didn't spell it out so clearly as this, so this is fine.

Subamendment agreed to.

Amendment as amended agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

**March 14, 1968**

information of what organizations have been approached and what unions have been asked and whether central labor bodies have been requested to name people. It has been a general problem we have been facing since this Government took office. It has not asked union bodies, the organizations concerned with the various labor laws, to have people appointed to committees and boards. What they do, Mr. Speaker, is at its own whim at its own wish to appoint the kind of people who do not represent labor. In the main they are political appointees. In this particular case, certainly there is an urgent need for a proper review of the Act and the administration which has become highly political. It is extremely important, Mr. Speaker, that we have a committee of review that will be set up, that will be properly representative of employers and employees, not just political appointees. I'm sure that there are other Members who will want to express their views on the amendment that the Minister proposed, but I would suggest that this amendment be turned down and the original Motion approved as proposed by the Hon. Member from Moose Jaw South (Mr. Davies).

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. G.T. Snyder: (Moose Jaw North)** — Mr. Speaker, I know that all Members of the House are or should be concerned with providing all of the information that can be made available to the Members of this House. In keeping with this general philosophy, I'd like to move, seconded by Mr. Michayluk (Redberry) a subamendment be made to the amendment proposed by the Hon. Mr. Coderre to the Motion for Order for Return by Mr. Davies, No. 41. The following words be added to the amendment:

“(5) And all correspondence between the Government and any individuals and organizations concerned with respect to such nominations.”

**Hon. L.P. Coderre: (Minister of Labour)** — Mr. Speaker, on the question of the subamendment, the Hon. Member is asking for correspondence between the Government and any individuals and organizations concerned with respect to such nominations. Also, the Hon. Member, Mr. Smishek had the audacity to say that we are appointing people for political reasons on these committees. I'd like to draw attention of the House to Part Seven of the Workmen's Compensation Accident Fund Act though in this respect, Mr. Speaker, I feel obligated for the fact that the Act is on the floor of the House, I have to refer to it because it refers specifically to this Resolution. Section 128 (1) of the Act reads:

The Lieutenant Governor in Council shall at least once every four years, appoint a committee consisting of five or more members as may be determined by the Lieutenant Governor in Council to review and report upon all matters concerning the Act, the regulations made thereunder and the administration thereof which may be specified by the

Lieutenant Governor in Council.

Subsection 2:

The Lieutenant Governor in Council shall appoint the members of the committee and shall designate one as chairman and one as acting chairman and shall specify the number of members which shall constitute a forum. The membership of the committee shall include equal representation of employers and organized employees.

I submit to this House, Mr. Speaker, that the name of Mr. Tom Parks (and I'm giving the information in advance for the Hon. Member's information). Mr. Tom Parks, a railway engineer who belongs to the Brotherhood of Railway Workers, Michael Merk is now nominated to the Board. He is the local representative of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers for the Regina unit. And subsection four of Section 128:

The members of the committee other than those whose full time is at the disposal of the government shall be paid such compensation for their services and expenses as may be determined by the Lieutenant Governor in Council and the Minister of Labour shall provide such technical, clerical and other assistance as committee may require. The compensation and the expenses of the members of the committee and the cost of technical, clerical and other assistance provided by the Minister of Labour shall be paid by the Board out of the Accident Fund.

Finally subsection 6:

The chairman or in his absence, the acting chairman shall have the powers of the commissioner under the Public Inquiries Act and the committees may receive and accept such evidence and information on oath, affidavit, or otherwise as its discretion deems fit and proper.

And nowhere in this Act determines what section shall be used to establish this committee, nor does it say that you must consult with any political organization, any other group, and I certainly don't intend to consult with the Hon. Member from Regina North (Mr. Smishek) or his organization as to whom I shall put on this Board. The people I selected for this Board were requested by me. They are representatives of labor; they are representatives of management, but I will not, and I say again, will not consult with the political organization as to who shall be put on these Boards.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**An Hon. Member:** — Bunch of Communists.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order!

**Mr. Smishek:** — Mr. Speaker, on the



**March 14, 1968**

subamendment, as usual the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) always gets out into the bushes somewhere. I suppose he is still looking for that automobile. I did not ask him to consult with any political organization. I asked him to consult with trade union labor organizations. The Minister should have had no objection to the motion for information as was requested. Certainly the Act requires the appointment of representatives from employers and organized employees. The central and main labor organization that represents the largest body of trade union people is the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour; this the Minister knows. The Minister has not requested the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour to name anybody to the Review Committee. I submit he has not asked the central legislative body of the railway unions to name a person, and I submit that he has not asked the building trades organization of the province to name a person. If he did, then he should be prepared to admit which organizations he consulted. But as has always been the case with the present Minister, he does not consult the labor movement, a precedent that has been here for many, many years, whether it is in case of Workmen's Compensation, in the case of Minimum Wage, in the case of The Trade Union Act or any other body labor is concerned about. Mr. Speaker, not only has that been a precedent for many years in this province, it's exactly the same situation in every province in the Dominion of Canada. It wasn't until this Liberal Government took office in 1964 that they refused and failed to consult people's organizations where people's organizations have a right to be represented.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order!

**Mr. A.E. Blakeney: (Regina Centre)** — Mr. Speaker, I simply want to add a few words to this discussion. I hope I don't have to engage in the vitriolic comment that came from the Member from Milestone (Mr. MacDonald). I don't propose to call anyone a bunch of Communists or anyone a bunch of Fascists. I hope my arguments will be somewhat more pointed than that. All I want to say is that there has been for some considerable time a tradition of consulting both employer and employee groups, and the recognized groups have been consulted whether or not the Government of the day agreed with the politics of the recognized group. I think it cannot be denied that the spokesman of organized labor insofar as they have a spokesman in Saskatchewan is the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour. They have a much larger number of members of organized labor adhering to their group than any other group, and accordingly it seems as to me appropriate for the Minister of Labour to consult that group. May I point out, Mr. Speaker, that in the days when the previous Government was selecting similar committees, we consulted the Saskatchewan Chamber of Commerce and the Saskatchewan Section of the Canadian Manufacturers Association. And may I point out that at times the Saskatchewan Chamber of Commerce was not exactly a warm supporter of the Government. It was carrying on a little program called "Operation Freedom" which didn't seem to support the Government which I represented.

And I felt that this was certainly their right. If they wanted carry on those activities, then, that's their right. They did not thereby destroy their status as a representative of employers and they did not thereby get shut out by the previous Government from consultation.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — It seems to me that these organizations have a right to carry on public relations programs which advance the views which they adhere to. If these views happen to be contrary to the views expressed by the Government in power, that's too bad, surely the Government in power shouldn't then retaliate by saying "We send you to Coventry, we won't talk to you. You may think you're the Canadian Manufacturers Association but we've never heard of you. You may think that you're the Saskatchewan Chamber of Commerce but we've never heard of you. You may think that you're representing Saskatchewan Federation of Labour, but we've never heard of you. Now this is highly undesirable. I think it strikes me as being small and mean for the Government to decide that simply because a public organization doesn't happen to adhere to the views which the Government is now expressing, it thereby surrenders its right to be consulted. This view was not taken before.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Oh!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Oh, oh! The Member for Prince Albert West has very good sound effects, but when he stands up I hope he will tell us whether the Saskatchewan Chamber of Commerce was consulted, whether the Saskatchewan Section of the Canadian Manufacturers Association was consulted, and I think the answer is Yes. Similarly the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour was consulted and I think that it is entirely appropriate when a government's setting up a bi-partisan board of this nature, partly representing employers and partly representing employees that the Government should consult the recognized employer associations such as the CMA and the Chamber of Commerce and the recognized employee associations such as the Federation of Labour, the Building Trades' Council, the railway unions and the like. There are only three or four large groups on each side. Surely it shouldn't be too much for this Government, however reluctant it is to consult with public groups, to consult with three or four labor groups and three or four employer groups before it sets up a board which as the Act says, is to represent organized labor and employers. I don't know how the Government decides who are to represent organized labor. I don't know how the Government decides who are to represent employers. I would have thought the employers might have some idea who ought to represent them. And I would have thought organized labor might have some idea who ought to represent them. I doubt whether they have elevated the Minister of Labour to the status of selecting their representatives for them, and this I think is equally true of employers and employees. I think it's a retrograde step for

**March 14, 1968**

the Government to decide that it is not going to consult employer and employee groups, but instead it is going to decide who shall represent organized labor and employer groups. I think it is one more indication that this Government wants to set itself apart from public groups, it wants to make all of the decisions. We've seen this this evening when the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) says, and he apparently is proud of his position, that he is not going to consult the largest labor group in Saskatchewan.

**Mr. Coderre:** — Will you permit a question, Mr. Speaker. Not being a lawyer I'm not quite sure, but have you read Section 128 and can you show me in that particular section where it indicates I should consult with specific groups or organizations. All it says is appoint members . . .

