

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Third Session — Seventeenth Legislature
63rd Day

Tuesday, April 24, 1973.

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

QUESTIONS

Status of Women Report

Mr. D. G. Steuart: — (Leader of the Opposition) Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I should like to direct a question to the Premier, I have had some information from the Status of Women Committee in Regina that the Premier or someone in the Government promised to set up an advisory committee to look into and advise the Minister of Culture and Youth (Mr. Tchorzewski) on the implementation of the recommendations of the Status of Women Report, with the special attention to those recommendations that can be implemented by the Provincial Legislature. They were promised this sometime in January and they haven't heard anything. My question to the Premier is: Is he aware of this promise that they feel was made to them and if so would he be prepared to tell the House when he intends to set that advisory committee up? They also would like to be consulted before the committee is set up as to its membership which would include the kind of people who should be on it.

Hon. A. E. Blakeney: — (Premier) Mr. Speaker, quite frankly I don't remember the promise but I don't by any means say I didn't give it because it is a thing we intend to do in any case and I might well have indicated to someone that that was the case. The present position is that we have a small working group within the Government reviewing the Status of Women Committee Report and making some recommendations to us with respect to a terms of reference for an external committee. The small internal group is headed by the Deputy Minister of Consumer Affairs, Mrs. Hynd. We have had one opportunity to give consideration to possible members of the external committee. We are expecting from the internal group some recommendations shortly. I wouldn't wish to give an indication of when we would be able to move on this but I would anticipate, subject to any comments that the Minister of Culture might have as to the likely rate of progress, that it would be a time measured in weeks and not in months.

Mr. Steuart: — A supplementary question. Would the Minister or the Premier or the Deputy Minister of Youth and Culture maybe transmit this information to the Status of Women Committee here in Regina.

Hon. E. L. Tchorzewski: — (Minister of Culture and Youth) Mr. Speaker, certainly I have spoken to Members of the Status of Women Steering Committee on a number of occasions about this and I certainly will be speaking to them again.

Ward System of Urban Municipality Act

Mr. J. C. McIsaac: — (Wilkie) Mr. Speaker, I have a question I should like to direct to the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Wood) or in his absence the Premier or any other Member of the front bench who would like to comment.

I can understand why the Minister isn't here this afternoon. After the unveiling in today's Leader-Post of a deliberate, deceptive, deceitful and vicious plot of this Government opposite to interfere with the democratic rights of the citizens of Regina and Saskatoon; to interfere and manufacture phoney news releases, phoney, 'phone calls and phoney committees and by every other devious means known only to the Members opposite, Mr. Speaker, is the Premier or the Minister ready to tear up that Ward Bill and burn it, withdraw it from the House?

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I do not know to what the Member opposite refers.

Some Hon. Members: — Oh, oh!

Mr. Blakeney: — The member opposite is required by the rules of this House to direct questions to the Government. If he is asking whether or not we are prepared to stop proceeding with the Urban Municipality Act and The Urban Municipal Elections Act, then the answer is no.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — If he is asking whether the Government or any Members of the Government have been manufacturing news releases or otherwise, interfering with the processes of the news media, the answer is no. I am not aware of what else he may be referring to, but if he has any particular points which he thinks the Government is acting upon in a way in which he believes are inappropriate, I would suggest that he might put his question in somewhat less colourful language.

Mr. McIsaac: — Mr. Speaker, the only reason that I didn't put a motion to adjourn the House and debate this was because this Bill was before the House and that is the only reason we didn't debate this question in that manner.

Now for the Premier's information I will be prepared to hand over this morning's copy of the Leader-Post to let him read the article. If he is happy with that and if he is convinced that they are doing nothing, well, Mr. Speaker, I am completely amazed at the Premier. Here, you can have a look at the article.

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I simply want to make it clear that whatever the Leader-Post proposes to print, fine. I read the story and they attributed nothing so far as I could see to the Government.

An. Hon. Member: — Oh, oh!

Mr. Blakeney: — And I say flatly that the Government is not involved in any of the allegations referred to by the former Minister of Municipal Affairs, the Member for Wilkie.

Mr. C. P. Macdonald: — (Milestone) I should like to direct a question then to the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow).

The threat of deliberate political blackmail by 'phone calls threatening the mayor of the city of Regina and the aldermen of the city of Regina by NDPs, threatening their political support, is a disgrace to the democratic system in Regina. It now smacks of our own Watergate affair right here in the city of Regina. Now, the question, Mr. Speaker. Is the Attorney General a part of that plot as the report indicates the newspaper or is he willing to take action to protect the independence of local Government in Saskatchewan and have an immediate investigation?

Hon. R. Romanow: — (Attorney General) Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult to understand any questions that are asked by my learned friend from Milestone. It is generally typical of the Liberal front bench because I don't think they know themselves precisely where they stand on particular public issues. If the member is talking about threatening 'phone calls in the sense of threatening, improper, criminal 'phone calls, we will take any steps that are open to him to report it to the police, and we will take any steps of the Department of the Attorney General that are within our purview to make sure that that is eliminated. If, however, he is talking about 'phone calls that say that the mayor's political future is threatened because of his obstinate refusal to enact a progressive piece of legislation, that is in the proper avenue and it is legal to do so.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — And you know something, I wouldn't bet very much either for the political future of the mayor if he continues this approach of obstructionism to good positive legislation in this province.

Mr. Macdonald: — (Milestone) Isn't that just typical of the minister who dispenses justice in the Province of Saskatchewan. I want to read . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I think we are getting all out of order on this because Beauschesne makes it quite clear that statements in newspapers cannot be read on which to preface questions. There is a Bill before the House, the Members will have ample time to express their feelings at that time. To read newspapers and so on and base a question on it, Beauschesne makes it quite clear that it is out of order.

Mr. Steuart: — This question of newspapers. I should like to remind you that we had a special debate a year ago in this House when you quoted a newspaper article at that time as a basis for allowing the debate. I just want to remind you of that if you look back in the record you will find it. Secondly we are not

attempting to debate the Bill, we'll debate that in due course. We are attempting to ask the Government questions about a dirty little leak that came out of their Government about a scummy little act that has been condoned by the Attorney General and obviously by the Premier, that is what we are trying to ask.

Mr. Speaker: — I think this can be debated when the Bill comes up. Our procedure has been to allow a question and a supplementary question and now we have had two questions and a supplementary on this same item which I think is not according to the rules.

Mr. Macdonald: — (Milestone) I am asking a supplementary question, which is my privilege and it has nothing to do with the Bill involving the Ward System. I am asking about the integrity of this Legislature and the insult of your Attorney General to the mayor of the city of Regina and the aldermen of the city of Saskatoon. What this newspaper article says is that:

A meeting called Monday night at which the Premier, Mr. Wood the Regina MLAs and Saskatoon MLAs were to attend along with Regina NDP executives.

I want to ask the Premier if he was in attendance at that meeting and if so did he condone the actions and the decisions of that meeting? Also I would suggest that if any MLA did attend that meeting he should resign.

Mr. Blakeney: — The Member asked, was I at the meeting. The answer is No. The member asked, by inference, whether I was aware of what went on at the meeting, the answer is No. I found out some reports later but I was not at the meeting. I had no prior knowledge of what was going on. Thirdly, I do not either condemn or condone what went on at that meeting. That's the responsibility of the people who were at the meeting.

Mr. McIsaac: — He is not responsible for the actions of his Party, that's nonsense.

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, in this Legislature I am responsible for what this Government does. I am not responsible for what the New Democratic party does, in this province or throughout the Dominion, any more than any Member on that side of the House is responsible for what the Liberal Party does in any of its many machinations all across this province and all across this Dominion. I speak for the Government of Saskatchewan, that is what I am required to speak for and that is what I propose to speak for. If you have quarrels with any other group, direct your questions there.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I cannot allow this to continue. This is not a debate.

Mr. Macdonald: — On a Point of Order, if you don't mind. The Premier answered a question, then he got up and made a speech on his

second reply. Certainly we should be permitted the same privilege.

Mr. Speaker: — I should like to read the House, Beauschesne, page 151, Citation 177.

Mr. Macdonald: — (Moose Jaw North) Take it as read.

Mr. Speaker: — Will the Hon. Members act accordingly when the Speaker is on his feet. Citation 177:

Reading telegrams, letters or extracts from newspapers as an opening to a question when the Orders of the Day are called is an abuse of the rules of the House. It is not good parliamentary practice to communicate written allegations to the House and then ask Ministers either to confirm or deny them. It is a Member's duty to ascertain the truth of any statement before he brings it to the attention of Parliament. This has been decided long ago in the United Kingdom, House of Commons. On the 14th of June, 1882, Mr. Speaker Brand in preventing a Member reading a telegram or a newspaper and founding a question on it, pointed out the extreme inconvenience of founding questions on every telegram and every newspaper. I am bound to say he added that it appears to me that before questions of such gravity are put an Hon. Member should take some measure to ascertain the truth of the telegram.

RESOLUTIONS

Resolution No. 20 — To Urge the Federal Government To Construct A New Runway at Regina Airport.

Mr. K. R. Macleod — (Regina Albert Park) moved, seconded by Mr. McPherson (Lakeview):

That this Assembly urges the Federal Government to construct anew main Northwest-Southeast runway at Regina Airport at least one mile south and west of the present main runway and that the present East-West runway be extended to the West, for the use of all jet and large aircraft.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the resolution which I propose today calls for a first step in a phased redevelopment of Regina airport. The present runways, particularly the main northwest-southeast runway create an unbearable noise hazard to large numbers of Regina people and more than \$30 million of real estate is affected.

Mr. Speaker, to allow the Members to have full appreciation of the situation as it presently exists and the result of the proposed changes, I have asked the pages to distribute some material to the Members which I would identify as follows: The main pieces are two maps. The larger map is a proposal drawn by a private organization in Regina for submission to the Minister of Transport and to the city of Regina. The smaller map is a part of a report which I refer to as the Grimble Report prepared for (it's an independent study) the city of Regina.

April 24, 1973

They are very similar but there are some slight differences. To begin with I would refer the Hon. Members to the larger map.

The larger map shows the present situation at Regina airport with the main east-west runway and the northwest-southeast runway in place with the airport circled with a heavy dark circle. For those who are familiar with the airport you will observe that there is at the present time a button, at least that is what we refer to it, as a button on the east-west runway. It is proposed that an extension to the west of some 2,000 feet be made to make that east-west runway a total runway of some 8,200 and that a brand new northwest-southeast runway of some 12,000 feet be created south and west and that is the very large runway which is drawn to the south and to the west of the present airport runway apparatus and the setup as it is now presently located.

Mr. Speaker, that 12,000 foot runway would accommodate all jet aircraft and all jumbo aircraft of the size now manufactured for commercial use in the world. The essence of it is that if you produce that runway to the north and to the north-west and to the south-east you would observe that it does not cross any part of the city of Regina, the built-up area, and that the main noise levels would be substantially away from the present built up part of Regina.

Now I refer to the smaller map, Mr. Speaker, because the Grimble Report has one or two slight changes and additions. If you look at the smaller map you will observe the present airport setup and then the proposed extension of the east-west runway is approximately 5,000 feet. It is a considerable extension beyond that which had originally been proposed. The Grimble Report actually proposes that the northwest-southeast runway intersects with the east and west runway and that they serve as taxi strips for each other. Consequently it is not necessary to build the type of taxi strip that is envisioned in the first or larger map.

Now, Mr. Speaker, involved in the Grimble Report map you will observe some fancy wavy lines drawn around the new runways. These are the noise measurement indications and an extension will show that the all-dangerous levels of noise are away from the built-up parts of the city of Regina. None of the troubles which presently afflict large parts of Regina would actually occur to the citizens of Regina if the runways were built as indicated. The Grimble report, as I mentioned, was an independent report submitted to the city of Regina.

Mr. Speaker, the proposal then is basically that not less than 2,000 feet be added to the present runway. If the Grimble Report is accepted it would come close to 5,000 feet. And secondly, that a brand new main runway of 10,000 or 12,000 feet be created on the northwest-southeast direction parallel to the first old main runway or the one which is presently in use and which causes such tremendous hazard to the city of Regina.

The immediate cost of this proposal would be about \$7 million. The main runway would cost something in the vicinity of \$5 million — runways do not come cheap. If you look at the other makings on the Grimble map you will see heavy lines to the top left hand corner of it and that is the proposed future development that is possible, although not necessary. It is possible if it should be desired at some future date to replace the present terminal with a new terminal to the west. I might say

that is not part of my recommendation or proposal.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there have been some alternate proposals and sometimes a few objections. One of the other suggestions is that a new airport should be constructed closer to the city of Moose Jaw. This may well be a future development. But it is a substantial time down the line. Any movement farther to the west would create serious air corridor conflicts with Moose Jaw. In fact, there is at present time, close to a conflict with Moose Jaw. This would not cause any difficulty. If the entire airport were picked up and moved to the west, 2, 5 or 10 miles it could be a cost of \$50 million or more. It is not likely that \$50 million or more could be paid out of the Federal Government at one time to create an entirely new airport 5 or 8 miles west of Regina. Consequently, it is better to suggest that a \$7 million expenditure be made to resolve the problem that future developments be permitted to take place at an appropriate time. Instead of an airport 5, 8 or 10 miles west of Regina, the Ministry of Transport has, in fact, suggested that if an entire pick-up of the airport is to take place it should be taken north of Regina and that some central point be located between Regina and Saskatoon and that a major airport serve both cities of Regina and Saskatoon. I regard that suggestion, Mr. Speaker, as totally impractical and I would oppose that kind of a suggestion. But that is one suggestion that was made from the Ministry of Transport in reply to a suggestion that an entirely new airport be built west of Regina.

