

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Fourth Session — Seventeenth Legislature**  
**51st Day**

Tuesday, April 16, 1974.

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

**WELCOME TO VISITOR**

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Before calling the usual proceedings I should like to advise the Members that we have a visitor here today who is seated down at the table, Mr. Doug Blain. He is the Assistant Clerk of the Council of the Northwest Territories, a visitor from Yellowknife. I hope that the Members will extend to him a welcome and permit him to sit with the other Clerks for a few moments before he goes on to his business here today.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. A.E. BLAKENEY (Premier):** — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I may on behalf of all the Members of the House join with you in extending a welcome to our visitor from Yellowknife and express our pleasure at his having visited with us to see our Legislature in action.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**REPORT OF SELECT STANDING COMMITTEE ON CROWN CORPORATIONS**

**HON. H.H. ROLFES** (Saskatoon Nutana South) moved, seconded by **Mr. G.B. Grant** (Regina Whitmore Park) the **First Report of the Select Standing Committee on Crown Corporations** be now concurred in.

**MR. A.R. GUY** (Athabasca): — Mr. Speaker, I should just like to say one or two words. I am not going to disagree with the content matter of the report, however, as a member of the Committee, a Member of the Opposition side of the House, I think it was very regrettable that the Committee met under a cloud for a good part of this session because of the fact that the chairman and certain Ministers involved with Crown Corporations and Members of the NDP Government saw fit to meet in private prior to the holding of the regular and the appropriate meetings of the Crown Corporations Committee.

These private meetings, as you know, are not in the spirit of the terms of reference of the Crown Corporations Committee. It is intended that both sides of the House should meet together and in front of the Press and in front of the public, discuss the matters that are related to each of the Crown corporations. It is our hope, on this side of the House, at least, that in future years the Minister involved and the chairman and the NDP Members will desist from this type of activity because it does nothing to enhance the reputation of the Crown Corporations Committee. In fact, it reflects on the integrity of every Member of this Legislature.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. J.G. RICHARDS** (Saskatoon University): — Mr. Speaker, I should like, too, to speak to this very briefly before we vote on this motion.

I think the most important point to be made is one that does not deal on any specific, but deals upon what are the attitudes of this House toward the review of the activities of its Crown corporations. I see some smiling faces on the Treasury Benches opposite and some of the Ministers who are smiling have been grilled by me as well as by other members of the Committee, I hope with some purpose and with some result.

I think what is failing in this Committee is that Members take the job seriously but get unsatisfactory answers. The Members take the job seriously of reading the annual reports, working out their questions and to which Ministers should be expected to provide the information to the Committee, to the public. We have corporations dealing in hundreds of millions of dollars of public debt; we have these as major institutions, larger by far than many of the departments which are regularly considered under Estimates, in the Committee of the Whole.

To that extent if dollars of sales, dollars of activity are important, these Crown corporations are embodiments of government policy. And yet time and time again there are no satisfactory answers to questions and the Government majority on the Committee assures us that the issues cannot be pursued. The Government Members seem to perceive their obligations on the Committee as getting through each of these reports as quickly as human ingenuity can achieve it.

I have to say with respect to Members on this side of the House, with rare exceptions, they too, have not fulfilled their job of digging deeply into what is the philosophy and what are the directions of the major Crown corporations. We start from elementary issues: What should be the rate of return on Crown corporations? What is the policy of the Government with respect to what kind of return we should like to have? I am not coming forward with any pat answers as to what I think should be the rate of return. We have Crown corporations ranging from losses incurred by the Water Supply Board of half a million annually, which constitutes an unwarranted subsidy to the potash industry primarily of this province. On the other extreme we've got the Saskatchewan Transportation Company earning a 30 per cent annual rate of profit on capital. What is the justification for having pricing policies of the Crown corporations which yield those wide divergencies of rates of return? Why should the potash companies be able to get away with their water resulting in a loss to the Provincial Treasury while the person who is usually poor, who travels with the Saskatchewan Transportation Corporation, its bus routes, is putting in a 30 per cent rate of return to the province.

The same thing could be said with respect to Saskatchewan Forest Products which on basic calculation of profit on equity is earning in the order of 40 per cent rate of return on equity. What is the policy of Saskatchewan Forest Products in terms of what it is about? Is it trying to maximize the rate of return in terms of throwing money into the Provincial Treasury or is it trying to act as a marketing agency to assure the maximum price for northern wood producers for their products?

These are the questions, Mr. Speaker, that the Crown Corporations Committee should be addressing itself to. These are the questions that when raised do not yield answers. One of the last Crown Corporation to be studied was Saskatchewan Forest Products, Mr. Speaker, and in the Crown corporation two or three pages of the annual report were turned over to extensive planning and research which was being undertaken by that corporation. I tried for at least an hour to extract from the Minister and from the officials who were there representing the Crown corporation what were the research projects which had been undertaken during the year under review. At first the Minister said he knew nothing but them. Either the Minister was not telling the truth or he was grossly uninformed about the nature of this Crown corporation. Finally it turned out that the official admitted to having heard rumors about large pulp mills to be built in Prince Albert at a cost of \$70 million; about 50 million or 100 million board feet sawmills in Prince Albert; about extensions of sawmills and possibly even a newsprint mill in Meadow Lake. These were major capital projects, total capital value amounting to \$180 million, approximately \$95 million of private capital and \$80 million of public capital were being considered. These were legitimate, major items which should have been discovered and should have been discussed in the Crown Corporations Committee, but repeatedly upon request for this kind of information the Government Members tried to stop the debate and Opposition Members wanted to move on to something else.

Mr. Speaker, I think that in order to, in some way, complete the report from the Crown Corporations Committee and given the magnitude of the projects involved it would be appropriate to table some additional information for the consideration of Members of the House with respect to Saskatchewan Forest Products and its undertakings. And accordingly before I take my seat and I profoundly do not agree in concurring with the nature of the report given to us, I should like to table for the benefit of the House, for consideration of the House, documents prepared by the Department of Natural Resources and by Saskatchewan Forest Products of the various capital projects totalling \$180 million involving in Hudson Bay, a sawmill, plywood mills, post-cutting treatments in Prince Albert, sawmill expansions, chip and saw and planer at Meadow Lake, various capital projects in Prince Albert, a hardwood pulpwood line to the order of \$70 million. I should like to see some discussion from the Government on what are the implications for these northern capital developments. We hear repeated rumors about there being over-cutting, based upon what are the Department of Natural Resources estimates but in the Crown Corporations rather than discuss the obvious inter-relation between the Saskatchewan Forest Products developments and the Department of Natural Resources allowable cut estimates, there was an attempt to cut off the debate as not being immediately relevant to Saskatchewan Forest Products.

But clearly the proposed developments of Saskatchewan Forest Products cannot be isolated and separated from the question of to what extent is the forest cut available to sustain on a sustained yield basis the projects which are being conceived. For example, in the eastern block with what one government report states to be a 210,000 white spruce cord annual allowable cut, 200,000 is already being used and the plywood mill will use another 60,000. If these figures are wrong I stand to be corrected by the Hon. Premier who is finally coming forward with some figures. I am delighted to have these figures. I trust that when I table this document, in response the Government will

come forward with what it perceives to be the relevant information with respect to these projects.

But in the Crown Corporations Committee itself none of this material was forthcoming and all we got was the murmured response from the chairman of the Saskatchewan Forest Products and officials, they said it was rumors. Rumors, I say, are a good deal more concrete when they come forward in details outlining annual cuts, outlining capital investments.

The second issue, Mr. Speaker, pertaining to these northern developments, apart from the question of the allowable annual cuts, is what kind of employment will be generated? If, as the indication is, that the majority in the order of 60 to 70 per cent is in mill employment, that is the kind of routine employment which will guarantee that 90 per cent based on experience of Papco and other large institutions, will be white, it will not be native employment.

There is serious question as to whether one should proceed with large capital intensive integrated operations at this juncture, bearing in mind the desperate need to create native employment. I don't want to deny that these projects do constitute a considerable improvement over what the Liberals argued in the middle 1960s. They argued, one large pulp mill in Prince Albert, we have a monster there, consuming the bulk of the softwood capacity, in the centre part of the province. They are arguing for another mill at Meadow Lake which would have done the same thing to the western third. But, Mr. Speaker, before we plunge into a hardwood mill, which would do in the hardwood species exactly what Papco has done in the softwood species, surely there is room for a lot more serious debate.

I tried to force this debate out in the review of the Saskatchewan Forest Products, under the Crown Corporations, but to no avail. The Members on both sides of this committee, the Minister responsible, the senior officials were not interested in discussing what were their plans for a \$500,000 cord annual pulp mill in Prince Albert. They were interested in discussing the \$7 million which had been spent in the previous year.

Clearly, Mr. Speaker, that is not good enough. As I take my seat I should like to table this information for the edification of Members of the House and my apologies to the Page for having to wait and listen for all this time.

**HON. E.L. TCHORZEWSKI** (Minister of Consumer Affairs): — Mr. Speaker, I should just like to make a few comments in a general way on this Report and its concurrence. I submit to this House, Mr. Speaker, that I don't think there was ever a cloud over the operations of the Committee. I think it will be agreed to by all Members who are members of the Committee on both sides of the House. I am a new Member of this House, first elected in 1971 and I am a new member in Crown Corporations. To me it is a new experience, but as I have sat on Crown Corporations since I was first elected, I have found that the operations of the Committee have been good and in particular this year, Mr. Speaker. The meetings were run very well. There were detailed discussions on many of the issues that were raised by the Members on both sides of the House, who asked questions of the Ministers and the Ministers came in well prepared to provide the answers that were asked of them. From time to time the answers were

certainly not immediately available and that, I think, is quite understandable but there was never any hesitation to have those answers provided a day later or whenever the next Crown Corporations meeting took place. So I think in that even the operations of the Crown Corporations Committee this year was a very good one and I think that is certainly exemplified by the fact that in this last meeting which we had this morning on a motion by the Member for Regina Whitmore Park (Mr. Grant) which every member of the Committee supported, a motion of congratulations to the chairman of the Committee, Mr. Rolfes, for the excellent job that he did as the chairman of that Committee.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — I want to take this opportunity to indicate, Mr. Speaker, that it is true that maybe the rules and procedures of Crown Corporations Committee or other committees, or in fact this Legislature as a whole, need to have some reconsideration. I, for one, personally believe that that may very well be the case. I think it was raised in Committee today, we discussed it and I think that at some time in the near future we should have a committee set up that will consider the rules under which we operate and bring them up-to-date to fit the modern situation. I will certainly have no hesitation in supporting, Mr. Speaker, that this report be concurred in.

**MR. D. BOLDT (Rosthern):** — Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few words. Members of the Committee on Crown Corporations on this side were criticized by the Member for Saskatoon University (Mr. Richards) and I take strong exception to that, that we were not sincere. I think that if there was an insincere member maybe the Member for Saskatoon University was one because I don't think that he attended 50 per cent of the meetings and whenever he did come he wanted to get some publicity and then walk off or bring his staff with him. All he does is preach socialism.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. BOLDT:** — I mentioned today in Crown Corporations that this motion not be debated. I am surprised to see myself on my feet because I didn't want to be involved in the debate and I didn't want to hear the Member for Saskatoon University preach another sermon to us. We hear of nominating conventions now and this is not the place for his argument. He has argued with the NDP caucus and he was kicked out because he couldn't convince the NDP that we should have total socialism. Now he is sitting on this side, he accuses us. Well, he has an opportunity and he'll never convince me that we should have socialism.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. BOLDT:** — There is an opportunity now, Members of both parties, at least the two major parties of the province, we have a few minor ones that are nominating and I suppose the NDP Waffle Group will be the minor one. He can go and nominate in every constituency and preach to the people and maybe some of them will vote for him and if the majority of them will vote for his party well then we will have socialism to the full extent. In Crown Corporations I don't think the Member for Saskatoon University has the right

to preach socialism, I call it communism. He can do that to the people of Saskatchewan if he has got enough supporters but the NDP aren't convinced that his philosophy is the right one, the Liberals aren't convinced, and every opportunity he has he preaches that gospel and I am just so filled up with it that I don't want to hear it again. I hope next year that he will attend less Crown Corporations meetings than he has done this year.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to.