**Mr. Blakeney:** — I'll be glad to answer that for the Hon. Member. Of course it doesn't say he should consult; it says he shall appoint representatives. Now I would be delighted to know how he could appoint a representative of anyone without consulting with that person. How do you appoint representatives of doctors without consulting doctors? How do you appoint representatives of lawyers without consulting lawyers? I would like to know how anyone could appoint representatives of this House without consulting the Members? The Minister has indicated that he has not consulted the major labor groups and it seems to me that when the Legislature used the word "representative" they must have meant something. Selected by whom? Nominated by whom? If the Minister is going to choose them there would be no point in saying that they should be representative of labor. If the Minister is going to select them all by himself, what is the point of designating them as representing anyone.

**Mr. G.T. Snyder: (Moose Jaw North)** — Mr. Speaker, I've been grossly disappointed again a number of times in closing the debate.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I think the Member moved the subamendment, did he not? He hasn't got the right of speaking in the subamendment or the amendment.

**Mr. J J. Charlebois: (Saskatoon City Park University)** — I gather from the remarks of the Hon. Gentleman that has just spoken to this matter that he declares now that the people that are appointed, Mr. Parks of the Brotherhood of Railway Workers, is not worthy to represent his trade union, and does he say that the gentleman that has been appointed to represent the electrical workers — this is a man that is a representative of a trade group in the construction trade industries — does he mean to say that these men are not worthy to represent their groups and to represent labor? I think he should be thoroughly

ashamed to make such a statement as this in this House.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Romanow:** — Mr. Speaker, once again we had a very penetrating question asked by the Hon. Member for Saskatoon City Park-University (Mr. Charlebois) but I'm afraid that he failed to grasp the central question in issue. The fact of the matter is this, Mr. Speaker, as I understand the subamendment, this Government fails to recognize it, this Government over a number of years should have followed the established practices of good government in the Province of Saskatchewan. When you are going to deal with labor and management, you should be dealing through the central organizations of both groups, labor and management. Now I happen to know Mr. Parks personally and I think he is a very good person. I think he is very qualified. The question that Members on this side of the House are asking is simply this: Has this Government taken the liberty to follow the accepted patterns of approach by consulting the formal trade union organizations in the Province of Saskatchewan? The answer is simply, No. They haven't done it and to me, Mr. Speaker, that points to only one thing and one thing only, that this Government speaks for a very small, small minority, the big businesses. It refuses to recognize the working man, the farmer groups, any type of organizations as long as it's their friends, the big businesses. Now I'm saying simply this, Mr. Speaker, that the question on hand here is simply this. This House must decide on this subamendment, whether or not this Government's conduct in bypassing democratically elected and chosen, widely supported, widely based people's organizations, whether it is doing the right thing or not, and I say it isn't.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Steuart:** — Mr. Speaker, there is just a slight difference here. When the Hon. Member from Regina talks about them consulting with the Chamber of Commerce and the Manufacturers Association, I think insulting would have been a better word. Over the years as a Member of the Chamber of Commerce, I saw that consultation work. It was a farce, it was hypocrisy. They pretended. Oh they'd meet with us once a year and they would be polite. Two or three of their Members would show up and the rest would come in and go out, if they showed up at all. They paid no attention to the Chamber of Commerce year after year, and this was their right. But now to come and try to pretend that they democratically consulted with the Chamber of Commerce, or the Manufacturers Association, of course is sheer hypocrisy and nonsense.

But there is another point in this. We do consult with the labor groups. This is how we got those excellent labor representatives on these Boards. But we don't consult with the Saskatchewan Federation of Labor. There is a difference between our attitude and our relationship between the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour and our attitude and our relationship between the Chamber of Commerce and the Manufacturers Association. The

**March 14, 1968**

Chamber of Commerce and the Manufacturers Association are independent groups. They might support the CCF, they might support the Conservatives, they might support the Liberals. They don't always support us and we are not controlled by them. But the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour supports the CCF-NDP. They own the NDP lock, stock, and barrel and we proved that in this House. Why should we consult with the labor arm of the New Democratic party? Mr. Davies, Mr. Snyder, Mr. Smishek, all Members and leaders in the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour. This is their democratic right, we don't deny it, but please don't be so hypocritical or don't ask us to be as hypocritical as you, and even pretend that we should insult them, I mean consult them, we have no intention of it.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. W.S. Lloyd: (Leader of the Opposition)** — Mr. Speaker, you know, a little dog between here and my home, every once in a while runs out when you are walking by, barks, nips away until you turn around and look at him, and then he goes the other way. I call him, Davey, because that is precisely what the Provincial Treasurer does, never answers a question, gets up and yaps away and goes off in the other direction in the hope that he can distract attention.

You know on this particular case I think that the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) has given us just a little bit more insight into the philosophy of this Government. It has given us a little more insight into the willingness of this Government to attempt to punish anyone who disagrees with them politically.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lloyd:** — No one in this entire debate has disagreed with one central statement. That central statement is that the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour is the largest and the most representative trade union organization in the Province of Saskatchewan. Nobody on the other side has attempted to deny that. They represent more unions, more workingmen than any other organization in the Province of Saskatchewan. And as a result, Mr. Speaker, this is a logical group to consult with when making appointments to boards who are semi-judicial boards and whose decisions are of great importance to trade union groups across the province. The Government says we won't consult with them. Why not? It has given one reason and one reason only. Because, it says, that group does not support it politically. Because that group dares to have a political opinion of its own, then this Government will not consult them. In other words, it is saying to every group in this Province when it says that, if you dare to have to have — and to use the word which is the favourite expression of the Member from Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) — the guts to stand up and say you oppose the present Government, if you dare to have the courage to have an independent political thought of your own, then . . .

**Mr. Steuart:** — Independent?

**Mr. Lloyd:** — Yes, independent political thought of their own, let there be no doubt about it. Anybody who knows anything about the situation — that doesn't include the people over there I am sure — will agree that this group does have its independent point of view. They have been as critical of us when we were in government as almost any group that I can think of. There was no attempt to varnish over on their part their comments or feelings about the previous government. What the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) has said is simply to echo and to define the position of the Government across there. It is that no group that dares to oppose the present Government can expect any consideration from it. The price of having some courage and some independence in this Province is to be discriminated against by that Government that sits on that side of the House.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. C.P. MacDonald: (Minister of Welfare)** — Mr. Speaker, I just want to have one comment. First of all the Leader of the Opposition has stood on his feet and said that they represent labor. The question that the people of Saskatchewan are asking is: Does the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour represent labor or the NDP? Mr. Speaker, they proved beyond the shadow of a doubt, three months after the election of 1964, that they were no longer concerned with the labor movement in this Province. They passed a Resolution before this Government had an opportunity, had a chance to announce a policy, had an opportunity to have a session of the Legislature, had an opportunity to pass an Act, had an opportunity to pass a Budget, when they passed a Resolution calling for all their members to work for the defeat of this Government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if that is the representation of labor in the Province of Saskatchewan by an independent labor movement, then, Mr. Speaker, I want to question that. And the question is, if the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour is willing to represent labor and not the New Democratic party, then we will be willing to listen.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

Subamendment negatived.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

## ADJOURNED DEBATES

### RESOLUTION NO. 1 — HOUSING PROGRAM

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion

**March 14, 1968**

by Mr. E. Whelan. (Regina North West):

That this Assembly urges the Provincial Government to enlist the support of the Government of Canada in developing a housing program particularly for low and medium income families which would include:

- (1) the establishment of a provincial housing authority;
- (2) the provision of funds at a low interest rate for home building;
- (3) the establishment of research facilities to develop new and less costly techniques for the construction of homes; and
- (4) the development of a program which will guarantee the construction of a minimum yearly quota of housing for each province in Canada.

**Mr. H.H.P. Baker: (Regina South East)** — Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to be able to take part in the debate supporting the Resolution that has been proposed by the Member from Regina North West (Mr. Whelan) earlier, which is recorded in our proceedings, and at the same time to try to outline some of the things that we have done in our city. Someone in the Chamber here had mentioned a few things about not taking positive action in the development of low-rental housing and subsidized housing. We in the city of Regina have been most alert over the years in promoting good housing and the type of housing suitable for all people in various wage brackets. We have had an outstanding program in the light of what has happened across Canada. The city of Regina, I might point out, when I first got on city council in 1956, that my friend from Regina South West (Mr. McPherson) who was an alderman before I got on city council, did everything possible to keep out low-rental housing in our community and he sits with the Government today. Not until some of us got on in 1956 and fought two or three more years, and not until I had the privilege of becoming mayor in 1959, did I manage to convince council within a week after taking office, that we undertake our first low-rental subsidized housing plan, known as Regent Court. We were one of the first in Canada, and the first in Western Canada to promote a project of this type.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Baker:** — The Member from Regina South West, oh how he used to stand up in council and frighten some of his own colleagues and some of my own too. He would use the same tactics as he did here when he stood up the other day. He thought that he was going to frighten some over there and some over here too. We know him for his actions. “The man to get things done was Don.” Do you remember that slogan, Mr. Speaker? It should have read, “Get things done for Don and not with Don.” We used to know him as “Percentage Don” ‘in our council. How he opposed me and stood up against me on many occasions in council on issues of this type. At times I don’t know whether he had just ice in his water or not,

but I can tell you that he used to be most abusive, when anyone mentioned anything on housing . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order! On a point of order from the Member for Gravelbourg (Mr. Coderre).