The present solution, which I propose, has substantial support from citizens in Regina, from the city government and I hope will have the moral support of Members of this Legislature. To be effective this change in runway location would require that the city of Regina amend its bylaws to effect a sterilization of the area around the end of the glide path. It is no use moving the runway only to find that people again build underneath the glide path and thus create a renewal of the problem. The present runways, I might add, would be available for all small aircraft. The private aircraft and small aircraft don't cause the kind of trouble that exists with the huge jets and consequently they would continue to use the present runway.

This is not a wasteful proposal. The present heavy traffic causes runway deterioration and we are going to find ourselves replacing runways and making major improvements to runways periodically as heavy aircraft are employed on a regular basis by airlines. In fact, I am informed that whenever a large aircraft rests 39 times in front of the terminal building, the area must be inspected by the Department of Transport personnel. That is the result of those very heavy pieces of equipment that we are now flying around between our cities. So re-location of the main runway is consequently a most important feature of my proposal. It is the essence today of the proposal being made to the city of Regina by private proposals and by the Grimble Report.

I might say that 85 per cent of all landings are on the main north-south runway. An extension of the east-west runway still causes slight, but very slight, problems to the city of Regina for that 15 per cent of the time when the aircraft need to cross over the city of Regina. I might also add that in thinking of changing the location of an airport and this has

April 24, 1973

occurred, there are many people suggesting it, it is to be noted that 97 per cent of all loading in Regina come and originate in the city of Regina. It is to be admitted that this proposal is of immediate benefit to the citizens of the city of Regina. It may well be suggested that it is merely a local matter; it may be suggested that it ought not properly to come before the Legislature. I think, Mr. Speaker, that it is important to get the support of the Members of Regina and areas around Regina and the moral support of this Legislature to encourage the Department of Transport to go ahead with what I suggest is a very necessary change in the airport location and the runway location to benefit people, particularly in the southern part of Regina.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I have pleasure in moving this Resolution.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. D. M. McPherson: — (Regina Lakeview) Mr. Speaker, I should just like to say a few words on this today. I want to compliment those who have worked so hard to prepare these maps and to give all the Members an indication of the effect it does have on certain areas of the city. The constituency of Regina Lakeview happens to be one of those along with Albert Park. As the Hon. Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) and the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) know, who live in that great constituency of Regina Lakeview, they get awakened quite often with the planes, Mr. Speaker. They have been urging me to do something about it. I am certainly going to do something about it.

The Member from Albert Park has indicated, toady, the things that can be done. Mr. Speaker, I have a plan that fits in with his. I would ask leave to adjourn the debate at this time, so that I can bring it up-to-date.

Debate adjourned.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

Final Report of the Special Committee on the Review of Liquor Regulations in Saskatchewan

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. Faris (Arm River): That the Final report of the Special Committee on the Review of Liquor Regulations in Saskatchewan be now received.

Mr. J. C. McIsaac: — (Wilkie) Mr. Speaker, before adjourning debate on this particular motion I had discussed the work of the Committee in general, the nature of the study and the extent of the study that was undertaken by the Committee. May I say, again, that I think it was a good Committee. It was a good use for the inter-sessional committee concept and I think it was a study that certainly will be of real value to this Government and any other Government that follows with respect to a blueprint insofar as action is concerned in this general field.

Mr. Speaker, I don't want to take any particular extended time period on the report. I do want to comment on a few of the recommendations that I feel are a little bit difficult

perhaps to implement, some that I don't agree with completely, before adjourning debate. I think this is one aspect of the report that there are extensive recommendations in there. There are a number, I am sure, that I myself and other Members of the Committee don't support wholeheartedly. But I think that is the value of the report. All of these various things were put out and put forth and they are there for discussion purposes and I just want to comment on a few of them.

I think the Recommendation No. 10 on page 38 of the report on the surface, sounds fair and sounds reasonable. I suppose you can certainly argue for restricting advertising as far as liqueur is concerned. On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, I don't believe it is a workable one, I don't believe it is going to accomplish anything really, unless and until we can cut out movies, television, films and everything where there are all kinds of references to the use of liquor. So merely to implement a move in that respect, I don't think will result in very much of an improvement in the present situation. I think it needs to be more extensive than that. I think, also, until we can shut out advertising by way of American magazines, other Canadian magazines and so on, that at the moment to penalise a few people in the province really is about all we are doing and we are not really stopping advertising. Mr. Speaker, I have been of different minds on this particular point on different occasions. I first felt that there is really nothing wrong with prevention of prohibition of advertising but I have looked at the present situation and have to feel that to move to prevent advertising, as we are suggesting, really isn't very practical. I am not so sure it is going to accomplish what we want it to. Better controls and more restrictions perhaps, yes, that is one aspect, but not to shut it out completely.

I should also like to urge the Government, Mr. Speaker, to move along fairly rapidly on those recommendations dealing with rehabilitation, those recommendations, for example, dealing with the industrial alcohol program with the better education type of program that is mentioned. In short, Mr. Speaker, to take what steps it can. This doesn't necessarily mean spending a lot of money to develop improved attitudes to drinking and a greater awareness of the potential danger that is contained. I know it is going to be a slow process, it is going to be a continuing process and it isn't going to be easy. I also hope, Mr. Speaker, that Government efforts in this regard will utilise community organizations be they service clubs or fraternal organizations, groups, for example, and I think the classic group in this respect is Alcoholics Anonymous and the various groups that they have throughout the province. I would hope certainly Government efforts in this regard for prevention and better attitudes toward liquor and the handling of it will utilise fully the many people and many organizations throughout the province that are intersected and are concerned in this connection. I think Government must never give the impression that it alone is the chief agency or the main agency involved in this task. Because I think if it takes that approach the efforts of the Government will fail in this regard. I realise this is a difficult thing to ask the Government to do and at the same time not to become too directly involved, but to involve themselves to see that the work does get done.

I think the Government has a real responsibility to spend what funds it requires to launch programs of a rehabilitative and preventative nature. If it is necessary to raise more money

from the sale of liquor or the price to handle this, well I, for one, will certainly have no objection.

Now the Member for Pelly (Mr. Larson) in his remarks in this debate, Mr. Speaker, made some observations with respect to drinking in general versus excessive drinking. I think he pointed out that a bottle of beer in the home or in the car or at a picnic table is really no different, no matter where one chooses to have it. The problem is, and I say so very seriously, Mr. Speaker, we are not all as sensible as he is when it comes to handling liquor in that respect. Education programs, good as they are and the objectives that we all hold for them, I have a feeling are not going to solve all of the problems and it is going to take a good deal of time to bring this about.

The native problem in Saskatchewan is one that is now, I think, deserving of a good deal of attention from the Government opposite. It is one, Mr. Speaker, that the native people themselves are concerning themselves with and involving themselves in. I believe the Native Alcohol Council is an example of the kind of agency involved here as one that should be assisted by the Government opposite. I am not thinking entirely of funds, I am thinking, for example, the provision of adequate training for staff personnel at some of the various centres that are now operating and others that they may well propose in future to operate.

I think that the basic preventative program and the basic approaches as far as treatment and rehabilitation for the native people are concerned are no different than for any other group or any other group of citizens. There is no doubt in my mind, Mr. Speaker, that the people handling the programs for the native people should primarily be native people themselves. This is why I suggest to the Government that they make some assistance available to train people in this respect.

I, again, express my hope that the Government will make available to the Alcoholism Commission adequate funds, whatever funds they may need to expand the rehabilitative and testament programs that they now operate. In general, along with that particular move, I would hope the Government would move along to implement the main 15 recommendations contained on page 46 of the report dealing with treatment and rehabilitation.

There are a number of other provisions, Mr. Speaker, that I would hope the Government drags its feet on a bit. In fact there are a few that I would just as soon they forget. For example, the liquor in grocery stores. This is one move, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion that we simply don't need. I am just not convinced that there is a need for this. I think, for example that the expansion of the present special liquor vendor outlets would accommodate any need in this respect and I am not convinced that beer in grocery stores is something we really need that badly.

The question of drinking in cars as referred to by the member from Pelly and a few others on the surface, in theory, I suppose should be acceptable. You could argue that there is no reason why it shouldn't be allowed but I think it is a theory that doesn't really work and won't work in my opinion, Mr. Speaker. I just don't think it is workable. Stricter measures will need to be adopted and I think should be in any event with respect to the driver himself. Of course, on that

theory, if there are penalties and greater restrictions be they .06 or .04 or 0, alcohol as far as the driver is concerned, the theory would have it that it wouldn't matter what his passengers did but I don't believe that we are ready to move in that direction, Mr. Speaker.

I think, also, another recommendation that we did make with respect to special licences to private halls. I am not really convinced that that will be a step in the right direction, Mr. Speaker. I can't see it really benefiting very many people except the operators of the halls really. I just think that the policing and so on of this is going to prove a little bit difficult and I am not convinced we need it. I am not sure also, Mr. Speaker, whether we need to proceed with liquor at sporting events. I have had different opinions about this, but I am not really convinced that we need this provision. I am not convinced, for example, that the provision of liquor at the Roughrider games is necessarily that wise. Anybody who wants liquor is going to have a few before they go and many of them are going to take a little bit with them. I question the desirability of such a move and I question the desirability or the provision of beer at every county ball game or ball tournament. I am not convinced that is a step in the right direction.

I think one recommendation that would help in this respect as far as rural Saskatchewan goes and that is recommendation number 42, on page 84, and that is the one that deals with the community event licence. From what we can learn in Alberta this seems to be a very popular kind of move and a popular measure. I think it is a kind of a compromise provisions to some of the others that are there, the community event licence which would be made available to agricultural societies, fairs and exhibition boards where perhaps major tournaments and so on would be held. That, I think, would be a good move, Mr. Speaker, and one the Government should certainly consider.

There are other recommendations that I could comment on. I would hope the liquor board itself will brighten up their premises a little bit, will in one way or another improve the selection and the availability — when I say availability I am thinking of self-service, better displays and so on, particularly with respect to wines and that general category of liquor. I think this is a move that the Government should make, it is one they could make themselves and it is one that will help certainly from all of the reports and all of the studies that are done. The encouragement of wine with meals and better drinking habits is one area where the Government itself could make a move and make a beginning.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. W. E. Smishek: — (Minister of Health) Mr. Speaker, I want to make a few remarks on the report of the Committee. I want to at the outset say that I am not going to be stating any Government policy. What I have to say is the report of the Committee has yet to be considered by the Government, so nay views I express are my own observations and as Minister-in-Charge of the Alcoholism Commission.

I should like to join with other Members in complimenting the Committee on its work and the report that they delivered to us. The report and recommendations are going to be very useful

for the Government to come up with a new or better policy towards the particular problem that we are discussing. The final report has therefore several useful functions. It has drawn public attention to the seriousness of the alcohol problem in Saskatchewan, both in human and economic terms. It has offered some useful suggestions for dealing with this major health and social problem. Further the Committee has made some interesting legislative recommendations concerning specific changes to the liquor regulations in Saskatchewan.

The report concentrates on two key issues. Firstly, that alcoholism is a major social and health problem to which we must be prepared to devote significant amounts of money and more staff. Secondly, that the existing regulations dealing with alcohol may need to be changed to meet the present day needs of our people.

As Minister of Health responsible for the Alcoholism Commission of Saskatchewan, I want particularly to deal with recommendations relating to the prevention of alcoholism and treatment and rehabilitation of the disease in Chapters Three and Four of the report, as well as the observations of the Committee relating to the present program as noted on pages 42 and 43 of this report. The report is critical of the present Alcoholism Commission and its deficiencies. It quotes that the deficiencies listed in Culliton Report of 1967 and states that they are still relative today. It also describes that the Alcoholism Commission, quote:

Lacking financial resources, overall direction and effective management.

Mr. Speaker, I do not accept this charge made by the Committee. Perhaps the Alcoholism Commission has not grown as quickly as many of us might have wanted but this program has developed into an effective operation in the last three years.

Let me tell the House of the progress which has been made in the last few years. The amount of funds devoted to the Alcoholism Commission has grown at a faster pace than any other provincial program. In its first full year of operation the Alcoholism Commission had a budget of \$468,722. It was increased by 27 per cent in the fiscal year 1970-71 to a total of \$594,638. In the fiscal year of 1971-72 the budget increased to \$635,190. Since taking office, Mr. Speaker, under our administration the budget has increased even at a more rapid pace. In the coming fiscal year it will be increased to \$1,071,740. This is an increase of 68 per cent in the last two years, Mr. Speaker. The Special Committee is talking about tripling the budget of the Alcoholism Commission, at the pace which our Government and the Alcoholism Commission have set in recent years, we may achieve this goal in a relatively short period of time. The increase in the Alcoholism budget has allowed the Commission to increase its permanent staff from 34 to 46 persons and the number of new patients entering the program was increased from 858 in 1969-70 to 1,006 in 1971-72 and has increased sharply in the last year. I do not have the exact figures at the moment as the year-end has just come to a close a few days ago.

Last year we opened an in-patient treatment centre in Saskatoon. We are now providing long-term in-patient rehabilitation to alcoholics at the Jack Calder Centre in Saskatoon and

at St. Joseph's Hospital in Estevan. Detoxification treatment is being given to alcoholics admitted to special wards at the University hospital in Saskatoon and Regina General Hospital and at the Weyburn Psychiatric Centre. The opening of the Jack Calder Centre in Saskatoon will allow us to operate a total immersion and social rehabilitation program for the patient. The increased emphases on rehabilitation is only one of the Alcoholism Commission expanded scope of operation.

