

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Second Session — Sixteenth Legislature**  
**42nd Day**

**Tuesday, April 1, 1969**

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

**ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**TELEGRAM FROM THE PRIME MINISTER RE – GUARANTEED WHEAT PRICE**

**Hon. W.R. Mr. Thatcher (Premier):** — Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago this Legislature passed a Resolution concerning wheat prices unanimously. The Resolution the next day was forwarded to the Prime Minister requesting some Federal action. Yesterday I received a telegram from the Prime Minister, which I think would be of interest to the House.

With respect to your telegram of March 17th, the Government has under review the implications for the grain producers and for the economy generally of the current difficult wheat marketing situation. A meeting of the main exporting countries has been called for early April to consider ways and means of dealing with the present deterioration in prices in relation to the minimum price provisions of the International Grains Arrangement. I have discussed the problem with President Nixon this week. Your representations concerning Western producers' income are being examined in the context of the present difficulties.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that that telegram might be hopeful, but certainly isn't very meaningful up to this point. I would indicate that the Government will continue to press Ottawa for price guarantees.

**BUST OF RT. HON. J.G. DIEFENBAKER**

**Mr. Thatcher:** — While I am on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce that the Government will honor one of Saskatchewan's most famous native sons. On April 22nd His Honour the Lieutenant Governor will unveil a bust of the Right Honorable John G. Diefenbaker during special ceremonies in this Chamber. At the request of the Government, Mr. Diefenbaker has made available a bust of himself which will be placed on permanent display in this building. The exact location will be determined at a later date. On the day of the unveiling, Mr. Diefenbaker will also be guest of honor at a special Government function. I think all Hon. Members will agree that Mr. Diefenbaker is certainly worthy of such a tribute. He is the first native Saskatchewan citizen to become Prime Minister of Canada.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

MOTIONS FOR RETURNS

RETURN NO. 114

**Mr. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition)** moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 114 showing:

Copies of all agreements entered into since February 23, 1966 (together with any amendments thereto to March 15, 1969) between Prince Albert Pulp Company Ltd., or Parsons and Whittemore Inc. and the Government of Saskatchewan, but excluding:

1. Agreements dealing solely with pollution.
2. Agreements between the said companies or either of them and any Crown corporation, board, commission or like agency of the Government of Saskatchewan to which no department or minister of the Government of Saskatchewan is a party.

**Hon. W.R. Thatcher (Premier):** — This matter has been up repeatedly in the House last year, and this year. The Government does not believe this information should be given, because it might give information to competitors. We think it is not in the public interest and we must defeat the motion.

**Mr. Lloyd:** — Mr. Speaker, I am not going to extend the debate on the matter, but I think we must draw attention to this latest in a large number of refusals of the Government to give information of this kind. Surely when we have as large an investment, as large a potential and as large a degree of support involved as there is with respect to the Prince Albert Pulp Company or Parsons and Whittemore Inc., then the people of Saskatchewan have a right to know what the arrangements are with respect to them. I really don't think, Mr. Speaker, that there is another government in the face of all of Canada that would withhold information of this kind except the one that sits to your right. As the Premier said it was discussed many times before. This simply reiterates the willingness of the Government to hide behind the curtain of alleged public interest. Motion negatived on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 21

Lloyd  
Kramer  
Willis  
Wood  
Davies

Berezowsky  
Smishek  
Thibault  
Whelan  
Snyder

Baker  
Pepper  
Bowerman  
Matsalla  
Messer

April 1, 1969

Dewhurst  
Meakes

Michayluk  
Brockelbank

Kwasnica  
Kowalchuk

**NAYS — 28**

Thatcher  
Howes  
McFarlane  
Boldt  
Cameron  
Heald  
McIsaac  
Guy  
Loken  
MacDougall

Grant  
Larochelle  
MacDonald  
Estey  
Hooker  
Gallagher  
Heggie  
Breker  
Leith

Radloff  
Weatherald  
Mitchell  
Gardner  
McPherson  
Charlebois  
Forsyth  
McIvor  
Schmeiser

**RETURN NO. 115**

**Mr. Lloyd** moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 115 showing:

Copies of all agreements entered into since February 23, 1966, (together with any amendments thereto to March 15, 1969) between Prince Albert Pulp Company Ltd. or Parson and Whittmore Inc. and any Crown corporation, board, commission or agency of the Government of Saskatchewan, but excluding:

1. Agreements dealing solely with pollution.
2. Agreements with respect to the supply of power, natural gas or telephone services to the said companies or either of them.
3. Agreements between the said Companies or either of them and Saskatchewan Pulpwood Ltd. or Woodland Enterprises Ltd.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Mr. Speaker, for the same reason as in the previous order, the Government does not believe that this Resolution would be in the public interest and we must ask that it be turned down.

**Mr. W.J. Berezowsky (Prince Albert East Cumberland):** — Mr. Speaker, I think the public is entitled to some information. We hear all kinds of rumors, we have asked questions as to the actual cost of power to the company. People are telling us they are getting concessions, cheaper power than other places. I think it doesn't really matter but this has to do with Crown corporations, dealings with Telephone Companies, and Saskatchewan Power and other companies. I don't know why the Government is trying to hide this information. I would hope

that the Minister would reconsider. This is setting a kind of precedent. We'll never be able to get any kind of information if this is now the established precedent.

Motion negatived on the following recorded division.

**YEAS — 21**

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

**NAYS — 28**

Thatcher	Grant	Radloff
Howes	Larochelle	Weatherald
McFarlane	MacDonald	Mitchell
Boldt	Estey	Gardner
Cameron	Hooker	McPherson
Heald	Gallagher	Charlebois
McIsaac	Heggie	Forsyth
Guy	Breker	McIvor
Loken	Leith	Schmeiser
MacDougall		

**RETURN NO. 116**

**Mr. Lloyd** moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 116 showing:

Copies of all agreements entered into since February 23, 1966 (together with any amendments thereto to March 15, 1969) between Prince Albert Pulp Company Ltd. or Parsons and Whittemore Inc. and Saskatchewan Pulpwood Ltd. or Woodland Enterprises Ltd.

He said: I just want to say briefly that this motion has reference to agreements which have been made by two companies which are wholly owned by the Government of Saskatchewan. The reference is first of all to Saskatchewan Pulpwood Ltd. which is a wholly owned subsidiary of the Government Finance Office which is wholly owned by the Government of Saskatchewan. The reference is further to Woodland Enterprises Ltd. which is wholly owned by the Finance Office which is wholly owned by the Government of Saskatchewan.

April 1, 1969

With respect to Woodland Enterprises we know that it exists somewhat accidentally. We have not been able to find out what it exists for, we have not been able to find out anything about the structure of the company. We have not been able to find anything about its relationship with the other Government companies. We have not been able to find out anything with respect to the amount of public money that may be involved in it. We have not been able to find anything about its purpose whatsoever. All we know is that it is one of a string of subsidiaries in a very complex web of operations. This all leads up of course again to the fact that the Government has and with this we have no quarrel, considerable amount of money invested and has guaranteed large amounts of money with respect to the pulp operation in Saskatchewan. It seems that, if the Government really wants this operation to be understood, it should be making some information available with respect to it. It seems impossible to explain why agreements of this kind could in any way whatsoever jeopardize the relationship with other industries. It seems incredible that the Government should once again stand on the right of public interest to refuse information of this kind to the public.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Mr. Speaker, this Government several years ago was successful in getting one of the greatest industries that ever came to Saskatchewan, the Prince Albert Pulp Company. Now we are not prepared to jeopardize the operations of that pulp mill in its early stages by giving information to competitors. I know the Socialists wouldn't understand this, although we have told them at least 15 times this session. I must in the public interest ask that this motion also be rejected.

Motion negatived on the following recorded division.

**YEAS — 21**

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

**NAYS — 28**

Thatcher	Grant	Radloff
Howes	Larochelle	Weatherald
McFarlane	MacDonald	Mitchell
Boldt	Estey	Gardner
Cameron	Hooker	McPherson
Heald	Gallagher	Charlebois
McIsaac	Heggie	Forsyth

Guy  
Loken  
MacDougall

Breker  
Leith

McIvor  
Schmeiser

**RETURN NO. 133**

**Mr. F.A. Dewhurst (Wadena)** moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 133 showing:

Regarding the 4,373 copies of the 1969 Budget Speech distributed (see Answer to Question 185)

1. The number distributed to (a) individuals; (b) institutions; and (c) organizations.
2. The names of (a) the institutions and (b) the organizations and the number of copies distributed to each.

He said: I would like to say a few words in moving this motion, Mr. Speaker. Some time ago I asked the question which was No. 185, asking the number of copies of the Budget Speech that were printed. I was informed it was 5,000 copies of the Budget Speech printed at a cost in round figures of \$2,000 - \$1.93 short of \$2,000. It said there had been 4,373 copies distributed to individuals, institutions, and organizations upon request. Later on I asked the question, if any of these had been sent into the Kelvington constituency, and whether they were addressed direct or to the householder. That question was turned into an Order for Return, and the answer I got said that the Treasury Department does not have this information. The only record of distribution of the Budget Speech is the mailing list of those persons, institutions and organizations which request they be placed on the mailing list and mailed a copy each year. The other day I asked a question for the number distributed to (a) individuals; (b) institutions and (c) organizations, the names of the institutions and organizations and the number to each institution and organization. Then the other day when this question came up, it was turned into a Motion for Return. I cannot see why this couldn't have been answered as a question because on the Return it said the Department had the record of those it was mailed to direct to institutions and organizations. But evidently it has turned into a Notice of Motion for Return, so that in getting near the end of the session I will not get the information this session. I know that copies of the Budget Speech were sent into the Kelvington constituency, and the cost being about 40 cents a piece. I was trying to find out how many. But I have no other alternative than assume that the Government is using the public money to pay for the printing of Budget Speeches and send them into Kelvington. I know they have been addressed to householders and not to individuals. So now if the Government wishes to turn this into a Motion for Return, it has that privilege. But the information will come out, I don't see any reason why the information couldn't have been supplied

**April 1, 1969**

on a question, because it said it has that information. So I am asking that the Assembly pass this now as a Motion for Return so that some time we will have the information.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Mr. Speaker, it has been traditional in this Legislature for many, many years that the Budget and Throne Speeches be printed and sent out throughout the Province. I think it is up to the Minister to decide where it will be sent. The only complaint I have is that Mr. Steuart only had 5,000 copies printed. Mr. Fines and Mr. Blakeney usually had 10,000 or more to send all over the Province. If the Hon. Member is worried that he didn't get some of these Budget Speeches, I'm very willing to have another 5,000 printed, and give them to him for redistribution, because this was the finest Budget that was introduced in all Canada. Mr. Speaker, did you notice what happened in Nova Scotia the other day, a 7 per cent sales tax, and many other increases? New Brunswick introduced an 8 per cent sales tax in their budget. This is one of two Provincial Budgets to date that have been balanced. I am sure some of the people of Kelvington along with other people would like to know these facts . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — And Wadena!

**Mr. Thatcher:** — . . . And Wadena too, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Lloyd:** — I find the Premier's argument intriguing you know. He compares Saskatchewan with the poorest provinces in Canada . . .

**Hon. Mr. Thatcher:** — Well, what about Alberta!

**Mr. Lloyd:** — . . . and boasts about it. He compares it to the poorest province and boasts about it . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — What about Ontario!

**Mr. Lloyd:** — . . . and he overlooked conveniently the fact that Saskatchewan last year introduced almost \$40 million of new taxes.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lloyd:** — He overlooked also the fact that as a result of the failure of this Government to put enough money into school grants, property taxes for education are going to skyrocket again this year as they have in the past . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Not if the teachers hold their salaries at a reasonable rate!