**Mr. Coderre:** — On a point of order. I have just been looking over the Resolution and I fail to see . . .

**Mr. Baker:**— Now just a moment. I am leading up to . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order! Now a point of order is heard and that is what interrupts anyone's speech.

**Mr. Coderre:** — I just fail to see where there are any personalities in the question in connection with housing and not with an individual. I believe that the Member is certainly straying from the intent of the Resolution, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Baker:** — Mr. Speaker, I am talking about housing, low-rental housing, as it affects our city and as it affects this province. We've got to talk about land assembly and low-rental housing, if I am going to establish what we have done in our city. I am supporting this Resolution which says that we should have a housing authority or corporation similar to that which is in the Province of Ontario, where they promote and wholeheartedly support housing undertaken by local municipalities. The Ontario Government last year made available some \$90 million. This is the thing that we have been after the Government to establish these last three years, so that we would have large low-rental housing schemes in every community in Saskatchewan. I am trying to show Mr. Speaker, what we did in Regina. Yes we were one of the first in Canada. Some remarks made in this House as to why we haven't applied for any housing of this type, I will answer later. I am looking at this time for a housing corporation or an authority to take care of the housing needs with some sort of incentive so that people can purchase and own homes as well.

When I look at the figure for housing in the Budget, something like \$1 1/2 million dealing with land assembly and supporting other low-rental units, this is a paltry sum, Mr. Speaker, for a Province of this kind. Had there been \$10 million in this item supporting housing projects in different centres, then I would say that the Minister in charge was doing something worthwhile. Under this Resolution we are trying to get some action to see that something better will be done. In Regina, we have a study going for land assembly. We have heard from other municipalities that land assembly has not always worked in the best interests of communities. I understand that Saskatoon has bought some land at \$1,500 an acre. By the time you survey and take out roads,



**March 14, 1968**

provide green acres and things of that sort, you will probably end up with a price on a raw lot of \$2,000 plus your prepaid services. So you could end up with \$3,300 or \$3,400 per lot. Perhaps they can get them cheaper. I will point out later what we did in the city of Regina to try and create an incentive to get housing throughout this community, taking care of our needs today, because of certain conditions that exist. Now land assembly is perhaps good in some areas, but I have heard also that it has been detrimental to the construction industry. It puts a noose around their necks, not permitting them to expand and develop housing in their own private areas. We in Regina have always felt that, whenever developments took place, as long as the city had owned about 30 per cent of the land that was being developed, that 70 per cent of it could be developed by the private construction industry. This is a good ratio and it has worked well. It stimulates housing from all directions.

Coming back to the low-rental schemes, that we had in Regent Court, I wish to inform this House it ran well over \$1 million and was one of the first of its kind. Immediately following, about two years later, I started another project. Council approved it, known as Greer Court, another 141 units, which we opened for occupancy three years ago. In total we now have something like 250 units in Regina, 44 per cent of all low-rental subsidized housing in Saskatchewan. Our sister city to the northwest has only something like 19 per cent of rental units in our Province. I understand that they are in the process of a project now. I am trying to show how Regina has led the way in low-rental housing and to point out that we are so far ahead of our sister city, that perhaps I should go there to be mayor, for awhile, too, and probably straighten them out.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Baker:** — I wanted the House to know this as well as for the edification of our Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Estey). However, I am glad that he is pressing Saskatoon to construct more units there. We have reached the point in Regina now, where we had to advertise to fill some of our units in the low-rental areas. We can't establish need at this time in Regina. This is what some of the councillors say, who have similar politics as my colleagues across the way. They say you cannot build anymore in Regina as there is no need for them: I tried to get an Indian and Métis settlement through, which would give priority to some 150 native people. They have been arguing this since last June. This is a development that I have been promoting and not getting the support that I need. I don't know whether the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Estey) is working with them behind the scenes to stop it or not. I say this to the 'Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt), the former Minister of Welfare, while we say a lot of things about him, we did get the new Pioneer Village under way, a \$2 1/2 million project. I had real co-operation from him, and I would like to thank him for it. I am pleased to say we have gone so far ahead of any city on a per capita basis in public housing. I am being invited to speak at

national conventions of CHMC and others, to tell them how we did it in Regina. I am looking for incentive programs to promote housing, housing that we need today so that people can purchase homes no matter what salary bracket they may come under.

You know, Mr. Speaker, we got into a good project with the former Minister of Municipal Affairs — he was ha-haing a few minutes ago. You will recall the Tuxedo Park development, an urban renewal scheme the first of its kind we ever got into in this Province. Now I will tell you that as long as I am mayor, it will be the last of its kind, if we have to deal with people like that across the way. What did they do? They tried to put the people out of their homes who had lived there for 30 and 35 years, by offering them \$2,800 to buy another home. Yes, \$2,800! This is the reason why the fight took place. You will recall it took place last winter. The Minister of Municipal Affairs would not budge an inch, “Let them go and fend for themselves.” I’ll give my council credit, when we met with these people, we decided that we had to do something. We stated even though it would cost us \$60,000 or \$70,000 more as a city, we must look after these people. Fifty-two families were taken care of. But did we get one nickel from the former Minister of Municipal Affairs and his Government? Not one cent. So I am going to tell you that municipalities are afraid to get into projects with this Government whether it’s low-rental subsidization or not. With one exception the deal that we worked out with the former Minister of Welfare (Mr. Boldt) was satisfactory. He did support us every inch of the way and didn’t ridicule anybody. We have always been doing well to cope with the housing situation in Regina. I’ll have a little more to say about the Minister of Municipal Affairs from a clipping that you have probably read, as to how he opposed a plan that we as city Councillors had put through. He expressed strong words against the plan, because it was probably a Baker Plan.

I want to deal further with regard to the housing in Regina and the money spent over the years. In 1956 — and the Member for Regina South West (Mr. McPherson) was on council at that time — when the Hon. Mr. Sturdy promoted the first Pioneer Village project in Regina, sure the city had to get into it, but he practically begged the council in the early 1950s to get this under way. That was a \$600,000 project and it contained 100 units for the aged. There were others throughout the country, and I don’t know who had them first. All in all, the city of Regina, over these past nine or ten years, has invested \$5,180,000 into this community for housing projects. The very thing that the Minister of Municipal Affairs wants to promote in this Province. How in the world is he going to promote anything with the small amount of money that he has put into that Budget? Why we wouldn’t even get 28 units out of it in Regina. Today in Regina to take care of our growing population, 1,400 homes need to be purchased; we also need another thousand apartment units, and here we have a subsidy from the Provincial Government which would only take care of perhaps 28 units in this community as our share. That is why, we on the city council, had to do something very drastic. We felt that there was a need to help

**March 14, 1968**

people with lower incomes. I brought in a resolution and asked council to give it support, which would look after people with under \$6,000 a year or under \$500 a month. With the way the interest rates are with Central Housing and Mortgage, I realize that it is difficult to get this down very low. You might get some at \$400 or \$425 per month, but it really works out to about \$454 per month. With the assistance of other lending institutions, I think that you will find that many earning \$400 a month will be able to get loans through credit unions or other institutions in order to qualify. We are doing all we can. I think 200 applications have been picked up at city hall already on this 500-lot project that we plan by June 1. What did we do? We called in the building industry and asked them to advise us as to how this could be handled. So we worked out a plan for those with under \$500 a month. We said we would provide 500 lots at a reduced price as an incentive bonus, for \$750 a lot. They are worth from \$1,500 to \$2,000 today. This is the sort of incentive plan I expected from the Government across the way for housing in this province, so that people in lower incomes could buy homes and own them just as you and I have the privilege of doing. I want people to own their homes. Sure, low-rentals fill the gap, but heaven forbid we don't want everybody in low-rental and subsidized housing. We have sufficient in Regina, according to the aldermen on the city council in our city. It was mentioned that we hadn't even applied for any. Well, we haven't been able to establish need. We can't establish need in order to get additional projects. Central Housing and Mortgage won't approve them so we have to await our turn. But we are not stopping. I am still hoping to get an Indian and Métis settlement through to take care of aged families and others who want to live in a hostel, the same as we have in our Pioneer Village setup. This 500-lot project that we have developed or hope to develop, can serve a real need. When I talked about incentive bonuses, I thought that perhaps we would have something brought in, similar to this.