The education division through the medium of seminars, workshops and public meetings reached over 5,000 persons in 1971-72. Figures for 1972-73 are expected to show a sharp increase over the year previous. Last year the research division of the Commission focused attention on an evaluation of our rehabilitation program, the purpose of the evaluation was an assessment of the effectiveness of the existing treatment of alcoholics and their families. A comprehensive evaluation of a sample of discharged patients from the Regina and Saskatoon Centres was carried out. Copies of this report were released to the general public. Early indications suggest that the success ratio of our rehabilitation program in Saskatchewan is comparable with other programs in Canada. Knowledge gained from this evaluation will provide a base for the development and expansion of our future rehabilitation programs.

Mr. Speaker, I want to correct the impression that the Alcoholism Commission lacks financial resources, overall direction and effective management. The Commission has strong financial support from the Government and has carried out evaluation programs which will assist future programs. It has hired the services of many capable treatment counsellors and hired the services of many capable treatment counsellors and managers in recent years. Mr. Speaker, I might point out to the Members of the House that in the last few months we have enlarged the Commission to the full complement of 12 people. We have tried to get broad representation from various interested groups and those who are working with people who may be affected. We have a labour representative, we have an employer representative. On the Commission we have a teacher, we have a Metis person, we have an Indian person, a clergyman, a couple of doctors. There are also people from the Departments of Health and Social Services as well as from the University. I believe we have structured the Commission to try, to reach the total community and be able to work with people who are in various organizations, to try to get the broadest input into the Commission.

There is a problem for the Commission of being able to recruit skilled personnel. This is a problem that not only exists in Saskatchewan, it is a problem that is universal. Alcoholism, finally, in recent years has been recognized as a sickness and the number of medical people as well as lay people who are trained and have any skills to deal with this particular problem are relatively few. The truth of the matter is that every province is now trying to steal from the other province any skilled people they may have. This is an unfortunate situation. In some cases what is happening is the provinces are outbidding the other to try and steal the most capable people that the other province may have. I have written to Mr. Lalonde Minister of National Health and Welfare, after his announcement that the Federal Government proposes to get into the field of developing a program for treatment and rehabilitation of alcoholics and have suggested that perhaps the area that the Government of Canada can provide the most useful service for

April 24, 1973

all the provinces, is to develop an effective education and training program of staff that is needed. Because only through the national level can we, it seems to me, develop any effective training program for the provinces. At the present time each province is on its own and each province is trying to steal the skilled people from the other.

Mr. Speaker, one of the key achievements of our Alcohol Program is the extension of our services to the native people of Saskatchewan. I wish that the Hon. Member for Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac), who made reference to this, was here, because perhaps he is not familiar, not aware, of what has been done in the last 12 months.

For the first time in the history of alcoholism programming in Saskatchewan, the Provincial Government has made available through the Alcoholism Commission, funds for persons of native ancestry to set up and administer their own programs of alcoholism. In 1972-73 their grants and contributions reached \$214,700. In the current fiscal year these grants will increase to \$249,280 almost one-quarter of a million, that we have made available to the Indian and Metis people to develop their programs for the treatment and rehabilitation of their people.

The native programs are co-ordinated with those of the Alcoholism Commission and are administered by the Metis Society of Saskatchewan and the Federation of Saskatchewan Indians.

The Commission continues, of course, to make their own facilities and resources available to native persons who require it. They give consultations and assistance to the native programs as well.

I think it is important that Members be aware and be familiar with what we have done in the first 12 months to try and tailor a program for the Indian and Metis people.

Let me return to the recommendations of the report, Mr. Speaker. There is a great deal of merit in broadening the name of the Alcoholism Commission to include other drug dependencies. The Commission, I am pleased to say, has itself recognized the need to broaden its terms of reference in its existing educational and prevention programs. A change in name in terms of reference will be in keeping with our increased knowledge of the health needs of our people. Later on in the report it is recommended that the same Minister be responsible for the Liquor Board, the Liquor Licensing Commission and the proposed Alcoholism and Drug Dependency Commission.

Mr. Speaker, this it seems to me, would place the Minister responsible in a position of conflicting interests. The implications of this recommendation suggest that the basic review of the Government philosophy regarding alcoholic beverages might be in order. I really question that particular recommendation of the Committee for reasons that I have already said, that there may be conflict of interest.

I am unable to agree with the recommendations regarding drinking in automobiles and the sale of alcoholic beverages in grocery stores. We know this, that alcohol is now perhaps readily available to all kinds of people. It would be my guess that by having alcoholic beverages sold in grocery stores would make it perhaps even easier for youngsters to purchase alcohol.

It seems that even now they are able to get access to alcohol even though there is an age limitation.

It would seem to me that grocery stores would have a very difficult time of being able to determine the age limits of people who might want to buy alcoholic beverages. It seems to me that these steps would only increase the problems of drinking and driving and increase consumption.

I want to say a few words about the concept of social health pricing policy, I do not wish to quarrel with the Committee's economic findings but I would personally have serious doubts about the results of this kind of policy, There are too many unknowns in this area and it will certainly require additional study, It has been my observation that past increase in the cost of liquor has done little to dampen the demand for the products.

Many people place a very high value in the enjoyment gained at the club functions or the entertainment bars where alcohol is sold. Working people respond to increases in the price of liquor as if it were an increase to income tax, regressive tax at that. Some social drinkers, after many years of consumption, have become attached to a particular brand with a given alcoholic content. It may be extremely difficult to persuade such a person that price increases especially in say the price of beer, are protecting his health.

I suggest that a social health pricing policy will touch the tip of the iceberg. It is ten times more important that we persuade the Federal Government to first establish a more equitable tax structure to provide more assistance to the family of persons who are handicapped by the alcohol problem.

Since we are talking about prices, I was also surprised by the recommendation regarding the allocation of at least 10 per cent of the revenue derived from alcoholic taxation to the work of the Alcoholic Commission. If we follow through on this recommendation to allocate more resources to both education and prevention and treatment and rehabilitation, it is going to cost the Government a great deal more money.

The implication resulting from this recommendation on a fixed percentage funding allocation to the Alcohol Commission would seem to be that increased consumption and revenue from the sale of alcoholic beverages should be encouraged so that more money can be allocated to treatment and rehabilitation. This leads to a situation of the dog being wagged by its tail and sets extremely dangerous precedents for the Government.

Mr. Speaker, that kind of tax policies if related to other areas, say if we allocate a percentage of the liquor profits for treatment, I suppose you should then allocate a certain percentage of an individual tax to particular programs. It seems to me that this is somewhat contradictory to the general principles of our system of Government budgeting and Government responsibility for funding of programs. Because 10 per cent in some cases, or even in this case, in time to come may not be enough and thereafter it would be difficult trying to persuade governments to provide more, if that were needed.

I contend that the Alcoholism Commission budget should not be related to the alcohol taxation as has been suggested. In

April 24, 1973

response to the recommendation on increased Federal co-operation in fighting alcoholism, I have already written to Mr. Marc Lalonde, Feral Minister of Health and Welfare, on this subject, We will be making special application to Ottawa for more financial assistance for the alcohol program, or some financial assistance, and I hope to discuss this matter with Mr. Lalonde in Ottawa next month. We intend to follow though on many of the recommendations of the Committee. However, our enthusiasm for dealing with this major health problem, alcoholism, must be balanced with a broad perception of the public interest.

I make reference to the recommendation to extend the definition of approved facilities under the Mental Health Act, to include rehabilitation centres and holding units of Alcoholism Commission.

Mr. Speaker, I would personally not like to see people being committed to rehabilitation centres against their will. Further regulatory authority of this kind might serve to discourage people from coming forward for rehabilitative treatment and care. We are not going to be successful with the shock tactics to reduce alcoholism. We must concentrate on prevention, education and reasonable methods of rehabilitation to achieve our goals.

Mr. Speaker, before closing may I, again, congratulate the Committee for their hard work. I believe that they have put the problem of alcoholism abuse and alcoholism prevention clearly before this House and before the people of Saskatchewan. They have made concrete proposals on many ways and means of showing society how to change its attitude towards alcoholism and how to handle this particular problem.

At the same time you will notice that there are some recommendations that the Committee has made that I question their validity and, indeed, as a Member of the Government I will be giving more attention to the recommendations of the Committee.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. D. H. Lange: — (Assiniboia-Bengough) Mr. Speaker, on speaking to the Liquor Committee Report, and as a member of the Committee, I should like to say that during the past year I enjoyed very much sitting as a member of the Committee and as a result of our deliberations in our travels and in our investigations I learned several things. Perhaps the most important of all these, is that two political parties with opposing ideologies can work together towards a common end. And this, of course, raises in my mind some obvious questions about the party system within politics and the waste of both money and energy, which this system engenders. Moreover, I learned that man, indeed, does not live by bread alone.

The report in itself is without a doubt the most progressive report in North America. But in spite of that it is not by any means adequate. If it is implemented it will not change the dialectic of history as far as the alcoholism problem is concerned.

And although I unequivocally support the report, I think it makes little difference whether it is or whether it is not implemented. Committee investigations show that alcoholism is

a far, far deeper problem than the terms of reference of the Committee's jurisdiction would allow us to investigate.

The magnitude of the alcoholism problem is apparent to anyone if he simply walks into an airport. The most obvious essentials are depicted to us in sign language. They are the food centres, the restroom centres and, of course, the alcohol centres. There is an international symbol to indicate where alcohol can be found.

Alcoholism to my mind is merely a superficial symptom of a serious social problem which exists the world over, but primarily in North American society. The root of the problem does not lie with legislation or with laws but it lies with the individual.

I think it is interesting to note that there is fundamental difference between the attitude of Europeans and the attitude of North Americans regarding alcoholism. Europeans use alcoholism as part of their life style and North Americans use alcoholism to get away from their life style.

In order to exemplify this I should like to postulate what I consider to be one of North America's gravest social problems. I call it the problem of alienation. The word alienation was introduced by Hegel, who was a 19th century German philosopher. He used it to detect the schism between man and God.

I should like to use it in a more general term. Whether psychological, sociological, metaphysical, alienation describes anxiety, apprehension, apathy, despair, depersonalisation, chronic loneliness, powerlessness, loss of beliefs or loss of values, all problems which are inherent within the alcoholic.

Whatever the ramifications basic to the concept of alienation, is that man has ruptured, lost or dissociated relations with the world about him, with his environment, with other people, with art and culture and ultimately with himself.

Many examples of alienation exist within our society. A man who identifies himself through his clothes, his car, his house, rather than through his personality, is experiencing alienation. The shallow television shows and commercials which depict good things in life to be money, social status, beautiful bodies and personality manipulation, rather than warm fellowship, wholesome honesty or genuine charm are examples of a society which is alienated from intrinsic values.

But perhaps the most blatant example of alienation can be observed in our attitude toward liquor. Nowhere in our social structure is there an element of society which has not been influenced by alcohol.

In order to exemplify alienation, which I consider to be the basis in this context, and to relate it to alcoholism from liquor, and ultimately to the contents of the Liquor Report I would ask that you bear with me while I give a bit of background to show how alienation has developed within our society.

The basis for alienation is mechanisation and as mechanisation has taken place over the last 150 years, man has been forced to become less and less involved with the means and the end of production. As the factor of production advanced, the role of the worker was reduced to handling only small segment

April 24, 1973

of production, rather than seeing the production processed through from beginning to end. No longer does he make a whole chair in a furniture factory, instead perhaps, he is responsible for only fitting the legs into the bottom portion of it. Or instead of making a whole piece of pottery, he now is perhaps responsible for only firing the kiln.

What has this segmenting and division done to the lives of man? It means that the significance of a workman, the significance that a workman confers on an object, becomes something outside of himself, something alien from him. Rather than seeing himself reflected in his environment by virtue of his creative work, the environment becomes foreign, incomprehensible, and this in turn evolves a different personality necessary to cope with the situation.

The way that North American man has learned to cope with his situation is through alcohol. The worker becomes a commodity himself to be bought, sold or traded in a market place as a thing and not to be valued as a whole human being, rather as an object valued for its ability to fit into the work process.

The work process itself is also alienating. The workman is in bondage to a system in which he must participate in order to subsist. His work is not part of himself, it is not satisfaction of a creative urge. He doesn't develop physical and mental abilities, but instead he becomes physically and mentally exhausted. Alcohol is his only readily available relief. The only relief because society has not taught him any alternatives such as meditation, exercise, or forms of relaxation.

During this period of exhaustion, the individual is again subjected to pressures, which coerce him to consume useless products of society. Man consumes with no relatedness to that which he consumes. He doesn't value an object for the intrinsic worth of the object, but only for the purpose of having the object — he consumes a fantasized facsimile of the object.

The playboy, for instance, with his finely tuned Jaguar coupe, is not driving a machine which he respects and understand for its inherent qualities of precision and performance. He is driving an ostentatious hunk of metal, which, in his mind comes equipped with a naked centre fold-out girl wrapped in mink.

Given a situation where man produces and consumes with no relatedness to himself, how can he use leisure properly. As would be expected, leisure too becomes an alienating process. In leisure man becomes a consumer. He buys his entertainment, consumes sports as a spectator, goes to the movies classified good or bad according to their market potential. He walks into his home, turns on a television or entertains useless chatter in order to escape from being alone.