**Mr. Lloyd:** — . . . He overlooks that it balanced this Budget . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — You bet we balanced it!

**Mr. Lloyd:** — . . . by making it necessary for a great many people on the lowest incomes in the Province to dig down into their own pockets and pay more for their accommodation in senior citizens homes. It balanced . . .

**Hon. A.R. Guy (Minister of Public Works):** — Nonsense!

**Mr. Lloyd:** — . . . this Budget by nonsense to the person who has a low income and has to pick out \$4, \$5 or \$10 more a month . . . it's not nonsense to them, Mr. Minister. Not nonsense to them.

He balanced this Budget, boasts about it, by maintaining the deterrent fee, which imposes a hardship on a lot of people in this province. Mr. Speaker, he can boast all he likes, about balancing the Budget, he balanced it on the hardships of a great many people in the Province of Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. D. Mr. Boldt (Minister of Highways):** — Mr. Speaker, the Member from Dewhurst is interested in . . . Wadena . . . Ah, it doesn't make any difference what I call him. You know I would like to know, the other day you said, you informed the House, how many tens of thousands of letterhead material came out of the Clerk's office, and was very interested in the taxpayers' money. A lot of your propaganda is going to be printed on it and sent to Kelvington, not only one in every home, but I would say dozens of times. I saw some of the MLAs carry out great big cartons, and I thought it was the end of the session. But no, this is the material you're getting out of the Clerk's office. It is paid for by the poor people of Saskatchewan. It is paid by those people that have to pay deterrent fees, whom you're concerned about. They are paid for by the poor farmer that you are concerned about. I just wonder how many thousands and thousands of dollars it costs to the taxpayers of this province to peddle your propaganda to the people of Kelvington.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lloyd:** — . . . that went out that way. How much did it cost to call the Liberal meetings that were advertised in that way.

**Mr. Dewhurst:** — Mr. Speaker, it is amusing to hear our learned friend



April 1, 1969

from Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) get up and make such a speech. He says that on several occasions, not once, but several times, Members on this side of the House have sent information to all households in Kelvington . . .

**Hon. Mr. Boldt:** — On a point of privilege, I didn't say that, that it had been sent, I said you were going to send it out.

**Mr. Dewhurst:** — . . . That we were going to send them out. Mr. Speaker, he said not once but several times, now he says we were going to send them out. I'd like him to show where they have been sent out even once to the householders in the Kelvington constituency. This motion here, I am not objecting to the printing I must tell the Premier, I'm not objecting to the Budget Speech being printed. I think it should be printed. I'm not objecting to individuals or organizations or institutions receiving a copy of the Budget Speech. I have no objections whatsoever. But the only thing I have been trying to find out is, what organizations and what institutions? I didn't ask for the individuals because I didn't wish for them to have a long list. This wasn't necessary. The answer could have been supplied as a question so that we would have had it this session, and not next session. As far as the Premier trying to say that there was a larger number spent in previous years, that may be or may not be. But I can assure the Premier when the questions were asked of the former Government, the questions were answered, they weren't held up. They were always answered immediately.

I can say that, on these questions here, I have had the run around and I have no other alternative than to draw my own conclusions because I know I won't get this Return for this session. I feel that the House should pass this now. We will get it sometime.

Motion agreed to.

### ADJOURNED DEBATES

#### RESOLUTION NO. 14 – TRAINING AND EDUCATION FOR MENTALLY HANDICAPPED

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. Kwasnica (Cutknife).

This Assembly reaffirms its belief that every child has the right to develop his potentials to the maximum and recommends to the consideration of the Government of Saskatchewan that appropriate training and education be provided for mentally handicapped by:

(1) further extending modern training and educational facilities at Moose Jaw or other centres elsewhere in the province;

(2) passing legislation making it mandatory that educational and training facilities be provided for all students; and

(3) co-ordinating and assisting all governmental programs and voluntary organizations working for the cause of mental retardation in -Saskatchewan.

**Hon. G.B. Mr. Grant (Minister of Public Health):** — Mr. Speaker, in connection with this Resolution I would like to say a few preliminary words, then introduce an amendment.

The program for mentally retarded in this province has been under review for some time within the Department. Certain steps have been taken that I think will accomplish what the Resolution is calling for, namely the co-ordination and assisting all Government programs and voluntary organizations working for the case of mental retardation in Saskatchewan. There has been a co-ordinating committee set up, working toward this end and making good progress. The first two involved the Department of Education and I am sure the Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac) would have some comments to make about the second part of the motion that deals with legislation, making it mandatory that education and training facilities are provided for all students. This is an area that is not just as simple as it sounds and one that I am sure everyone in this House would endorse if practical, but I will leave the detailed comments to the Minister of Education.

The first clause is all embracing, because it not only mentions training and educational facilities at Moose Jaw, but also includes other centres elsewhere in the province. I think this is something that can't happen overnight, but is being improved and extended as people and funds make it possible, Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move seconded by the Hon. Minister of Education that Resolution No. 14 be amended as follows:

That all the words after "Assembly" in the first line be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

commends the Government of Saskatchewan for recognizing that a new approach in the training and education of the mentally handicapped is needed, and having recognized this need, has first of all established a new position of Director of Mental Retardation and, secondly, has established an Inter-departmental Committee on Mental Retardation under the Chairmanship of the Director to:

(a) review the adequacy of existing programs for the mentally retarded in the institutions and in the community.

(b) advise the Government on new programs required to ensure that each mentally handicapped person in the province has the opportunity to develop his maximum potential;

April 1, 1969

- (c) advise on the organizational structure for mental retardation programs and methods by which co-ordination of efforts among government agencies, private agencies, and other interested parties can be improved; and
- (d) suggest any changes in legislation that might be desirable.

**Hon. J.C. McIsaac (Minister of Education):** — Mr. Speaker, let me say that when one reads the preamble of the original motion proposed by the Member for Cutknife (Mr. Kwasnica) there is certainly no doubt of this Government's support of the view that mentally handicapped children should have every opportunity that is possible to be made available to them to develop every potential that they have. However, there are some real problems associated with legislation making it mandatory that education and training facilities be provided for all mentally handicapped children in the province at this point in time. I think, Mr. Speaker, that the first thought that comes to mind, it would not be sensible at this point to compel all school boards to provide services and facilities for the mentally handicapped, when there is such an acute shortage of specialized teachers for teaching in this particular field. In this respect, I think, Members will be interested, I don't know how many have seen the press release yesterday, indicating that the College of Education is expanding its teacher training offering in this particular field. I am sure everybody will be pleased to see that announcement.

The other section of the Resolution I would like to comment on briefly is the extension of facilities at Moose Jaw and "the provision of similar centres elsewhere in the Province," I believe the phrase was, is not the total answer either in this regard, because as useful as Moose Jaw and other such centres may be, I think everyone recognizes that they are still institutional in character. Many parents, Mr. Speaker, of the mentally handicapped are reluctant to place their children in institutions. The approach that the Government has taken and will continue to take, I can assure Hon. Members, is one of encouragement to the school authorities to accept more and more responsibility for the education of the mentally handicapped and we will assist our local school boards in the Province in providing greater opportunities for the handicapped children. I think that the statistics of the growth of these programs in the last two or three years will support the fact that this method has brought about real achievements in this regard. I realize that the Member for Cutknife (Mr. Kwasnica) when he was speaking on this Resolution initially said that he didn't want to hear a great variety of statistics. Well, I'll not keep him very long, Mr. Speaker, but I think the statistics are such that they should be read into the records. Since 1965, 21 additional school board operated classrooms for the educable mentally handicapped have been opened. We had 77 classrooms in '65, the total now

being 98. Secondly for the trainable retardates who are severely handicapped an additional eight classrooms are now operating in the last two years. There were 54 two years ago.

Another project that I am sure Members would be interested in hearing of is a new four-room school for the trainable retardates which has been approved for the city of Swift Current. This school with roughly half of the capital costs provided by Provincial grants will serve about 40 retardates from Swift Current City and five surrounding school units. The school boards and local service clubs are to be given the primary credit for the operation. The Co-operative School Work Training Program which was introduced by this Department in 1965 has now been implemented in 54 different centres throughout this province, and this program is particularly appropriate, Mr. Speaker, for slow learners and for the educable mentally handicapped. 57 now pre-vocational classes for slow learners and mentally handicapped students in the adolescent age group have been established since 1965 and there were 21 classes in 1965. There has been a new Vocational A School approved by the city of Regina in the past year. Forty new remedial classes have been opened and these special classrooms provide remediation of reading disabilities. In 1965 there were only four such classrooms operating in the Province.

A number of school boards also, Mr. Speaker, have been employing itinerant remedial teachers who travel from school to school throughout their jurisdiction. In 1965 there were no such teachers employed by boards in the Province. Another point raised in the initial Resolution suggests the need for co-ordinating and assisting all Government programs and voluntary organizations working for the cause of mental retardation in Saskatchewan. Certainly the need for such co-ordination in the field of mental retardation in this province is acknowledged, Mr. Speaker. And at the same time I should point out to the House, as the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) did, that there is a Provincial Co-ordinator of Rehabilitation and secondly, that the work of this officer is guided by an Inter-departmental Co-ordinating Committee. This Committee is composed of representatives of the Departments of Health, Education, Welfare, Labour and Treasury. This Committee does work in consultation with the voluntary organizations interested in the problems of mental retardation in this province and there are many.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the problems associated at this point in time with mandatory legislation and because secondly, significant progress has been made in this overall field of providing more and better educational opportunities for the handicapped, I will be supporting the amendment proposed by my colleague, the Minister of Health, and not the original motion.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. A. Matsalla (Canora):** — Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to add my support to the

April 1, 1969

motion requesting the Government to provide special educational programs for the mentally handicapped as submitted by my colleague, the Hon. Member from Cutknife (Mr. Kwasnica). Mr. Speaker, I suggest that consideration in this House on the all-important question of providing necessary educational facilities for children who are slow learners and handicapped should be guided by the principles in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of the United Nations, Article 26, I quote:

1. Everyone has the right to education. Education shall be free, at least in the elementary and fundamental stages. Elementary education shall be compulsory. Technical and professional education shall be made generally available and higher education shall be equally accessible to all on the basis of merit.
2. Education shall be directed to the full development of the human personality and to the strengthening of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. It shall promote understanding, tolerance and friendship among all nations, racial or religious groups and shall further the activities of the United Nations for the maintenance of peace.
3. Parents have a prior right to choose the kind of education that shall be given to their children.