The Mayors Federation of Canada presented to the Federal Cabinet a suggested plan as follows: For a house under \$15,000, a bonus of \$1,500 would be paid toward it for couples who wanted to own a home. For those over \$15,000 to \$20,000 we suggested a bonus of \$1,000; for those over \$20,000, \$500. We also recommended that the interest rate, in order to bring down the down-payment and monthly payments, be reduced from 8 5/8 per cent to 6 5/8 per cent. This could have been an incentive program that the Government across the way might have undertaken, absorbing the two per cent below the 8 5/8 to bring it to 6 5/8. This would have also reduced the down-payment and reduced the monthly payments on homes, so badly needed for our young couples and their children. We see nothing of it. We also asked the Federal Government — and I haven't seen anybody on the other side promote this — to continue the \$500 winter bonus that they used to have. I believe it worked quite well for winter construction. You will notice how winter drop-offs were in the housing industry and this is one of the reasons for it. The \$500 was a good way of promoting this sort of development. All through these housing programs that we are undertaking, we are trying to look after

every area of income. We have looked after those in low-rental and subsidized areas because of their wages. We are looking after, or trying to look after those with under \$500 a month who want to purchase and own a home. If they buy the lot at \$750 the prepayment will be incorporated into their mortgage plan. Central Housing and Mortgage are willing to take this on. We have arranged it with them. If contractors get some of these \$750 lots, they claim that they can build these homes for only \$650 down. Some of these monthly payments will run at \$125 a month including interest, principal and taxes. In this day and age, it is the best deal that we can get. Today rents in suites are \$135 to \$140 and I think that it is a great thing to encourage our young people to own homes, just as the farmers came out to this great country and took up homesteads and finally owning their own farms as it is today. I think that these people want to own a little holding, a homestead too, whether it be in the city or out in the country.

And all through these developments, the Member from Regina South West (Mr. McPherson) had opposed every move for any low-rental subsidized programs. He stands up in this House and wants to ridicule people in saying that Members on this side couldn't even run a peanut stand. Well, you know, Mr. Speaker . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order!

**Mr. McPherson:** — On a point of order. I would like the Member for Regina South East to bring these facts before this House, if this is true. It is not true, Mr. Speaker, and I am denying it here now and I would like him to produce proof if he can.

**Mr. Baker:** — I am speaking. And I am saying that if he wants notice to refute it that's his right. And I am telling him that is exactly what took place and every project that came in was opposed by him, until we got a new council and when I became Mayor in 1959. I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, we took him out of city council and we will help to take him out of this House, too someday. The Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) has the tools the job he wants to do, that's one of them to help finish the job. I am going to tell you this that I'll stick with the Premier to see that he stays there in order to help get rid of him at the next election. Well, Mr. Speaker, I realize on some of these things we diverged a bit from the regular motion, but who hasn't broken a few of the rules here, even today. I have been sitting here quietly and letting everybody go to it, but I want to say that this great private sector man — I was going to say something but I better be careful — I realize it is beginning to hurt as he never did like the truth. When I used to see headlines "Get things done with Don", how it made me smirk. I am sorry that I didn't have more time to get over to the South West to help get rid of him.

I want to just refer back to the Resolution if I may, I think the points listed are worthwhile reading. The first says,

**March 14, 1968**

the establishment of a provincial housing authority. This is what is needed in this province, with some real money pumped into the economy for housing programs and we don't see it, Mr. Speaker. There is no provision to help take care of lowering the interest rates. It was said that if interest rates were raised money will flow like water and there will be lots available. It is tighter than ever. The answer to it is that, if the Government across the way would do its part and force their colleagues in Ottawa to roll back interest rates to where they were a year and a half ago, there would be plenty of money available for housing and industry. I reiterate, this Resolution dealing with interest rates is a very, very important one, even the lending institutions would like to see the interest rates rolled back. In a discussion with a banker the other day he said that they would prefer to have it at 6 5/8 and/or 4 5/8 per cent on deposits. They don't like having to pay 6 5/8 and then charging 8 5/8. They prefer it the other way, and the way these interest rates are going it will affect the whole financial structure of this country. We are going to be heading for a real depression as I mentioned earlier and nothing is being done across the way. The cost of living that is being borne by the people of this province as brought out in a report from one of your former colleagues shows what is taking place. I give her credit for courage in printing it, to show the public what is taking place. That is why we have to have housing programs within the reach of the low wage-earner. This Government must take steps to provide millions of dollars making it available either through subsidies, reduced interest rates, for down payments or some other incentive program.

I see the Member for Yorkton (Mr. Gallagher) is feeling a bit uneasy, he hasn't spoken during this session as yet, I don't know what is worrying him but he does get a bit itchy when I get up.

The answer is we must do something and do it now, and I am asking the Government to support the Resolution. There is nothing wrong with it. Any Government could support it, regardless of political faith. I don't know whether there is going to be an amendment or not. The Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Estey) seems to be anxious to get up, I guess he's next. You know, I used to know his father quite well when he was Minister of Education, and I am pleased to see him here. I notice he's the heir-apparent and wants to rest on the great laurels of his father, I can see he hasn't been left with much of anything. I reiterate, Sir, that this is a good Resolution, one that will develop a sound and comprehensive housing program in Saskatchewan, coupled with the wonderful programs we've had in the city of Regina. We are a shining light for the rest of the province and to the rest. of Canada.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. J.B. Hooker: (Notukeu-Willowbunch)** — Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

## ADJOURNED DEBATE

### SECOND READINGS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. D. Boldt (Minister of Highways) that Bill No. 41 — **An Act to amend The Automobile Accident Insurance Act** be now read second time.

**Mr. E. Whelan: (Regina North West)** — Mr. Speaker, last year The Automobile Accident Insurance Act was amended and a surcharge was introduced. The Bill last year contained the exact amount of the surcharge, \$25. It applied to accidents where damages exceeded \$50, where a driver was more than 50 per cent to blame. Mr. Speaker, we were told this would contribute to safety and it may have contributed to the Automobile Accident Insurance fund. There may have been less money spent on automobile repairs; but, Mr. Speaker, if it was supposed to reduce traffic deaths it was a miserable failure. More people died on the highways of Saskatchewan, not less people, during the year 1967. In spite of the fact that 10,500 people paid the surcharge we set an all-time record for deaths on the highways.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Government is back. It has brought in new legislation and this legislation has some things that will not recommend it. The old legislation didn't reduce traffic deaths and this legislation does not tell us how much the surcharge will be and it doesn't specify when it will be levied. It doesn't give us the accident limit. These details, Mr. Speaker, will be, and I quote the Bill, "prescribed by the regulations." Obviously, Mr. Speaker, the Legislature cannot be trusted. It is not capable and therefore is not to be consulted regarding the amount of the surcharge or the amount of damage or the limits on damage when the surcharge is levied. There may be a different surcharge at Shellbrook than at Bengough. There may be a different damage limit at the Battlefords than in Yorkton. Mr. Speaker, the Government has levied so many taxes that when it came to levy this one it ran out of courage. It was afraid and it has hidden this amount. The amount will be "prescribed by the regulations."

Last year you were to be assessed if you were more than 50 per cent at fault. This year you will pay the assessment if you are 50 per cent or more at fault. In other words, Mr. Speaker, it will collect two surcharges on one accident. In declaring who is at fault the appeal arrangements set out insist that you have a temporary licence for 60 days or longer only if extended by the insurer, SGIO. If you want to drive with a full-fledged licence you must pay the surcharge. The insurer, SGIO, also sets the time and the place for a hearing and sends the notice by mail. Mr. Speaker, the jurisprudence contained in this Bill is a strange kind and foreign to our version of Canadian jurisprudence.

**March 14, 1968**

There is also a very bad principle in this Bill because two amendments suggested violate civil liberties. I am glad that the Attorney General is in his seat. This is brought out by the amendment to Section 3 (2) d. I am not sure what section is amended but the amendment as I interpret it, and Mr. Speaker, you will have to bear with me while I refer to sections of another Act, The Vehicles Act, as well as The Automobile Accident Insurance Act, but I must do this in order to establish the principle. I want the Attorney General to listen carefully as I refer to the amendment which I feel violates civil liberties. Now the insurer, SGIO, may place before the Magistrate, who is to decide whether the driver is at fault, certain documents. Before, however, it specifically exempted information or reports obtained pursuant to Sections 65, 66 and 67 of The Automobile Accident Insurance Act. Section 65 compels the driver, involved in an accident causing bodily injury or property damage to the extent of \$50 or more, to furnish a report to the police. Section 66 requires the police to forward this information to the Highway Traffic Board together with such other information as is necessary to make up a coherent report. Section 67 provides that the insurer; SGIO, may compel anyone, including the driver who may be a party to the court proceedings necessary to determine whether or not he is at fault, to appear before him, the insurer, SGIO, to furnish any information relevant to the accident. The Vehicles Act contains certain similar provisions and further provides that on failure to do any of the things required by Sections 65, 66 and 67, a person may be fined. Both The Vehicles Act and The Automobile Accident Insurance Act have made abundantly clear that any information furnished pursuant to Sections 65, 66 and 67, could not be made public and could not be used as evidence in court against him. It was only for the records of the Board. By deleting the reference to Section 67 as Bill 41 does, the clear implication is that the information obtained when the driver is compelled to appear before the insurer may be used in the court proceedings to determine whether or not the driver is at fault. This is an unthinkable invasion of civil liberties.

Mr. Speaker, no police force in any Commonwealth country has the power to compel a person to furnish information where it may be used against him in court proceedings. To do so is tantamount to establishing a police state. It should be kept in mind that this will usually occur — that is, the insurer, SGIO, will get the information — before the driver has any occasion to consult a lawyer as to his rights. It is easy to visualize a driver confessing his guilt when he has no idea what constitutes fault, since that is very often a complex legal question. Mr. Speaker, it should be kept in mind that to fail to furnish any of this information is a criminal offence. This is also in conflict with The Vehicles Act and The Automobile Accident Insurance Act, both of which continue to provide in unmistakable terms that the information shall not be admissible as evidence in court.