Mass advertising monopolizes upon this and forever drives him to search for contentment and satisfaction in leisure by consumption. But always something is missing. And the cycle continues.

And what of the salesman who must promote this sort of a society? He must have a psychological condition which remains at a high energy level in order to maintain his power to sell. He must not forget that he has to sell to collect a commission

to live. Nothing in his life can be allowed to interact with this state of mind.

The only solution for a salesman to obtain relaxation is go to a nightclub and down several drinks in an evening. Here he can surround himself with people who will not make him question the values of his goal. He can escape to the possibility of a euphoria in liquor and the blaring electronic music, which will drown the possibility of a psychological low and its inevitable counterpart for him — no sales. Here he can fantasize and drool after the painted women and express what he would do if he could get his hands on one of them. He continues to sell a version of himself. He emanates an aura of confidence and success as he struts around in his fancy pants and buys drinks for the whole table. Doing this, he is not convincing others as much as himself, that his life and work are indeed worthwhile.

Or think of the high school student or the university student who goes to the car with the boys, because perhaps they are all lonely or looking for excitement. In the bar he feels that to-night he will meet the girl of his dreams. He thinks that everything he ever wanted in a woman will by chance occasion happen to sit beside him. And, if, in spite of chance, she does sit beside him he will be so inhibited that he won't be able to make an advance until he drinks enough to make a fool of himself. And so week after week he is an obvious victim of his own inability to cope with his serious social problem.

In this manner man tends to be alienated in his work. In his consumption and in his leisure. And ultimately alienated in his personality. He is alienated from the world about him, from art and culture, from people and from himself.

Here is where the roots of the alcohol problem lie. In North America, liquor is a relief from problems which are inherent within society. Problems of alienation, alienated work, alienated consumption, alienated leisure, all of these problems can be manifested by the superficial bar room syndrome.

In my opinion it makes little difference except in economic terms whether the contents of this liquor report are implemented or not, because the problem does not lie with laws and with legislation.

I believe that as legislators we will not write the mores, customs or social norms of society. I think liquor laws which infer or establish values are inane and useless. Furthermore they are a burden on our social structure because they create, in their turn, alienated responsibility for law offices.

However, liquor laws which protect innocent people who are affected by those who use alcohol are absolutely mandatory.

This report contains both types of laws. But the responsibility for consuming alcohol, drugs, stimulants, depressants, has, done and always will rest only with the individual.

Where and when we sell is really immaterial because it is the individual who will buy. Where and when we drink is also immaterial because it is the individual who will drink. Liquor

April 24, 1973

has been with man since time immemorial. And if it hasn't been alcohol it has been some other form of depressant or stimulant. And if all of the religions in the world haven't solved the alcoholism problem, then we can hardly expect legislation to solve it. The only hope that I can see out of this report will be that of its educational features. Perhaps through education we can instil other types of values within society. And certainly if we can't instil them within society; by proper counter-advertising through education we can certainly compete with coercive forces which promote alcohol in society.

In spite of the obvious futility of solving the alcoholism problem, governments must still try. And this Committee has made an excellent attempt at trying.

Mr. Speaker, I will support the report.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. A. E. Blakeney: — (Premier) Mr. Speaker, I wanted to report of the Special Committee on the Review of Liquor Regulations. I want to sketch in as bit of the background to that report.

On August 9, 1971 the Assembly passed a resolution constituting a Special Committee of the Legislature. The purpose of the Committee was to conduct an inquiry into all aspects relating to the sale, advertising and distribution of alcoholic beverages in Saskatchewan.

The Committee decided that they would accumulate some facts concerning specific problems and they would consider the attitude of the people of Saskatchewan towards the legislation, particularly The Liquor Act and the Liquor Licensing Commission. They would seek views from other jurisdiction, particularly as expressed in the laws and administration of the other jurisdictions. They would consider the problem of alcohol abuse and alcoholism. They would consider the problem of drinking and driving. And then they would, having done that, present a report to the Legislature outlining their findings and recommendations.

Members will see that the Committee's study was broad in its scope and that the final report deals thoroughly with the problems associated with the use alcoholic beverages.

You will be aware that on March 22, 1972, the Committee's interim report was tabled in this Legislature. On April 7, 1972, the interim report was concurred in by the Legislative Assembly and you will recall also that legislation was introduced dealing very largely with those recommendations in the interim report which required legislation.

We, therefore, saw the interim report dealt with expeditiously, the Committee having during the period from August 1971 until March, 1972 identified a number of matters which in their judgement required relatively rapid action.

The Committee then continued its work and I want now to turn to the final report and the recommendations. I think that each of us is aware of the social and economic costs associated with the abuse of alcoholic beverages. With this in mind I

should like to congratulate the members of the Committee for their concern in this area and for their in-depth study of the problem.

It is generally accepted that to curb alcoholism the following steps must be adopted. There are two, possibly three. These include firstly, the reduction of the consumption of alcoholic beverages. This is essentially a preventive measure. The development of an advanced educational program to bring about a social awareness of the effects of the abusive use of alcohol. This is essentially an educational program. The second step is the development of a program of rehabilitation and research.

The Committee looked at the various means of reducing consumption and made the following recommendations. They suggested a social health pricing policy. Under this policy the price of alcoholic beverages must relate to the alcoholic content and secondly the relative price per unit of alcohol must be such as to reduce the level of consumption.

They recommended a low alcoholic content beverage in the hope that this type of beverage would decrease the absolute amount of pure alcohol consumed. They recommend a vigorous program of education, rehabilitation and research.

As Minister-in-Charge of the Liquor Board and the Liquor Licensing Commission I endorse the Committee's objectives to bring about a reduction in the consumption of alcohol and above all a reduction in the abuses associated with the excessive use of alcohol.

The view is rather widely held that if there is an increase in the accessibility of alcoholic beverages that it will necessarily follow that the amount consumed will be increased. Others dispute that proposition.

The Government intends to look closely and critically at the desirability of increasing the number of liquor outlets and hence the accessibility. We intend to look at this closely and critically before implementing any recommendations which would in effect increase the number of liquor outlets.

Before turning to the specific recommendations as I relate to the Liquor Board and Liquor Licensing Commission, I wish generally to concur with the Committee's recommendations that more of the revenue received by the Government from the sale of alcoholic beverages should be made available for educational rehabilitation and research programs.

We have observed that the revenue from alcoholic beverages in the last 12 or 15 years has increased very rapidly from \$10, \$12, \$13 million a year to upwards of \$30 million a year.

The amount spent on the Alcoholism Commission has increased from in 1969-70 of \$470,000 to this year's estimates of to something over double that — \$1,071,000. In addition, the province covers the cost of medical services and hospital care for alcoholics of the order of \$600,000 or \$700,000. My figures indicate \$653,312.

It is certainly true that the amount being spent on rehabilitation is rising rapidly. The question arises however, as

to whether we are still doing enough.

I wish now to turn to the specific recommendations as they relate to The Liquor Act and The Liquor Licensing Act. The Members will note that there are some 45 recommendations. In reviewing these recommendations I think one must attempt to relate them to the general objectives of the Committee, that is to reduce the total consumption of alcoholic beverages on a per person basis and hence reduce the problems associated with excessive use of alcohol.

Here are a number of recommendations made by the Committee, and if the House will bear with me I propose to mention a number of them and comment on them.

One recommendation was that the Saskatchewan Liquor Licensing Commission, in its discretion, allows the sale and consumption of beer at sports events at special designated areas. Another that legislation be amended to allow the consumption of beverage alcohol in a vehicle by individuals other than the driver. A third that legislation be amended to allow the consumption of beverage alcohol with food at a park campsite or picnic site.

All of these in a sense are directed to making alcohol more accessible. Certainly to those who have experienced the problems resulting from the use of alcoholic beverages, any increase in accessibility is not readily welcomed.

It will be the task of the Government before considering whether or not to bring in further changes in liquor legislation, to attempt to determine the likely results of any such changes.

This will not be an easy task. One theory states that if alcoholic beverages are more accessible then less abuse will arise. Because people will consume the alcohol under conditions which lead to more moderate consumption.

The second theory in essence says that the more available we make alcoholic beverages the greater will be the amount that will be consumed. And the more consumption, the more abuse. That argument runs in a simple, almost arithmetic progression. If you make it more available, more will be consumed. If more is consumed, more of it will be consumed in an abusive way. And if more of it is consumed in an abusive way, the problems of the abusive use of alcohol will increase.

I want to deal now with a number of the recommendations and to indicate some of the problems that I see would arise as a result of introducing the specific recommendations.

One deals with the sale of beer and wine in grocery stores. The major objection to implementing this provision would be that it would further remove the Government's direct control over the sale and distribution of alcoholic beverages. This control is now primarily vested with the Liquor Board. More over we should consider the fact that many of our small communities now have this service provided through special liquor outlets and the position of special liquor outlets would clearly be prejudiced. The Government has reached no conclusion with respect to this recommendation. I express a personal view in saying that I am not at all impressed with it.

Special liquor vendors. That there be additional

appointments of special liquor vendors if required. And that the number of appointments be the responsibility of the Liquor Board. This would require certain changes in the legislation. The present statutory limit is 135. We do not intend to act upon this recommendation at this Session. We will consider the matter further. It will not be dealt with at this Session.

Live entertainment in hotels. The recommendation is that live entertainment be permitted in licensed premises with the opportunity of patrons to sing and that dancing to live entertainment or juke boxes be allowed. It also recommends that live entertainment be permitted in private clubs and that licensed premises be extended to allow sidewalk cafes and patios.

Clearly, I think, there is nothing inherently wrong with live entertainment in licensed premises. This would require some changes in legislation. Live entertainment is now permitted in private clubs. There are some practical business problems so far as the hotel industry is concerned. Particularly those hotels which operate in smaller centres. We are conscious of this. We have had some discussions with the hotel industry and with others who are concerned. There will not be action at this Session on that recommendation.

A further recommendation is that all licensed beverage rooms and cocktail lounges and dining rooms be allowed off sale of wine and spirits during regular hours. The present Section 101(a) of the Liquor Act permits the holder of a dining room licence, during regular hours, to sell liquor by the glass but not by the bottle. This recommendation we can look at. If it would not open the door to abuse by persons representing themselves as bona fide guests, there is clearly not the level of objection to this recommendation that there might be to some others.

Recommendation 20 deals with married minors and says that present legislation be amended to allow legally married persons under legal age to consume liquor in licensed premises when in the company of their spouse who is of legal age. Presumably this would operate in beverage rooms, dining rooms, licensed restaurants, cocktail lounges. I would think that particularly with respect to beverage rooms and cocktail lounges it would create more difficulty for the proprietor to screen out minors. Our administration now is being tough with the hotels on the matter of age. We think that this was implicit in the amendments made last year and discussed with the hotel industry. We have had occasion to close down hotels for short periods and it is a pretty serious matter for a hotel to close down for a week on this matter of age. We are asking the hotel people to be very, very vigilant in this regard; we are assisting them with the voluntary I.D. card; we think that the adoption of this recommendation would simply increase their problems and ours in dealing with them. You would not only have to deal with age, but they would have to come to grips with the question of whether or not the person before them, who might obviously be a minor or appear to be a minor, was, in fact, legally married to the person who was accompanying him or her and that is clearly an extra burden.

Recommendation 22 deals with licensed outlets at university campuses. There are a good number of pros and cons to the idea of having a licensed outlet operated by the Students' Unions of Saskatoon and Regina campuses. We are not ready to act on this

recommendations one-way or the other. We think it requires some further study.

Recommendation 23 is that the Saskatchewan Liquor Licensing Commission, in its discretion, allows the sale and consumption of beer at sports events at special designated areas. I have referred to that briefly. This recommendation proposes that beer is allowed to be sold and consumed at sports events in designated areas. Before any such recommendations can be considered some criteria would have to be established to select and determine what sports events would qualify. While there may be not great objection to having beer available at the games, let us sway of the Saskatchewan Roughriders, the way that it's available frequently at baseball games in the United States or at football games in Winnipeg, other considerations might well arise if we are taking about sports events in smaller centres where families with children are frequently in attendance as families. I think that serious questions arise as to what sports events would qualify and we have not yet had an opportunity to reach any conclusions with respect to that matter.

Recommendation 34 deals with the transportation and consumption of beverage alcohol in vehicles other than by the driver. No recommendation made by the Committee has received more adverse comment than this one. During the past year the accidents on our highways have increased at an alarming rate. Many of the accidents can be attributed, at least in part, to drinking drivers. The Committee's aim in the report is to reduce the consumption and where there is consumption to have it take place in an atmosphere where drinking will be done with moderation. That's the overall aim of the Committee. I can't accept the idea that adopting the recommendation that liquor can be consumed in cars will help either to reduce consumption or to ensure that consumption take place in a place where it will be done in moderation. Again, I have to state the position of the Government that we have not taken a position on this matter. I state my own position in saying that I personally and firmly oppose this recommendation.

Time does not permit me to deal with all of the recommendations set out in the report. I congratulate the Committee again for the thoroughness of their report. As will have been indicated by my previous remarks it is the Government's position to receive the report but not be bound to implement the recommendations contained therein.

We do not intend to introduce any amendments to The Liquor Act or The Liquor Licensing Commission Act at this Session that would have the effect of making alcoholic beverages more accessible to the general public. Quite frankly, in my judgement, some of the proposals will not be acted on by this Government either now or later. We want, however, to take more time to study the report in detail and to consider the reasons put forward by the Committee for some of the recommendations before either agreeing or prematurely discarding some of the recommendations which — at least on the surface — do not appear attractive.