Society today, Mr. Speaker, is inclined to accept that education in the greater part is something available to those who have normal adaptability and possess ability to absorb knowledge and who are capable of learning in accordance with a course of studies of the day. Further for children possessing excellent abilities our society is prepared to go out of its way to provide special training in order that their gifts and talents may be exercised and developed to the fullest. This, of course, I say is desirable and should be encouraged in every case, but regrettably in our interest to make the best use of our education system for the average and the exceptionally high I.Q. children, we have been losing sight and forgetting the poor children who are slow in learning and handicapped. The tragedy that exists in a classroom, Mr. Speaker, is the case of a lonely boy who is separated from and rejected by his classmates because he is different – different because he does not seem to fit in the classroom environment. He is slow – he makes mistakes – he doesn't respond like the other children. The poor boy becomes frustrated. He develops fears and in general he feels bad about the whole world around him. This boy is handicapped physically, emotionally, mentally, environmentally or in a combination of these ways. His learning and behavior might also be affected because of unusual circumstances. The education and training of the handicapped child, Mr. Deputy Speaker, with special disabilities in early days was left to the parents. Until just a few years ago, the public became more conscious to the fact that the education and training of the handicapped child should become the responsibility of society. It is being recognized that the child in many cases, if given adequate educational

opportunities, could develop and achieve skills that would prepare him to be of economic and social benefit to himself and his society. I want to point out, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that we haven't been entirely unconscious of providing facilities and education for the handicapped. Schools are provided for the blind, the deaf and the crippled. But for some unknown reason we have been and are very slow in developing an educational program for the retarded and the slow learner. For some reason we are lagging behind in establishing schools for the retarded. The retarded virtually have become separated from the mainstream of the educational program. I believe that the main reason for the slowness of action is simply because of our wrong concept towards the retarded in that very little could be done to help this child. However, as I said earlier, our attitude today is changing to one of better understanding and acceptance of the fact that a handicapped child could be helped. We should now move positively towards extending our present educational facilities and take on the challenge contained on the United Nations' Declaration of Human Rights, the principle that, "Everyone has a right to education." Now this means that the retarded child should be helped and educated without discrimination. There seem to be two schools of thought surrounding the area of providing education for the handicapped. One thought is that a mentally deficient child should be removed from regular classrooms and provided a special education program separate and apart from the ordinary school program. Another thought is that this child should not be isolated from the whole process of education. He should become an integral part of the ordinary school program. I personally tend to agree with the latter, but at this point it is a matter of opinion based on the pros and cons of the two thoughts. I want to emphasize, however, that the main thing in either case is that the child be recognized as a child having a desire and an ability to learn, and that we accept responsibility to provide means of developing this desire and ability. The unfortunate child, Mr. Deputy Speaker, should in our good conscience be entitled to opportunities for education in the same manner as is available to his more fortunate brothers and sisters. Responsibility for providing the required educational services for the handicapped should concern each and everyone of us. The leadership in this area, however, I would say, should be one for the Provincial Government and perhaps one for the Federal Government to consider.

At present, Mr. Speaker, facilities for the retarded are very limited. I believe because of apathy on the part of the public in general, our Government has been moving very slowly into this area of education. At this point I want to say that the amendment that has just been introduced is just another way of delaying this slowness. Community branches through the Saskatchewan Association of Retarded Children organized themselves as local committees to sponsor educational programs for the retarded in their local areas. With the limited resources the committees are doing as well as could be expected under the circumstances. I want at this time to take the opportunity and express a word of appreciation for their interests and concern.

April 1, 1969

Their promotion of the ideal that the problem of retarded children could be lessened through preventive and remedial methods is most gratifying. They ought to be highly commended for their work. It is time now that the Provincial Government be more concerned in this relatively new area of education. Existing facilities would have to be reassessed and co-ordinated and they should be put to best use. I believe, too, that every effort should be made to utilize local committees of voluntary organization to the greatest benefit. They could become very useful as contact and liaison between the community and the Government. The Provincial Government should now put greater effort into taking steps of providing necessary facilities. The child should as soon as possible be given a fair and equal opportunity of developing whatever ability he may possess.

In this new area of education, Mr. Deputy Speaker, a special education program would have to be developed, firstly that of research and teacher training. I am very pleased to note an article in *The Leader Post*, March 31, 1969, that a special education course is being planned at the University of Saskatchewan this fall for this special purpose, secondly, that adequate school plant facilities be provided. And with respect to the latter I want to say that every consideration should be given to provide the school program in the community where the child lives or as near to his home as possible. I want to say again that the amendment that has been introduced does not provide for immediate and positive action in this area of special education. It suggests a delay in providing a definite go-ahead in this area.

I will not support the amendment but I will support the main motion.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. C.P. MacDonald (Minister of Welfare):** — Mr. Speaker, I only want to add one small comment. There is one real deficiency in the original motion presented by the member for Cutknife (Mr. Kwasnica) and that is the lack of any mention of community services. There is a real change in the philosophy and the concept for the treatment of the retarded in the world today, particularly among the psychologists and psychiatrists and those people who are most vitally interested in this field. Thinking now or the modern thought is that the philosophy of treating the mentally handicapped should not be to institutionalize them in training centres like Moose Jaw, even though we will always need those kind of centres, perhaps for the severely retarded and for those that need intensive treatment. We must also take advantage of community services that are available. There are two programs that the Government has started or initiated that I would like to bring the Members up to date on. One is called Elmwood Residences in Saskatoon which is a new pilot project initiated by the Department of Welfare in co-operation with the Board of Elmwood residences in Saskatoon, which is a special-care home for 50 mentally

handicapped people. These people will obtain board and room within the special-care home itself. They will receive of course, laundry services and any attention that they need in a medical regard. In other words they will receive the same kind of limited care that you would receive in a special-care home for the aged and they will then have the advantage of community services in a wide variety of fields such as the sheltered workshop, recreation and so forth. I would hope that Elmwood Residences would become a pattern for other cities in the province and that we would begin to see the kind of residential facilities for the handicapped available in all urban centres. The second is the Sheltered Workshop Program. In the last three years there have been four new Sheltered Workshops established in the Province of Saskatchewan so that we now have seven located in every major urban centre in the province. They are looking after between 400 and 500 mentally handicapped people. Over 60 per cent of the people within these workshop programs are mentally handicapped.

You will notice in the Budget this year there is an increase of approximately \$48,000 in this program and it has jumped very substantially in the last two or three years. We would hope that this would continue to expand each year so that eventually we would be able to reach the target and look after all those people in Sheltered Workshops that would benefit from this program.

I point out, Mr. Speaker, that I believe there is a real deficiency in the first point of the original Resolution, also in the third part, relating to co-ordination. The Member from Canora (Mr. Matsalla) suggested that this would bring about a delay. I disagree very violently with that. There is one problem in dealing with the mentally handicapped people in Saskatchewan caused by divided responsibilities between many Government Departments. The Department of Health, the Department of Welfare, the Department of Education and the Department of Labour have all programs in this field. However there has been very limited co-ordination, there has been no overall program, there has been no overall policy in dealing with the retarded in Saskatchewan. This Inter-departmental Committee has been meeting now for close to a year. We anticipate the report early in July or towards the end of June and I think this is the first priority that is required in this field. Therefore, I think the amendment is a good one and I am forced to vote against the original motion.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kwasnica:** — Well, I am very glad that I brought this Resolution before the Assembly because it has provoked some serious consideration of the problem. But in looking at the amendment I am just a bit disappointed. It is just too much of what has been going on this session, a kind of a whitewash job, patting the Government on the back, saying that everything is fine and not really sinking its teeth into the real problem.



April 1, 1969

I find that the first part of the amendment (a) which asks to review the adequacy of existing programs for mentally retarded in the institutions and in the community was my idea given in the original speech so I can't argue with that at all. Section (b) of the amendment advising the Government of new programs required to ensure that each mentally handicapped person in the province has the opportunity to develop his maximum potential. Well, we can't really argue with that either. We find section (c) suggesting greater co-ordination which is exactly what my original Resolution said, so it was my idea there too. When we look at section (d) we find that "suggest changes in legislation which might be desirable." Well, this to me is very weak; we know what changes are desirable. If you read any works written by people in the province who deal with the mentally handicapped they know precisely what changes in legislation are needed and particularly the part which I have in my Resolution, that is, making it mandatory that the Government and the school boards provide for education for the handicapped. It seems to me that this is where you get the best push, starting from the Government and the school boards. If you don't have this type of legislation well nobody seems to know where we should start. I would like to remind the Minister of Education when he says that there is a shortage of teachers in this field, I would agree with this. And he said, well, therefore, we can't provide the necessary facilities. I would like to remind him that legislation making it mandatory to provide facilities for the handicapped was passed in the State of Connecticut in 1959 and that idea really worked. This is where the push came from. The universities then went back to the schools and had real good dialogue to find out what kind of personnel they needed, what types of programs for the teachers, and the number of classrooms jumped very substantially in a short time in that state, something like 70 at the beginning to 400 in four years' time. So really it is a matter of where you want to push to get the job done.

Commenting briefly on the Minister of Welfare's (Mr. MacDonald) comments, he says that the Resolution didn't mention community services as a branch necessary for this program. Well, if he had read my speech he would have seen that I dealt in quite some detail stressing the fact that we should keep the children in the community providing sheltered workshops and so on, so you can't really say that that is much of an argument.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot support the amendment but I will support the motion.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

#### **RESOLUTION NO. 7 – HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. A. Thibault (Kinistino):

That this Assembly recommend to the consideration of the Government the immediate implementation of recommendations submitted by the Special Legislative Committee on Highway Traffic and Safety on December 31, 1966.

**Hon. D.V. Heald (Attorney General):** — I would like to say a few words about this Resolution, and in particular the observations of the Member for Regina North West (Mr. Whelan) when he was speaking in this debate. He made a number of statements that I think must not go unchallenged because in my view they are inaccurate and I would like to refer to some of these statements. First of all he sort of scoffed at the 24-hour suspension law which we have in this province and which has been in effect since last fall. He talked about experience in British Columbia and he said and I quote. “Police officers in British Columbia will tell you there are many repeaters on the 24-hour suspension law.” In another statement he made, “A traffic officer in my acquaintance insisted on a longer term basis.” Then he said, he referred to it as the babysitting system which hasn’t worked out in British Columbia. Then he made another statement, “people in British Columbia.” again this great anonymous, “they say or people say.” “People in British Columbia laugh about it.” Mr. Speaker, that wasn’t my experience in discussing this program with the people in British Columbia, and it hasn’t been my experience in discussing it with the police officers in this province, since it has been on the Statute Books of this province, so I asked my staff to check with the people in British Columbia about this. I will name names. The Member for Regina North West seems very hesitant about naming names and of course it is very difficult to successfully rebut this statement which starts off. “They say or a fellow told me, or people say.” But anyway I had my executive assistant, Mr. Holtzmann get in touch with Mr. Sharp, the administrative officer for driver licensing in the Motor Vehicle Branch of the British Columbia Government, who had advised Mr. Holtzmann that he had just returned from a tour with the superintendent of the RCMP in that province. They had gone up the Coast and toured a number of detachments with the RCMP. Mr. Speaker, without exception Mr. Sharp tells us that the RCMP officers were very much in favor of the program. Then he indicated that the program gave police officers the power to remove drinking drivers from their motor vehicles where no power had existed before. Then on this question in Saskatchewan, I had Mr. Holtzmann contact Inspector Gilbert of the Regina City Police Traffic Division, and Inspector Gilbert and Sergeant Braumberger both indicated satisfaction with the program. And on this question of repeaters, Mr. Speaker, Sergeant Braumberger told Mr. Holtzmann that he had knowledge of only one person being suspended on more than one occasion. Therefore I say that in the city of Regina, the number of repeaters in this 24-hour suspension program is almost non-existent. Then I had Mr. Holtzmann contact Superintendent Ross of the RCMP who indicated that the program is being very well received by the personnel of the RCMP in this province. I also asked him to get in touch with the RCMP with regard to the question of repeaters because the Member for Regina North West talked about repeaters.

**April 1, 1969**

Mr. Speaker, the records of the RCMP in this province indicate that only one person since they started has repeated under the program. The same is true in the city of Regina.

I would like to read into the records of this House, Mr. Speaker, and I will table it when I finish reading it, part of a report from the RCMP Traffic Report for the year 1968, and I'm quoting:

It is indeed gratifying to present a report with a reduction of accidents in all categories in this Division.

This Division is the Province of Saskatchewan.

It is the first time that we have been able to report a decrease in the last decade.

The records are available only from 1959 to date.

This is not a minimal decrease but is rather quite substantial, particularly when the usual increase in vehicle registration and traffic volume is taken into consideration.