Mr. Speaker, there is a second amendment which I believe also violates civil liberties. It should be kept in mind that this provision is retroactive. A person may have furnished a

report, pursuant to the Act, confident that the Act and 300 of common law liberties would protect its disclosure by persons in authority, but he is in for a shock. Not only is this retroactive, not only does it hide from us the actual penalty, but it violates civil liberties.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, it does not tell us the amount of the surcharge, or the accident limit. Because it would violate basic civil liberties and because it is retroactive, I am opposed to this Bill. This is one more tax but it is so big apparently they are afraid to tell us the amount. It is a blank cheque on surcharges, on accident limits and there is also a section on disability that is again referred to in regulations. And as I said before, it is retroactive 14 1/2 months.

Mr. Speaker, enough is enough, there have been no lives saved, there's been no safety program and jurisprudence is thrown far, far away. We have just been asked to pay and pay and pay and stand up and be sentenced. The Government says in this Bill we'll fix the amount, we will use your own report to prove that you are at fault regardless of the circumstances. Mr. Speaker, this is an infringement of our rights. I say, let it bring its regulations here. This Legislature is here to legislate. It is not a rubber stamp to approve something that is a negation of democracy.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose the Bill.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. D.V. Heald: (Attorney General)** — Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member has made some suggestions about civil rights, I didn't have. an opportunity to check the Bill or the old Act when he was making the reference to them, so I would like to look into these matters and ask leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

## SECOND READINGS

Mr. E.F. Gardner (Moosomin) moved second reading of Bill No. 34 — **An Act to amend The Agrologists Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, a number of amendments have been suggested to clarify this Act and to bring it up-to-date. For one thing I believe the objectives of the Institute were not set out in the old Act, and the Institute feels that it has a duty to set out these objectives. I believe many of the other professional Acts do this and they would like to include this in theirs. They would also wish to have a President-elect instead of a Vice-President. They feel this will improve the efficiency of their organization and will ensure that the President has some experience when he takes over the job. This requires amendments in several places in the Act. There was also a clause in the old



**March 14, 1968**

Act which provided that this Institute should not hold real property in excess of \$10,000. They feel that this is obsolete and they may wish to have a building or something of this nature, and they would like to have this clause deleted. They also wish to change their operations to a calendar year which is a minor amendment. Mr. Speaker, I have studied these changes and I don't feel that any of these amendments will affect the rights or privileges of any other group such as farmers or teachers, and therefore, with these few words, Mr. Speaker, I would move second reading of this Bill.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

Hon. D.V. Heald (Attorney General) moved second reading of Bill No.6 — **An Act to amend The Direct Sellers Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, this Bill is designed to clarify certain sections of the Act to better facilitate the carrying out of the intent and purpose of the Act. This Bill will provide for exemption from licensing of a person who is required to be licensed under The Motor Dealers Act and also under The Agriculture Machinery Act and repeals the previous exemptions applying to motor vehicles and farm implements. This is really a tidying up of the Act. The Bill will clarify the Act with respect to the licensing of non-legal entities such as firms or partnerships. Although licences have in the past been issued in the trade name in which the business is carried on, it has been pointed out by the courts in prosecution actions that the licence was improperly issued and should have been in the name of the individual. This Bill provides that a licence may be issued in the name of a non-legal entity and in such event the sole proprietor or the partners are deemed to be the persons licensed. This covers the case of non-registered partnerships and so on. It also prohibits the firm from carrying on business as a vendor under a name other than the name shown in the licence. The Bill enables the registrar to add to, remove or alter conditions of licence. In this matter it provides a measure of flexibility which does not presently exist. We think this provision is required to deal with special situations and I will give you an example. A form of sales gimmick such as a referral plan may be introduced by a licensee after a licence has been issued. That's the problem at the present time. Everything is fine at the time the licence is issued, but afterwards some added promotional gimmick is put in and we don't have the power to alter the terms or conditions of the licence. Or the reverse of that situation, a condition may have been attached to a licence prohibiting a practice which had subsequently been corrected to the point where the registrar might be prepared to remove the conditions. An example of this might be where the registrar at the time of licensing imposed a condition calling for weekly reports setting out certain information to be filed by vendors. Later on we may find that the reports are no longer required or they may not be required on a weekly basis. It gives more flexibility to the registrar in the administration of the Act and I would point out, of course, and remind all Hon. Members that any decisions of the registrar with

respect to his decision remain as always subject to the right of appeal to a judge of the Court of Queen's Bench provided for in the Act.

The Bill also sets out more fully the procedure to be followed in cancelling a contract. It has been found that contracts are being rescinded by telegram whereas the Act as it presently stands provides for rescission only by registered letter. These amendments will provide that a purchaser may cancel or rescind a direct sales contract by serving a notice on the vendor by either registered mail or telegram. The date of service is the date of the postmaster's receipt of the envelope containing the notice. The cancellation period or the cooling-off period continues to be four days except in the case of a breach of a provision of the Act where it is extended to one year. Those are the main changes.

There is a change in the penalty section, Mr. Speaker, the new penalty section provides for fines ranging up to \$500 and, in the case of a vendor engaging unlicensed salesmen, up to \$1,000. There is also a provision for the judge in his discretion, if he considers it necessary, to impose imprisonment up to one month. So the penalties have been stiffened under the Act because there been cases of the sale of large contracts. I am thinking of steel buildings, this type of thing, unlicensed salesmen selling steel buildings for the purchase price and those Hon. Members who are farmers will know the price is quite substantial, \$4,000, \$5,000, \$6,000 and the fines before were quite small. It has found that the profits on a transaction like that were sufficiently large that small fines, \$25 or something like that, really didn't serve as much of a deterrent, so we have increased maximum fine which will, of course, still be in the discretion of the court, but the court will now have power to increase the fines, where you get flagrant violations of the Act involving large contracts. So that's why we have considered it necessary to step up the maximum penalties under the Act. Those are the basic principles in this Bill, Mr. Speaker, and with that explanation I would move second reading.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

Hon. D.V. Heald (Attorney General) moved second reading of Bill 7 — **An Act to amend The Garage Keepers Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, these are minor amendments to The Garage. This Act as most Hon. Members will know presently provides for a possessory lien, and in lieu thereof a garage keeper is given a statutory lien where he parts with possession of the vehicle after having done work on it and he hasn't been paid and he files the claim. Now the present provision is that the claim must be filed within 30 days from when the work was completed. There is then a lien on the vehicle for a further period of 180 days from date of filing. At the end of that period the lien will expire, unless during that period the garage keeper has issued a warrant to a sheriff to seize the vehicle

**March 14, 1968**

and return it to the garage keeper. When a warrant has been so received by the sheriff, the lien continues for the further period of 30 days in addition to the 180 days from the date of filing, subject to extension by order of the court. Now the present amendment is very simple. All it does is it increases the time for making the claim from 30 days to 45 days and it extends the period of 180 days plus 30 days for the period of the lien, after warrant issued, to 225 days. This amendment has been requested by the Retail Merchants Association to enable a vehicle to be released to the owner. The garage keeper would then have 45 days in which to file a claim of lien, in the event that the bill is not paid within the regular 30 days' dating. The only point in extending the 210 days to 225 days is that the period, within which the lien runs after the issue of the warrant, is to maintain uniformity with the period for making the claim. So to recap the timing is as follows: (1) 45 days within which to make a claim, (2) 180 days for the lien period, (3) a further 45 days for the lien period after the issue of warrant. Just a change from 30 to 45 days. That's all it is .and with that explanation I would move second reading.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

Hon. D.T. McFarlane (Minister of Agriculture) moved second reading of Bill No. 9 — **An Act to amend The Dairy Products Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, inspection and other administrative services relating to the dairy industry have been the concern of my Department now for a good many years. Representatives of dairy producers and processors have met with myself on several occasions during the past few years to express their views on the matter. It now appears after several years of study and negotiations that we have worked out an arrangement which will be less confusing to producers and to processors. This new arrangement will eliminate most of the former duplication of effort and we hope will offer equal or better services. In the past our dairy farmers have been exposed to the questioning of up to four representatives of provincial and municipal government and the manufacturing plants have been subject to inspection by a similar number of provincial and local government employees. Confusion has resulted from conflicting recommendations in some instances and at times staff and travel costs have been greater than necessary.

In June of 1966, the Deputy Ministers of. Agriculture and Health met with the Regina and Saskatoon medical health officers to discuss this problem. It was agreed at this meeting that further. examination of the problem was desirable and that representatives of the two Departments would be chosen to undertake the study. This Committee was established and submitted its Report in February of 1967. The Report recommended that all farm and processing plant inspections and advisory services be provided by Agriculture and that the Department of Public Health specify standards of quality — sampling frequency and technique and conduct all laboratory analysis for both raw and pasteurized

milk, pasteurized milk and milk products. The Report also recommended that uniform standards be applied province-wide, including the Saskatoon and Regina milk shed and that farm and plant inspection and advisory services for these two cities provided by the Provincial Government, as is the case for all other milk sheds in the province.