### **WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**HON. E.L. TCHORZEWSKI** (Humboldt): — Let me try again, Mr. Speaker, I apologize for my enthusiasm a little earlier but I have a group of students who are here from a very fine community in my constituency and who are very fine students and I couldn't help my enthusiasm. I came late and was caught in not knowing exactly where we were. I had been to the Deshaye School, officially opening Highway Safety Week in Saskatchewan which I think all Members will agree is an excellent program to teach young people the safety needs of using automobiles in Saskatchewan on our streets and our roads, which unfortunately many of us adults failed to learn when we were of that age. I hope that when they take over from us they will set a better traffic record than we are setting at the present time.

But I got up, Mr. Speaker, to introduce to you some fine students from my constituency. They are 26 Grade Twelve students from Muenster High School, which is a very fine community located beside St. Peter's College. I know the Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) will know St. Peter's College well because in the days when they had a high school there they, from time to time, taught Notre Dame how to play hockey.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, the students are accompanied by their teacher, Mr. Roy Parker, and I should like to welcome them to this House.

Along with the students are a group of guests of theirs who are here from, I believe, St. Frederick High School in Drummondville, Quebec.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — They are students here under the Voyageur Program and I want to wish to them a very fine and exciting and worthwhile stay in the province of Saskatchewan. I was speaking to their chaperons, Fernand Chaput and Mrs. Chaput at which time they indicated that they had been here for four days. I should like to say to those students from Drummondville, bienvenue. J'espère vous avez une bonne journée en Regina.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. A. THIBAUT** (Melfort-Kinistino): — Monsieur l'orateur, pour les gens de la province du

April 16, 1974

Quebec je veut vous dire un bienvenue. Ça me fait plaisir de voir des enfants qui vient de la province d'ou mes parents sont venus. Mes parents vient du comté Rimouski, village du Bic. Nous vous souhaitons, une bonne journée ici a Regina et nous sommes contents de vous voir ici. Merci.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. J.G. RICHARDS** (Saskatoon University): — Je voudrais ajouter mes salutations aux étudiants qui sont venus du Quebec. Elles sont rares les occasions où je peux profiter de mon français, dans cette legislature. Il y a malheureusement beaucoup plus de députés qui parlent ukrainien que le français. Mais aujourd'hui si nos invités, de la belle province du Quebec, sont prêts à rester ici pour le reste de l'après-midi, je leur promets encore des serments socialistes.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. E.C. MALONE** (Regina Lakeview): — Mr. Speaker, I don't like to show off my knowledge of other tongues, so I'll keep my remarks in English.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MALONE:** — It is my pleasure, Mr. Speaker, as well to introduce to you and through you to the Assembly, 29 Grade Eight students from Davin School which is located in the Regina Lakeview seat. They are led here today by their social studies teacher, Mr. Short and their class president, Mr. Wimmer. They have had a short tour of the buildings and I understand they will be finishing this tour later. I will be meeting with them at another date to attempt to answer any questions they may have about today's proceedings. I hope they will find the proceedings both interesting and educational.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

## QUESTIONS

### BROILER CHICKEN MARKETING BOARD

**MR.E.F GARDNER** (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to ask a question of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer).

I have here a copy of a letter from the Broiler Chicken Marketing Board to a merchant in Maple Creek. And what they are doing in effect is threatening to seize his chickens. Now I am wondering if this is a new policy of the Board, I realize we've had the Board and legislation for some time, but is it a new policy to insist that these people have a permit before they sell chickens?

**HON. J.R. MESSER** (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, there are certain rules and regulations that have been laid down by the Broiler Board which have been approved by the National Product Marketing Council. The producers of broiler chickens in the province are then to adhere to those regulations because they have been advanced and agreed

to by the producers themselves. I cannot specifically reply to the situations that you make references to but I assume that it is action that has been undertaken by the Board, the producers, in regard to someone who is contravening the rules and regulations that they have decided on to apply to their industry.

**MR. GARDNER:** — I'll just ask a supplementary question. I think we'll all agree we don't want to start a chicken and egg war with Alberta. This letter indicated that they were going to check his store again and he would be subject to seizure and legal action if each one of these products didn't have a marketing sticker attached, a marketing permit. I wonder if this is going to apply all over the province, if the Minister could tell us, or is it just in border areas that this is taking place?

**MR. MESSER:** — As I said earlier, Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of the specific instance that the Member for Moosomin refers to. I think it would be best for me to investigate the matter and give him a more complete answer at a later time.

## CONDOLENCES

**HON. A.E. BLAKENEY** (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I want to move, seconded by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) the traditional motion of condolence, in this case in respect of a deceased Member of this Legislature, Frank K. Malcolm. I accordingly move, seconded by Mr. Steuart:

That this Assembly having just become aware of the passing of a former Member of the Legislative Assembly on June 19, 1973, records with sorrow and regret the death of Frank K. Malcolm, who was a Member of this Legislature for Milestone from 1944 to 1948. He was born in Toronto, Ontario in 1893 and received his education in London and St. Thomas, Ontario. He came west to Calgary where he worked as a plumbing engineer. He attended the first YMCA conference and from this conference he was chosen and served as a probation officer at the Alberta Juvenile Court from 1913 to 1914. He homesteaded at Aneroid, Saskatchewan. During this time he became a member of the Saskatchewan Grain Growers Association. He was also a member of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool from its inception. He was later invited into the ministry and gave both part and full time service for many years at several towns including Bracken, Neville, Vanguard, Riceton, Kisbey, Redvers as well as Aneroid while continuing farming and plumbing contracting.

Mr. Speaker, may I add a word or two in addition to the formal motion. I am advised that Mr. Malcolm who was the Member, as is indicated, for Milestone, died in Claresholm, Alberta last June. He was the son of John A. Malcolm and Mary J. Walton. He married Marjorie Henderson of Vanguard in 1947. He had three sons, Keith, William and John. Keith will be remembered by some Members of this House as the first air ambulance pilot in the mid '40s. Keith now lives in Vancouver and the other two sons, William and John, live in Claresholm, Alberta. Mr. Malcolm's lengthy career of public service particularly in the work of his church indicates his concern for people which characterized



his entire working life.

In recording its deep sense of loss and bereavement this Assembly expresses its most sincere sympathies with members of the bereaved family.

**MR. D.G. STEUART** (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to join with the Premier in paying a tribute to the member of the late Mr. Malcolm who served his community and his province and served in this Legislature, and pass along with the Premier and other Members of the Legislative Assembly, our condolences to the family of the late Mr. Malcolm.

**MR. C.P. MacDONALD** (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, I just want to join with the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition in expressing also my sympathy to the family of Mr. Malcolm. I did have the opportunity of meeting Mr. Malcolm very briefly and it was back in those days when my hockey team was beating the pants occasionally off St. Peters. I remember on one occasion we went down to Redvers and after playing the hockey game we were invited over to the home of Mr. Malcolm. Mr. Malcolm was at that time in the ministry in the community of Redvers. At that time I was not elected but I had become active in the Liberal Party and Mr. Malcolm explained to me that he was a former Member of the Saskatchewan Legislative Assembly. I remember him as a rather short, kindly man, very, very soft spoken. One of the things he told me, as he said, "I retired myself voluntarily in 1948 because I could never quite accept the bitter batter and the battles that went on across the House." He said, "I enjoyed the work outside the Legislature," but he said, "somehow I never really fitted into the hoi polloi of the battle within," but he said he did enjoy politics, he had very strong feelings about the social needs of the Province of Saskatchewan. I think he made a very important contribution in whatever walk of life he was in. I do want to pass on my sympathies to his family.

**MR. BLAKENEY**: — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Steuart:

That the resolution just passed together with the transcripts of oral tributes to the memory of Mr. Malcolm be communicated to the bereaved family on behalf of this Assembly by Mr. Speaker.

Motion agreed to.

## ANNOUNCEMENT

### PURCHASING OF FURTHER IPSCO SHARES

**HON. K. THORSON** (Minister of Industry and Commerce): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I should like to inform the House that the Government of Saskatchewan and Interprovincial Steel Pipe and Steel Company have entered into an agreement which will give the Government of Saskatchewan an option to purchase a further 135,200 shares in the company.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS**: — Hear, hear!

**MR. THORSON:** — When the Government exercises this option it will have the effect of giving the Government of Saskatchewan an equal interest in IPSCO with the Government of Alberta and Slater Steel Company. The Saskatchewan agreement with IPSCO commits the company to proceed immediately with applications to the Federal Department of Regional Economic Expansion on the following proposed developments:

1. The construction of an ore reduction plant in the Province of Saskatchewan .
2. An expansion of the company's present electric furnace facilities in Regina.
3. An expansion of IPSCO's rolling facilities in Regina.

These expansions will raise the production capacity of the company in Regina from the present 600,000 tons to 850,000 tons of steel annually.

It will also, of course, result in further expansion of the other side of the plant after the basic steel has been produced. The investment will enable IPSCO to greatly expand its operations in the province and this arrangement fits in with the earlier arrangement made between the Government of Saskatchewan and the Federal Department of Regional Economic Expansion for the expansion of the iron and steel industry in the Province of Saskatchewan.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. D.G. STEUART** (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, in commenting on the announcement by the Minister (Mr. Thorson) IPSCO has become a strange hybrid — starting out as an English private enterprise corporation, or whatever Slaters is . . .

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — No, no.

**MR. STEUART:** — Oh, they're not. They are what?

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Sochilists! (sic)

**MR. STEUART:** — An NDP Government and a so-called Conservative Government. I think it's only the genius of Mr. Turvey and his executives that could make this strange mixture work and I wish him well. He'll need all the well wishes that he can get in the months ahead to try to untangle this situation and keep one step ahead of the NDP in Saskatchewan and the Government in Alberta. I don't know whether they will continue this mad little gamble. I presume Mr. Turvey hopes they will, as I presume some one is enjoying selling those shares, at whatever prices they are.

However, if it results in making the steel mills stronger, IPSCO stronger, and making sure it stays in Saskatchewan, we welcome it. I am not sure that it does but if it does we welcome that and we look forward to hearing a great many more details about the tremendous expansion that we are being threatened with

April 16, 1974

by both the Federal and Provincial Government. I just suggest that the 1,700 people who are to be put to work not hold their breath for a day or two at the rate we are going.

**MR. J.G. RICHARDS** (Saskatoon University): — Mr. Speaker, in responding to the statements made by the Minister of Industry and Commerce (Mr. Thorson) I would like to state first, I trust, and this is a general philosophical statement, that we are not going to see . . .

**MR. T.M. WEATHERALD** (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order, my understanding is there is allowance of one response to an announcement by the Government.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — That has been the usual rule of this House, that the Minister makes a statement, the Opposition makes one counter-statement. I think we were getting away from that. It puts the Chair in an awful position.

**MR. WEATHERALD:** — I suggest, Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order, that should all Members be allowed a response we will all exercise that prerogative.

**MR. RICHARDS:** — Mr. Speaker, I was using the precedent that I felt we established with respect to the Premier's statement on the return from the first Ministers' Energy Conference in which the Leader of the Opposition spoke and then I spoke and you construed my remarks to be a comment in response to a ministerial statement to the House.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — On that particular occasion the official Opposition spokesman spoke. The Member for Saskatoon University spoke and started to ask questions and I ruled at that time that there was only one statement, one reply and questions to other statements were definitely out of order and I think we must follow that or as the Member for Cannington says, we are going to have 52 speeches on every statement. So I will have to rule that way at this time, that there is no further statement.

**MR. RICHARDS:** — You are ruling that I cannot make a statement or ask a question at this time?

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Yes, I am. The Member can do it in Estimates under the department concerned.

**MR. STEUART:** — Mr. Speaker, on your ruling, if the official Opposition ever decides to let the Member for Saskatoon University be our spokesman, we will give you about 172 hours notice I can assure you.