Then further on and I'd like all Hon. Members in particular and particularly the Member from Regina North West (Mr. Whelan) to mark well these words and I quote:

Section 104 (a) of The Vehicles Act was proclaimed effective the 15th of October, 1968, and this program of 24-hour suspension was certainly effective in reducing accidents. This is particularly true of the fatal and injury-type accidents where there was a notable decrease after this program came into effect, whereas just prior to the program it appeared as if our totals for the year would be drastically increased over the experience for 1967. The Mobat breath test has certainly proven effective to date and has enabled all law enforcement agencies in the province to remove the boarder-line impaired driver from behind the wheel.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask you, is that evidence or isn't it evidence as to the effect of this 24-hour suspension law? Mr. Speaker, the Member for Regina North West tried to undermine this 24-hour suspension program before it ever got off the ground. He rushed on to a hot-line program, trying to discredit it, said it wouldn't work, talked about what people say in British Columbia. Now I think he's really disappointed at the fact that it has worked and is working in the Province of Saskatchewan and is reducing accidents and deaths in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in addition, of course, to the 24-hour suspension law we did impose, effective August 26, the very stringent suspension insofar as drivers' licences were concerned for impaired drivers and drunken drivers. I would refer Hon. Members to an article in the Toronto Daily Star of March 15, and

I'm not going to read the whole article, but as I indicated earlier in this Legislature, the headline is and I quote:

How Saskatchewan won first round in its war against drinking drivers.

I would like to quote two or three paragraphs in this article. Here is one which says and I quote:

In both Alberta and British Columbia, for example, 1968 was a bad year for accidents in the wake of drinking driver legislation that had shown early success.

And further on:

Alberta had a six-month licence suspension law but unlike Saskatchewan, the province makes wide use of the restrictive licence system. Accidents were on the increase in 1968 in British Columbia too.

So what is the situation, Mr. Speaker? I would point out that the lady reporter that wrote this article went across the Western Provinces, certainly Saskatchewan, Alberta, and British Columbia. And she apparently came to the conclusion that our laws insofar as drinking and driving are concerned are far more effective than the laws in the other provinces. I'd like to quote the last paragraph of this article:

Regardless of what measures are adopted, it appears pretty conclusive, on the strength of experience in Canada's three Westernmost provinces, that the most important new legislation in traffic safety is the stiff no-exception licence-suspension law introduced by Saskatchewan's determined Darrel Heald and the publicity given to it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I know that we have to continue this battle against slaughter on the highways and I welcome constructive criticism, but I think Hon. Members will forgive me if I get a little bit annoyed at Hon. Members opposite, particularly the Member for Regina North West (Mr. Whelan) when he tries to discredit and place doubts in the minds of the people of Saskatchewan about a program that is signalled all over this country as being a new and a fresh approach to the problem of slaughter on the highways.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Heald:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to put on the record of this House some of the legislation that we have passed and some of the policies that we have passed in the last few years with respect to highway traffic and safety. Now the Member for Regina North West said and I want to quote him exactly, he said:

April 1, 1969

The recommendations of the Committee (that's the Traffic Safety Committee) have in the main been ignored.

Mr. Speaker, I went through the recommendations again after I heard him say that and according to my estimation, about half or perhaps more than half of the recommendations contained in this report, have been in fact implemented in the Province of Saskatchewan and steps are being taken to implement many of the other recommendations that are made in the report. But I do resent the effort of the Member for Regina North West who, well first of all, scolded the Government for a while and then he got involved in really trying to bully the Government by saying that we defied the Committee. Nobody has defied the Committee. Because the Committee sat and heard recommendations doesn't mean that every one of those recommendations should necessarily be accepted. The Government has given very serious consideration to all of these recommendations. But let me give you an example of one or two recommendations that I think need more study yet before they should be implemented in this province. Let's talk of about driver re-examination. This was one of the recommendations of the Special Committee on Highway Traffic Safety and it was mentioned by the Member for Regina North West. He said, "Why haven't you gone into driver re-examination?" Well I would like to take Hon. Members back a few years and some of the Members who were in the House at that time are still here. I would like Hon. Members who were in the Government at that time to recall that you had a driver re-examination program and you had it in all drivers in the age group of 75 to 80 years of age. But how long did you have that program? Well, I'll tell you. You had it about six months. Why did you stop it? Well, you know I've come across some very interesting information in the files of the Highway Traffic Board. One in particular is a memorandum from Mr. A.E. Blakeney, Provincial Treasurer, who was Minister responsible for the Highway Traffic Board at that time to Mr. J.A. Christie who was chairman of the Highway Traffic Board. This memorandum is dated May 11, 1962, and I'm going to read a portion of this memorandum. This is from Mr. Blakeney to Mr. Christie, and I'm quoting:

At the caucus meeting on Sunday, I was again subjected to the bitterest complaints concerning our current testing practices. Unless the level of complaints subsides, I would think that many of the testing programs of the Highway Traffic Board are in jeopardy.

In other words, the murmur of the grass roots, Mr. Speaker.

Any program which arouses such a storm of complaints without giving compensating advantages in the eyes of persons who I think are fair-minded, cannot long survive.

Then he goes on and I ask you to note this sentence:

It is no answer to say that we do not have enough staff to do this job properly. We presumably recommended the

program knowing staff limitations. There is no reason to believe that our staff will be increased.

No matter how good the program was they weren't prepared to increase the staff. And here is a great little gem, Mr. Speaker, and I quote. This is the fearless Government trying to stop slaughter on our highways. I quote:

If we cannot convince the public that our traffic laws are fair and fairly enforced, we will have lost far more in alienating public support than we ever can gain by eliminating some incompetent drivers from the road through the application of testing procedures.

In other words it doesn't matter how many people you kill, but if you alienate some public support, pack it up. And that's what you did. You packed it up after six months. That's the kind of fearless Government we had stopping slaughter on the highways a few years ago.

Then there is another very interesting memorandum here, Mr. Speaker, having to do with the same thing, driver testing of older citizens of our province. And here is a memorandum dealing with driver testing at Allan, Saskatchewan. It is a memorandum from Mr. Blair, the district supervisor to Mr. Christie, chairman of the Highway Traffic Board and it talked about some problems at Allan. For those of you who don't know where Allan is, it is in the constituency of Hanley, which in 1962 was represented by my predecessor, Mr. R.A. Walker. Now here is what the report says:

Allan has always been a difficult spot to test, as Mr. Whininger, the issuer has tried to run things himself and we have done all we can to keep him satisfied knowing his connections.

A very interesting comment. Then further on,

The Hon. R.A. Walker states that he visited our office . . .

This is in Saskatoon.

and we were still giving oral tests to older drivers.

That's an absolute and complete distortion of facts. When he was in the office there was not one oral test of any kind given, there has not been an oral test of a senior citizen after 2 p.m. April 26 when you informed me by phone that they were no longer authorized.

Now this is interesting.

When Mr. Walker was in our office, I was out . . .

This is the supervisor at Saskatoon.

April 1, 1969

And he . . .

That's Mr. Walker,

. . . interfered so much with the heavy traffic at the time in our office that Mrs. Keegal . . .

That's one of the employees,

. . . gave him a seat in my office as she had to move him out of the eye-test area, then out of the way of those writing tests, and as he was in a very indignant mood, she felt that moving him out of the way was just adding to his anger. At this particular time our six desks were being used and some were standing waiting a turn to write. Mr. Walker's actions were noted by a number of those present.

Mr. Speaker, this is the kind of political interference in the program which probably had some merit . . . driver retesting. This is the kind of political interference by the Minister of the day, by the Attorney General who represented a constituency and then my friend opposite who was a Member of the Government at that time sitting on the Government side of the House says, "Be careless, go ahead with the driver retesting program." Mr. Speaker, we are looking very seriously at a driver retesting program. But let me tell you why I think your program failed in 1962. I think it failed because you were picking on a particular group of citizens. You singled out a certain age group and you subjected them to tests that they couldn't possibly pass. Now there is a lot of merit, a lot to commend in this business of driver re-examination. As I say, I think we'll be into it . . . but we are not going to do it on the basis of picking out a group between 75 and 80 and saying to them, "You've got to pass a test that you can't possibly pass." So that was the kind of ill-conceived and ill-timed experiment that the Government of the day in 1962 engaged in so far as driver re-examination was concerned.

And now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to put on the records of this House some of the things that this Government has done in the last few years insofar as accident prevention and highway traffic prevention is concerned. I would like to remind you that we have some solid accomplishments in the past few years through progressive legislation, by modifications to existing programs and administrative practices and the introduction of new ones. We have co-operated with other departments of government, we have co-operated at the inter-provincial and federal level, and we have supported agencies in the safety field. And we have tried to do our best through public education and information.

I would like to talk now about what we have placed on the Statute Books of this Province. First of all, authority for phasing out the colored licences this year. With this the demerit point-system is being discarded. A driver interview

program has been planned by the Highway Traffic Board and problem drivers will now be selected for attention by criteria approved by the Lieutenant Governor in Council. Further improvement is contemplated through a driver re-examination program and the enabling legislation has been introduced. Mr. Speaker, our legislation to control both the motorcycle and the motorcycle operator is quite comprehensive and so progressive that it is being used as a guide by other jurisdictions. Motorcycle helmet standards have been formulated by regulations and through inter-provincial effort. By use of the Canadian Standards Association, a new standard is being phased in and will eventually become the only one acceptable. The snowmobile problem has been approached from the standpoint of utility and recreation. Legislation for licensing and control generated by the diversified usage is being expanded to adequately meet all situations. Considerable attention has been given to the school bus problem through an adjustment of the loading and unloading requirements to procedures followed by the school bus operator in connection with the above, by provision of better warning procedures at stopping points and by introducing school bus chrome as the mandatory color on all new buses. Stricter penalties are proposed for driving while under suspension and in concert with other provinces, we have made representations to the federal authorities for a similar move to increase the penalty under the criminal code for driving while under suspension. During the Speech from the Throne you were alerted to plans for a compulsory motor vehicle inspection program. The enabling legislation which we passed before has been expanded in the amendments to The Vehicles Act which will shortly be before you and we believe that this advance in highway safety will before too long be in full operation. The high school driver training program has expanded under the Department of Education. In the past year some \$210,000 was expended to train in excess of 8,000 students. At the present rate, expenditures should reach \$300,000 and involve 12,000 students, a program four times greater than the one conducted by private agencies at a considerable saving, because the cash outlay is little more than double the previous \$140,000 expended annually.

Now as I have said earlier, drinking drivers have received and are receiving their full measure of attention. We have worked with the other provinces through the office of the ministerial conference on highway traffic administration with the Federal Government and have urged on them to reduce the .10 in their legislation to the .08, and I am pleased to say that they have gone along with that in the legislation before Parliament which now is .08 per cent. Driver licensing has become the subject of inter-provincial study with the intent of establishing uniformity and standards, testing and classification of drivers, so that reciprocal recognition of both operators and chauffeurs will exist across Canada. This study is progressing favorably. Accepted principles and completed vision standards have been put into practice. There is every indication, Mr. Speaker, that uniform standards in driver licensing will come into existence across Canada. Uniformity in the control of traffic through The Vehicles Act is maintained in all areas of the province.