Following receipt of the Report, a small committee was established by the Departments of Health and Agriculture to draft proposed standards for milk and milk products, and also standards farm and processing plant facilities. Upon reaching an agreement on standard, the two Departments, Health and Agriculture, commenced discussion directed toward improved inspection and advisory services. Agreement in principle has been reached and discussions are now being arranged with the cities of Saskatoon and Regina to indicate the services which the Government is willing to provide to these cities in order to obtain province-wide uniformity. However, Mr. Speaker, I wish to emphasize that these two cities may continue to provide their own inspection and advisory services, if they so wish. In general it has been agreed that to begin with Agriculture will provide all the services at the farm level and Health will provide all services at plant level. After a trial period of two or three years, these new administrative arrangements will be reviewed to see if further divisions are desirable. To implement the first phase of the program, the Department of Health will transfer two milk sanitarians to the Department of Agriculture to be added to Agriculture's four dairy inspectors to permit more extensive services at the farm level.

Dairy field men now employed by Agriculture will also be given added responsibilities following further in-service training. During the first few years the Department of Health will provide all advisory and inspection services in plants processing fluid milk and cream. The Department of Agriculture will continue provide the services in plants which manufacture butter only. A Joint Review Committee will be established with representation from the Departments of Agriculture and Health and from the cities of Regina and Saskatoon to maintain a watching brief on the effectiveness of the revised inspection and advisory services as outlined. It is suggested that this Committee meet at least once every two months and perhaps more frequently at first, to assure all parties concerned that their interests are being properly attended to. This Review Committee presumably will report to the two Government Departments and the two cities concerned, if the cities wish to participate in this type of arrangement. Any modifications suggested by the Review Committee would then be studied by the administrative agency concerned. We are convinced, Mr. Speaker, that this procedure will result in improvement in the quality of milk produced throughout the province. In addition, this will avoid the duplication of efforts which have existed and will eventually, due to introduction of uniform standards, put us in a position to transfer milk freely from one milk shed to another throughout the province.

I would like also to note that all the discussion and

**March 14, 1968**

committee activity which I have referred to have been carried out in good part by all concerned. The medical health officers in the cities of Regina and Saskatoon and the regional public health officers throughout the province as well as personnel in the Departments of Public Health and Agriculture have co-operated toward the development of what we believe will be a major improvement in administrative and advisory services to the dairy industry in Saskatchewan.

The legislation then is being presented to this session of the Legislature to provide authority for the Department of Agriculture to provide broader services to the dairy industry.

Now dealing with the Bill, Section 2, Section 7 of the Act authorizes the Lieutenant Governor in Council to make regulations and subsection (1) (d) says that he can make regulations concerning the pasteurization of cream for butter making purposes, the amended subsection would provide for regulations for the pasteurization of milk and cream. Milk is added to this clause to give the Department of Agriculture authority to inspect milk plants. This authority may be used to a very limited degree for a period of two to three years while the Department of Public Health is gradually transferring this responsibility to Agriculture.

Section 3, this adds a new area for regulations to Section 7 of the Act so that regulations maybe made under The Dairy Products Act respecting milk and cream. This will give the Department of Agriculture authority to make and administer regulations concerning acceptable standards of facilities and sanitation for all phases of production of handling of milk and cream from farm to the plant. This is at present a responsibility of the Department of Public Health or the Public Health Departments of the cities of Saskatoon and Regina.

In Section 4, the amended Section 8 adds the words equipment and patron to the existing section. This will extend Department of Agriculture authority to include sanitation of the dairy farm buildings and equipment. This is now a responsibility of the Department of Public Health or the Public Health Departments of the two cities concerned.

In Section 5, this addition to the Act will require that every fluid milk shipper be licensed. This has been put in so that there will be no legal problem involved in cutting off a milk shipper where there is a serious problem. The second clause is put in so that it will not be necessary to renew these licences every year. These provisions will also provide assurance that no milk will be delivered to a milk plant from a dairy farm which has not been approved by a representative of the Department of Agriculture. After the licence has been issued routine inspections will continue and the licence will remain in effect from year to year as long as the dairy farm adheres to the requirements of this Act.

Mr. Speaker, with those brief remarks, and those explanations, I move second reading of this Bill.

**Mr. F. Meakes: (Touchwood)** — Could I ask the Minister a question before he sits down. Does this mean that every farmer who ships a can of cream will have to have a licence? Will his premises be inspected? Does this Bill mean that for every farmer, who ships a can of cream, milks four cows and ships a can of cream once a week, that his premises may be inspected and that he has to have a licence before he can ship cream?

**Mr. McFarlane:** — The concerns the Member for Touchwood has just indicated do not mean that every farmer who ships cream would have to have his premises inspected, unless there was a complaint by the public health authorities. Then an inspector would go out and check it over.

**Mr. Meakes:** — Does he have to have a licence?

**Mr. McFarlane:** — No, not to ship cream.

**Mr. Baker:** — The inspection program that we have, is there anything further we can get in the form of a grant to carry out these' fine services that the two major cities have carried out over the years.

**Mr. McFarlane:** — The amendment to the Act would indicate that if the cities wish to carry on the way they are at the present time, they can do so. If they wish to come under the provisions of the Act, then the Department of Agriculture will carry on the cost of the inspection. That will be a decision up to the city.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

Hon. L.P. Coderre (Minister of Labour) moved second reading of Bill No. 11 — **An Act to amend The Apprenticeship and Tradesmen's Qualification Act.**

He said: Rising to give second reading to this Bill, I'd like to explain to this House what is happening. At present an apprentice who wishes to avail himself of training through the Apprenticeship Training Program must in essence have a contract signed with the Department, the employer and himself. At present under the mobility of the work-force you will find that an indentured apprentice could be indentured with an employer and after a month may be laid off, take employment with another employer, and still wish to continue the training. This entails a fair amount of work in the Department to have the contract re-signed, and the apprentice re-indentured with the other employer. Now with the amendment the Act will make it possible to have an employee who wishes to avail himself of training to be indentured either to the employer or to a joint committee of employer and management, to the union, or to the Department, or to any other

**March 14, 1968**

person that could be so designated, in other words taking out any blocks that could arise in indenturing a student who wishes to avail himself of the training. It is our desire to continue and expand the training, and this is the only way we can do it.

**Mr. W.E. Smishek: (Regina North East)** — Mr. Speaker, before the Member sits down I wonder whether I can direct a few questions to him, firstly, whether this amendment was recommended by the Apprenticeship Board and secondly prior to the amendment being introduced, did the Minister have any consultations with, say, the building trade who are very much concerned with the Apprenticeship Program.

**Mr. Coderre:** — Yes, we've had consultation with the various craft unions that are concerned in this area. It is a very, very desirable thing. We find, for example, the plumbers have a joint council. They would like to have possibly a joint council of management and labor for an apprentice to be indentured to. We find that the electrical people, for example, would find it more convenient to be indentured with the electrical people. Each particular class or trade has been consulted with in some respect.

**Mr. Smishek:** — Mr. Speaker, I want to make but a few comments in respect to the principle of the Bill. Basically I go along with the amendment that is proposed to the Act. I know that this kind of a provision does exist in other provinces; it broadens the whole principle of apprenticeship training. My concern really is that in this province not enough is being done in extending apprenticeship, not enough is being done in terms of consultation, in terms of bringing about new programs. If you look at what is proposed in the Budget, you will find that under Apprenticeship, this Government is proposing to spend less money in 1968 on Apprenticeship than was spent back in 1964.

The other very important thing, Mr. Speaker, is that while we are talking about bringing in amendments to improve the Act — and I think it is important to strengthen the legislation and to broaden it — the legislation will not work by itself unless the Government makes it work. If you take a look at the questions that I have directed to the Government during this session, the questions I asked at the last session of the Legislature, the Apprenticeship Board which is established under the Act did not meet last year, did not meet the year before, for that matter it hasn't met since this Government took office. As I said, it is important, Mr. Speaker, for us to improve and strengthen the law, to get the Government behind the laws. If there is anything that is trying today, it is the development of a manpower program. This Government has talked about apprenticeship, has talked about vocational training, has talked about technical training, but to this point, Mr. Speaker, it has done virtually nothing about developing a manpower program and about instituting programs where we will be training the unskilled persons that we have, thousands of them, as you know, today in the Province

of Saskatchewan. Some have no skills, 120,000 workers have grade eight or less education. Mr. Speaker, there is a crying need for us to develop a program where we will be training these people, where we will be re-training them for new skills in the age of automation. So, while I support the principle of the Bill, I urge the Government not just to amend the legislation, but for goodness sake let's start doing something about apprenticeship training.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Coderre:** — The Hon. Member; Mr. Speaker, from Regina North East has the uncanny knack of bringing a bogey into this House every time he gets up on his feet. He hasn't got a clue what he's talking about. All he has to do is take the Annual Report and if you wish me to take it across to you and put it under your nose, I'll do it. You'll notice that on page 72 of the Annual Report in 1961 or 1962, you had approximately 35,000 man-days training. If you look at the Report this last year, we had over 62,000 man-days in training, twice the number training in three years than you have done in 20 years. Then he complains. He doesn't seem to realize, he seems to lack the knowledge, he's supposed to have advisors somewhere. For one thing, he says there is less money in the Budget for the new program. He is so naive, he knows so little about the program, he doesn't realize that the great bulk of the program today has been transferred to Manpower and Federal Manpower which has taken over the program and we are providing the training. We're providing the personnel and the people for that training. But of course, he is not satisfied. Well there is nothing so true, Mr. Speaker, that when this Hon. Gentleman speaks, truly to fact, truly to his way of life, it is politics before people. We are concerned with the training of the unemployed, training of the apprentices in his province. We're doing a better job in three years than has been done in 20 years. I need apologize to no one, anywhere in province for the work we're doing.

to and Bill read a second time.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

Hon. L.P. Coderre (Minister of Labour) moved second reading of Bill No. 12 — **An Act to amend The Credit Union Act.**

In rising, Mr. Speaker, to move the second reading of Bill No. 12, to amend The Credit Union Act, I would like to indicate to Members of the House that the amendments being recommended in this Bill have originated from the Credit Union League of the province.