### **ROYAL ASSENT**

At 3:27 o'clock p.m. His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor having entered the Chamber, took his seat upon the Throne and gave

Royal Assent to the Bills presented to him.

### **MOTION FOR FURTHER ESTIMATES**

**HON. W.A. ROBBINS (Minister of Finance):** — Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill No. 109:

An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of Money for the Public Service for the Fiscal Year ending the 31st day of March, 1975,

be now read a second time.

Motion agreed to.

### **MOTIONS FOR RETURNS**

#### **RETURN NO. 180**

**MR. D.W. MICHAYLUK (Redberry)** moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 180 showing:

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

He said: Mr. Speaker, Motion for Return No. 180 appeared in the Blues on the 10th of April in a form of a simple question that I had put for this Legislature. It was converted by this House to a Motion for Return debatable. My question was very simple.

I requested this for a very simple reason. A day prior to my submitting that question, the Hon. Member for Elrose (Mr. Owens) showed me a pamphlet that he had received in his constituency titled "Under the Legislative Report," Opposition Office, 259, Legislative Building, Regina, April 1974. A very impressive front — it has the picture of the late Premier Thatcher on the left hand side of this report. It also has a very nice looking picture of our smiling Premier on the right hand side, Hon. Allan Blakeney. This was sent, I presume, from the office of the Leader of the Opposition to inform the people in the Elrose constituency as to the state of the Premier's office as it existed in 1971 under the late Premier Thatcher and as it now exists under the present Premier, Hon. Allan Blakeney.

I went home on the weekend and I found that this was not only sent into the Elrose constituency, it also made its appearance in my constituency, the Redberry constituency. So I took it as a point of fact that the Leader of the Opposition is interested in several constituencies. I went to the town of Blaine Lake on Saturday and my dad says, "Dick, I received this from the Leader of the Opposition. You tell him to stop bothering me."

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MICHAYLUK:** — So this was the purpose of my placing the two questions. I have since received an answer to the first question. The question reads as follows, Mr. Speaker. And with your permission may I read it to the Hon. Members of this Legislature.

The question was:

Mr. Michayluk asked the Government the following question which was answered by the Hon. J.E. Brockelbank. Did Government Services pay postage under free mailing privileges for the Leader of the Opposition for more than 25,000 pieces of mail in the weekend of April 5? If so, (a) what was the cost of the postage paid by the Government Services, (b) how many pieces of mail was sent out this Session under the free mailing privileges, and what was the cost of the postage paid by the Government Services?

**MR. MacLEOD:** — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order. I observe that the Hon. Member is speaking with respect to a question which has already been answered in the House. The point I should like to draw to the attention of the Speaker is that I would presume, and I should like my presumption to be verified or denied, that the Opposition and other Members of the House will be allowed equal latitude in dealing with this particular subject, if and when the occasion requires.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I would say when a Member is using a question and answer that they had on a previous occasion they must tie it in with the motion that is before us. If it is not related or tied into the motion before us, then it is out of order, but the Speaker has no knowledge as to whether it is out of order or not until these statements are made. But it must be tied in with the motion that is before us, otherwise it is definitely out of order.

**MR. MICHAYLUK:** — Well, the answer to the first part of that question, Mr. Speaker — and I want to thank you for your ruling — is yes. The Leader of the Opposition's office did mail more than 25,000 copies on April 5. At what cost? \$854.31. Question (b) how many pieces of mail had been sent out this Session under the free mailing privileges and what was the cost of the postage paid by Government Services? The answer to that part of the question, Mr. Speaker, was 65,683 pieces were sent out at a cost of \$2,587, to date, that is April 16, 1974.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MICHAYLUK:** — What also prompted me to place this question on the Order Paper, Mr. Speaker, was because I have had some experience with the Party opposite when they were in Government.

Hon. Members who are here in this Legislature will recall that at that time there was supposed to have been a number of cars lost of which the Government, presumably the CCF or the NDP Government had no knowledge. As a matter of fact the then Minister of Public Works, the Hon. Lionel Coderre had found the car on the Legislative grounds. In their Saskatchewan Liberal paper, Mr. Speaker, they said that it was a Ford car, "Lost Ford" I can recall, it was in bold headlines in the Saskatchewan Liberal.

I made it a point to make an enquiry through the same channels that I am doing presently and I placed a question on the Order Paper asking: "What was the make of the car? The Model? The year and the serial number?" The answer that I received, Mr. Speaker, as Hon. Members who are here will recall, was that they had no knowledge of the car, it was one of those phantom cars, it was there but they didn't see it. Yet an item appeared in The Saskatchewan Liberal about a lost car.

I got concerned when I started to closely scrutinize this little pamphlet and, of course, this pamphlet is used I suppose for comparative purposes from the financial aspect. On the front page of this Legislative report we have a caption with the late Premier Thatcher and presumably the staff that he employed in his office. According to this report they numbered eight. The total expenditure for the Premier's office was an amount of \$46,919. But when you shift over to the right Premier Blakeney is given a larger caption on the front page of this report, "Premier's office under the NDP Government March 1974." I didn't count the number of people that presumably, according to the Leader of the Opposition's office are currently employed in the Premier's office, but the amount that is expended for the personnel which are presumably working in the Premier's office amounts to \$466,730.

I have been here now for 14 years, and some of the names that are listed on this Legislative report by the Leader of the Opposition's office, I know these civil servants. Some of them I know for certain are not connected with the Premier's office but with the Executive Council.

Let's take for instance, the first one, there are a few that I know and I know that they are definitely employed in the Premier's office, but the first name that I want to use, Mr. Speaker, is the name of Don McMillan.

I remember Don McMillan, if this is the same Don McMillan that the Leader of the Opposition makes reference to; he was acting electoral officer for several months. I am also aware that he has left the Province of Saskatchewan in September 1973 to further his education in eastern Canada.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MICHAYLUK:** — So this is one. I went down the list further, Mr. Speaker, and, of course, I presume that like Robby Burns once said the best laid plans of mice and men aft gang agley, and I hope this goes real agley. This was sent out to be intentionally misleading and is riddled with inaccuracies.

May I use another name, Mr. Speaker, R. Meldrum, who according to the Leader of the Opposition is working in the Premier's office. Well I know Mr. Meldrum and I know that he is with the Attorney General's Department. He is a constitutional advisor. He has nothing to do with the Premier's office. Then we have another name, W.H. Horner. I presume this is the gentleman who was the Deputy Minister of Agriculture for many years in this province. And he is now employed in a different capacity. He is not with the Premier's office. He is now with the Rail Rationalization Program, he has no connection with the Premier's office. Then we come to Mr. A. Svetkov. Mr. Svetkov, I am given to understand is not at all connected with the Premier's office. He worked in the Department of Industry and Commerce and

April 16, 1974

he was also on the Small Business Committee.

These are some of the reasons, Mr. Speaker, why I placed that question on the Order Paper. I hope that I am given in this Motion for Return as I am requesting, where these people are employed, whether they are presently in the employ of the Provincial Government, if so, where are they employed.

I think that it is material like this that is intentionally used to mislead, to falsify . . .

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MICHAYLUK:** — — to misinform. And, Mr. Speaker, may I warn the Leader of the Opposition and the few gentlemen that are left there since the 1971 election, that were here prior to 1971, that this type of information will not get you to first base.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MICHAYLUK:** — This is misleading, this is put out with the purpose of falsifying and misinforming the people of Saskatchewan and they have had enough of your propaganda.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MICHAYLUK:** — They showed you what they thought of your propaganda in 1971. And come next election there will be a few more of you gentlemen booted out.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MICHAYLUK:** — Just in glancing over this report, I don't want to take up too much time of the House, but I just want to make one particular reference to the inaccuracy, just one more inaccuracy and that is, two Liberal MLAs are shown on page two of this Legislative report, one I can't detect, but I can read the name, one is John Gardner, MLA for Moosomin, agricultural spokesman. And Jack Wiebe the MLA for Morse, his face is not so clear here, there is a blot here because this is a photostatic copy, but I presume in the original report it looks different. The title of this, what I call misinformation and intentional inaccuracy is, "Land Bank Refuses to Sell."

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MICHAYLUK:** — I suppose he makes reference to the land which the Land Bank Commission has bought since the inception of the Land Bank Commission and has leased out to various lessees in the province and now they refuse to sell.

Well, the Hon. agricultural critic must be aware, Mr. Speaker, that the regulations of the Land Bank Act say, that they will sell the land to lessees. We have stated over and over again that lessees will have the option of purchase after they have held lease for five consecutive years.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MICHAYLUK:** — The Hon. Leader of the Opposition knows that there isn't any Land Bank Commission land that has been under lease for a period of two full years, because it is only a little over a year ago that the Commission commenced purchasing land from the farmers. So that any lessee who is currently holding land or leasing land from the Land Bank Commission does not yet qualify for purchase.

May I, Mr. Speaker, with your permission read Section 21 of the lease which makes a specific reference to the sale of leased land. I quote from a portion of the lease:

Where the land has been leased to the lessee for at least five years and the lessee is domiciled in Saskatchewan, the Commission may upon application sell the land to the lessee at its market value at the commencement of this lease or the then market value whichever is higher, payable in cash within six months.

Mr. Speaker, this same information could be derived from Section 18 and 19 of The Land Bank Commission Act. Section 60 of The Land Bank Act refers to matters that are subject to appeal. Any decision made by the Commission under Section 18 is appealable by a person aggrieved by the decision of the Commission. Section 26 of the Land Bank regulations says precisely the same as Section 21 that a lessee may purchase land after he has leased land for five years.

**MR. GUY:** — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order. I would ask the Hon. Member to tell us where in the motion that we are debating the Land Bank is mentioned in any place, form or shape. I think, Mr. Speaker, you should call him to order and have him stick to the motion that is under debate.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I would have to agree with the Hon. Member, the debate is getting far away from what I can read in this motion. It is difficult for me to rule on things when I don't know what it is they are trying to tie it into but it isn't even tied.

**MR. MICHAYLUK:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank you for your ruling and I will bring this to an abrupt close. There are exceptions to the rule and the exceptions where land will not be sold is when it is required by the Government for a community pasture, by the Department of the Environment, by the Department of Natural Resources for wildlife habitat or for other reasons. But, Mr. Speaker, might I remind these gentlemen and they are getting pretty edgy, oh yes, they are on edge. You are not going to prevent me from saying this to the people of Saskatchewan when I get out of this Legislature, nor any Member sitting on their side. The truth shall and will be known. It is material of this type, Mr. Speaker, that I take offence to and I hope that when the Motion for Return is given that I will be able to judge this on the basis of the return that I get. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I will move this motion.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. D.G. STEUART** (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I find this



rather interesting, especially when he says, "employed in the Premier's office." I don't know whether they allow the Member for Redberry into the inner sanctum of the Premier's office but if he looked in the Premier's office I think the only guy he will find employed in there is probably the Premier. The point of this is, who works under the Premier? Who works in an advisory capacity to the Premier? Who works for the Executive Council? And as a matter of fact the Member is right, this is not accurate. I have to agree it is not accurate. Because we find out in a question just answered for us today that there are even more people employed in the Premier's office. Monday, April 15th, question by myself:

Is Betty Montgomery an employee in the Executive Council? For the information of the Member who just sat down, the Executive Council is the Premier's office. The Premier is the presiding officer of the Executive Council and Mr. Romanow doesn't understand this either obviously.

Now, let's see, now I have another one. Mr. Steuart asked the Government the following question, which was answered by Mr. Blakeney:

- (1) Is Bruce Lawson an employee in the Executive Council?
- (2) If so, what is his position and his salary?

Yes, he is a Cabinet press officer, 18 years with the media. I asked another question of Mr. Blakeney and he answered. Isn't it peculiar Mr. Blakeney would answer these questions just as we got this information, if these people were not employed directly under his supervision, answerable to him?

Is Paul H. McNeil an employee in the Executive Council? And the answer is, yes, seconded from the Federal Government. How much does he receive? Answer: \$23,000 per annum. He is paid by the Provincial Government.

Now, we asked another question: Is Max Wolfe Rubin a Research Officer in the Chief Electoral Office? We will leave that one out, he is not in the Premier's office.