The policy of the Government with respect to this report therefore, may be stated in one word — "caution." We do not propose to introduce at this Session any legislation which will make liquor more accessible. We believe that great caution must be used before deciding what further changes, if any, are to be made in our liquor legislation. Personally, I am far from

convinced that we should move in some of the directions indicated. For example, and to suggest only a few areas: I am not convinced that we should permit any consumption of alcoholic beverages in cars; I am not convinced that persons under 18 years of age should be permitted to consume alcohol in licensed premises. On the other hand, the Government is prepared to endorse the recommendations that further revenue received by the Government from the sale of alcoholic beverages be made available to the Alcoholism Commission of Saskatchewan, or other organizations with similar aims to develop programs to combat alcoholism. I do not believe that education and rehabilitation are going to solve all, or most of the problems of alcoholism. I do, however, believe that it is incumbent upon us as a society to devote more of our resources to the treatment and prevention of the disease of alcoholism and to seek new knowledge, through research, in coping with those problems.

We are prepared, also, to endorse and act upon the recommendation to establish a highway safety committee which we will ask to explore every possible way of dealing effectively with the problem of the drinking driver.

Our general approach, as a Government, is that we must learn more about handling the alcohol problem we have with us. I suggest that as a Legislature it must be our number one priority to learn more about handling the alcohol problem what we have with us now. That must be our number one priority in the field of liquor legislation. That, it seems to me, is the appropriate response to the report of the Committee on Liquor Regulations.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. D. L. Faris: — (Arm River) Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the Members of the Assembly for the debate which has taken place on this report. I think it has been a very worthwhile exercise. I feel that the Members have exercised good taste and made intelligent and worthwhile comments in regard to it. I am very pleased that the Government has chosen to give the Legislature and the public of this province a very good deal of time in order to study this report and to respond to it. I understand that there are something like 4,500 copies of the report which have been sent out from the office of the Clerk. I would not doubt at all that by the time these public discussions are over there will be something like 5,000 copies out in the province and I know that they are being very thoroughly studied both by individuals and by groups. At this time, I, and I am sure other members of the Committee, are receiving some very intelligent comments from the public in regard to this report and a good many of those comments are including thanks to the Government and to the Committee for this opportunity to express their opinions.

I understand that most reports of the Legislature are sent out in approximate numbers of 400 or 500. Five thousand is probably the most that has ever been requested of any report. I can assure you that the mail which I have received has been considerable. Most of it has been — I may say quite frankly — concerned about further liberalizations of liquor laws, but I am sure that the indication from the Premier that the Government does not intend to act hastily in regard to changes in liquor laws will be well received by the public if the response I have received concerning the report, is any indication whatsoever.

April 24, 1973

I was very pleased, indeed, by the comments from the Member from Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) because it indicates that he's got both an intelligent grasp of the points that we are trying to make in the report and has been struggling, as we are trying to make in the report and has been struggling, as we did as a Committee, with these very difficult issues. I want to express once again my thanks to the Members on both sides of the House for their intelligent and courteous behaviour in this debate. I want to thank Members on both sides of the House who were members of the Committee for throughout making it a pleasure to work with them.

It is with pleasure that I support the motion that this report be received.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to.

Report of Committee on Public Accounts

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. McPherson (Regina Lakeview): That the First Report of the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts and Printing be now concurred in.

Hon. K. Thorson: — (Minister of Industry and Commerce) Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on the Motion proposed by the Member for Regina Lakeview that the first Report of the Public Accounts Committee be concurred in and I do so because of the statements which were made by the Member for Albert Park (Mr. McLeod) in the course of the debate on this Resolution.

Now it is true that others in the Opposition associated themselves with those remarks, particularly the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy), who treated it in his own clown-like fashion as something out of which he should give a fictional account of imaginary telephone conversations which he says in this Legislature that I made. But there is no basis whatever for the statements he made or the versions he gave of telephone calls, which he says, I made to people in the Public Service, or in the Service Printing Company.

That fictionalized account, of course, was reported in the Press as though there were some substance to it. I want to say categorically that there is no substance to it whatever.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thorson: — As I say, the Member for Athabasca has so thoroughly discredited himself with that fictionalised account that I am not going to take any more time to deal with what he had to say.

The Member for Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac) also associated himself with the remarks, Mr. Speaker. All I can say about that is — and I have read through the transcript of Proceedings of the Public Accounts Committee — dealing with myself and dealings with the Department of Industry and Commerce and I can say about the Member for Wilkie is that he didn't take the time or the trouble to examine the facts that were before him and to get behind the allegations which were made by the Member for Albert Park. I am not going to say any more about what he had to say

in this debate, Mr. Speaker.

Let me begin, Mr. Speaker, by reminding the House of the people who are accused of wrongdoing by the Member for Albert Park. First of all he accuses me — then he accuses my colleagues in the Government, the Members of the Cabinet. Secondly, Mr. Speaker, he accuses officials in three Government agencies who were invoiced in the transaction which is the subject matter of paragraph 8 of the Committee's report. Those officials are in the office of the Queen's Printer, they are in the Department of Industry and Commerce and they are in the Department of Finance.

According to the Member for Albert Park these are at least three people who make accusations and I want to refer the Members to a report which appeared in the Leader-Post and so I will add that name, the Leader-Post, as a fourth party which are making accusations relative to the subject matter of paragraph 8 of the Committee's report.

First of all, according to the Member for Albert Park, is the Provincial Auditor, who is making accusations of wrongdoing.

Secondly, according to the Member for Albert Park and his version, it is the Public Accounts Committee which is making accusations of wrongdoing and, of course, the third one is the Member for Albert Park himself and I am going to deal at some length with his accusations.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order!

Mr. Thorson: — Then, of course, there is the published account which appeared in the Leader-Post. What are these accusations, Mr. Speaker?

Well, first of all, what are the accusations of the Provincial Auditor? I refer the Assembly to page 10 of the report of the Provincial Auditor for the year ending March 31, 1972, and in particular to the last paragraph of the Auditor's comments about the Department of Industry and Commerce. And in that paragraph the Provincial Auditor says in reference to an advance payment on a printing order and contract; he says the following in effect: "There was no evidence of a formal contract." And his last sentence reads as follows: "Therefore, it would appear that the payment of \$12,000 was made without proper authority."

Now let me refer the Members of the House to the report of the Public Accounts Committee, page 2 of their report, paragraph 8. And I say frankly, Mr. Speaker, that I am disappointed in the draftsmanship of this report because it clearly misquotes the Provincial Auditor and therefore distorts the meaning of his words. The Provincial Auditor says because he believed there was no evidence of a formal contract that it would therefore appear that a payment was made without authority, but in the draftsmanship of the Committee's report which we are considering we find these words:

In item 10 (iv) of the Provincial Auditor's report, it was reported that an advance payment of \$12,000 was made without proper authority.

April 24, 1973

Now by taking out the words of the Provincial Auditor they changed the meaning. Now instead of the Provincial Auditor saying that it would appear that there was a payment made without proper authority, now we have the drafted report of the Committee saying the payment was made without authority.

An. Hon. Member: — Oh, oh!

Mr. Thorson: — Now there is nothing wrong, perhaps, Mr. Speaker, and I will come to that in what the Provincial Auditor said, but it is wrong, I submit, for the Committee to misquote the Provincial Auditor.

Some Hon. Member: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thorson: — Then, Mr. Speaker, we have the accusations of the Member from Albert Park (Mr. McLeod).

Mr. Romanow: — Oh, terrible!

Mr. Thorson: — I have read through what he had to say a week ago in this debate. I find that in the course of his remarks in reference to this advance payment he used the term “illegal” or “illegality” ten times. You know, it was after all nothing more than an argument of assertion. He had no basis or substance for his argument. He asserted that it was illegal or that there was illegality. And in one occasion, the 11th time, he said it was completely illegal. But, Mr. Speaker, he went further, he went further than that.

An. Hon. Member: — Shame!

Mr. Thorson: — To say that something is illegal suggests that it is wrong which the law recognizes such as breach of contract for which damage ought to be paid or some injury was done to someone and the law recognizes that those responsible for the injury should pay damages. That’s a civil wrong. And to say something is illegal suggests in most people’s minds a civil wrong. But the Member for Albert Park, Mr. Speaker, in this Assembly went much further than that.

An. Hon. Member: — I hope so.

Mr. Thorson: — He went much further than that, Mr. Speaker. He was not content to make unfounded allegations of civil wrong. He made an allegation of criminal conduct. Let me refer to the words he used.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! Will the Members let the Hon. Member do the speaking.

Mr. Thorson: — Here are the words that the Member for Albert Park used in his speech. He called it, and I quote: “Open-handed banditry.” He said the Government was guilty of, and again I quote him, “A flagrant violation of all honest treatment of the moneys of the Province of Saskatchewan.”

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thorson: — He said, “This Government is simply and deliberately stealing money from people of Saskatchewan.”

Mr. Romanow: — Oh, resign, boy. Resign before the day is out.

Mr. Thorson: — Mr. Speaker, what are the accusations contained in the report by the Leader-Post? Well, I have here a clipping out of the Leader-Post for April 18, 1973, and taking their cue from the Member from Albert Park there are a couple of headlines, one of them reads: “Payment to Service Printers Termed Illegal.” The other larger headline reads: “Government Accused of Stealing”. Then, Mr. Speaker, let me quote the last paragraph in this published report in the Leader-Post to see how far editorial licence can carry some people. The last paragraph and the last sentence says, and I quote it from the Leader-Post of April 18, 1973:

Mr. Thorson is the first Cabinet Minister of the Blakeney Government to be condemned by the Provincial Auditor.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thorson: — Now I say editorial licence, Mr. Speaker, I take it that the inference is that somehow there's a long line-up and I am just at the head of it. And the reporters and the Members of the Opposition are just waiting for more Members to appear in the line behind me. But the real licence is in saying that Mr. Thorson is condemned by the Provincial Auditor. No one can find that in the report of the Provincial Auditor. No one can find that in the draft report of the Public Accounts Committee which we are now considering under this motion. That existed only in the imagination of the reporter for the Leader-Post.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thorson: — But he published it as though it was a statement by the Provincial Auditor or as though it could be inferred from the statements of the Provincial Auditor.

Well, Mr. Speaker, before I sit down I am going to say something more about the Leader-Post and the people who are in it.

An. Hon. Member: — Pulpits for the Liberal Party.

Mr. Thorson: — Now, Mr. Speaker, what are the facts in relation to this particular advance payment on a printing order? I am going to point out some transactions of the former administration a little later on. I hope the Members will be around long enough to hear it. But let me state, briefly, the facts in this particular case.

In the fall of 1971 the Tourist Branch of the Department of Industry and Commerce determined that it wished to have printed some Travel Guides for the following year. Accordingly,

April 24, 1973

as is customary in these matters by all departments of the Government, the appropriate requisition was sent over to the Queen's Printer. And on October 22, 1971, the Queen's Printer placed a purchase order with Service Printers for the required printing. And as a matter of fact, the Members of the Public Accounts Committee afford themselves the opportunity to look at the purchase orders and the vouchers and the intern bill and the final bill and the final voucher in connection with that order. And so those members of the Committee who did make that examination will have some idea of the dates we are dealing with and printing order we are dealing with. Now it was contemplated at the time the order was placed that the delivery of the completed order would be made by the end of 1971 or early 1972 or at the very best it would be not more than four weeks after delivery to the Department of the final approved copy for printing. And, of course, that is after the type has been set, after galley proofs have been run, after they have been proof-read by the printer, after they have been proof read by the people in the Tourist Branch and it is approved as a final form for the printing order then it was thought that there would be not more than four weeks after that to simply run the presses and have the order delivered and payment would be made.

As a matter of fact the purchase order is silent as to the time for payment. And in the ordinary course of events it would be expected that payment would be made on delivery of the completed order. However, by the end of January, about a month after it was contemplated order would be that most of the delay in that period of time had to do with supply of copy material by Tourist Branch to the printer and was not in any way the fault of the printer. In that period of time, from October 22, 1971 until the end of January 1972, the supplier, the printer, had, of course, incurred expense. And as members of the Public Accounts Committee will know, because they looked at the interim bill which the printer submitted, first to the Queen's Printer and then it was routed over to the Department of Industry and Commerce and which was dated at the end of January in 1972, the printer in his bill of January 28, 1972 says, "interim payment on account re stock, typesetting, wages," and asks for a payment of \$12,000.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we could spend a lot of time if we wanted to, as the Member for Albert Park did, reviewing what happens to the bill and how the vouchers are prepared, through whose hands these documents pass. But let me just summarize it by saying that when the bill reached the Queen's Printer, it was sent to the Tourist Branch, Mr. C. Springstein, signed approval for payment on the bill. It was then sent back to the Queen's Printer and there, again, it was endorsed as approved for payment. It was then sent back to department of Finance. And it was there, Mr. Speaker, according to the information I have and according to information supplied to the Committee, the Public Accounts Committee, that a memorandum was prepared by myself and signed by myself and delivered to the Director of Administration for the Department of Industry and Commerce. And I want to come back to that memorandum which the member for Albert Park so very carefully avoided presenting to the Members of the House. I want to come back to that in a little while.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, the voucher and the bill went to the Department of Finance and there the payment was made. On February 1, 1972 the voucher and the bill was delivered to the Department of Finance and, of course, those who read from the transcript of the Public Accounts Committee report and those who heard the Member for Touchwood (Mr. Meakes) speak the other day in this debate, know that the controller, Mr. Kerr, in the department of Finance, indicated that the cheque was mailed from the Department of Finance to the supplier of printing on the third of February 1972.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am quite content to take the statement of facts as being accurate insofar as they deal with all of the facts. And I may say that it is an abbreviated and limited version, but it is a statement of facts contained in the Provincial Auditor's report. It is found on page 10 of his report and I refer the Members to that report and I read it all because I find that no exception can be taken to that statement of facts. This is what he says:

On February 3, 1972 an advance payment of \$12,000 was made by the Department of Industry and Commerce on account of a printing order for 250,000 Travel Guides 1972. According to the invoice submitted to the Department the \$12,000 represented an interim billing to cover stock, typesetting and wages. There was no provision for any advance payment in the order placed with the supplier. The goods ordered had not been received by the Department of Industry and Commerce up to the date of the advance payment although they were subsequently received on March 22, 1972 when the final payment of \$16,894.32 was made.