The majority of recommended changes in the Act that are being proposed at this time deal largely with circumstances that have been brought about due to the tremendous increases in the assets of the credit unions during the past few years, outdating some of the provisions of the Act as they now stand. Most of the recommended changes involve providing more flexibility in



**March 14, 1968**

the operation of particularly large credit unions, which have developed to this extent, especially during the past 10 years. This will involve providing an increase in the powers of the board of directors, commensurate with the increase in assets of the credit union. It will also allow more flexibility in the appointment of credit union committees as the membership of committees grows larger. The other major amendments to the Act involve the clarification of authority of credit unions to provide or continue to provide loan or savings insurance. Final amendment involves the operation of the mutual aid fund and is again recommended to deal with the growth of the movement in the province. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that probably most of the information that might be necessary to Members could best be provided in Committee.

**Mr. F. Meakes: (Touchwood)** — Mr. Speaker, I agree with the Minister that these amendments, I think, are all good ones. The only remarks I would pass is, for all the publicity that this Bill got in the Speech from the Throne, it isn't that spectacular.

**Mr. Coderre:** I think that the wonderful work, Mr. Speaker, that the credit union has done to the economy of the Province in the last few years, particularly the last three years where it has doubled its assets and almost doubled its membership, I think is worthy of mention in the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Speaker.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

Hon. L.P. Coderre moved second reading of Bill No. 13 — **An Act to amend The Fire Prevention Act.**

He said: In rising to move the second reading of this Bill, we have found particularly when a fire is in progress in a building that it is desirable to prevent the conflagration from spreading, that the firemen should be permitted to enter into the building on fire. Here we have had some difficulties and this will permit firemen to enter the building where the fire has occurred. It has happened where some people say, "The place is insured, don't worry about it, let it burn." This could cause a major conflagration. Consequently this is an amendment to the Act in that respect. There is another amendment as well that provides for the fire inspector, or fire assistant to serve an order to replace faulty heating equipment, on the person who installed it. At present the Act only makes provision to issue an order to the owner. Very often people have installed furnaces while actually they have installed faulty equipment. It is felt that the onus should be on the person who installed the faulty equipment. Then there is the usual prohibition of selling unapproved fire extinguishers. You find every now and then that there are fire extinguishers being sold that do not have the underwriters' laboratory or the CSA stamp on them and just don't quite meet the regulations. I think this pretty well covers the Bill in general. I think most of the details in that Bill could be

dealt best in Committee.

**Mr. R. Romanow: (Saskatoon Riversdale)** — Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

Hon. D.V. Heald (Attorney General) moved second reading of Bill No. 14 —An Act to amend The Limitation of Civil Rights Act.

He said: This is an amendment to Schedule A of the Act which we're proposing. It's been prompted by a situation which was brought to our attention by a firm of lawyers in Prince Albert. They had a case where a Saskatchewan resident entered into a conditional sale agreement to sell machinery, to which The Agriculture Machinery Act applies, to a woman living, normally resident in Waterloo, Ontario. The articles purchased under the conditional sale agreement are still within the Province of Saskatchewan. It was drawn to our attention that Form A instructs the woman in this case living at Waterloo, Ontario, to make an application to the District Court nearest to her, without any mention that it must be the District Court of Saskatchewan. They draw this to our attention, that in this kind of situation and in this set of facts the form is deficient. I think it is clear that the Legislature did not intend to in my opinion, could not in fact authorize a person to commence proceedings in a court in another province. The form is not clear the way it is and we think it is misleading in its present form to a person living outside the province. In this amendment, we are altering the form to provide that where the Act has application to a person resident outside Saskatchewan, this application should be made to the District Court in Saskatchewan at the judicial centre nearest to the place where the article was sold. You will notice in the Bill, it is specified there, if you reside outside Saskatchewan, then you can make an application to a judge of the District Court of Saskatchewan nearest to the place where the article was sold. I think it's clear that the schedule as it was in the Act didn't contemplate the set of facts that I have described, so we have decided that the point is well taken and we are proposing that the form be amended accordingly.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

Hon. W.R. Thatcher (Premier) moved second reading of Bill No. 31 — **An Act to amend The Liquor Act (No.1)**.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this particular Bill has to do with liquor outlets. Some years ago, as you know, the Government began to establish liquor outlets in the small communities of Saskatchewan. At the same time, we began a policy of closing down the traditional type of liquor stores in the very small centres. As outlets have been established, they have been placed in town or villages which were too small to support the ordinary kind of

March 14, 1968

Government store. Despite what some Hon. Members might think these outlets have been designed primarily to give service to people in the rural areas. Formerly we found that many people had to go 50 miles, sometimes 75 miles in the country districts to obtain their supplies. We have tried to rectify that situation with this legislation. Manitoba has used outlets for many years. Generally speaking these outlets have been established in drugstores. However on some occasions, if there is not a drugstore in the community or if the druggist won't take the outlet, sometimes it is placed in other retail establishments. I think Hon. Members know that each retailer is paid a commission of 10 per cent of the liquor sold on the first \$40,000. After that he is paid a commission of 5 per cent. Hon. Members might be interested to know that, since this legislation came into effect, 18 of the traditional stores have been closed. There is a question on the Order Paper so I won't give the details tonight of where those 18 are. It will be the policy of the Government to continue closing additional stores in very small centres — I'm talking about centres of under 200, 300, 400 and the smaller points. At the present time, the Act provides for 80 of these special outlets. Seventy-nine of them have been established to date and I may tell you, Mr. Speaker, that there are many, many applications on file. The amendment which is before us provides for an additional 25 outlets. As I say, part of those will be used to replace existing stores. In all cases, votes have been held in the communities involved and almost without exception, the votes have been overwhelming. We find that people in these areas usually voted in favor by majorities of 9 to 1, 10 to 1. I may say that the Government believes we are now nearing the saturation point with these outlets. I believe, if the House approves 25 additional units tonight, that it will not be necessary in the foreseeable future for the Government to ask for more. I suggest that this legislation is wanted by many rural areas, Mr. Speaker.

Debate adjourned.

Hon. D.V. Heald (Attorney. General) moved second reading of Bill No. 15 — **An Act Respecting Hail Insurance by Municipalities.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, this is a new Municipal Hail Insurance Act. The purpose of the Act I think could be stated very briefly as follows: First of all, it eliminates the schedule to the present Act and brings all municipalities into one class, thereby removing what has proven to be an unnecessary distinction. The second thing it does is to simplify the operation of the plan by having one uniform system for farmers of any municipality in Saskatchewan. The third thing it attempts to do is to improve or clarify the drafting of certain sections of the Act. Mr. Speaker, prior to 1947, a farmer could be insured under the municipal plan, only if the municipality in which he resided had passed a bylaw to enter the plan. A total of 160 municipalities passed such a bylaw. Now where a municipality passed a bylaw, crops on lands in that municipality were automatically insured under the plan, unless they were withdrawn once the farmer by

his own application opted out. In 1947 the plan was extended to allow individual farmers in municipalities, which had not passed a bylaw, to obtain insurance by application to the association through his municipal secretary. The earner was not automatically insured each year but had to make a new application, if he wished to be included in the plan for that year. In 1963, the new Act was passed. Under this Act, individual farmers, having made an initial application to come under the plan, remained thereunder and until an application was made by this farmer to withdraw from the plan. That's the same as was the case with the farmer and the municipality which had passed a bylaw. Unfortunately, perhaps, a schedule was added to that Act which listed all municipalities in Saskatchewan which had not passed the bylaw. That schedule in addition to providing in principle for two classes of municipalities, namely those listed and those not listed therein, presented a problem in a case where municipal boundaries were altered or where existing municipalities were amalgamated or where a new municipality was created — at least until such time as the Act or the schedule could be amended by the Legislature. We've had in the last year or so some new municipalities. Under this new Bill, every farmer presently under the plan will remain thereunder, until he withdraws by application, and any farmer who is not under the plan may come under it by application. This in effect does not change the present situation, but it simplifies the operation of the plan bringing all municipalities together under one system. Any differences, which presently exist in the administration of the plan as between the original municipalities and those listed in the schedule, will be removed. This Bill has been asked for and, has the support of the Board of Directors of Saskatchewan Municipal Hail Insurance Association.