Now, let's look at some of these others, I've got the Estimates here. Mr. Meldrum. You mentioned Mr. Meldrum. Well, Mr. Meldrum is employed in the Executive Council.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — No.

**MR. STEUART:** — Well, then he's changed according to this Estimate. We'll ask this when it comes up under the Executive Council. This is the information we got, this is the information we got from Orders-in-Council, that he was in fact employed by the Executive Council. Did you say that is not where the money to pay this man comes from?

**MR. ROMANOW:** — I am saying it comes from me.

**MR. STEUART:** — Well, you've got him listed here. Let me ask another question, Mr. Speaker, and, very interesting, they haven't answered this yet. We asked them to give us the names of the personnel in the Planning and Research. Now that is under the

Executive Council. There are 21 of them, 21 people employed in the Planning and Research personnel service. We haven't got them in here, so this shouldn't be \$466,000, it should be more than that. How much are they paid? They are paid \$274,000. Now, I admit there might be the odd one on here that is updated and is not there now. As a matter of fact there is the odd one here and they are pretty odd some of these persons that are on here, I can tell you. Some of the oddest birds I have ever seen. There are some of them that I wouldn't be surprised if they stood up on that side of the House and said they were not here. I wouldn't be surprised at that at all. I wouldn't be surprised if they said Brian Coulter isn't here. I don't think he is about seven months out of the year. He's down fighting and losing an election somewhere. I don't hear them suggesting that Wes Bolstad, that Jack Kinzel isn't there, that Roy Borrowman isn't there. Let's look at their salaries — \$25,900 for Wes Bolstad; Jack Kinzel \$27,200; Roy Borrowman \$21,300. Well, just take those three, those three alone, \$74,000, just for three employees. That is almost double the total salaries that were paid out for all the planners, all the secretaries working in the Premier's office and under the Premier in the Executive Council when we were the Government of Saskatchewan.

And so they may pick out the odd one and they may have played a little bookkeeping after we exposed this to the public and we know it stung them because they brought it up and they are going to make a big issue of it. They may have played a little bookkeeping and a few games and pulled a few out but if they tell the whole truth, it won't be just \$466,000, the whole truth is it is probably closer to \$600,000 paid out to Executive Assistants and planners.

**MR. MacDONALD** (Moose Jaw): — We'll have to . . .

**MR. STEUART:** — Well, I think we will. I am sure we will because we are just getting the latest information now. So I hope that the Members debate this and they continue to debate it and I hope they bring it to the attention of the people all over Saskatchewan because they should be very interested in this. You know, when you stand up and you tell the people of Saskatchewan that that Government is squandering their tax money like never before in the history of this province; when you tell them you are spending at least \$900 million, they can't really believe it. Nobody can understand \$900 million. It is too difficult, it is too large a sum. But when you hold something like this up at a meeting, you hand it out and they look at it and they can look at these people, some of them whom they know, and they can see the kind of salaries they are getting. Then they know that some of these people getting \$12,000 and \$20,000 a year are excused at a moment's notice, publicly, they boast about it, to go fight elections in British Columbia, or Nova Scotia. I don't know how many are down in Prince Edward Island. I hope they haven't got too many or they will sink the little island and they won't elect any NDPs I can tell you that. When they find this out, it gives them some grasp, some small grasp of the waste and extravagance and political morals of this Government across there, the amount of money that they are spending of the taxpayers' money for one effort only, to enhance their own political reputation.

So, Mr. Speaker, this particular motion that's on the books is just an admission of their guilt. Just an admission, and while

they may come back and say, this fellow is gone and that particular girl has gone somewhere else, that may be true. But when we update this, and we will update it. So, Mr. Speaker, I think that they are dead right. They are dead and they are right when they say that this is misleading, because it is. It doesn't tell the whole truth. We haven't been able to get the whole truth of all the people employed in the Executive Branch yet. When we get it we will be forced to put out another pamphlet because that's our job. The member says, the truth shall come out and believe me it shall come out.

As for when he strayed to the subject of the Land Bank — of course I would never think of doing that on a motion — Mr. Speaker, he hung himself with his own words, when he read that part of the regulations which says, "The land may be sold." May, m-a-y, not shall be sold but may be sold. And again I predict to the people of this province that there won't be enough land sold under the Land Bank to raise much wheat or oats or barley if that Government by any mischance is ever returned to office.

So, we welcome the information and I just hope at the same time that the Government would be prepared to give us the information we want about the Executive Council and the Planning and Research group so, in fact, the next time we put out a pamphlet like this we can give them all the facts.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. E.L. COWLEY** (Minister of Mineral Resources): — Mr. Speaker, I listened with a great deal of interest and some shock and amazement to first the speech by the Hon. Member for Redberry, which laid out the document with the Leader of the Opposition had sent out, and then later on the attempt by the Leader of the Opposition to cover up the very erroneous information that his Office was sending out. Now like it or not the Leader of the Opposition tried to make a point in his pamphlet and then when he found out that the information was all wrong, he just ignored it and said, oh, well, it must be somewhere else. You know it is very interesting the way they went about it, when they were looking at the Liberal Government under June, 1971, they looked at the Premier's office. That's all that went in. They headed it the Premier's office.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — They had all the guys hidden away.

**MR. COWLEY:** — Yes, the Attorney General says they had all the guys hidden away, but they did not even include all the other members of the Executive Council. But when they came to March, 1974, they headed it "Premier's office," but what they meant was Executive Council, so they used Premier's office for the Liberals and only the Premier's office and not all of them. Then on the other hand they used the heading the "Premier's office" again, but the people they excluded were from the Executive Council. They included, for example, one person I know, Mr. G.J. Darychuk, Greg Darychuk. To the best of my knowledge he has never worked in the Premier's office or in the Executive Council. I can say that he certainly wasn't working there in March, 1974. Now some of these other people I don't know, Mr. Meldrum, for example. The Leader of the Opposition says Mr. Meldrum is in

Executive Council. Well, all you have to do is look on page 36 of your Estimates, Constitutional Secretariat, Personal Service, etc. Total for Constitutional Secretariat, dot, dot, dot, for the information of the Members opposite, that means nothing.

**MR. STEUART:** — I got lost on the second dot.

**MR. COWLEY:** — Two stars beside it and I know the Leader of the Opposition has stars in his eyes, but he missed these, and it says: "This sub-item is included in the Attorney General in 1974-75."

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. COWLEY:** — Mr. Speaker, Don McMillan, Special Assistant to the Premier, the Member for Redberry pointed out he has been at University since last September. He certainly wasn't in the Premier's office and he isn't in the Premier's office in March of 1974. Mr. Speaker, in February of 1974 he wasn't in the Premier's office either.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the Opposition has blatantly attempted to distort these figures. It is a pure political ploy on the part of an Opposition which has got nothing better to offer the people of Saskatchewan in place of criticism. They have a page headed, "There is too many staff in the Premier's office." If you read through this little pamphlet, they have nothing at all to offer the people of Saskatchewan in the way of policy. They are bankrupt in policy, Mr. Speaker.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. COWLEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I want to take a look at these figures, I want to see how many people there were in Executive Council in June of 1971. I want to take a look at these figures, I want to see how many people are in the Premier's office in March of 1974, so that we have comparable figures. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

Debate adjourned.

## **STATEMENT BY MR. SPEAKER**

### **REGULATIONS RE: MOTIONS**

**MR. SPEAKER:** — In principle every Member of the Assembly has a right to discuss any question in accordance with the rules and usages. Rule 40 of the Rules and Procedures of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan 1970, page 29 states:

All motions shall be in writing, and seconded, before being proposed from the Chair. When a motion is seconded it shall be read by Mr. Speaker before debate.

In Erskine May's Parliamentary Practice, Eighteenth Edition, page 368, the point is made that:

A Member called upon to move a motion may speak in its favor before he actually proposes it. But a speech is only allowed upon the understanding, first, that he speaks to the motion; and, secondly, that he concludes by proposing his motion formally.

A Member when he submits a notice of motion is indicating that he complies with the rules of the Assembly regarding motions. It is within this understanding in the Assembly that after a Member has given a notice of motion, he will conclude his speech by formally moving his motion and will provide the name of the seconder.

Standing Order 43 of the House of Commons (Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, Fourth Edition, page 161) maintains that:

All motions shall be in writing, and seconded, before being debated or put from the Chair.

The Member, by not having a seconder, is not complying with the rules regarding motions; therefore, although he may be speaking to a matter he feels is important, he is not proposing a motion. Moreover, by not formally moving a motion for want of a seconder, he is denying the Assembly the opportunity to debate the matter because it drops from the Order Paper.

The Assembly has also been lenient with Members regarding Standing Order 48(3) of the House of Commons (Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, Fourth Edition, page 162) which states:

No member shall have more than one notice of motion at a time on the order paper.

This rule does not apply to notices of motions regarding questions and returns. The Chair finds that it would be impossible to continue such tolerance if Members continue to abuse the rules.

That is the end of my quotation. Now, the other day we had four motions on the Order Paper by one Member. One was taken off, and another one is added. I have looked this over carefully, while the House had agreed the other day, three of them had been stood, unless the House takes objection under that rule which I have quoted to the Members, I will let those three stand, but Resolution No. 27 which was added to the list, at this time I declare it to be out of order under that rule, but can be added later when the Order Paper is clear. The reason for that ruling is quite clear so that all Members have the right to get motions on the Order Paper and no one, two or three, by working together can plug the Order Paper. So I rule No. 27 out of order.

## **RESOLUTIONS WITHDRAWN**

### **RESOLUTION NO. 21 — PRIMROSE AIR WEAPONS RANGE**

**MR. J.G. RICHARDS** (Saskatoon University): — Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your ruling and I do not intend at this juncture to offer any challenge thereto, however, the relevant rule which you cited I was informed of only

yesterday, Rule 48 which was a 1927 ruling in Beauchesne Page 162, paragraph 48. I should appreciate it if you would allow me the discretion to permit one or more other motions to drop in order that No. 27 could be potentially debated.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Once the other three motions are disposed of, either dealt with, dropped or withdrawn then this one could be resubmitted. It can be resubmitted. It does not kill it for all time, it is just removed from the Order Paper until the others are dealt with. But if the Member wishes to drop the others, withdraw them or once they have gone into the Adjourned Debates then another motion can be introduced.

**MR. RICHARDS:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, in that case when Motion No. 1 is called, as it has been, I should like to allow it to drop.

Motion withdrawn.

### **RESOLUTION NO. 23 — CONSTRUCTION OF A MACKENZIE VALLEY PIPELINE**

**MR. RICHARDS:** — Mr. Speaker, this Motion stands in the same category.

Before I proceed with the same procedure on asking it to be dropped, I should like to make a request that a Member opposite be willing to second this motion, inasmuch as again I have been through the ranks of both the Liberals and the NDP, trying to seek a seconder on this Motion which is obviously of major importance. It corresponds with the official NDP policy at the federal level. They have refused, to date, to find a seconder. I had hoped that during the course of making a speech I should be able to solicit a seconder.

I interpret your ruling to mean that despite the somewhat ambiguous statements in Beauchesne and Erskine May, on the question of moving a motion without having a seconder, you have interpreted that it is out of order. That to make a speech in the attempt to secure a seconder, albeit, standing Order. No. 12 of the British House of Commons does allow that motions that required formally to be seconded, need not be seconded except on formal occasions. Certainly our rules in the House are quite explicit, Rule No. 40, that a motion must be seconded before it can be formally put and debated. Your ruling today has quite explicitly been that I cannot speak to a motion unless I have a seconder at the time when I speak.

I do not have a seconder to this motion. I make it as a Point of Personal Privilege, a plea, to that large NDP caucus, that they be prepared to debate a motion which is obviously of crucial importance to the determination of energy policy in Canada.