April 1, 1969

Municipal authorities are allowed bylaw control of such problems as parking and speed limits, which in no way affect the basic standard rules of the road. The Highway Traffic Board in its bylaw approval program pursues a policy intended to ensure that this uniform code is not varied. Working in conjunction with the Department of Highways, several revisions have been made in the speed limits applicable to Provincial highways. In so doing we have gone beyond the recommendations of this Committee and discarded the concept that separate maximum speed limits were required by different classes of vehicles. All motor vehicles can now travel at the same maximum speed and the number of overtaking and passing situations has been reduced with a commensurate reduction in the accident hazard potential. The safety equipment placed on vehicles at the time of manufacture is primarily dictated by the Canadian American Import Agreement. Extensive Federal regulations have been formulated for the guidance of manufacturers. Wherever some question of deficiency arises, we alert the proper authorities by communication of course. Our study on an accident research program and the conclusions reached have been supported through the findings of our neighboring provinces. With the number of vehicles, drivers, and annual accident involvement in this province, a full-scale research program cannot be carried on a full-time basis and is economically impractical. The National Research Council and associated agencies at the Federal level have adequate facilities. The provinces are continuing to encourage the Federal Government to accept traffic accident research as one of their contributions to highway traffic safety in Canada. Regulations under The Vehicles Act are constantly under review and new sections are being added. The tire standards developed by the Canadian Standards Association have been very effective in Saskatchewan to a degree that full conformity becomes effective very shortly. Regulations on vehicle licensing are presently under review and new regulations concerning driver training schools are contained in the new amendments to The Vehicles Act. Interested agencies of Government are working together to resolve problems of mutual concern, such as, reflectorization and better driver identification. Conversion of motor vehicle registration records to computer storage is also a joint undertaking.

Mr. Speaker, I think I have indicated to you in the past few minutes the kind of work that we are doing in the Highway Traffic Board. I think that we have these matters under control. I don't really expect all that much help from the worn-out warriors over there or the tired toreadors on the Front Benches if we got into a Committee again. You know it is a great tendency, Mr. Speaker, for the Members opposite who always want to have a committee or commission about every problem that faces the people of Saskatchewan. Now we had this Commission three years ago and there were many good recommendations. The Government has added to many of these recommendations. We are looking at some of the others and I really can't see the point in having another commission or another committee at this time. We are giving it our full attention, the staff of the Board, we are enlarging the staff of the Board hopefully to solve these problems as we go along and I really can't see a diversion of effort on

the part of the people on the Board towards another Highway Traffic Safety Committee so I shall have to vote against this motion.

**Mr. D.W. Michayluk (Redberry):** — Mr. Speaker, would the Minister permit a question before he sits down? He mentioned that some 8,000 students are now receiving student training in high schools. Are these students receiving this training free of charge without any fee or charge to them or is there a charge being assessed against them for the training?

**Mr. Heald:** — Yes, I think there's a charge. The details of the plan are under the Department of Education but I think they pay.

**Mr. E. Whelan (Regina North West):** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I would like to make two corrections in what I said in a previous debate. First I said police officers in British Columbia will tell you that there are many repeaters in this temporary arrangement and that the only answer, the only answer for the breathalyzer test to be used properly to prove impairment is to have a compulsory breathalyzer test in British Columbia or in any other province. That is the full statement of what I said. Now regarding the other statement which was quoted in part, providing recommendations of the Committee, I said the main recommendations have not been implemented.

**Mr. E. Kramer (The Battlefords):** — Mr. Speaker, I don't want to say too much but I feel that I must say a few things regarding this particular motion, especially after the Attorney General has pontificated for a short period here. It is not very often that I would find any area of agreement with the Minister of Highways, but I somehow or other see where he gets his particulars and peculiar opinions of lawyers after associating continually with the Attorney General. In listening to the arguments that have been put forth by the Hon. Attorney General I have never heard such an amount of laboring and then producing the proverbial gnat in any debate so far. The Hon. Attorney General quoted from two letters and he suggested he had some tremendous gems to bring forth, and of two Members who incidentally were not in the House. It is unfortunate that our Member for Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) is of necessity away and of course the other former Member for the gerrymandered Hanley seat is also. I am sure that they would amply take care of themselves were they here. There was very little to take care of when these gems had been produced. It is simply that of two Members doing their job possibly because of an overzealous traffic officer. You have them too, Sir. And we had them. Certainly there was nothing wrong with the experiment that we conducted at that time, and I certainly make no apologies for dropping it. I happen to agree on this particular thing with the Attorney General. I don't think that we should be selecting one particular group of citizens. You must try

April 1, 1969

things and there was nothing sinister in anything that you produced or pretended to produce concerning either Mr. Blakeney or Mr. Walker in any of that correspondence, Sir.

You produced the proverbial gnat. Now what I would suggest is that the Minister has said that we have done this, this and this, but the main thing that you have not done is one of the main things that the Highway Committee, that committee that you derided a short while ago, suggested, from their studies accord to this report. They studied the situation and they said that they ran into difficulty. They said they were able to do many things and receive many recommendations from individuals and groups, but what did they say then, Sir? I'll tell you what they said and I want to quote a short statement or two from this report. They mention the death toll here of 222 at that particular time which incidentally is higher now. I would like to say a few words too about the death toll later on. I quote:

From the material submitted and through the efforts of the research staff, the Committee was able to appreciate more fully the problem that we are facing today in trying to arrive at solutions to the traffic problem. On many matters those presenting briefs were opposed to one another and they varied in their opinion. They were pretty unanimous on the problems of the drinking driver.

And here is the meaningful thing:

Aside from these sources, however, the Committee felt that there was insufficient information in some areas of the inquiry upon which to base a considered recommendation. For this reason many matters that might have been considered by the Committee could not so be considered, as the Committee was of the opinion that only through extensive research could the problem be adequately solved.

There is therefore recognized by the Committee an immediate need for an agency.

and I underline that agency and it is not underlined here, Sir,

to take up the task of bringing concerted study to bear on the safety and traffic problem. For this reason the Committee will recommend in this report to the Government the establishment of a continuing research program.

Further on:

The recommendations of the Committee that follow represent the beginning of a new program and approach to the problems of highways, traffic control and safety. These steps, however,

and once again mark this,

will be totally inadequate in the long run less accompanied by a continuing study and research followed by appropriate action.

You have sat on it for three years, Mr. Attorney General, and you have done nothing on this which possibly is the most serious recommendation of the entire report. And further on, on page 12.

Recommendation as stated previously in this report, the Committee felt the lack of adequate information as the cause of accidents was not available, and therefore handicapped the work of the Committee.

Here again they are saying they did not have adequate information because there was not the proper research and the research staff available.

Research division contemplated would involve a team of investigators who could devote their time, not only to determining the cause of the particular accident, but to seek ways to prevent further accidents from occurring. For example; they should be responsible for recognizing potential

And I would like you to mark this, Mr. Attorney General,

accident-causing situations such as dangerous intersections requiring better traffic control techniques. It could approach the agency responsible and point out the existence of the potentially dangerous situation. The Committee was of the opinion that this division would best be attached to the Highway Traffic Board through which all records of accidents and convictions in the province are channelled. It would also have the responsibility of maintaining adequate records so that the frequency of accidents on a particular road or at a particular intersection would initiate some action toward preventing further accidents occurring. Statistics maintained by the division should be made available to the general public.

Now, Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Attorney General (Mr. Heald), it has been three years as I said that this recommendation was made. It has been three years if for instance you had had somebody, (apparently none of the people on the Front Benches opposite from the Premier right across either way, were able to talk any sense to the so-called Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt)) when we were begging and pleading with them on an accident in North Battleford which caused three deaths, twenty people injured and 37 cars involved. Figure that out when you are trying to save money for this Government across the way. Figure that out in total cost. I suggest that there was close to at least \$100,000 worth of property damage. There was close to another \$100,000 worth of doctors' bills, and I don't know what price this Government across the way puts on three lives. I am not sure what the Government thinks. I suggest that it should be considerable and

April 1, 1969

it could have been avoided. It is all very well for the Attorney General to get up and pontificate. It is no use talking to the Minister of Highways who is now in his seat, but I had thought better of the Attorney General. The Attorney General I thought was trying, but apparently he isn't, and there is recent evidence of that. When I raised this matter in the Budget Debate I made the statement that there was a dangerous area at the CP bridge and everyone knows about it. It has been nearly six weeks and that bridge is still not marked or lighted. Surely to heaven there is some phosphorescent tape that could at least be put on that bridge, because, Sir, mark my words there will an accident there. And your archaic weigh scale at Borden which causes slow moving trucks to move across traffic on a highway with 500 vehicles a day traffic count.

**Mr. Heald:** — The Government drafted the plans . . .

**Mr. Kramer:** — I don't give a hoot what Government drafted the plans for it, Sir, it is wrong. I am suggesting that this is what we set the Committee up for, wasn't it? Wasn't this what we set the Committee up for and why? You are the Government, why don't you set up this research committee? If you did, I can quote you chapter and verse of many other potential accident-causing areas. Surely it is time in an age when we are having more and more traffic, surely it is time that we do something more concrete except dribbling around the edges, and not getting at the heart of the matter which was pointed out to you adequately by this Committee.

Certainly we are not going to accept the, "Well, we are trying," and "Give us a little time." You have had a lot of time and people are dying because you have taken too much time, and there are more of them that are going to. Every Member in this House knows of accident-causing areas that nothing is being done about. The United States had a survey and an individual citizen took up the cudgel and recorded every accident-causing area that he saw. When they set up the committee this particular one individual was able to point out 200 in one area, 200 constant accident-causing areas or situations. Surely we can do the same thing here. Obviously, Mr. Speaker, there are going to be more problems. In spite of all the talk about tightening up on drinking drivers, I don't see much headway being made there. I don't know of any place that you could go any evening here in Regina when the pubs are being let out, you will see people in no condition to drive. And it was you people who have continually added longer hours of drinking, made booze more available in many areas. The Minister of Highways who walks out when votes on these things are being held is just as responsible as anybody over there. There is more liquor being consumed, there are more people walking out into cars out of the various drinking areas in this city and every other city in Saskatchewan every week, every year. And simply blowing into balloons isn't going to stop it, Sir.

**Mr. Heald:** — Accidents are down.

**Mr. Kramer:** — Accidents are down? Wait and see, Sir. One swallow I suggest doesn't make it springtime but two, three or four swallows sure make a lot of drunks, and the three or four swallows over an extra hour or two make more and you people are responsible for this.

**Hon. W.R. Mr. Thatcher (Premier):** — Mr. Speaker, that is outrageous what this fellow is saying. This Government, he is suggesting, is responsible for people who are drinking. Now that is just nonsense and he knows it. It is a damnable lie.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order! Now just a minute. The Premier adjourned this debate at one juncture, but he didn't speak in the debate when it came up the second time around. I draw your attention to the fact that he has all the opportunity of speaking and refuting the statements of others sometime during this debate.

**Mr. Kramer:** — Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Premier interrupted me, but not only that, I thought I heard him say something about a damnable lie and I would like it withdrawn.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Well, we can't have people calling liars back and forth across the floor of the House and I think it would be in order for the Premier to withdraw.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — If you say that, then I feel that I must withdraw. But what he said . . .

**Mr. W.S. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition):** — Mr. Speaker, the Premier either withdraws or doesn't withdraw.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Now he has just withdrawn and that ends it right then and there. That is the end of the matter.

**Mr. Kramer:** — What I was saying before I was interrupted that the longer hours cause more drinking, and everyone admits this. In spite of the Premier being touchy about this everyone will admit that liquor has become more and more available. And I will go further. This Government is even popularizing it by serving untold amounts at public openings, helter-skelter all over. In fact they served so much . . .

April 1, 1969

**Mr. Thatcher:** — You were at the trough with the rest of them too.

**Mr. Kramer:** — Never mind who was there. Were you there? As I said last year, Sir, was somebody there to see who was partaking and who was not? I suggest simply this, that this Government has served so much according to an answer last year by the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron), that they couldn't even keep track of it. He said it would take 50 civil servants to add it up.