**Mr. E.I. Wood: (Swift Current)** — Mr. Speaker, I am glad to hear the explanation that has been given by the Hon. Attorney General. When you have a new Bill of this type that is reworded, it is a little difficult to compare it with earlier Bills, but I quite accept it and I'm glad to hear his explanation regarding the removal of the schedule that was appended to the earlier Act. I think this is logical for him to do. He did not mention that the maximums under the Act had been raised for additional coverage from \$4 to \$9 which I do believe also has been recommended and agreed to by the municipal people, and I have nothing whatsoever to say against the principle of the Bill.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

Hon. C.L.B. Estey (Minister of Municipal Affairs) moved second reading of **Bill No. 21 — An Act to Amend The Village Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, this Bill refers to certain amendments to The Village Act. As some Members of the House know, we are attempting to combine all of our urban Acts and to bring that Act in at the next session of this Legislature. However, certain amendments were asked for, mainly by the Saskatchewan Urban

**March 14, 1968**

Municipalities Association to The Village Act and these are incorporated in the Bill which is before you. These amendments refer to increasing the number of councillors from three to five if a village has a population of over 400 people. There is another amendment which clarifies the situation of nominating a councillor. He must be nominated by two persons other than himself. Other amendments to the Act bring it in line with The Time Act. Certain complaints were received from urban centres regarding the control or registration of trailers and portable shacks and there are amendments coming before the House in this Bill which we hope will clear up certain difficulties in this respect. The Act also provides for amending the procedure of money bylaws. Formerly these money bylaws had to go to the burgesses and then the Local Government Board. The amendment provides now that the village may go to the Local Government Board and the Local Government Board has the discretion as to whether it should go to a vote of the burgesses. The amending Bill also deals with certain items in regard to the assessment of land and buildings in the villages which I think are self-explanatory.

**Mr. H.H.P. Baker: (Regina South East)** — Mr. Speaker, I am not trying to hold this Bill up at all but there are parts which dovetail into The Town Act and The City Act regarding abandoning of vehicles and also that portion dealing with the Local Government Board on the issuing of debentures. There are some fine changes in this and in the other Acts. I would like to adjourn the debate if it is all right with the Minister — I'm not trying to hold it up — I would like to study them a little more closely.

Debate adjourned.

Hon. C.L.B. Estey (Minister of Municipal Affairs) moved second reading of Bill No. 23 — **An Act to Amend The Rural Municipalities Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, this concerns amendments to The Rural Municipality Act and the vast majority of these amendments were asked for by the SARM. One of the main amendments which this Bill proposes is to regard wives of burgesses as having the same right to vote as the burgess, providing they reside in the municipality. The amendment will also permit a municipality to assess certain parcels of land as a hamlet without the Minister's order. Previously an assessor required an order of a Minister to permit an assessment of a parcel of land as a hamlet; and this was deemed to be unnecessary. The amendments also deal with the qualification and disqualification of councillors, the treasurer's bond, certain other amendments deal with the piling of earth a certain distance from an intersection of a road. The Bill also provides that municipalities may license owners of gravel pit plants and equipment and provides for the enforcement of tax arrears. This problem has been rather severe to

certain municipalities in the past, and we think the amendment will clear up this difficulty. We have also inserted in this Act certain amendments which you will find in the other urban Acts. We are providing rural municipalities with power to remove abandoned vehicles from road allowances, which as I say has been asked for by the SARM. The amendment also permits the licensee or lessee of railway property to be assessed as if that company or individual was the registered owner. We have simplified the provisions, we think, for the reporting of oil and gas-well equipment to the secretary to the municipality in which that equipment is located. The amending Act also deals with a council's power to grant an exemption of a lien on crops when the owner is on the elevator list, and I think the other amendments to this Act are self-explanatory.

**Mr. E.I. Wood: (Swift Current)** — Mr. Speaker, I think that we all concur with most of the things that have been mentioned here and undoubtedly there will be some of them that Members will desire to ask some questions concerning when this Bill Comes into Committee. There are a few items, however, that I think worthy of looking at in regard to the principle of the Bill. One is the change in regard to the borrowing powers of the municipality. I believe earlier the section intimated or set out that the council could either proceed to borrow money by having the approval of the burgesses or going to the Local Government Board. This amendment makes it a must to go to the Local Government Board, and the Local Government Board may advise that they must go to the burgesses. This I know is a good problem, it is a good question. In time past the Local Government Board has questioned this clause because the Local Government Board does have the responsibility of the marketing of these bonds in other parts of Canada and the United States, and it's their responsibility that they must stand guard over the bonds of the rural municipalities as well as other public organizations in the country. I felt that the way it was before may have given some leeway, but some municipal men have spoken to me about this. They are not entirely happy with the idea that their ability to borrow money must always go through the Local Government Board, that is, borrowing money that hasn't got to be repaid during the current year. Some have expressed to me the idea that, possibly if Regina is going to take over everything, they might as well do away with local governments. I'm not really prepared to be too critical of this because I do realize that there are the two issues at stake here. It is one of those things I think we could have a little further discussion on when it comes up in Committee.

Another one that I think is worth looking at is the matter of the penalty in regard to unpaid taxes, which is being raised by this Bill. I understand of course that it is optional with the municipality whether they do put on a higher penalty for unpaid taxes. Indeed I think it can be argued that the 5 per cent penalty that is now imposed is more of an incentive in some ways to not pay the taxes than it is to pay them. But on the other hand I think there is something here again that those people, who are just unable to pay their taxes and find it very difficult

**March 14, 1968**

to so do, are going to find this an added burden, which again I think we should be prepared to take another look at.

With these comments, Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to ask further questions in the Committee of the Whole.

**Mr. W.J. Berezowsky: (Prince Albert East-Cumberland)** — Mr. Speaker, I haven't got much to say but there is one point . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — Sit down.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — . . . No, I don't have to sit down and you don't have to talk to me that way. I'm representing people and somebody says, "Sit down if you haven't got much to say." You know quite well I meant I didn't intend to take much of your time, and I haven't been taking up any time today as Hon. Members opposite know.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — But I do want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that there is one section that seems to imply higher taxes and if it is the intention of this Act, which says that the penalty can be increased to 7 per cent then I can just imagine what rate of interest that would be. If a man is in arrears two or three weeks after the New Year and he has to pay a 7 per cent penalty, provided there is no bylaw reducing it, then that is a tremendous amount of interest. Now, is this amendment for the purpose of bringing more revenue to the municipality or is it to be an incentive to pay? Now if a person can't pay by the 31st of December, surely you can't expect him to pay on the 2nd of January or February; you may have to wait a little longer than that. And I don't think that the penalty in the Act as it was too low at all. I think that some care should be taken in increasing the penalty, because you are penalizing the people who cannot pay promptly. Concerning those who aren't able to pay, you're penalizing them much more because they have difficulty in obtaining funds. These amendments simply mean that you are going to scare many more people off the land and send them down to the pulp mill in Prince Albert.

**Mr. Estey:** — It is not the intention, Mr. Speaker, of this Government to drive anyone to the pulp mill at Prince Albert or some other fate. The whole purpose of this amendment, as suggested to us by the SARM, is due to the fact that the former penalty was 5 per cent which is less than the current bank rate, and there is no incentive to pay your taxes. That is the only purpose of putting in the amount. I might say the Act also provides for the usual prepayment features.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

Hon. L.P. Coderre (Minister of Labour) moved second reading of Bill No. 24 — **An Act to amend The Workmen's Compensation (Accident Fund) Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to draw the attention of this House in introducing this Bill that considers people before politics. It considers the welfare of widows and their dependent children of fatally injured workmen, I suppose, Mr. Speaker, after I finish introducing and giving some of the points of the Bill and some of our colleagues in the House will say we haven't gone far enough. This progressive legislation is one that's handled in a modest degree in a modest approach to it: It is not far-fetched, it is something that can be handled effectively. One section is increasing the amount payable to a widow, the other one is making it possible for a dependent child who is attending school at the age of 19 and wishes to continue in attending a recognized school can receive an allowance until the age of 21. Another provision made is to increase the ceiling to \$6,600, an increase of 10 percent. I do believe, though at this point, Mr. Speaker, that I should mention, though it is not in the Act at the moment that I intend to bring an amendment to it that the increase to \$6,600 becomes effective for accidents that have occurred only after July 1, 1968. I thought I would mention this at this point. There is also an increase in the amount of compensation payable in the case of temporary employment disability. There is also a provision that when a widow who is receiving 100 per cent allowance arrives at the age where she is entitled to the Old Age Security, her pension will not be reduced in proportion. There was a provision we had in this Act and I think the only Act in Canada that had that provision that reduced the widow's pension — when she's entitled to Old Age Security.

I think most of the matters in the Bill can be best discussed in Committee.

**Mr. R. Romanow: (Saskatoon Riversdale)** — Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 9:58 o'clock p.m.