**HON. E.L. COWLEY** (Minister of Mineral Resources): — Mr. Speaker, just a short statement to that request.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order! We are not debating the Motion. The Member is trying to explain why he couldn't proceed with it. But the rules are plain that all motions shall be seconded before being debated or put from the Chair. It is not up to the Chair to

find seconders, it is up to the Members. Therefore, I have to abide by the rules because we get into difficulty when we don't. I am not asking for a debate on the rules of each motion, I am just informing the Member if he complies with the rules, he may proceed. Otherwise he can either let it stand until he finds a seconder or withdraw it whatever he wishes. It is in his hands.

**MR. RICHARDS:** — Mr. Speaker, just to make it absolutely clear. Is it your ruling that it is out of order to speak on a motion without having a seconder, with the hope that by the speech inducing one of the other Members of the House so to second?

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Yes, it is definitely out of order to speak on a motion without having a seconder first because Members could speak, as Beauchesne points out, and not having a seconder other Members would not be allowed to reply to the debate because the motion is out of order and must be dropped, therefore, there is no chance to reply. So it must be seconded before it is debated.

**MR. RICHARDS:** — I repeat my Point of Personal Privilege and it is not a challenge to your ruling, that is, is one of the Members of this House willing to entertain a debate on the Mackenzie Valley Pipeline, which is surely a pressing issue, subject of public debate.

**MR. COWLEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I just want to respond very briefly. I think that as a Member of this Government I don't want to comment on the merit or otherwise of Resolution No. 23, but rather to say that when the Government decides, and the Government caucus decides, to bring forward a motion with respect to the Mackenzie Valley Pipeline or any other issue —

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order! We are not debating the Resolution No. 23. He cannot speak unless he gets a seconder.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Why do you allow him to speak?

**MR. SPEAKER:** — All the Members are sitting silently and they are not going to second it, I will have to declare it dropped.

**MR. BROCKELBANK:** — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order. I think the point that the Members are trying to make here is that the Member is out of order to make a plea before the House for a seconder and be his doubly out of order to make a plea a second time. We are sitting silent, waiting for the Member to drop his motion as you have dictated in your rule.

**MR. RICHARDS:** — Mr. Speaker, there being no seconder forthcoming from either side of the House, the Motion drops and I think the people of Saskatchewan will . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order!

**MR. RICHARDS:** — . . . the fact that the Members of the New Democratic Party . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order!

**MR. RICHARDS:** — . . . are not willing to debate a crucial issue . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order!

**MR. RICHARDS:** — . . . in the Legislature.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order! This is the greatest outburst of indignation I have seen from any Member who professes to be university trained. To stand up in his place, when the Speaker rises, after making several pleas and the Speaker tolerating it, giving him the chance because he is by himself, to be so vulgar and rude to stand there and shout back at the Speaker. You ought to be ashamed of yourself. There is no way that you have any more special privileges in this Legislature than any other private Member. There are certain privileges for Cabinet Ministers and certain privileges for the Leader of the Opposition, otherwise all Members are equal. I don't think that you should ask for special privileges and people should bow down and say, 'please Sir we wish to do it for you.' It is up to you to obtain a seconder first.

I have been lenient by saying that I have only ruled the one out of order allowing the other three to stand, but the Member abuses the privilege that I have given him, by leaning over backwards to be lenient with him, trying to abuse the House and abuse the Chair when the Chair rises.

The Motion is dropped.

**MR. RICHARDS:** — Mr. Speaker, I was not in any attempt trying to make a personal reference to you, as Speaker. My indignation stands as a rebuke to the Members of the House.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — . . . not to be done at this time.

#### **RESOLUTION NO. 25 — PROFITS OF SASKATCHEWAN LIQUOR BOARD**

**MR. RICHARDS:** — Mr. Speaker, I would not proceed at this juncture with this Motion. I will allow it to be dropped.

Motion withdrawn.

**MR. RICHARDS:** — Mr. Speaker, there remains Motion No. 4, having dropped the other three will you permit it to stand?

**MR. SPEAKER:** — No, I ruled it out of order. You can resubmit it if you wish to put it back on the Order Paper for the next Private Members' day.



## ADJOURNED DEBATES

### RESOLUTIONS

#### RESOLUTION NO. 13 — NATURALIZATION OF PROVINCIAL OIL AND GAS INDUSTRY

**MR. A.R. GUY** (Athabasca): — Mr. Speaker, I have a few words to say on this Resolution.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order!

**MR. ROMANOW:** — It was stood.

**MR. GUY:** — That's all right, he doesn't lose his right to speak. It is open for any Member of the House to speak on it.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker, on a Point . . .

**MR. GUY:** — Stand, is only a courtesy.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — On a Point of Order. I agree it's a courtesy, and I am asking the Hon. Member to extend me the courtesy, the Hon. Member is not here, I am asking the Motion to stand. It happens frequently on your side when the Member is not around and you ask to have it stand. We haven't challenged your right on this. I do say to the Hon. Member, extend the courtesy to me as we have done to you. We ask to have it stand.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — May I read to the House Standing Order in our Book No. 9.

All questions put by Members on motions not taken up when called may upon the request of the Government be allowed to stand and retain their precedence. Otherwise they will disappear from the Order Paper, they may, however, be renewed.

Now this rule interpreted to restrict this intent, means that only the Government can ask that the Motion stand. But, we have in this House, that any Member could ask it to stand, but the Government has the priority on that.

Now the Hon. Leader of the House, the Attorney General, has asked that this item stand. So I think that we should try to go along with those things and keep it in order.

**MR. GUY:** — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order. I agree with what you say but what we have witnessed in this House, of course, is that this motion has come up on at least three or four other occasions when the Member in whose name it stands, has been in his seat and he has had the opportunity. At that time I did not get to my feet to make a speech because I thought that he was going to. Now, today, it is obvious that he is not here and he has no intention of speaking on this Motion today. He will not lose his opportunity speak and I have a few words that I wish to say on this Resolution.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — You won't lose your right.

**MR. GUY:** — Well, I will lose my opportunity to speak, Mr. Speaker, because the House Leader will stand it until the end of the session. He has done it before. His record is clear in this House.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order! I think we are getting out of order by debating rules too much. The Hon. Attorney General has asked the motion to stand.

### **RESOLUTION NO. 17 — PROBLEMS OF NORTHERN SASKATCHEWAN**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution by Mr. M. Feschuk (Prince Albert East):

That this Assembly commends the Provincial Government for its determined efforts to positively direct the energies of Saskatchewan in resolving the deeply rooted social and economic problems of Northern Saskatchewan by having taken the following steps: (a) the establishment of a five-year northern housing program; (b) the completion of plans for sewer and water in four northern communities; (c) the successful election of Northern Saskatchewan's first civic Northern Municipal Council; (d) the provision of economic opportunity for northern people, resulting in increased employment; and (e) the establishment of a single Department of Northern Saskatchewan to implement and monitor the continued transfer to northern people of programs, opportunities and decision making powers not previously offered to them by any former Government.

And the proposed amendment thereto moved by Mr. Guy:

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

"expresses its regret at the failure of the Provincial Government through its Department of Northern Saskatchewan to: (a) encourage economic development in Northern Saskatchewan; (b) provide sufficient housing to meet the needs of the people; (c) provide a Northern Municipal Council free of political interferences; and (d) to transfer to the northern people the programs, opportunities and decision making powers necessary to run their own affairs."

**MR. P.P. MOSTOWAY** (Hanley): — Mr. Speaker, I feel that I have to enter this debate to help set the record straight about the Department of Northern Saskatchewan.

You see, Mr. Speaker, just like the Goon Squad made up of some Members opposite, who visited the North, I, too, am an expert in things northern having made one trip up there.

**MR. GUY:** — To play bingo.

**MR. MOSTOWAY:** — I have heard that you play

something up there, too, Hon. Member. Did you want me to elaborate now or a little later on? Or will we drop that? Oh, you agree; that is fine. But I should like to tell you that I didn't go up there with the political bias like some Members opposite. I didn't go up there trying to wreck the North as Members opposite did, at least some of them. I didn't go up there trying to make political hay at the expense of our native and Metis people, like some Liberal MLAs did.

Mr. Speaker, what I saw, heard and asked there was in a spirit of true inquiry. And, furthermore, when up there northerners didn't hesitate to talk to me as they did with some Members opposite. It is plain to understand why they didn't want to talk to them, because northern people will know how some of them, particularly the northern MLA, who is running scared, tend to drag innocent people into their smear campaigns. Northern people are experienced in dealing with some Members opposite and I don't blame them one bit for being tight-lipped as it is claimed that they were.

Mr. Speaker, all people of Saskatchewan, and in particular northerners, are sick and tired of false accusations made by most Members to your left. They are sick and tired of listening to Liberal gibberish. In fact, many people that I have talked to assume that such nonsense can only come from a rump group that will clutch at anything in a desperate bid to avoid being completely annihilated at the next election. Some of them were around when Cromwell was around, too.

Mr. Speaker, when I was up North I had the opportunity of freely discussing things relative to the North. I met many northerners. Every one to a man said that he was happy to see Liberal oppression replaced by a freely accessible government, this Government. To a man they seemed to be breathing a sigh of relief as if some sort of nightmare was finally over. Mr. Speaker, when this people's Government took over from the Liberals it was like a breath of fresh air after a seven year winter of unbelievable denial of the rights of our northern people, in fact, for all Saskatchewan people.

Mr. Speaker, I will not say that things are a bed of roses in the northern area — far from it. But conditions are much better than they were — although I grant you this is not necessarily a great accomplishment, when one considers how the Liberal regime, in co-operation with their masters, the corporate joe boys, dragged the North down to a level that almost makes the blood curdle. I will not hesitate to say that more should be done. I will not hesitate to say that more will be done. I will not hesitate to state a good start has been made under the Department of Northern Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, there has been agitation in the North, and I don't presume to imagine that some Members opposite were behind this. I wouldn't dare think that they hope and pray for more agitation. Far be it from me to even harbor one iota of a thought that would link some Members opposite with immorally supporting confrontation in the North. Far be it from me to dwell on this thought any longer, Mr. Speaker.

It is claimed by some that there are many rumors about the Department of Northern Saskatchewan up North. Now just suppose it was a Liberal MLA from the North, who might make this claim. I would certainly have to ask what this MLA has done

about these rumors. I would have to ask if he tried to get at the root source of these rumors and if he pursued these rumors in his community. Mr. Speaker, if he did not pursue them, I should have to label that MLA as being derelict in duty in this capacity as a northern MLA. I should have to say that an MLA really doing his job properly, would relentlessly pursue such a rumor until he found it to be true or false. And if he found it to be true, I would imagine the next logical step would be to present pertinent facts in this House or to a law enforcement officer.

By the same token if he found the rumors to be false, the only honorable thing to do would be openly to announce that finding for all to hear. Mr. Speaker, if a Liberal MLA found himself in such a position, would he follow the suggested course? If you think not, I wonder why? Would it be because he might have something to gain from these rumors? Then the question arises, would he start any such rumors himself to try to save his own skin? I say he would.

Mr. Speaker, I am of the opinion that if the Liberal MLA found himself in the position just mentioned, he would actually go out of his way to grind the old rumor mill. I am of the opinion, that a Liberal MLA would gleefully gloat over such a situation so as to throw a smokescreen over his own ineptitude and inability to really comprehend the situation. Mr. Speaker, such a Liberal MLA would have to be condemned as one, who in his hypocrisy, really dislikes northerners, as one who cannot be trusted, as one who cannot act positively, as one who is negative in his approach and as one who deep down harbors a distinct dislike for people.

Mr. Speaker, if we look at the DNS record in the North we find that a new emphasis on development has taken place. And it is a development that should be looked at closely so that it can be compared to development under the Liberals.

Mr. Speaker, I have to mention that whereas development under this Government has helped many areas of the North, the only people who benefitted under Liberal underdevelopment were large corporations and the puppeteers who control these large concerns. Now this doesn't surprise me one bit, it is really part and parcel of Liberal philosophy which demands robot-like obedience to corporations. Mr. Speaker, such a philosophy is un-Saskatchewan, un-Canadian, anti-Christian and, of course, anti-people. Only Liberal MLAs could sell time-honored principles of decency down the drain. Only Liberal MLAs could live with such an inhumane philosophy.