That's the end of the Provincial Auditor's statement of the facts which caused him to raise the questions which he did in his report to the Legislature. And, as I say, Mr. Speaker, I have no quarrel with that statement of facts as they occurred.

Now what was the question that was raised by the Provincial Auditor in his report to the Legislature? Mr. Speaker, the Provincial Auditor was not objecting to the substance of the transaction.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thorson: — He never, so far as I am aware, and I say I have read his report to the Assembly, I have read the transcript of the Public Accounts Committee meeting, but the Provincial Auditor so far as I am aware never at any time or in any place said or even suggested that the supplier of printing was paid out too much or paid for something that was not supplied.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thorson: — The Provincial Auditor's comments, Mr. Speaker, on page 10 of his report to the Assembly are presented in three parts. First, the Provincial Auditor quotes verbatim, Section 58 of the Department of Finance Act, which was The Department of Treasury Act. Secondly, he devotes one paragraph to a statement of facts, that's the paragraph I have just read. The third part, his last paragraph is in two sentences. He says in

the first sentence that there was no evidence of formal contract. In the second sentence based on what he had already said in the first, he says, "It would appear the advance payment was made without proper authority." Now, Mr. Speaker, what does the Provincial Auditor mean by that term he uses in his report, 'formal contract'. Well, as I say, I have read through the transcript of the Committee's report and as far as I can determine no member of the Committee, no one asked him that question. No one asked him if he meant by using that term to imply that there was any difference between a contract and a formal contract. No one asked him if there was any evidence of a contract as distinct from a formal contract. No one asked him if the Government was found in contract to make payment. No one asked the Provincial Auditor what he thought the terms of that payment should be. Mr. Speaker, I submit there was ample evidence of a contract, a binding contract, which obliged the printer to supply and the Government to pay.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thorson: — I am going to deal a little later with the timing of the payment as a term of that contract. However, Mr. Speaker, it is clear, if one reads the report of the Provincial Auditor, that he addressed himself to the form of the contract and he did not address himself in his published report or his statements before the Public Accounts Committee either to the terms of the contract such as times for payment, and he did not address himself to the substance of the contract such as the quality or the value of the goods to be delivered under the contract.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thorson: — Now, Mr. Speaker, the minutes or the transcript of the proceedings of the Public Accounts Committee for March 21, 1973, contained some statements by the Provincial Auditor which confirmed that his only question, his only concern, was with the formalities. And again I noticed the Member for Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod) carefully avoided any reference to that.

Let me direct his attention to page 140 of the Committee's meeting and the minutes of that meeting. Here at the bottom of page 140, and I quote it exactly, we find the Provincial Auditor, Mr. Lutz, making a statement. This is what it says:

Under Section 58 of The Treasury Department Act an advance payment is not legal.

Mr. Engel is reported as saying, "If it is not a contract." Mr. Lutz says, "That's right." Mr. Engel: "If there is a contract involved then it is, is this right" Mr. Lutz: "Yes."

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thorson: — Now, it is clear as I say, Mr. Speaker, that an advance payment under a contract, in the view of the Provincial Auditor, is perfectly legal and perfectly valid.

Let me take the Assembly over to page 141 of the Minutes of the Public Accounts Committee Meeting. Here we find the Member for Albert Park says this:

If there had been a written contract which called for an advance payment of \$12,000, would the Provincial Auditor have commented on this item at all.

Mr. Lutz, in reply says: "If there had been a formal contract as we normally accept a contract under the laws of contract, no." Not I offer that, Mr. Speaker, to show that the Provincial Auditor was concerned about the formality and the form of the contract. He never, for a moment, suggested that there was anything amiss about the substance of the contract. It was only the Member for Albert Park who tried to leave that impression in his statement in this Assembly.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me say something about the memorandum which the Member for Albert Park, not having had apparently any opportunity to say anything about it before he spoke in this debate, which the Member for Albert Park announced that I had prepared and delivered. He announced it in these terms. I noticed Mr. Speaker, that there is nothing in the Committee's report about that. There is nothing in the Provincial Auditor's report about that. There was nothing in the statements of the mover of the motion, the Member for Regina Lakeview (Mr. McPherson) but here are the words used by the Member for Albert Park in referring to my memorandum. He says, and I quote him:

In any event on the 1st of February, 1972, in response to the requirements of the Director of Administration Branch, Kim Thorson, the Minister of Industry and Information . . .

The error in the title, Mr. Speaker, is his not mine.

. . . Prepared and sent a memorandum authoring this payment.

Well, I am sure, Mr. Speaker, when the Member for Albert Park said that, all of us waited for him to produce the memorandum. But he failed to do that and I can understand why he did fail to do that, because had he produced it, it would have destroyed his whole argument. But, Mr. Speaker, I am glad to fill the breach. I have enough copies here of my memorandum for every Member of the Assembly and some left over for the members of the Press gallery. So I should now like to lay on the table one of these copies and I hand to the page enough other copies so that they can be distributed to every Member and to the Press gallery. I hope that will be done as quickly as possible.

Now, I don't want to go on, Mr. Speaker, until the Members have the photocopy of my memorandum before them so they can read it and, indeed, I should like to be sure that all the members of the Press gallery are able to read it for themselves.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thorson: — This is what it says: It is in the usual Government of the Province of Saskatchewan form and it indicates at the top that it is Department Memo. It is dated February 1, 1972 and it is from myself to Mr. Switzer the Director of the

Administration Branch and the substance of the memorandum reads as follows:

Re Service Printing Company. Invoice for Travel Guide. This is to advise you that I approve the \$12,000 advance payment on the contract of Service Printing Company in this connection as requested.

I have put my initials to it above the designation Minister of Industry and Commerce.

Mr. Speaker, it is very clear from reading my memorandum that I did not, as the Member for Albert Park would have us believe, authorize this payment. He was very careful not to use the words I used. He wanted to use his own words in order to leave the false impression that he tried to leave with the House. I did not authorize the payment. I did not direct the payment to be made. I said in my memorandum and I quote, “that I approved the \$12,000 advance payment on the contract.” I did not approve the \$12,000 advance payment on the contract.” I did not approve of an advance payment except on the contract so when the Member for Albert Park tries to hurl the mud and the false accusation at me and the Members of the Cabinet, he ought to have taken a look at the basis of that accusation. Because, Mr. Speaker, if there was on contract on which an advance payment could be made no one could read my memorandum as saying that a payment should be made even if there was no contract. No one could read it that way. If there was no contract then clearly my memorandum is not authority to make a payment. On the contrary my memorandum contemplates the existence of a contract and no one can possibly read it any other way. That, Mr. Speaker, is the reason why the Member for Albert Park refused to table the memorandum in this House so everybody could see it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thorson: — It was clear, Mr. Speaker, it was clear in his false accusations that he did not want the truth to be known. Now, Mr. Speaker, if this advance payment was illegal as he alleges, if it was made without the benefit of a contract, then no one, Mr. Speaker, can hide behind my memorandum which approves payment only on the contract. So if there are any accusations and there certainly were by the Member for Albert Park — of illegality, of stealing, then they land on all of the people that I mentioned when I first began to speak: On my colleagues in the Cabinet, on the members of the public service in the Queen’s Printers office, in the Department of Industry and Commerce and in the Department of Finance.

An. Hon. Member: — Start reading from where . . .

Mr. Thorson: — Oh, you want me to start reading from where Mr. Switzer says, “If you call it a contract.” No formal contract, that’s what the auditor said to the Legislature, Mr. Speaker, the Member said there was stealing, there was illegality. He didn’t content himself with the words of the Provincial Auditor that there was no formal contract.

Now let’s address ourselves to the question of whether or not there was a contract. Let’s just take a look at the question of whether there was or was not a contract, Mr. Speaker. I

submit, as I have said earlier, that there was a contract and I say that, Mr. Speaker, because it is quite clear that all of the essentials of the contract can be clearly identified in this transaction. We can identify who the parties were and we can identify the property, the subject matter of the contract, and we can identify the terms of payment.

In fact, it is only the terms of payment, which require any consideration at all. There is no doubt about who was obliged to supply goods. There is no doubt about who was to pay for goods and there is no doubt about what was to be paid for. The terms of payment, Mr. Speaker, are the subject matter of the Auditor's report and which we have to consider. Now, as I said at the outset, the parties contemplated the situation in which the completed printing order would be paid for in full at the time of the delivery of that completed order. Subsequently and before the delivery, the parties both consented to a change in the time for payment. Both agreed to amend the contract so that there would be an interim payment before final completion.

At that time, Mr. Speaker, the supplier had incurred expense as he sets out clearly in his interim bill: for stock, for type setting, for wages. And he had incurred that expense in pursuance of his obligation under the contract and for the benefit of the purchaser. There was no doubt about what was happening and anyone who examines the documents, the purchase order, the interim bill, the final bill and the vouchers can readily determine what the terms of the payment were as agreed upon by the parties to the contract.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if it was not a contract, what was it? The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) repeats the criminal accusation. Well, Mr. Speaker, the facts are that no payment was made as a gift. Payments were made for benefits conferred by the supplier. No payment was made illegally. All payments were made by virtue of the law which binds the purchaser under a contract with his supplier. If that were not so, Mr. Speaker, the Government would have the right to recover the money paid. No one has ever suggested that, not even the Member for Albert Park. No one can possibly believe that the money was paid except in accordance with the contract. Therefore, the payments, both the interim and the final, were properly made insofar as substance of the transaction is concerned. No one, Mr. Speaker, no one, not my colleagues, not myself, no one in the Public Service is guilty of any illegality or of any theft of money.

I have addressed myself and I ask the Members of the Assembly to address themselves to the substance of the contract. The Provincial Auditor dealt with the form of the contract. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am quite prepared to follow the Provincial Auditor in the matter he dealt with. All persons in the Government should do the same, do that the form of the contract like its substance, cannot be the subject for questioning by the Provincial Auditor or by anyone else. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, I urge that in these matters all of us should observe the proper formalities. I have no quarrel with the Provincial Auditor in raising it in that context. But, Mr. Speaker, I submit that the Members of the Legislative Assembly have a higher duty than the duty of the Provincial Auditor. The Members of the Legislative Assembly cannot escape the responsibility for dealing with the substance of contracts entered into by the Government

April 24, 1973

with various suppliers. The Committee on Public Accounts, for whatever reason, chose not to address itself to the substance of this contract but, like the Provincial Auditor, to deal only with the form of it. Unlike the Provincial Auditor, Mr. Speaker, in the drafting of their report, they do not confine themselves to the terms used by the Provincial Auditor.

But let's take a look at the substance of a couple of contracts entered into when my friends in the Opposition were in Government in this province just a few short months ago. Now, Mr. Speaker, in that seven years that the Liberal Party was in office in Saskatchewan in the 1960's and up until June 23, 1971, many unfortunate things happened to the public service of this province. And it may well be, Mr. Speaker, that the Provincial Auditor of the day was not as vigilant as the Provincial Auditor of 1972 and 1973. Because, Mr. Speaker, I am informed and I am now going to document a case which is identical to the one which is the subject matter of the Provincial Auditor's report and which is the subject matter of the Public Accounts Committee report we are dealing with now. A case which goes back to 1969, Mr. Speaker, a contract for printing, in which there was a purchase order issued by the Queen's Printer which was silent as to the time of payment, a contract under which an advance or interim payment was made before the delivery of the goods. Let me just refer the Members of the Assembly to this. I am sure that I wouldn't need to tell those Members who were in the Government of that day about it. I am sure they are thoroughly familiar with it. But the Member for Albert Park was not in Government at that time so it is worthwhile that he learn about it and I am very glad to present this information to him.

Here in the early part of 1969, the Department of Industry and Commerce, the Tourist Branch, under the signature of Mr. Springstein, who was the director of the Branch, indicated that certain printing was needed. That is 500,000 copies of a park folder, five different folders but 500,000 in total. So he sent that over to the Queen's Printer, who in turn, under the date of February 24th, 1969, the Queen's Printer issued a purchase order to Midwest litho, 221 Somerset Block of Regina, asking for the 500,000 copies of park folders, five sets, estimating the cost at \$15,578.33. That, Mr. Speaker, was on February 24th, 1969, the purchase order went over. Midwest Litho, on March 26th, 1969 submitted a bill to the Queen's Printer and it is addressed to the office of the Queen's Printer at the Legislative building and it says:

18 sets of separation negatives for park folders, 135,000 sheets of satin coat offset.