What I want to suggest again is that we have to look at all facets of this area of safety. I am getting just a little bit tired of hearing the Attorney General pontificate about all he is doing, while the Government is actually encouraging certain areas of accident potential. I am happy that the Government no longer agrees with a former Member who sat on this side, a former hon. learned Member, who berated the Government on that side of the House at that time for introducing the breath test. I am pleased to see that there have been a lot of conversions over there, contrary to the opinions that were given from this side of the House a few years ago about such things as breath tests. I remember eloquent speeches being made over here about invading personal rights and personal freedoms.

**Mr. Heald:** — Why don't you give . . .

**Mr. Kramer:** — I am giving you credit, Sir. I am giving you credit but I am also pointing my finger, Mr. Speaker, at the most crucial area, the area of this report that says we need, and need badly, a research division. I am pointing out accident-causing areas that were ignored by this Government. I am sure that there are Members who are sympathetic, but then you hear the Hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) who doesn't relent or retrench one inch, and continues to scoff at any attempt by any citizen to bring about a correction.

Mr. Speaker,

**Mr. Heald:** — Two-bit signs.

**Mr. Kramer:** — Yes, there is another one with two-bit signs. I will tell you what those two-bit signs did. They brought about the proper, at least a much better safety measure, and since those two-bit signs were erected, Mr. Premier, Mr. Speaker, there has not been a single accident at that area. Nine months.

**Hon. D. Boldt (Minister of Highways):** — That is not true!

**Mr. Kramer:** — Mr. Speaker, there may have been one or two minor ones, but there have not been incidents at the rate that these accidents

were taking place. I repeat, three deaths in nine months since the highway was opened. You must remember that it had to be closed for three months to keep it from sliding down the river. Don't forget that one. Let's take a look at this situation now. It is nearly another nine months since the fatal accident in August and there has not to my knowledge been a single major since I erected signs. At the rate they were going, Mr. Speaker, there would now have been two more deaths and at least 15 more people hospitalized and some 25 or 30 cars involved in accidents if it hadn't been stopped.

These statistics cannot be denied and you people suggest that you need more time. You need no more time to institute a research division to determine accident-causing areas. There are many other things that a committee like this could do, Mr. Speaker. I suggest that as long as this particular need exists, as long as this particular need remains, we cannot give the Attorney General the accolade and the praise that he seems to feel he deserves. I cannot give you that, Sir. I will compliment you on some of the things that you have done, but it is no use just doing the little things, as I say, dribbling around the edges, you have to do the big ones first. This is the important one. Therefore, I take great pleasure in supporting this motion.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Boldt:** — Mr. Speaker, I have to control myself a little bit, because that fellow over there. You know if I was his father I would put him in a mental institution. He was . . .

**Mr. Kramer:** — On a point of privilege. Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member addressed me as that fellow. If I had been his father all I can say is that he wouldn't even be here.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order!

**Mr. Boldt:** — He has no question.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order! It is not necessary for one Member to refer to the mental ability of other Members of the House. The House itself will make up its mind as to whether anyone is sane or insane on the basis of what is said in the House in debate and later the public will also make up its mind on the basis of what is said in the House.

**Mr. Boldt:** — The Member from The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) said that we didn't do anything about highway safety and I say this is a deliberate lie and he knows it.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order! You can't call Members deliberate liars.



**April 1, 1969**

You can say that the statements that they have made are not in accordance to the facts, but you can specifically call an individual Member a liar.

**Mr. Boldt:** — I said that the statement was a lie. I didn't say that the . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order! You can say that the statement was incorrect but you can't say that the Member told a deliberate lie.

**Mr. Boldt:** — Well, I am sure that he did, but I will withdraw . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Well, as I understand him he just withdrew the statement.

**Mr. Kramer:** — Mr. Speaker, I believe he said, but . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order! Now just hold on to yourselves for a minute. I didn't exactly hear what the Minister of Highways said, so perhaps for the benefit of the House and myself, he would be good enough to repeat it.

**Mr. Boldt:** — I withdraw, but he is very reckless with the truth.

**Mr. Kramer:** — Is it the rules of the House to permit qualifying withdrawals?

**Mr. Boldt:** — Mr. Speaker, let that poor fellow sit down please. He spoke before . . .

**Mr. Kramer:** — I am simply asking what the rules of the House are.

**Mr. Speaker:** — He has withdrawn his statement to the effect that this was a lie. Now he is proceeding with his speech, I hope.

**Mr. Boldt:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I hope that you keep that fellow down now.

**Mr. Kramer:** — Once again, Mr. Speaker, I think that the rules of the House demand that you don't use terms like "that fellow". I think that we refer to each other as Hon. Members. Now you have been very careful about the rules and I would like to see them carried out.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Members should be referred to as the Member for the constituency which he represents and in no other manner.

**Mr. Boldt:** — I want to draw to your attention, Mr. Speaker, and to this House that one of the most dangerous intersections that we had and which the Socialists didn't do anything about was No. 1 and No. 6 just south of Regina. There had been dozens of people injured and a good number of them killed in one year. And what did you do? I just about said liar and I withdraw that. But when the Member for The Battlefords says that we haven't done anything, we spent hundreds of thousands of dollars on the intersection of Nos. 1 and 6 with the clover-leaf. It was the first clover-leaf that this Government built in the Province. And we haven't done anything! There are many areas where we have straightened out some of the mess that you made. If we had done what the Opposition had wanted us to do last year, you know we wouldn't have been able to accomplish these things.

You fellows over there wanted us to reduce the Highway Budget by \$20 million. I have a report here, Mr. Speaker, for which I will take full responsibility. I want to tell him what the city of North Battleford is doing and we are putting money into it. I am talking about the Police Chief of North Battleford's statement (Mr. Sexsmith) that traffic lights don't operate effectively in preventing accidents in some instances. He said, "Since the installation of traffic lights at the intersection of 11th Avenue and 100th Street, the frequency of accidents has doubled." And that is right in your town of North Battleford.

I haven't yet checked out what our cost was. The Chief said that SGIO has probably paid out more already in damage claims than the amount the Highway Department contributed originally under Urban Assistance Agreements. This information seems to concur with Jack Syrnik's comments of the Planning Branch seminar in Saskatoon a few weeks ago.

What I want to point out regarding the accidents is . . .

**Mr. Kramer:** — Never mind that one. Tell us about the intersection.

**Mr. Boldt:** — You should sit down there, please. I would beg you to sit down or I might call you something else. The accidents at that intersection suggest, if people don't stop at stop signs, they are going to be hit. There is no argument about that. And if we are going to make improvements at that area which we might do next year the Member for North Battleford is going to say, "Well why are you spending all that money and what for?" This is what we have been doing throughout the province. We have been trying to make our highway program safer. And here he has the nerve, the guts, to stand up and say that we are not

**April 1, 1969**

doing anything for safety.

Well, you know I pity the poor fellow. I really do. You know he must be associating too much with the company that we sometimes call the mental institution in North Battleford.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. A. Thibault (Kinistino):** — Mr. Speaker, I will be adjourning the debate. I just want to draw that to your attention. Closing, rather.

**Mr. I.A. MacDougall (Souris-Estevan):** — Why don't you . . .

**Mr. Thibault:** — I don't need any instructions from Souris-Estevan.

I just want to recap briefly on what has taken place. I think going back into the past is usually an exercise in futility. I think that the work done by the Committee was very conscientiously done. I brought this Resolution in because I felt that, as we said in the report, but as many sections of the report were read by the Member for North Battleford, I will not bother to read it. But it points out that if we are going to succeed with driving safety, we are going to need the co-operation of every Member in this House. We need the co-operation, we need to push ahead in this area and the way to get co-operation is to have Members on the Committee from both sides of the House. This is why I want to see the Committee reformed. I don't have to be on that Committee, but my conscience will not allow me to let this go by for another couple of years without the Committee being reinstated, because the situation on our highways continually changes from day to day and month to month.

We can talk about the thousands of '65 Pontiacs and Chevs that were running with faulty brakes. How many of them are chasing around the province right now with this defect? We don't know. Under the previous Government when the breathalyzer was brought in I heard the speeches that were made from this side of the House when the CCF were the Government. I am going to tell you that it must have been pretty hard for the Government. I am going to tell you that it must have been pretty hard for the Government to go ahead with any safety program after listening to the former Member from Humboldt. I am not going to go all over this as it is just a waste of time. But at a time when you have pressure from both sides of the House it is difficult to get something done about safety. I know. I've had a lot of people who have been punished in the courts come to me and they got no sympathy from me. I said we've got to do something about this slaughter on the highways.

Now we want to talk about how well Saskatchewan has done. I want to read a few statistics to you. They appeared in The Leader Post on March 25th on page six. Well, they talk about British Columbia that their 24-hour suspension was very effective,

but last year they had 15 deaths more than the year before. Now does that prove anything? Then you have Alberta which has a reduction of 34 deaths in the same period. Does that prove anything for Saskatchewan? I'd like the Attorney General (Mr. Heald) to listen to this. Maybe I'll wait until he gets back.

You could go on and we can talk about Alberta dropping their death rate. They didn't have anything like what appeared in The Toronto Star without any fanfare, without 24-hour suspension, without impairment legislation. The Province of Alberta's deaths show a reduction of 34. Now what does that prove? You want to say that Saskatchewan got a reduction of 18 in the death rate. I want to say that the Attorney General has done fairly well in putting some pressure and getting some of the things going, but I wonder a bit if the reason why we have a reduction in traffic deaths is because the economic situation in the Western Provinces is such that the people are not buying the liquor they would buy otherwise. This could be part of the situation. When you want to talk about the reduction of a few deaths, from 287, a drop of 18 to 269, it could just be a temporary affair, because we cannot attack driving safety only in one area but it should be attacked on the entire front.

Now we have a Bill before us and it covers quite a wide range of law. I remember on the Committee when we were talking about .10. Some members of the Committee were very reluctant to support .08, but after we had the breathalyzer demonstration and we had the whisky right there and the subjects, they were all satisfied that .08 was the right level to accept. But when you're going to reduce it to .07 I'm going to tell you you're getting into a grey area. Some countries have adopted two levels, a .08 and .04. The penalty is rather minor at .04 and up to .08. Above .08 they throw the book at them. This is one thing that should have been studied by a Committee before introducing .06. Perhaps we could have come up with something that could have been more acceptable to the general public. I'm sure that after the Committee had studied this .06 and made a recommendation to the House it would have gone right across the board. The way it is now we'll have a see-saw job. Just like a farmer with an outfit of horses and there's one pulling back. You don't get the results. And I have no doubt in my mind – I don't care you can ban alcohol altogether as far as I'm concerned – but at .06 you're going to get some see-sawing on the question and it will not be as effective. That's one area that the Committee could have studied and made recommendations to the House.

Now we go back to the death rate in this province. When the CCF were voted out of office it was 200 a year. I raised the question in the House at that time – you can go back to 1961 when I brought in a Resolution on driving safety – you know that your Government gave the meat axe to driving safety when you came into office. That's a recognized fact but now you have different thoughts on the matter. I am sure that every Member on this side who has been on the Committee and has spoken, is speaking quite sincerely that they want a reduction in traffic deaths.

April 1, 1969

**Mr. Heald:** — If you want . . .

**Mr. Thibault:** — What did you say, Mr. Attorney General?

Mr. Attorney General, I can assure you that I have not played politics with the Committee and I'm sincere about what I'm saying here this afternoon. I'll try and make my remarks as short as possible.

I'm sure that by supporting this Resolution that the Attorney General and the Government will see fit to reinstate the Committee to continue our studies. I think we need a good atmosphere and what we've heard here this morning, the atmosphere is beginning to erode. What we heard when the report was brought in, it was supported by both sides of the House very nicely and what we've heard here this morning should prove to the Government beyond the shadow of a doubt that if we're going to have results of reducing the slaughter on the highways, it's going to be by the reinstatement of the Committee, and it's going to be by having the wholehearted support of both sides.