Mr. Speaker, I note that under the Liberals a task force recommended a single agency for the North. Did the Liberals act on this recommendation? Oh, no! And do you know why, Mr. Speaker? Well, I am sure it was because they couldn't. By their very nature they dared not act. You see, Mr. Speaker, change is impossible for a true Liberal MLA. They hate change because they have no capacity to visualize, to be imaginative, to consider alternatives. Mr. Speaker, with a heavy heart, I must admit, Members opposite are true Liberals.

Mr. Speaker, is the Hon. Member for Athabasca, in moving his amendment, trying to say there should be an enquiry into the Northern Municipal Council? I believe that is the implication. I also believe he would like the local community authorities

investigated. I believe he would persecute the northern school unit boards with his enquires. Why would the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) turn his back on the native people, he should be representing and have them appear before a body of inquisition? Why would he have every native and Metis investigated along with the Government? Mr. Speaker, it is plain to see why. It is because he is willing to drag down every citizen of the North in order to try to embarrass this Government.

If he mistrusts this Government, why does he allow this dislike to spill over onto northern people? Mr. Speaker, northern people put their trust in him and how does he reciprocate? Well, he implies they should not be trusted with local government. No wonder he doesn't want to run up North again. Because I am sure if he should try, they would run him out of the country, which is what will happen to him when he runs in the constituency that he has decided to run in.

Mr. Speaker, the various governing boards I have mentioned on which many native and Metis people sit, are creatures of the Provincial Government of the day. I know I speak for all on this side of the House when I say these boards are doing a good job. They are on the road to getting their various jobs done. They should not be persecuted as Members opposite suggest by their frivolous amendments.

Now let's take a look at economic development. I know Members opposite still are harping on the pulp mill they proposed to give away to their friends at public expense. I won't dwell on this except to say that numerous northern people I talked to, were happy to see this proposed give-away stopped. They were happy because they knew no real feasibility study under the Liberals was conducted. No thought was given to pollution; no thought was given to the poisonous fish which would have been the lot of northern people. No thought was given to the feelings of northern people. The Junta decided on an industry at any cost whatsoever. For their brashness they were given their just reward, a resounding defeat at the polls with a few tattered human remnants left to enter this House.

Mr. Speaker, there are four more sawmills in operation now than before in the North. Is this what Members opposite imply should be investigated? Numerous loans have been given for such things as tourism, recreation, trapping and fishing. In their effort to express regret concerning these loans are they saying natives can't handle their own affairs? Do Members opposite find displeasure with those who have taken advantage of the prospectors' incentive program? What have these people done to Members opposite? Why do Members opposite regret that many have been helped through training programs? Are they against the La Ronge Community College? Would they want to investigate children attending school? Why would they distrust little children?

In housing for staff members, why would they want to possibly investigate a procedure whereby lowest bidders receive the contracts? Could it be that this practice is odious to some Members opposite? Could it be they hate this principal? Could it be certain friends of theirs didn't get these contracts?

As for general housing in the North, Mr. Speaker, no one denies more should be done, but I do point out that every year more houses for natives are being built.

What would the Liberals regret here? And would they set up an enquiry to find out why northern natives want decent housing? Mr. Speaker, I am against harassment of northern people. I see no reason to regret a water and sewer system at La Ronge. I see no reason to force northerners publicly to state why they are in favor of more schools being built just because some Liberal MLAs are against this.

Mr. Speaker, maybe there should be an investigation all right, but into the activities of certain Members opposite or would that rattle too many skeletons? It just might be that such an investigation would reveal activities that bordered on the immoral and illegal. Mr. Speaker, I don't wish to embarrass certain Members opposite, but the tales about some of them as relayed to me, makes me want such an investigation. I believe many northerners would want one, too.

Mr. Speaker, I am a Member from the geographic southern portion of the province. I felt compelled to defend the Department of Northern Saskatchewan in answer to this amendment which is really a veiled attack on northern people.

Ted Bowerman is doing a good job. Ask men such as I had the pleasure of meeting, men like Marcel Couteau or ask Harry Longfellow and ask their friends. They will tell you that their lot is improving. They do not like knowing about the lack of faith some Members opposite have in them.

Mr. Speaker, I will be supporting this Resolution which expresses confidence in the Department of Northern Saskatchewan and its many jurisdictions which are creatures of the Provincial Government. I will not drag northern people down as the amendment suggests some Members opposite wish to do.

Therefore, I regret to say I cannot support the amendment as put forward by the northern Member, the Member for Athabasca.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. H.E. COUPLAND** (Meadow Lake): — Mr. Speaker, I wasn't going to say anything on this but after listening to that bunch of garbage coming from the Member for Hanley, I had held him in higher respect than that. In all the talk about going into the North, he never once mentioned the name of a settlement that he visited. Not once did he mention why there is all this unrest in the North. Why are all these delegations coming in and getting after the Government?

Mr. Speaker, I have a lot more to say and I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

#### **RESOLUTION NO. 19 — SASKATCHEWAN LAND BANK TRANSACTIONS**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution by Mr. E.F. Gardner (Moosomin):

That this Assembly urge the Government of Saskatchewan to consider the desirability of immediately providing to Members of the Legislature full details of all Saskatchewan Land Bank transactions that occurred to date.

**HON. J.R. MESSER** (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, Resolution No. 19, regardless of the information already given to the Members of the Legislature, relating to the activities of the Land Bank Commission and regardless of the information that will be made available to Legislature and the public in the future, suggests that the Members and the public are not able to comprehend the details of the Commission's operations and hence insinuates that the full details are not being provided by the Government and the Land Bank Commission. That, Mr. Speaker, simply is not a fact. It is simply not so.

There are, I think some instances where we have to respect the confidentiality of the dealings between the Land Bank Commission or representatives of the Land Bank Commission and certain individuals who may wish to sell land to the Land Bank Commission or for that matter may be in the process of submitting applications for leasing of land.

I want, Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the Members who sit to your left, to refer them to Section 69, subsection (2) of The Land Bank Act which states:

The report shall be laid before the Legislative Assembly within 15 sitting days from the commencement of the sessions next following the end of the fiscal year for which the report is made. But the Commission is not required to submit its annual report less than 90 days after the end of its fiscal year.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if the Opposition Members would read the annual report, they would find out the very things that they are now asking to have disclosed to them. I say that the information they are seeking is now contained in the annual report that is available to them and will also be made available in subsequent annual reports as the Land Bank Commission lays them on the table.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that this is the first time, the first time that such information has been made public through an annual report.

I would ask that for those Members opposite who do not feel that the information is detailed enough, that they should also give consideration to asking their federal colleagues to make available at least the information we make available in the Land Bank Commission annual reports, ask their federal colleagues to make available information in regard to the activities between the Federal Government and individual farmers as they make money available through the Farm Credit Corporation or for that matter through the Small Farm Development Program.

I ask them to recall a few short years ago when many of them were sitting on the Treasury benches of the Liberal Government of the day, to indicate to us why they did not see fit to make available even a minimum of information in regard to the activities of the Department of Agriculture's Land Branch which was in fact carrying out many of the duties that the Land Bank Commission is now carrying out. That Commission purchased land, they sold land and they leased land which comprises most of the activities of the Saskatchewan Land Bank. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am saying that if they would take the time to read the

annual report rather than to misinterpret the activities of the Land Bank Commission they would not now be moving resolutions or asking questions as they have asked at this particular Session of the Legislature for more information because it is already available to them.

I want to take a moment, Mr. Speaker, to refer to the annual report to indicate to them that virtually everything they are asking for is, in fact, contained in this annual report. If they turn to that first annual report which was tabled in 1973 they can acquaint themselves or better acquaint themselves as to what the objectives of the Land Bank Commission are. They would also be able to further inform themselves as to just what the functions of the Land Bank Commission are. They have talked at some considerable length about the point system in regard to the points that are used to tentatively allocate land to potential lessees of land from the Land Bank Commission. For the most part all of the land, that is tentatively allocated is done by the point system. And if they were to look at the annual report of the Land Bank Commission they would be able to see what the factors are and how the maximum numbers of points are totalled for those potential recipients of land. They would be able to find out that points are allocated for income results in the application that is made by a potential lessee. A maximum of ten points is designated for income results; past performance of farming experience, two points can be allocated for that purpose; utilization of resources, five points may be allocated for that purpose; experience, eight points may be allocated for that purpose; productive use of land, 10 points may be allocated for that purpose; education, five points; resource base, 35 points; net worth, 15 points; need, as it relates to dependents or other commitments of the applicant, five points; preferred recipient, five points.

Mr. Speaker, if they have some grievances or some concern in regard to how those points are allocated, then they should direct their questions and the enquiries in relation to the allocation of those points rather than attempting to misinterpret how the Land Bank in an orderly fashion dispenses and allocates land. If they were to turn their minds to the annual report, they would also see the organization of the Land Bank, the financing of the Land Bank. They would be able to acquaint themselves in some detail with the 1972-73 operations of the Land Bank. They would be able to look at the summary of land that was acquired by the Land Bank in the 1972-73 fiscal year. They would be able to read the auditor's report from which I want to quote one paragraph. That paragraph says:

In my opinion these financial statements read in conjunction with the note appended to the statement of revenue and expenditure present fairly, (and I emphasize, Mr. Speaker, present fairly) the financial position of the Saskatchewan Land Bank Fund as of March 31, 1973, the results of its operation for the period July, 1972 to March 31, 1973. The cash transactions of the administration account for the same period and the funds of this account on hand at March 31, 1973 in accordance with the generally accepted accounting principles.

That quote, I think, Mr. Speaker, from the auditor's report indicates that the Land Bank Commission is meeting the criteria that the Government has laid down for them to follow and that he as auditor has approved their activities for the



April 16, 1974

1972-73 fiscal year.

They could look further in the Land Bank annual report, Mr. Speaker, and further acquaint themselves with the Saskatchewan Land Bank fund balance sheet and acquaint themselves with the assets and the liabilities of that agency. They could look at the statement of revenue and expenditure and inform themselves in regard to what the revenues of the Land Bank were in that fiscal year and what their expenditures were. The report goes into some detail giving the statement of receipts and payments in regard to both receipts and payments that were made or were acquired by the Land Bank Commission.

But most importantly, Mr. Speaker, they would be able to look at Appendix B in the Annual Report of the Land Bank Commission which gives the statistical summary of all land purchases for that fiscal year. I may say that this is a first time to my knowledge any provincial government or any other agency of a government has in such a detailed way provided information to not only the Members of the Legislative Assembly but to the general public in regard to purchases that are made on behalf of that agency or on behalf of government.

Appendix B literally lists every parcel of land that was purchased in the Province of Saskatchewan, identifying it by RM number, its quarter section and section number, relating to the cultivated acres and the grazing acres and the total acres that were purchased, and then giving the purchased price. We do not, because we think we should respect some confidentiality between the seller of the land and the purchasing agency, list the name of the former owner of that particular parcel of land but for those who do want to know and who are inquisitive in regard to who the seller was or may have been, they simply can go to the RM office where the land in question is located and find out who the former owner was. Hence it is not impossible for them, if they wish to have more specific information in regard to cases which they may feel that they want, to get that information. What I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is that never before has there been an attempt by a government or by an agency of a government to provide as full as possible the details and information that people may wish to acquaint themselves with in relation to the activities of that agency.

It is for this reason, Mr. Speaker, that I move an amendment to the motion, seconded by the Hon. Attorney General (Mr. Romanow):

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

Congratulate the Government of Saskatchewan for providing full details of transactions of the Saskatchewan Land Bank Commission in the Commission's Annual Report; and further, that this Assembly urge the Government of Saskatchewan to continue in this present manner to disclose the details of all Saskatchewan Land Bank Commission transactions in the Annual Report.