The total for this with the education tax added was \$7,296.98. Now Mr. Speaker, at that time nothing had been delivered by Midwest Litho to any agency of the Government under this contract but they submitted an interim bill notwithstanding the fact that they had delivered nothing. That, Mr. Speaker, was on the 26th of March, 1969. On the very same day a voucher for payment was prepared and I see according to the stamp of the Treasury Department of that day, on March 31, 1969 the payment was made. It was paid to Midwest Litho, the suppliers.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in this particular case the final invoices were not rendered until May 30th, 1969. In total those final bills represented a request for payment of \$9,268.78. A voucher was prepared on June 6th, 1969. The total cost, including

the interim payment, in March of 1969 of over \$7000 and including the final payment in June, 1969 of over \$9,000, came to \$16,565.76. Mr. Speaker, there isn't the slightest bit of difference between the case with Midwest Litho, In 1969 and the case in 1971-72 with the Service Printing Company. Not the slightest but of difference. Purchase order sent out and nothing said about the time for payment. Interim bill rendered, agreed it should be paid, because after all the printer at that time has incurred expense for stock and supplies and for setting type, for other materials and for wages he has paid to people for doing work in pursuance of completion of the contract. The interim payment asked for in 1968, without the benefit of any formal contract whatever. Interim payment made by the Liberal Government of the day. And it apparently, as I say, did not occur to the Provincial Auditor of that day that that should be the subject of any comment.

I, frankly, welcome the fact that in 1973 the Provincial Auditor has made that kind of formality the subject of comment. I agree that the form as well as the substance of all contracts by the Government ought to be in order and I am glad to see that the Provincial Auditor is vigilant to see that that is done. But that is no support for the Member for Albert Park who tries to find in those two factual situations, one he know about and one he didn't know about, he tries to find in those factual situations something illegal, something that would give the Government apparently the right to get money back or worse still, as he suggests and accuses us, something criminal, some theft going on. Does he suggest for a moment that Midwest Litho was stealing money from the Government in that situation. How could that possibly be?

Well now, Mr. Speaker, let me take you to another time in 1969 and this story is going to take a little longer because it unfolds over four months and it isn't completed until just before the election in 1971. Now this is a situation involving the Department of Industry and Commerce requesting a film to be made by an outside supplier. This story begins, Mr. Speaker, with the preparation of a document, which I suppose some people might call a formal contract. This transaction I may say, for the benefit of the Members of the Assembly, is the subject matter of Questions and Answers in this Session No. 310, 311, 312. Those questions were answered just a week ago today on April 17th.

Now, in 1969, Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Government of the day, or at least the Deputy Minister of Industry of the Liberal Government of the day, signed a document dated May 23rd, 1969 which is headed 'Agreement' and says that this will constitute an agreement between Armadale Productions and the Saskatchewan Department of Industry and Commerce. It goes on to talk about a film, which is to be produced of approximately 25 to 30 minutes. It says the production cost to the client, that is the Department, is not to be less than \$25,000 and not to be more than \$30,000. That's on May 23rd, 1969. Now in this document there is a provision, Mr. Speaker, in this formal document, for interim payments and it says: "That upon the client's — that's the Department of Industry and Commerce — authorizing the producer — that's Armadale Productions — to proceed the producer is to be paid \$5,000. Upon approval of the script another \$10,000. The remainder upon delivery and approval of answer print." Now I want to point out to the Assembly just how far over those several months up to the time just before the election

of 1971, I want to point out just how far the Government of that day strayed from the terms of this so-called formal contract. Remember that the contract contemplates the production of a film of 25 to 30 minutes. It, of course, provides that upon authorization to proceed \$5,000 is to be paid. Well, as a matter of fact the contract was signed apparently on the 23rd of May 1969; an invoice for the \$5,000 was rendered on May 27th, a voucher was prepared on June 18th and a payment of \$5,000 was made on the 25th of June, 1969. Then, apparently on August 31st, 1969 there must have been a script which somebody approved of and so on that date, August 31st, Armadale Productions rendered another account and a voucher was prepared on September 19th and payment was made on September 23rd. I hope the Member for Albert Park will notice that between the date of the voucher and the date of the payment four days elapsed and it was \$10,000 that was paid.

Now it is true that it was in complete conformity apparently with the formal contract. Nothing wrong with the form of the contract and nothing wrong with the payment according to the form of the contract. I don't know about the substance of the contract. I don't know what script was approved at what time and in fact I am sure no one knows what script was approved because it never saw the light of any television screen or of any screen so far as a script for a single film was concerned.

Well, just to show you what happened, Mr. Speaker, let me quote from a memorandum prepared by Mr. Switzer who was then Director of Administrative Services in the Department. The memorandum was dated December 10th, 1970 and directed to the Hon. Mr. Estey, then the Minister of Industry and Commerce. A little later I am going to quote from a letter dated February 12th, 1971, signed apparently by on Bruce Cowie who identifies himself in the letter as Marketing Manager for Armadale Productions.

Perhaps it is important, Mr. Speaker, for the Members to know at this time just who Armadale Productions are. I understand, Mr. Speaker, that on March 24th, 1969, according to the records in the Provincial Secretary's office of the Registrar of Companies, on March 24th, 1969 a company called Phoenix Management Limited was registered here in the Province of Saskatchewan. The company didn't file an annual return for 1969 but on May 8th, 1970, Phoenix Management Limited changed its name to Armadale Enterprises Limited and Armadale Productions is the registered trade name of Armadale Enterprises Limited. I notice apparently the attorney who was acting on behalf of that company which changed its name and adopted a trade name, the attorney was one L. Robert Pierce. Members of the Assembly may be familiar with that attorney, that practitioner of law here in Regina.

According to the information available in the Registrar of Companies' offices, the shareholders of Armadale Enterprises Limited are Clifford Sifton of Toronto, Michael Sifton of Crombie, Ontario and T. A. Cookson, also of Toronto. According to the Returns they have the same directors in 1971, 1972 and 1973. Now I have had a look at the Directory of Directors for 1971 published by the Financial Post and I find that Mr. Clifford Sifton is chairman of a board of a company called Armadale Company Limited. He is chairman of the board of Armadale Publishers Limited, which publishes the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix. He is chairman of the board of Armadale Enterprises Limited, the company I just talked about that has been operating under the

name of Armadale Productions. He is chairman of the board of Armadale Communications Limited, which operates the television station in Regina, the radio station in Regina, another radio station in Winnipeg and another one in Hamilton. Of course, he is also chairman of the Leader-Post Limited, which publishes the Leader-Post. The other Director of this company, Mr. Michael Sifton, is president of all of those companies that I have listed. That includes, as I say, the Star-Phoenix, the Leader-Post, CKCK-TV, CKCK radio. But here now starting in 1968, just a couple of months before this contract is entered into the Department of Industry and Commerce, just a couple of months before that, the contract is signed, this new operation is organized and registered which becomes known as Armadale Productions.

Here is what happened to the film that was the subject matter of the contract. According to Mr. Switzer's memo dated December 10th, 1970 he refers to industry colour film and sets out the paragraphs in numbers:

1. The Department entered into an agreement with Armadale Productions on May 23, 1969 to produce a full sound and colour film on industrial development and tourism in the province. Film approximately 28 minute in length at a cost between \$25,000 and \$30,000.

Paragraph 2:

Payment totalling \$15,000 has been paid to Armadale up to the present time.

And he records payment in June of \$5,000 in 1969 and a September payment of \$10,000. And then he says, "Remainder is due in this fiscal year," and he is writing on December 10, 1970. In the meantime apparently the Deputy Minister who had signed the agreement resigned. Mr. Switzer goes on his report, Paragraph 3:

In June of 1970 the Department had certain reservations relating to the production of the film.

The reasons:

- (a) We had no ministerial authority to sign the contract.
- (b) We had no approved funds in our Estimates other than approval to produce a black and white one half hour film at \$5,000
- (c) It was felt that the story line in the previous approved script placed too much emphasis on departmental staff and its work rather than developing a picture of industrial progress and the benefits and amenities resulting from diversification.
- (d) The length of the film 28 minutes was too long.

Mr. Switzer goes on to report, under the heading, "Action".

- (a) We wanted the producer to cancel the contract and produce a short 15 minute or less film to fit into the amount of money already paid, \$15,000.
- (b) The producer advised that they would not allow us to cancel the contract.
- (c) It was then agreed: (i) we would get two films, 15 to 18 minute film on industrial development, a 12 minute film

April 24, 1973

on tourism; (ii) a new script would be written for both films.

Nothing said about that in the formal contract signed on the 23rd of May 1969 by the then deputy minister

I go on and quote from Mr. Switzer's memo:

(d) A departmental film advisory committee was set up and recommendations made to the producer.

(e) A new script was approved for the industrial film.

(f) A script for the tourism film was developed.

Results to date: (and he lists them):

(a) The answer print for the industrial development film will be ready for review before Christmas.

(b) The answer print for the tourist film will not be ready until after the Winter Games, each of the games to be included.

(c) Cost of the two films will be \$30,000 — estimated \$18,000 for the industrial film and \$12,000 for the tourist film.

Then under "Problems" he lists:

(a) We did not budget for the \$15,000 expenditure for this year.

(b) We did not budget for any kind of exposure for next year.

Then he goes on with his recommendations:

We tried to absorb costs this year by reducing expenditures approved for other projects. Virement or transfer of funds from one sub-vote or branch may be necessary.

For your information.

He signs it with his own signature.

Now, I promised the Members, and I know they wouldn't want to go to supper without hearing this, I promised the Members that I would read them something from the letter dated February 12, 1971 of the marketing manager of Armadale Productions, one Bruce Cowie. He writes to Mr. Switzer under that date. I won't quote all of the letter but there are a couple parts of the second paragraph that are very interesting. He said:

For your information may I recap our financial arrangement as it affects both films. The total cost of both productions is \$30,000. We have billed the entire amount as of December 31, 1970.

Mr. Lane: — . . . was a contract!

Mr. Thorson: — Well, that's right there was a contract. According to the contract the remainder of the payment was to be made upon delivery and approval of the answer print. But Mr. Cowie goes on in his letter and he said this:

The above figures include one approved release print per film. If it was the desire of your department to effect

a pay-out prior to receipt of the tourist film answer print, we would be prepared to accept the payment as the project is very near to completion. The total price for the two films . . .

He goes on and repeats the figures I have given. Now he is billing December 31, 1970 the whole amount. On February 12, 1971:

We are very near to completing the contact and making the delivery of the prints, but if you would like to pay us now we would be very glad to receive the payment.

No one apparently concerned in those days about contacts or what the terms were or what the budgets were. Now let me just recap what actually happened in terms of these payments. I have already set out that \$5,000 was paid in June of 1969; \$10,000 was paid in September of 1969. Now we go down to October 26, 1970. Another invoice is sent, voucher prepared, on that one, not until March 29, 1971. On March 31st of 1971 the payment is made of \$3,250. On December 31, 1970 another bill was rendered, at that time in the amount of \$10,500, but the voucher is not prepared until March 31, 1971. The payment is made on March 31, 1971 for \$10,500. The final invoice, Mr. Speaker, is rendered on April 30, 1971, the voucher was prepared on June 1, 1971, the payment was made on June 4, 1971 for \$1,297.30. Making a total payment, Mr. Speaker, of \$30,047.30.

Mr. Speaker, what happened to these films? Well, if you will take a look at the answers to the questions I referred to earlier you will see the fate of the films. One of the films, called the Challenge of Change, the so-called industrial film, was used in the election campaign of the Government in 1971 to bolster its faltering image on the question of industrial development. The tourist film, Mr. Speaker, has never been televised. We don't know what happened to that one.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have a little more to say and I particularly want to have something to say about the Member for Albert Park, but I see it is 5:30.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Assembly recessed from 5:30 o'clock p.m. until 7:00 o'clock.

Mr. Thorson: — Mr. Speaker, I had dealt at some length with the subject matter of the Public Accounts Committee report as it relates to the Department of Industry and Commerce. I dealt at some length with the statements made by the Provincial Auditor in his report. I have set out as clearly as I can the reasons why I say that when the advance payment which is subject matter of both reports was made the people responsible believe there was a valid and binding contract consented to and agreed to by the supplier and by the Government to pay for the goods. We believe that both the interim payment and the final payment were properly made. The Provincial Auditor has said there was, in his words, "no evidence of a formal contract." In that sense there was no proper authority apparently to make the payment.

I have pointed out and I am going to come back to that before I sit down that the draft report of the Public Accounts Committee does not accurately re-state the words of the Provincial Auditor in his report.

As I said when I began the only reason I have had to enter this debate at all and to deal with these matters at such length is because of the false accusations of the Member for Albert Park.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thorson: — Mr. Speaker, the Member for Albert Park by these false statements has done great damage. He has slandered me, he has slandered my colleagues in the Cabinet, he has slandered the members of the Public Service in the three agencies of the Government concerned with this transaction. He has made false statements to the discredit of all of us, Mr. Speaker, he has had to make the statements he made here which are false.

The Member for Albert Park is not like a bull in china shop, some people might suggest he is, but I suggest he is not like a bull in a china shop. Well, Mr. Speaker, one thing about a bull in a china shop is that he does physical damage and that's all the damage he does. Not so with the Member for Albert Park. One thing about a bull in a china shop is that kind of an animal is mature, is bold, is strong, acts openly. Not so, the Member for Albert Park. Where maturity is called for he is petty. Where boldness would be commendable he is cowardly. Where strength is needed he seeks to take an unfair advantage.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thorson: — Where he ought to act openly and aboveboard he acts sneakily behind the closed doors of the Public Accounts Committee when he had an opportunity, if he had the courage or the courtesy to go into these matters thoroughly, he does not. The reason he does not is because he wants to wait his opportunity so that in the sanctity of this Chamber, where he will be free from any legal consequences, he wants to make false statements to the discredit of myself, the Cabinet and the members of the Public Service.