Now in closing I would say that I feel that, as I said before, the Members who on both sides have spoken really believe in trying to do something. Perhaps they have a different approach. Some may be a little more blunt and they don't pussyfoot around about things, but nevertheless in closing the debate I hope that the Government will give serious consideration, because I can predict right now that you will probably have a temporary reduction in death rates followed by an upsurge in not too many years, because this matter is too serious to be dealt with, without continuous interruptions like some of the Members on this side received. I want to compliment the Members on this side for having kept very quiet throughout the speeches by the Attorney General and other Members.

With this, Mr. Speaker, I will support the motion.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

Motion negatived on the following recorded division:

**YEAS — 20**

Lloyd	Berezowsky	Pepper
Kramer	Smishek	Bowerman
Willis	Thibault	Matsalla
Wood	Whelan	Messer
Davies	Snyder	Kwasnica
Dewhurst	Michayluk	Kowalchuk
Meakes	Brockelbank	

NAYS — 29

Thatcher	MacDougall	Radloff
Howes	Grant	Weatherald
McFarlane	Larochelle	Mitchell
Boldt	MacDonald	Gardner
Cameron	Estey	McPherson
Heald	Hooker	Charlebois
McIsaac	Gallagher	Forsyth
Guy	Heggie	McIvor
Barrie	Breker	Schmeiser
Loken	Leith	

**RESOLUTION NO. 15 - SASKATCHEWAN CODE OF HUMAN RIGHTS**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. Romanow (Saskatoon Riversdale):

That this Assembly recommend to the consideration of the Government the immediate passage of legislation to enact a Saskatchewan Code of Human Rights to be administered by a Human Rights Commission in Saskatchewan.

**Mr. Heald:** — Mr. Speaker, when I adjourned debate on this matter I indicated that I might have a few more things to say and I will be very, very brief.

The motion asks for the immediate passage of legislation to enact the Saskatchewan Code of Human Rights to be administered by a Human Rights Commission of Saskatchewan. I would remind all Hon. Members that there has been in Saskatchewan since December of 1967 an association known as the Saskatchewan Association of Human Rights. This Association is now in the process of being incorporated under The Societies Act and Mr. Procuik of Saskatoon is the solicitor handling the matter.

Earlier this year I am advised that Mr. Procuik who is a director of this Association had submitted material for the incorporation of the Association. The material has been returned and needs to be corrected, I guess, and we expect that very shortly the Association will, in fact, be incorporated under The Societies Act.

Now, I think, I'm not sure of everybody who is in that association but I think the Rev. Mr. Hobson of the Anglican Church of Fort Qu'Appelle is one whom I've had many conversations with. The Association as I say was founded in December of 1967 at a conference here, and I spoke to that conference. A second conference was called for October 25th to 27th in 1968 at Saskatchewan House and I understand they had quite a good meeting at that time also.

April 1, 1969

In the application for incorporation under The Societies Act, the objects for which this Association is to be incorporated include the objects of inquiring into, taking appropriate action and from time to time reporting upon, provisions of the law that are thought to require reform to more effectively preserve and assert fundamental human rights. As well the Society is being incorporated to investigate and report upon occurrences in which abridgments of human rights have taken place on account of race, religion, creed, color or sex. The Society is also to carry out research and public information respecting human rights and civil liberties.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that this Association is on-going and has been on-going since December of 1967, I really see little point in passing the Resolution which is before us because this Association is broadly based in the Province. I've met many of the people that are in this Association and I wouldn't see much point in a duplication of effort here. If we were to pass this Resolution and if the Government were to immediately set up the Human Rights Commission or legislation for a Human Rights Commission, I think there would be a duplication of effort. Accordingly I can't see much point in passing this motion at this time because the matter is in hand and we do have a Human Rights Association in the Province of Saskatchewan.

So accordingly I will be voting against the motion.

**Mr. Lloyd:** — Mr. Speaker, I want to say only a very few words with respect to the Resolution and the comments of the Attorney General (Mr. Heald). Like him, I'm aware of the Association which does exist and have talked with some of the people involved in it. I am happy that they moved into the field and they've got something going as the Attorney General has mentioned. And I would agree with him that there would be no point in duplication. It seems to me however, Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Attorney General, that the Association was set up rather in the absence of anything more comprehensive with a wider sort of public sponsorship. I doubt if they had intended, or I would doubt if it is their wish to stand in the way of a more comprehensive kind of organization. There is, it seems to me, a rather important difference between a Human Rights Association and a Human Rights Commission. There is, I think all of us feel, an increasing need for activities of this kind, an increasing need for a public body which has the support of some public finance at least behind it and has the recognition of being an official representative of all the people of Saskatchewan. While I say I agree with the Attorney General that there should not be duplication, I would hope that this would not stand in his way of discussing with the people presently in the Human Rights Association as to whether or not there isn't advantage in developing a more comprehensive, more all-embracing, more effective Human Rights Commission.

Motion negatived.

**ADJOURNED DEBATE**

**REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Wood (Swift Current):

That the First Report of the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts and Printing be now concurred in.

**Mr. W.E. Smishek (Regina North East):** — Mr. Speaker, I want to make a few observations in regard to the report of the Committee. In particular my remarks are directed to Section 8 of the report where the Committee draws attention that in the years 1967 and 1968 the Committee did recommend for consideration of the Legislature that the Committee meet inter-sessionally to do a more comprehensive job. This year the Committee has recommended that when the Inter-sessional Committee on Procedure meet that they take this matter under advisement.

Mr. Speaker, I am of the strong opinion that, if the Public Accounts Committee is to do an effective job and screen the Public Accounts thoroughly, the Committee requires more time. It must be recognized that the Government's role is increasing. The expenditures of the Government year after year are on the increase and will continue to increase. And it seems to me that we as the public guardians of the public purse should have the opportunity to do a more effective job in the interests of the public. If we examine the Public Accounts for 1968 we will find that the Government is now spending close to a half billion dollars a year on various programs. Our Committee this year had 16 meetings. In total we only spent about 36 hours in examining the Public Accounts. Surely, Mr. Speaker, it cannot be said that in a period of 36 hours we can do an effective job of reviewing the Public Accounts and satisfying ourselves and the public that all the expenditures that were made in the public interest were done in the best way.

My second observation, Mr. Speaker, is in regard to the role of the Committee and its work. The Hon. Member for Swift Current (Mr. Wood) has already discussed the report in brief, the report of the Special Committee on Public Accounts which submitted its report in 1964. I merely want to draw attention further to some of the sections of that report. On page 11 the Committee states:

In this setting the Public Accounts Committee conducts an important examination of the details of the Government's financial administration. The principles which regulate the use of funds by the Government have developed from the Committee's examinations and recommendations. They govern the details of the financial administration. They are the ground rules which give the Legislature and the public the assurance that the Government has acted with propriety.



**April 1, 1969**

Mr. Speaker, as I have already indicated it seems to me that, in the limited amount of time the Public Accounts Committee has to spend under the present procedure, we cannot assure ourselves, certainly I can't satisfy myself that all the expenditures the Government made, were made with propriety.

My next reference, Mr. Speaker, is to the authority of the Committee as set out in page 26 of the same report. It says:

The terms of reference of the Saskatchewan Committee on Public Accounts and Printing empowered it to examine and to enquire into all such matters and things as may be referred to it by this Assembly and to report from time to time its observations thereon with power to send for papers, persons and records and to examine witnesses under oath.

Mr. Speaker, during this year's work of the Committee on two occasions I moved resolutions asking that the Committee be given the opportunity to examine in depth and in more detail certain expenditures of the Government. I refer the Legislature to the minutes of the Committee on March 11th where I moved this motion:

That the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts and Printing request the following information regarding motor graders for the period January 1 to March 31, 1968:

- (a) copies of tenders called;
- (b) copies of tenders received;
- (c) tenders accepted;
- (d) prices paid.

I regret, Mr. Speaker, that, while the Civil Service assured us, and the records will show, that this information is readily available and could be provided to the Committee without undue amount of work, the Government Members chose to vote down that request. Again the following day, Mr. Speaker, I moved a motion listing a number of companies, and this is noted in the minutes of March 12th – incidentally, Mr. Speaker, the names of the companies were picked at random from pages 140 to 144 of the Public Accounts. The names as such are not important. In fact my intention initially was to call for and name all the companies who do highway construction work. I merely picked out a half a dozen, or seven of them so that we have an opportunity to examine certain facts in this respect. I moved:

That the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts and Printing be provided for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1968, with the following:

- (a) construction progress reports and interim invoices, including dates and amounts and when such progress reports were received by the Department of Highways;

- (b) date such progress reports and interim invoices were approved by the Department of Highways;
- (c) date such progress reports and interim invoices were received by the Treasury Department;
- (d) dates the cheques were issued for payment;
- (e) dates the cheques were cashed.

And further the Committee examine the actual documents, papers and cancelled cheques which include the above information.

Again, Mr. Speaker, the Government Members chose to vote down the provision of this information. We were assured by the Civil Service that there were about 200 documents involved. The record will show that they told us it would not require a great amount of work in order to examine that material.

I will be finished in just a few minutes, Mr. Speaker.

The important thing here, Mr. Speaker, in asking for this kind of information is for the Public Accounts Committee to be assured that expenditures are made with propriety and in the interest of the public. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Committee has broad terms of reference to call for papers, documents, witnesses and so on. We are very well aware of some of the investigations that are taking place in Ottawa at the present time, the investigations with regard to the expenditures on the Hydrofoil and the Bonaventure. If the Public Accounts Committee in Ottawa was not given the opportunity to examine papers, documents and other information then the exposure could never have taken place and the public would not have been given the information. It appears at this time that some expenditures are certainly in doubt.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that we have a good procedure generally, but I am concerned about the denial of information as has taken place this year and I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that in the future our Committee will not be denied the information. May I also ask that in the future as much as possible we establish more stability in the Committee so that we can do a more effective job.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

### WELCOME TO STUDENTS

**Mr. Speaker:** — I wish on behalf of all the Members of the Legislature to introduce the following groups of students situated in the galleries, and I trust that those Members representing constituencies from whence the classes come will rise when I mention their names.

In the east gallery from the constituency of Melfort-Tisdale, represented by the Member for Melfort-Tisdale (Mr. Willis) 25 students from the Ridgedale school escorted by Miss Powell.

April 1, 1969

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Speaker:** — Also, hopefully in the east gallery but I don't see them just now, from the constituency of Riversdale represented by the Member for Saskatoon Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) who is not here just now having been called away due to circumstances over which he had no control, 57 students from the Montgomery school in Saskatoon. I might say that they are not present just now.

In the Speaker's gallery, the grade seven group, 32 in number, from St. Mary's school in Estevan. They are accompanied by their principal, Mr. Hugh Bitz and their teacher, Miss Cornwall and their drivers. They are from the constituency of Souris-Estevan represented by the Member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. MacDougall).

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Speaker:** — On behalf of all the Members of the Legislature I express the very sincere wish that the visit of these students to our Assembly will be interesting, informative, enjoyable and that they will all have a very safe trip home.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

The Assembly resumed the interrupted debate on the Report of Committee on Public Accounts.

**Mr. T.M. Weatherald (Cannington):** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few remarks on the report of the Public Accounts Committee.

My first reaction is, Mr. Speaker, to congratulate the chairman on the report that he gave on the meetings held by this Committee. I think he gave a very factual and fair-minded report and particularly outlined one of the problems confronting the Committee when he said that a problem of questions which were being asked by the Committee.