Having moved that amendment, Mr. Speaker, I close by asking the Hon. Member for Moosomin (Mr. Gardner) who moved the original motion to acquaint himself with the information that is available in the Land Bank Annual Report and I ask him to

consider, the acceptance of the Land Bank by the general public of Saskatchewan and to give some serious reconsideration to attempts that have been made not only by himself, but by some of his colleagues to misinterpret the endeavors and the attempts of the Land Bank Commission to further give assurance and fortification to the family farmers in Saskatchewan that there will always be some land available to them and that we will be able to continue to contribute to the family farm way of life, which I assume by some of the remarks he has made in the past, is agreeable to himself, and change his ways and agree to support the amendment that I have just moved.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

The debate continues on the motion and the amendment concurrently.

**MR. J.C. McISAAC** (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, the Resolution proposed by the Member for Moosomin (Mr. Gardner) is a fairly straight forward Resolution. One would have thought with all the discussion that has taken place in this Legislature and in committees over the last year or more, that the Government would have been happy to comply and discuss the basic points at issue and the reason why this Resolution is before us. It is just regrettable to me, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Agriculture would get up and laud himself and his Government for the bare details that are now provided in the Land Bank Commission Report. Quite above the fact that those details are very sparse with respect to the purchase policies, with respect to the allocation, there is one other real key problem with respect to information emanating and coming or published or whatever with the Land Bank. That is, Mr. Speaker, the fact that we get a report from the Land Bank now, tabled in this current Session, covering a period of April 1st, 1972 to March 31, 1973. In short, the report and the material in it is about 15 to 20 months old by the time the Members get a chance to peruse it.

**MR. MESSER:** — How does that differ from other reports?

**MR. McISAAC:** — It differs quite a bit, Mr. Minister. This was one of the mistakes in the Land Bank legislation in the first instance, I suggest, Mr. Minister, and one thing very seriously I suggest that you should look at. Because, let us take the Crown Corporation's Report, and in a sense, I'm not sure whether we would call the Land Bank Commission a Crown corporation, perhaps it's a kind of a hybrid and exotic in that sense, but the Crown corporations go by the calendar year. We have the reports of the Saskatchewan Transportation Company, the Power Corporation, on our desks a month or so after the beginning of the new calendar year and it deals with the period up to last December 31, 1973. So the reports are fairly current. The discussion in the Legislature be it in Crown corporations or in the House in Estimates could then be a good deal more current than is now possible in dealing with the Land Bank with a report that is 18 months old by the time we get it.

Mr. Speaker, there is one other key point that is not covered in any of the information supplied by the Land Bank in its Annual Report and that is their policy with respect to allocation. I think if there is one area that is very much a subject to criticism and subject to concern and that is their

policy with respect to allocation of some of this land. May I say here, Mr. Speaker, that when the Liberal Government took office in 1964, at that time we cleaned up an NDP mess with respect to allocating land or misallocating of land. A point system was established which was operated by an independent board. An Appeal Board was established and land allocation took place on a non-partisan basis. Immediately upon the return of this Government opposite we were back to the old NDP pork barrel system of allocating land. There is ample evidence, Mr. Minister, not all of it rumor, that the allocation with respect to the Land Bank may well be directed by MLAs or political influence in certain instances. It is this kind of thing that should be clarified and cleared up. Well, okay, we know who got a certain piece of land, how many points did he receive, how many other people had higher points and why were they rejected? It is this kind of information that this Resolution seeks to provide the House and it is this kind of —

**MR. MESSER:** —Did you ever give us that information?

**MR. McISAAC:** — Yes, it was available, certainly it was available, Mr. Minister, no problem at all. There were very few occasions when the lease wasn't awarded to the individual with the highest number of points. But it is this kind of information that this Resolution seeks to have the Government provide to the Legislature.

To repeat again, Mr. Speaker, the two points where the Minister and the Government can improve and improve immensely, is with respect to policies dealing with allocation, appeal policies; it is with respect to making that report a much more current kind of report. I certainly suggest to the Minister that he consider that. It isn't a difficult thing to do, but if he wants to make that report more current and if he wants to ensure that the information is available to Members on a much more up-to-date basis, it is a very easy matter to change the year into a calendar year and make the information, as I say, much more current and avoid some of the problems that he has been encountering for the last year and one half, since he introduced the Land Bank Bill.

Mr. Speaker, needless to say I will be supporting the Resolution and I regret that the Minister saw fit to introduce an amendment lauding himself and his Government for doing really nothing in this regard and trying to create the impression that, indeed, they are giving us the kind of information that we are not now getting.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. J. WIEBE** (Morse): — Mr. Speaker, just to make a few comments in regard to the Resolution which we have before us. The Member for Wilkie clearly pointed out and explained the main reason why this type of information is required.

If the Government has nothing to hide and if they are free and aboveboard in the allocation of lease land, if they are free and aboveboard in the prices which they offer the individual for purchase, they should have no hesitation whatsoever in making this information available to us. Not only are

we dealing with the taxpayers' money in terms of the allocation of this land, but people out in the rural areas are competing for that land with the Land Bank Commission, which means they are competing against their own money. They are competing with their own money when they come up against the Land Bank Commission for the purchase of land that may be available for sale in an area. We have to ask ourselves as well, why isn't this Land Bank doing the job that it claims to be doing? Members opposite have said that the Land Bank is going to put more farmers on the land, more farmers in rural Saskatchewan and yet our rural population year after year continues to decline. In fact when you look at the RM directory which was placed before us about a month ago and compare that with previous years you will find that under the NDP administration the decrease of population in rural areas, in fact, is accelerating and not decreasing under this type of legislation.

What is happening is that the young man who is able to take advantage of the Land Bank scheme is one whose father is retiring, his father is capable of providing the funds for him to have the machinery and the operating expenses. What happens if that father has three sons? The Land Bank Commission does not in any way put those three sons onto a farm in this province. Basically, the father could possibly afford to finance one son, but he can't afford to buy the machinery for three sons which would allow them to begin operations. The fact stating that the Land Bank Commission is putting more young people on the farms in Saskatchewan is false.

The Minister of Agriculture asked why the Small Farms Development Program and the Farm Credit Corporation were not making their transactions public. Basically, Mr. Speaker, because they are not purchasing land. The Farm Credit Corporation is making loans available to individuals, so why in the world should the taxpayers of this province ask the Farm Credit Corporation to make their allocations of money public. Each and every cent of that dollar is going to be paid back to the Farm Credit Corporation. What's happening under the Land Bank scheme is that the taxpayers' money is being used to purchase land, there is no way that the taxpayers of this province are ever going to get any of that money back.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Wilkie has also mentioned several reasons for making the information available on a more current basis. A lot can happen in 18 months and basically this is what's happening now. There is no doubt that the Land Bank Commission has forced the price of land up in this province. The Land Bank Commission says that they are not doing it. Let's make that information public and prove to the people of Saskatchewan that it is not. We have received letters, we have received phone calls and personal representations from people throughout the province stating that the Land Bank is forcing the price of land up in Saskatchewan. If we are getting a few I can imagine just how many the Government is getting. If they have got nothing to hide why don't they make it public? You know the human nature of a farmer, if he makes a deal, nine times out of ten he is going to tell his neighbor and exaggerate the point a little bit as to what price he got for that land. So someone else comes into the district and wishes to buy the neighbor's quarter, the neighbor says, well, my neighbor sold to the Land Bank and got \$100 an acre for it. Yet in effect he may have only received \$90 per acre.

April 16, 1974

**MR. MESSER:** — It's right in the Annual Report.

**MR. WIEBE:** — Certainly it is right in the Annual Report, but it is 18 months old, Mr. Minister. If you tell me that the value of land in Saskatchewan today is exactly the same as it was 18 months ago, you are full of boloney and it is Blakeney boloney too.

Now going on to another point which was brought out by the Member for Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac) and that, Mr. Speaker, is in terms of the allocation of the land —

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order!

**MR. WIEBE:** — If the Minister of Agriculture wishes to make a comment I am sure that he can present a resolution at a later date and continue on with this discussion at that time.

Going back to the point which was raised by the Member for Wilkie. Mr. Speaker, is the Minister of Agriculture going to allow me to continue my speech or is he going to continue to interject? As I was saying before I was interrupted by the Minister of Agriculture for the third time in the last three minutes and so very rudely on top of that, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order!

**MR. WIEBE:** — Now, going back to the point that was raised by the Member for Wilkie in regard to the allocation of leased land. This is where the key to the entire question of our wanting information lies. We have had representations, we have heard rumors and we have seen statements under oath in court stating that the allocation of lease land in this province is not being carried out in accordance with the point system as described either by the Provincial Government or the Land Bank Commission. Now, Mr. Speaker, this is vital. I think that each and every citizen of Saskatchewan should have the confidence of this Government that they are not competing with a political party, that they are not competing with the Minister of Agriculture, that they are not competing with NDP MLAs, but that they are competing with their neighbor on a fair and just point allocation system. And that, Mr. Speaker, as has been clearly demonstrated, is not what is happening in this province today. If the Government and the Minister of Agriculture is not happy with the point system that they presently have, well, by all means don't meddle with it, change it. Change that point system so that you can be happy with it. Let the people of the province know what that point system is. Allow them to realize that that is what they are competing on. They are competing against that point system and not against the Government or NDP MLAs or NDP hacks throughout this province.

It is because of this reason that it is very vital that we know this information and put a lot of these questions to rest. You would think, Mr. Speaker, that the Government opposite would be happy to adopt a point system and stick to it 100 per cent. Because no one wins when it comes to the allocation of land. You've got about 20 people applying for a particular piece of land, you are only going to make one person

happy and 19 people unhappy because they did not receive that land. If there is any inference that there was political interference in that allocation, the people, of course, are very unhappy. If they realize that it was done honorably and according to the point system and that point system being made public, the 19 people who did not receive that land would realize that it was done on a fair and equitable basis.

There are many other points, Mr. Speaker, which I want to comment on in regard to this Resolution and I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

## **ADJOURNED DEBATES**

### **REPORTS OF COMMITTEES**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Motion of Mr. Mostoway (Hanley) that the **Final Report of the Special Committee on Welfare** be now concurred in.

**MR. A. MATSALLA** (Canora): — Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Special Committee on Welfare I feel obliged to make some comments on the work of the Committee as well as our findings and recommendations. In making the comments I will attempt to lay aside partisan politics, but I do intend to speak in full sincerity and frankness. I want it to be understood by the Members on both sides of the House that if I levy some criticism on the report and disagree with it, I mean to do it in a constructive way as I see it in the interest and welfare of our society.

Mr. Speaker, the work of our Committee, I believe, could be summed up thus: Lost to start with, because the task appeared almost impossible; found as time went on, because ideas begin to develop as to what approach the Committee should take; organized, because positive plans were made to proceed with; co-operative in body and spirit to carry out the plans; tactful and diplomatic in meeting people and obtaining information; harmonious in deliberations; conscientious in doing a complete job, and agreeable to the many of the recommendations in the report.

All in all, the Committee worked well, and I would say it has done a worthy job. It should be noted that the Committee confined its hearings, interviews and meetings within the Province of Saskatchewan. Its challenge was to make a thorough study of the conditions as they exist within our bounds and then from such study develop ways and means of dealing with existing situations. That is not to say, Mr. Speaker, that the Committee did not obtain information or did not confer with resource people from outside the province. This we have done, and to people making the information available, the Committee is most grateful since the information did enhance the Committee's thinking and provided guidance towards finalizing its recommendations.

Mr. Speaker, I want to recognize a number of people who, in my opinion, have dedicated their efforts in making the work of the Committee productive and as complete as possible. I want to make mention of the Hon. Member for Hanley, Mr. Paul Mostoway, who worked untiringly to give the Committee guidance

through the mass of pointed problems and the complexity of the subject areas: Mr. Gordon Barnhart, the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly, Mrs. Merry Harbottle, the Assistant Clerk, and Mr. Lorne Dunsmore, our Research Assistant — all have been of great assistance to the Committee. I should like to express my personal appreciation for their patience with the Committee and their sincerity in making this report as one of the significant documents in the records of this Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, one of the prime aspects of the Committee's work was its approach to the study of welfare. Committee members agreed to accept prevention as its theme. They agreed that welfare programs should be designed to provide support services to problem situations before they develop into a crisis and result in character and personality breakup. Early identification of a problem with an appropriate remedial approach could in many situations, prevent many a family breakdown.