I said, Mr. Speaker, he lacks maturity. How he is a new Member of the Assembly. There are new Members of this Assembly such as the Member for Gravelbourg (Mr. Gross), the Member for Assiniboia (Mr. Lange). They don't have as many years as the Member for Albert Park, but his extra years, Mr. Speaker, have done nothing for him. These younger men stand like giants compared to him.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thorson: — I said, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Albert Park is cowardly. Had he wanted the truth and all the facts he could have had me called by the Public Accounts Committee. He could have allowed me to face accusers, he could have let me cross-examine everyone who could shed any light on the questions raised by the Provincial Auditor's report. But if he had one that, Mr. Speaker, he would have been prevented from making this cowardly attack in this Chamber.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thorson: — I said he was weak in his conduct here. He makes accusations, Mr. Speaker, which have no basis in fact and no basis in law. One could perhaps excuse him if he did not claim to be a lawyer, but no self-respecting counsel worthy of that designation would, in arguing a case, ignore pertinent facts and distort other facts for the purpose of trying to make a case.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thorson: — Then he goes on from ignoring facts and distorting facts to making a legally indefensible accusation of civil wrong, of criminal conduct. I said he acted sneakily. He was careful in his statements in this debate to avoid quoting from my memorandum. I remind the Members again the memorandum said that I approved of a payment, an advance payment, and I emphasize the following words ‘on the contract’. It is a memorandum prepared and executed because I believed there was a contract just as the other members of the Public Service believed there was a contract. But apparently he hoped, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Albert Park, that he would not be detected in his deceit and his deception.

Mr. Speaker, I haven’t any great pleasure in having to say this about another Member of Legislature. I said that he has done great damage and he has, by his slanderous statements, false statements to discredit of members of the Public Service, to the discredit of Members of Cabinet, to the discredit of myself. But more than that, Mr. Speaker, he has done damage to the traditions of British Parliaments by resorting to this kind of false, cowardly attack on public servants, on Members of Cabinet. He slanders men without respect, not even with regard for the truth. He does it by deceit and by distortion.

Mr. Speaker, our language has a rich heritage of good literature, I wish I could express the depth of my conviction that the Member for Albert Park has done a great discredit to this province and to this Legislature.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thorson: — But perhaps I can call upon someone who is more eloquent than I am. Here is William Shakespeare in the play Othello.

Mr. Steuart: — Is he NDP?

Mr. Thorson: — Let me quote what he says which applies to the Member for Albert Park and to this situation. He says:

Good name in man and woman, dear my Lord,
Is the immediate jewel of their souls;
Who steals my purse, steals trash; ‘tis something, nothing;
‘Twas mine, ‘tis his, and has been slave to thousands;
But he that filches from me my good name
Robs me of that which not enriches him,
And make me poor indeed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Albert Park had to resort to falsehood and to deceit, made unfounded allegations of wrong

April 24, 1973

doing, of illegality; went further, made unfounded allegations of criminal conduct when he must have known that all of that was false. He could not, Mr. Speaker, have done it carelessly but did it deliberately.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the Assembly for giving me so much time to review in such considerable detail all of the pertinent facts surrounding this draft report of the Committee. I must say, while I endorse and support the Provincial Auditor's report on the basis on which he made it, I cannot support the Committee in misstating the words of the Provincial Auditor.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thorson: — I remind the House, again, that the Provincial Auditor was concerned about the formalities of the contract, about the technical form of the written documents. He never, for one moment, suggested that there was anything amiss about the substance of the contract. In the technical sense that there was something to be desired about the form of the contract, he made the statement that apparently an advance payment was made without proper authority. Unfortunately, the draft report of the Committee, which we are now considering, leaves out the full wording contained in the Provincial Auditor's report and says as though it were a fact stated by the Provincial Auditor, which it was not, that the payment was made without proper authority.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if the Committee is of that opinion then they could have said so in their draft report but that is not what the draft report says. The draft report of the Committee which we are now considering, purports to say that the Provincial Auditor said that the payment had been made without lawful authority. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it seems quite clear that this Assembly should not concur in the report of the Committee on Public Accounts for that particular reason.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thorson: — I emphasize again that I support the Provincial Auditor in his questioning of the technicalities and the formalities of contracts and calls for members of the Public Service to adhere to the technical requirements of the legislation in the Department of Finance Act. No one quarrels with that and if the Committee does say that it wants to see that kind of control followed, I agree with that. But no Members of the Assembly can agree with the misstatement of the Provincial Auditor's report as contained in the draft report of the Committee.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thorson: — Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I want to move, seconded by the Hon. the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow):

That the words "concurred in" be deleted and the word "received" substituted therefor.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. C. P. Macdonald: — (Milestone) Mr. Speaker, I have never heard

such unmitigated tripe in this House as I have heard in the last two hours. Mr. Speaker, the Member from Souris-Estevan quoted some poetry. I want to quote a little.

To be or not to be, that is the question,
Whether 'tis nobler in mind to suffer
The slings and arrows of outrageous fortune
Or to take up arms against a sea of troubles

And then the most important one:

Me thinketh he protesteth too much.

Mr. Speaker, I have never seen an occasion of a Member to attempt to whitewash an unanimous report, a report that was not signed by the Members on this side of the House. The Member who signed it and agreed to this unanimously was the Member for Touchwood (Mr. Meakes) and all the Members on that side of the House. Let me say, I want to see how the Members on the Public Accounts Committee stand up on that side of the House and support that particular amendment in an attempt to whitewash the thing.

And you know, Mr. Speaker, what he did to defend the actions was to take an attack against my colleague, the Member from Albert Park (Mr. McLeod). He said he was a sneak. Mr. Speaker, let me ask you, why did not the Member from Touchwood, why did not any of the other Members on that Committee stand up and invite the Minister of Industry to come to the Public Accounts and defend his position. And I'll tell you why. Because they were ashamed, they were ashamed of what he did, and they knew exactly what he did was wrong.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Industry and Commerce can stand up and make all the two-hour tripey speeches that he wants and there is no way he can whitewash the NDP preferential treatment to the NDP with public funds of the people of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, he said it did a damage to the British Parliamentary System. The only damage to the British Parliamentary System is a political party that will use public funds to promote their own self-interest. And that's the damage to the British Parliamentary System, and don't ever kid yourself.

Mr. Speaker, what is the issue here? The issue in this House tonight is whether or not the Government of Saskatchewan should use its power as the Government of this province to give preferential treatment to a printing press that is owned by their own political party to finance their own political machine at the expense of taxpayers and that's the issue here. Mr. Speaker, he talks about what it is. I want to tell you what it is. The reason that this particular thing is so important. I have here the printing orders received 1972-73 — \$39,730 was given to Service Printers without tender, Mr. Speaker, without tender. In 1971-72 — \$54,580 and two of those out of about 25 without tender. And they turn around, Mr. Speaker, and they the Minister of Industry and Commerce stands up . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! I must insist on a little more quiet. This talking across the floor and pointing fingers is not conducive to a good conduct of debate and I must ask Members to desist.

Mr. MacDonald: — The Minister of Justice, of all people, the Minister of Justice defending the Minister and seconding the motion to whitewash the NDP from a political scandal. And when my colleague from Albert Park says a theft, I say it's a theft of taxpayers' money, not by the Minister of Industry, but by the NDP and the NDP Government. A real theft, Mr. Speaker. Now he turns around, Mr. Speaker, and he says, "Well, let me ask you . . .

Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order. The Hon. Member accused the Government and all Members on this side of theft. And unless the Hon. Member can prove theft then I suggest that he withdraw that statement, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MacDonald: — Mr. Speaker, I don't know what you call theft, but when you turn around . . .

Mr. Smishek: — On a Point of Order again, to ask the Member to withdraw his allegation, an allegation which is unparliamentary accusation accusing everybody on this side of the House of theft.

Mr. Weatherald: — The Member for Milestone made the accusation against the NDP. According to the Premier, this afternoon, the NDP doesn't exist in this Assembly so the Minister of Health shouldn't have to worry.

Mr. MacDonald: — Absolutely! This afternoon, when placed in another compromising position, Mr. Speaker, where they had a deliberate plot and scheme, a nefarious scheme to distort the will of the people to elect a local government of the city of Regina, the Premier stood up . . .

Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Speaker, I ask you to make a ruling on that particular point that I raised. To accuse the Government and all the Members of this side of the House of theft and whether this is the parliamentary way of conducting business in this House.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! If I recall right, the Member said that he accused the NDP and the Members on that side of the House of theft. Will the Hon. Member sit down while I am speaking or I will adjourn the House until tomorrow. As I recall it, the Hon. Member said he accused the NDP and Members on that side of the House of theft. It is true that the parties can be stated but not Members and if the Hon. Member made that statement I wish he would withdraw it and continue with his debate.

Mr. MacDonald: — Mr. Speaker, there is no way that I would want to go against your ruling and I withdraw the Members of the House and just say the NDP. And, Mr. Speaker, there is just no question about it. When they turn around and deliberately channel almost \$100,000 to the Service Printing and then have the Minister of Industry get up here for two hours of tripe and justify it because of some apparent illegalities, I want to tell him there are probably hundreds of them but in this particular case the

Provincial Auditor pointed one out. And don't suggest that they are identical. A payment to an independent company and printer, a Saskatchewan company, a Regina firm which has done business and established a reputation of honesty and integrity in this province for years and say that's the same as channelling money into your own political pockets for your own re-election. Mr. Speaker, that is not the same. I say it was a shameful performance, a shameful performance to stand up here, not so much to stand up and defend the Minister of Industry because he's only the mouth-piece, he is only the spokesman, he is only the instrument of the whole Government. The NDP have stood up in this House for years and defended the channelling of public funds into the Commonwealth newspaper, they defended the channelling of public funds into Service Printing and now they stand up here, today, and channel a question of an illegal payment, an advance payment to look after the political necessities of the NDP. I say that is illegal, I say it is wrong. I say it is morally wrong and I say the people of Saskatchewan will judge you for it. And don't point the finger at the Member for Albert Park because he has a responsibility of bringing that to your attention and to the attention of the people of Saskatchewan.

What is the responsibility of the Public Accounts Committee? When the Auditor says, and let me quote. He says, you know, that was a formal contract. Let me quote:

And that appeared in this instance, Mr. MacLeod said. And you sent that requisition to the Queen's Printer which is in the Department of Government Services and the Department of Government Services, through the Queen's Printer, the agency of the Queen's Printer, then looked around and selected a company to do the job. Is that correct?

Mr. Switzer said:

Yes.

Then Mr. MacLeod said:

And they got a price on it. Did they then submit it to you before you made your final approval of the contract, if you call it a contract?

And then the Minister stands up here and says: "In my memo I mentioned the contract." And that's the very thing, even his own civil servant, his own administrative officer challenges his opinion of a contract. Where is the contract? Why don't you table it in the Legislative Assembly instead of talking about a formal contract? There was no formal contract and that was the responsibility of the Auditor of the Legislative Assembly in the Province of Saskatchewan to point that out that it was a wrongdoing.

Mr. Speaker, it was only a technicality and I am the first to admit it. If it hadn't been that it was the NDP political machine, the NDP Service Printers, where they took \$100,000 in the last two years and then they turn around and do you know what they do? They bring in a Bill, The Election Expenses Act, and they say that the Liberal Party, the Opposition in this province can only spend \$50,000 on an election platform and they channel \$100,000 in two years to their own political machine. And then

April 24, 1973

they stand up here and say morally and say that the Member is a sneak for bringing it to the public's attention, and saying that's a terrible thing. I say, Mr. Speaker, that I have seen some dishonesty. I have seen some political dishonesty and I say the offence of this afternoon and the offence of last night and the offence of this morning where they turn around and have a political, if you want to call it the Watergate Affair, I say this is far worse than the Watergate because it is a deliberate attempt not between political parties but by subterfuge to turn around and intimidate the mayor and the local council of the city of Regina, intimidation by organized phone calls of political hacks, and then they turn around and justify this standing up in this Assembly.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that's nonsense. We should like to examine and take the record of the Minister of Industry and what he had to say about the past records today and, therefore, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

MOTIONS

Additional House Sittings

Mr. Romanow: — (Attorney General) Mr. Speaker, I should like to move, seconded by the Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek):

That on Wednesday, April 25, 1973, and on each Wednesday until the end of the Session, Rule 3(3) be suspended so that the sitting of the Assembly may be continued from 7:00 o'clock p.m. until 9:30 o'clock p.m.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek):

That on Friday, April 27, 1973, and on each Friday until the end of the Session, Rule 3(3) be suspended so that sitting of the Assembly may be continued from 7:00 o'clock p.m. until 9:30 o'clock p.m.

Further:

Notwithstanding Rule 3(4), on Saturday, April 28, 1973, and on each Saturday until the end of the Session, the Assembly shall meet at 10:00 o'clock a.m. until 5:30 o'clock p.m.; that there shall be a recess of two hours at 12:30 o'clock p.m.; and that the Order of Business shall be the same as on Thursday.

Motion agreed to.

The Assembly adjourned at 9:34 o'clock p.m.