I would like to dwell on this matter for just a moment because it was later raised in this debate by the Member for Regina North East (Mr. Smishek). If I recollect clearly, without having his words in front of me, Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the Committee, the Member for Swift Current (Mr. Wood) said that the problem confronting this Committee was the asking of questions in that Committee which had been turned down by this Assembly. In his words, Mr. Speaker, he said, as I remember that this ultimately would bring about the complete breakdown of the Committee, if Members insisted on asking questions which had been previously turned down by the House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we come to the second part of this question, that was raised by the Member for Regina North East. I

concur in what the Member for Swift Current (Mr. Wood), the chairman has said. I do not in any way believe that the Member for Regina North East has exhibited a fair-minded point of view on this particular subject. He has particularly stood up in the last few minutes previous to adjournment and brought about two particular cases in which Government Members turned down what he says was legitimate information for the Committee.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to your attention the verbatim report of the Committee. In both of those cases it is outlined why Government Members did turn down this information, and I want to bring to your attention the reasons that were given at that particular time. These questions, it was felt by the Committee, were questions which could legitimately be answered in this House where the Ministers responsible for the various departments were available to answer these questions. Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask that on a Committee such as the Public Accounts Committee where there is only one Cabinet Minister sitting or one actual Minister of the Government and the rest were Liberal Back Bench Members on the Government side, whether it is fair or whether it is legitimate for a Member to ask a question in Public Accounts Committee that was previously turned down by the Legislature and the Ministers responsible for those departments. I suggest that this is unfair and that the Committee and the Government Members acted with wisdom in not allowing this practice to actually take place and thereby setting a precedent which could ultimately lead to a whole raft of questions being brought into Public Accounts that would hold up the Committee and result in the Civil Service becoming involved in political answers, political questions that previously were not answered here in this House.

This is the question which on the Public Accounts Committee will have to be decided upon and a definite ruling given, but I want to make it very clear, Mr. Speaker, that the allegations made by the Member for Regina North East as to the conduct of the Committee on giving information, as far as I am concerned, are totally unfair. They were questions which he could have had answered here which he had every right to ask here and which in the wisdom of the Ministers on this particular side could withhold the information or give the information as they so desired. But to ask the Members on the Government side to allow that information to be given was unfair and do not believe in any manner should be allowed in the Public Accounts Committee that has been set up by this Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, I only wanted to dwell on this one particular aspect of the Committee work. The Committee is new. It's the third year that it's been sitting. It's got various problems in developing a set of rules. I again would like to congratulate the chairman, I think he acted very fairly. I think his rulings were fair to both sides, and as he outlined in his own report, this problem had arisen. I have attempted to mention how it was dealt with and why it was dealt with in this manner by the Government members.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

April 1, 1969

**Mr. F. Meakes (Touchwood):** — Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on this motion, I might not have done it if it had not been for the Hon. Member for Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) rising in his place. I want to say first, at least I understood him to say that the questions that have been asked by the Member from Regina North East (Mr. Smishek) in the Committee and by the Member for Cutknife (Mr. Kwasnica) had been asked in the House. Did you say this, Mr. . . .

**Mr. Weatherald:** — No, they were legitimate questions which could be answered in the House. If the Minister didn't answer them, well that was up to him. Whether he asked them or not was up to him but they could legitimately be asked here.

**Mr. Meakes:** — Okay, Mr. Speaker, I misunderstood him. I just want to say this that certainly the questions that were asked were within the purview of the Committee. When the rules of the Committee were being set up this House gave the authority to the Public Accounts Committee to go through the Public Accounts, we were given the right to call for papers, to even call witnesses under oath which the Committee didn't consider doing. We never mentioned it but as far as I'm concerned, Mr. Speaker, the key point is this, that certain Members of the Committee wanted information. The civil servants present at the time agreed that the information could be given without too much work for the staff, but at the last moment the Government Members of the Committee refused to allow these papers to be brought in and I object to it on this ground.

But, on the other hand, Mr. Speaker, I do want to say that having served on Public Accounts Committee prior to the change and serving on this Committee now, I think it's an improvement. It's only, as the Member for Cannington has said, three years old and we're feeling our way, but I do think it's an improvement.

I just want to reiterate that Members in the Committee, that is Opposition Members of the Committee, were not exceeding their rights. Certainly this House gave the Committee the authority to call for papers and to examine them and this is what we have done, Sir. We called for papers, we made a motion to call for papers on March 12th and again on March 13th and on both times this was refused. There's no reason to refuse but all we're saying is that we were legitimately within our rights to call for those papers.

**Mr. E.I. Wood (Swift Current):** — Mr. Speaker, it's not very often that a mover of a motion may disagree however slightly with the seconder but I would like to point out one small matter if I may today.

In seconding the motion that this Report be accepted, the Hon. Member from Kerrobert-Kindersley (Mr. Howes), I believe these are his words as near as I can see, taken from the Report.

**Mr. Weatherald:** — If you've lost it, I'll give you a copy.

**Mr. Wood:** — I think I have it here somewhere.

Insofar as the recommendation that the method of operation of the Committee be referred to the Inter-sessional Committee on Procedure, a great deal could be said,

and then the Hon. Member (Mr. Howes) went on further,

I feel very strongly that the Inter-sessional Committee on Procedure should give the operation of this Committee very serious study and make further recommendations to the Assembly as to its mode of operation and its powers.

I would like to point out that if this is, and I think it says,

Insofar as the recommendation and method of operation of the Committee be referred to the Inter-sessional Committee on Procedures, a great deal could be said.

I think the inference is here that there was a recommendation by the Committee that the further Committee on the Procedures of the Legislature should look into the procedures of this Committee. I want to say that this is not quite the case. There was a section dealing with referral to this Committee on Procedures and this simply had to do with whether or not we sat as an Inter-sessional Committee and the matter of procedures being referred to that Committee was not a recommendation of the Committee on Public Accounts and Printing. I thought I would just like to clear that up. These may be the wishes of the Hon. Member from Kerrobert-Kindersley and he, I believe, is a member of this Inter-sessional Committee on Procedures of the Legislature. He has every right to bring them forward, but I do not think that the Committee passed any recommendation that the procedures of the Committee be passed on to the other Committee. I may read that, if you like, Section 8 – I believe that is the section in question – says:

The 1967 and 1968 Public Accounts Committee recommended that consideration be given to authorizing the Committee to hold meetings when the Legislature is not in session to enable our Committee to consider the Public Accounts and the Provincial Auditor's report when and if these documents are available prior to the opening of the regular session. This year your Committee recommends that this matter be taken under consideration by the Special Committee on the Procedure of the House established February 17th, 1969. If that Special Committee wishes to take this under consideration, it is suggested that they might wish to invite representations from Members who have had experience on the Public Accounts Committee.

April 1, 1969

Now this is a small matter but I just wish to point out that it is not the recommendation of the Committee that this procedure be taken under consideration.

The Members of the House were undoubtedly well aware we did have a good deal of discussion in our Committee this year in regard to what should be proper to report and otherwise. I have certainly no objection that this matter should be taken under consideration by the Committee on Procedures. I'm sure that, if anything can be done to assist this Committee to be more helpful and more useful, I would surely be in favor of it and I'm not objecting to what the Hon. Member from Kerrobert-Kindersley said in this regard.

I do wish to point out, however, Mr. Speaker, that so far as I can ascertain the rules under which we are operating at the present time are almost identical with those of the Public Accounts Committee at Westminster and about the only difference we have between our Committee here and that at Ottawa is that this one is held in camera while the one at Ottawa is open to the press. I feel that these other Committees have, through the years, been of real benefit to their Legislatures or to their Parliament, and I think that they have worked out how to handle these problems with which we are confronted. I think that Members here will agree that the Committee at Ottawa has performed a valuable public service this winter in their discussions of the Bonaventure and other things. I think, Mr. Speaker, that, with possibly a little more give and take on both sides I should maybe point out again what I read the other day in the House about this Committee being a Committee of the Legislature rather than a committee of parties. If there was an active effort on both sides of the Committee to endeavor to work this out, I think that we could operate our present rules and present procedures as effectively as other places in Canada and in the Commonwealth.

I don't see any reason, Mr. Speaker, why we should not be able to work out things here in Saskatchewan as well as has been done in other places. I feel strongly about this Committee, Mr. Speaker, as having been the chairman for a couple of years. Undoubtedly part of the difficulties to which we have fallen may be the fault of the chairman. Possibly a better and a stricter chairman might have been able to avoid some of the difficulties which we met, but I do feel that this is a good Committee and I would like to see it progress through successive years into a better one. I am not sure whether this can be done by more strictures being placed upon it or by a better understanding of what this Committee is trying to accomplish by the Members themselves and possibly by the chairman as well.

This is all I have to say, Mr. Speaker.

Motion agreed to.

## SECOND READINGS

**Mr. MacDougall (Souris-Estevan)** moved second reading of Bill No. 68 – **An Act to amend The Lord's Day (Saskatchewan) Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, in moving this amendment to the Lord's Day Act I just want to make a brief comment that the amendments required were asked for by the Wascana Centre Authority. I think most Members have on their desk an explanation of the reason for the amendments. They are to authorize the Crown, the municipality and the Wascana Centre Authority and the regional parks to provide recreational sport and associated services and facilities, many of which are now provided, without contravening the Lord's Day Act. At present the regional park authorities may provide some of the things that are outlined in the Bill, but the new amendments will also increase the number of sports and services that may be provided.

The amendments, as I said before, were prompted by a request from the Wascana Centre Authority to do on the Lord's Day many of the things that are now done by the Wascana Centre Authority. I don't think this is controversial because they required this amendment to be able to operate the bus, guide services, and so on.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

**Hon. W.R. Thatcher (Premier)** moved second reading of Bill No. 82 – **An Act to provide a Superannuation Allowance for a Certain Former Member of the Legislative Assembly.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, earlier this session we introduced a Bill having to do with the Hon. Mr. Patterson. At that time the Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) and I believe the Hon. Member for Wadena (Mr. Dewhurst) asked us if we would look at the case of Mr. Allan Brown, MLA, to decide whether or not a pension could be paid to this individual. The Government now investigated the matter. We find that Mr. Brown was a Member from 1944 – 1960. We find that his physical health is extremely poor and that he is unable to work. We, therefore, are proposing in this Bill that Mr. Brown be paid a pension at the age of 52 which would be the same amount as he would ordinarily be paid when he reached the age of 55. Hon. Members will know that under the present Act when a Member reaches 55 his pension commences. The amount of the pension that would start under this Bill on April 1st would be \$147.20. Thus the effect is to advance the pension by a little less than three years.

**Mr. Dewhurst:** — I would just like to say a few words on second reading, Mr. Speaker. On behalf of Allan Brown I wish to thank the Government for bringing in this Bill. As I mentioned to the Premier the other day the preamble which said 1945 should read



**April 1, 1969**

1944, and I hope that this will be corrected in Committee either as a printing error or a slight amendment in Committee because Allan Brown was actually elected in 1944. I just wanted the record to be set straight. I appreciate on behalf of Allan Brown the Government bringing in this Bill at this time as I think this is a Bill that deserves the support of all of us.

**Mr. W.G. Davies (Moose Jaw South)** — Mr. Speaker, I add only this word. This Bill points up the need for legislation to cure a general weakness in our present MLA pension structure. If there is the necessity for a Member to retire earlier than the standard retirement age because of physical or mental incapacity, then there probably should be specified section which would enable that earlier retirement. I think we should have some clause which would recognize this condition.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to say that in reply to the Hon. Member for Moose Jaw South we did promise the Member for Wadena several days ago that we would look into this for the next session. There was some emergency apparently for this individual case and we felt that we should proceed in this manner for the time being.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

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