Keeping the prevention theme in mind, Mr. Speaker, the community must accept a social and moral responsibility towards problems existing in its community, and it must get involved and share in an effort to provide a desirable solution. Community involvement means local people accepting a degree of responsibility for what exists in their community as a part of the entire society. A responsibility to help their fellowmen who find themselves in difficult situations.

The community could involve itself, first of all, in identifying problem areas and then co-operating with the Department of Social Services in developing suitable programs and assisting in administering certain services.

People at the local level must be encouraged to solve their own problems. Through their involvement, the community as a whole would better understand a problem situation. The problem cause and the circumstances as they exist could readily be compiled out of community observation.

The next thing that comes is a possible solution. The community people may need some guidance from the Department to design and develop a support program to fit a situation, but it is essential that emphasis be placed on local people to involve themselves in carrying out the program. The Committee recommends a neighborhood multi-service centre approach to local involvement. This kind of approach would lend itself to bring social services into the community. It would interest local people to become a part of the community service program. It would create an open line of communication and a common understanding between the government and the community and the client, and more important, between the community and the client, a communication that in many cases is sadly lacking.

Advisory and appeal boards at the local level should be continued. However, to make the role of the local board more meaningful, it is essential that they play a more active role in decisions for appropriate services at the community level. As a liaison between the local board and the Department, the Committee recommends a co-ordinator who would work with the local people to keep the board informed and assist in designing community service programs, as well as provide for continual interest and activity on the local board.

Mr. Speaker, when we speak of more activity and greater

involvement of local boards in community social services, we must be prepared to pay reasonable remuneration to board members as a recognition for their contribution and for their sacrifice of time and effort in making their community a better place to live in.

When we talk of community involvement we must include the involvement of municipalities, rural and urban. During the Committee's public hearings it was observed that there exists a difference of opinion with respect to what extent municipal councils should be involved in local social service programs. Some felt the local council should get involved in screening of applications for assistance, or at least be given a list of welfare recipients' names. They felt that they can be of real help in scrutinizing entitlement to assistance and prevent abuse of welfare funds. They felt, too, that by knowing who's who on assistance, the municipalities could direct their efforts in providing employment to local recipients and hence taking them off the welfare roll. Other municipal councils made it known, that they do not want to go back to the days when municipalities administered welfare. They also made it known, that personal welfare records should continue to be confidential and such confidentiality should be maintained. Our Committee believes that if society is to change social attitudes towards welfare, with the hope that the stigma attached to welfare is lessened and removed, personal welfare records should not be public information. Making individual records public, would be more destructive than beneficial. The abuses checked would be small in contrast to the creation of the increased stigma. Therefore, our Committee felt that municipal consultation and participation could best be accomplished by municipalities providing the regional office in their area with employment opportunity lists. The office would then direct the recipients to apply for the jobs available. It is also suggested that officials of the Department of Social Services meet with municipal councils on at least a semi-annual basis to discuss social problems in their respective areas and the ways and means of how best to approach the problems. The objective should be to analyse the problems and to develop local programs to adequately meet the social and economic needs of problem situations.

Now, Mr. Speaker, my understanding of reservations to a Committee report is to bring to the attention of the Legislature and the public subject matter that either has not been considered by the Committee or has brought disagreement among Committee members in its observations and recommendations. With that in mind, Mr. Speaker, I have made an analysis of the reservations made by the three Opposition Members.

One of the first points made by the Opposition states that the report completely ignores any job creation programs that might serve to lessen the number of recipients and that it is without concern for creating economic opportunities.

Mr. Speaker, if there is anything that came loud and clear to the Committee members, it is the desire of many recipients to work for a living and the need for society to provide greater employment opportunities. The Committee took a great deal of time and study in this area before it made its recommendations. The point was not ignored by any means as indicated by the Opposition reservation. I should like you to refer to pages 45, 46, 47 and 48 of the report and then let me ask you, Mr. Speaker, and the Hon. Members of the Legislature,



would you say that the Committee ignored the issue when they recommended: 1. The establishment of a provincially operated employment agency with federal cost-sharing, and, 2. That the proposed new agency be given the responsibility of organizing a unified provincial federal program of local job finding and creation. Also, Mr. Speaker, would you say the Committee ignored its responsibility on the issue, when it recommended that the private sector of our economy become more involved in developing a program of setting aside reserves for unemployment in a particular industry?

The second point raised by the Opposition Members on the Committee, is the irresponsible and ineffective attitude of the report in finding solutions to present social and economic problems. They termed the recommendations particularly that of the guaranteed annual income as financially irresponsible, and that the report ignores costs and does not give assurances of providing adequately to those in need of assistance.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer you to pages 21 to 26 of the report, which deals with guaranteed annual income. The Guaranteed Annual Income Program is not an entirely new program concept. In Canada, support for the guaranteed annual income has been given by the Federal Government's white paper, "Income Security for Canadians," and the Special Senate Committee on Poverty Report, "Poverty in Canada," the recent working paper on social security in Canada. These reports do not necessarily deal with people on welfare, they include all people who live in poverty because of inadequate income and inequality of opportunity. It is observed that one Canadian in four lives in poverty.

The reports further suggest in order to compile a realistic cost figure for Guaranteed Annual Income Program it is essential that a complete investigation be made on the needs of all people living below the poverty level. This you will realize is an enormous task for a committee to undertake and it would be ridiculous for the Committee to even suggest that it undertake the cost study at this time considering the time factor and the extensiveness of study. Unless there is consensus among provincial and federal governments that we positively move in the direction of the guaranteed annual income as a way of distributing income and as a program to provide for social security to the citizens of our nation, a cost study at this time would not be advisable nor serve any real purpose.

The report clearly states to develop a cost figure for a Guaranteed Annual Income Program a variety of factors would have to be considered. First, we would have to know what federal assistance programs may be phased out and discontinued. Then consideration would have to be given to the establishment of basic income guarantees and the transfer rate for earnings and the amount of government subsidy. You will readily note, Mr. Speaker, that the cost study at this time is just not realistic. The factors involved cannot be intelligently analysed unless the study is jointly undertaken by both provincial and federal governments. The Opposition's reservation suggesting that because the report does not give a cost figure for the guaranteed annual income, the new program would be financially irresponsible and ineffective demonstrates a negative attitude of the Opposition Members and their insincerity in attempting to solve existing social and economic problems facing today's society.

The third point raised by the Opposition in their reservations, is that the report does not relate itself to providing adequate income to the less fortunate, and that it does not cover possible programs to provide for training and job opportunities. Mr. Speaker, if there is any area in public assistance that the Committee concerned itself to the greatest degree, it was that of providing adequate income, employment, and maintenance of personal dignity. This reservation is unfair, contradictory and in great error. I regret the Opposition Members have resorted to this unwarranted criticism of the report. You will note, Mr. Speaker, and I do want to bring it to the attention of the Opposition Members particularly, in examination of the report, employment, job training and job opportunities are dealt with on page 25 under Guaranteed Annual Income Proposal; page 38 under Working Poor; pages 39 and 40 under Incentives, Welfare and Work; pages 45, 46, 47 and 48 under Unemployed Employable; pages 55 and 56 under Consultation and Participation of Municipalities.

In addition to this, Mr. Speaker, reference is made to employment and job opportunities right throughout the report. All one has to do, is read the report, it's there. And if the Opposition Members would take time to read the report, they would find the information. I would not only suggest, but advise that Opposition Members read the report carefully for their own enlightenment. It would appear, Mr. Speaker, the only reason the Opposition Members set out the reservations as they did, is to misrepresent the sincerity of the work of the Committee and to distort and ignore the recommendations contained in the report.

Mr. Speaker, I must admit that I personally have some reservations about the majority decision of the Committee on a couple of points, and these are not specifically contained in the report. Rather than recording my dissatisfaction in the form of official reservations in the report, I have decided to record my feelings in the Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, one of the issues I feel strongly about is the manner in which the present system deals with alcoholics. I am particularly thinking of one case, in my area, where the recipient is a young forty-five year old single man, living with his elderly mother. For the last 15 years or so he was and still is a heavy drinker. Earlier in his years, he farmed by leasing his mother's quarter section. Since about 10 years ago, he quit farming, continued with his drinking habit except heavier than before and apparently to the detriment of his health. He had run out of resources, and then was placed on the welfare roll. Since being on the welfare roll, the young man continued to drink as long as his welfare money lasted. When the money was used up and gone, he lived off the resources of his mother, and her only resource was the old age pension and the supplemental money.

In citing this case, two points concern and upset me. First, the future does not hold any hope for this young man. His health is weakened. His productivity is lost, and, generally speaking, his life is being wasted in terms of social and economic contribution to himself and society.

Second, we as leaders in society, are doing very little, if anything, positively to help this sick young man. The present welfare regulations, do not require that an alcoholic recipient take the necessary treatment for alcoholism. The recipient continues to receive his regular monthly allowance. He continues

to drink up the welfare money and his health is gradually getting worse.

My observation is, that we are not helping a person like this. As a matter of fact, we are guilty by contributing to the poor health of the alcoholic and, rather than getting the man out of the rut, we are prolonging and aggravating the situation in which the alcoholic finds himself in. To me, this is not right. I feel our welfare system is lacking in its responsibility in taking a firmer position with alcoholic recipients. I think that if we, as a society, believe in helping alcoholics and, if we want to see that welfare money is used up in a proper manner then, we must institute a program providing treatment to alcoholics on a mandatory basis rather than on a voluntary basis as it is today.

On the other point that concerns me, Mr. Speaker, is the situation of a poor elderly couple where only one, husband or wife, is in receipt of old age security and guaranteed income supplement, and where there are no other resources. In circumstances such as this, the entire pension money is considered as income and additional assistance may be provided by the Department of Social Services but only to the level of the schedule calculated for two people. In many cases, situations such as these, have proven to be a great hardship on elderly people. With old age, there are additional expenses of medication, household maintenance, and travel costs. Some of these are considered under Social Services but others at possibly a bare minimum and not adequate to cover entire costs. By no choice of their own, the elderly are made to be beggars for assistance when the need arises. This, we say, on the one hand, we cannot tolerate because it tends to destroy individual dignity but, on the other hand, we make it happen.

To illustrate my point further, Mr. Speaker, let us take an elderly couple who both are in receipt of full pensions. In comparison, you will readily agree that this couple is much better off than the one-pension and welfare couple I mentioned earlier, and only because of the age factor which may be of a very small differential.

To me, these situations are very much similar in that both couples are elderly and in receipt of pension moneys and possibly own the essential assets of a home and personal effects. But they are very much different, in that one couple receives one pension and lives on an income of about half of that of the other couple who are in receipt of two pensions.

It is an assumed fact, that the basic old age pension is a payment to elderly of our nation primarily as a recognition for their contribution to society and, secondly, as financial support in the event need arises.

On the basis of this principle, it appears wrong for us to treat the one-pension couple by considering the pension as income against the financial needs of the couple when application is made for additional income through public assistance. In my mind, I find this manner of calculating financial need as discriminatory against a one-pension couple. I believe that the basic pension should be exempt and it should be treated as a gift or an award and money that the aged could use as they desire to see fit. It should not be calculated as income in order to establish additional financial needs of the one-pension

couple.

These are two short-comings that I have with respect to the final report of The Special Committee on Welfare. I had hoped that the Committee would have given these two points greater consideration. Otherwise, Mr. Speaker, I believe the report before us is a good one with many practical observations and sensible recommendations to improve the welfare system in our province and the nation as a whole. I am pleased, as a member of the Legislative Committee, to give my support to this report.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

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

**MR. H.H. ROLFES** (Saskatoon Nutana South): — Mr. Speaker, from the outset I want to say that I am appreciative of the fact that I was a member of the Committee, The Select Standing Committee on Welfare. I say this, Mr. Speaker, mainly on three counts.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, the Select Standing Committee on Welfare afforded me the opportunity to get to know Saskatchewan and the people of Saskatchewan better as we travelled.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, I believe that I now have a better understanding of the Saskatchewan Assistance Program and how it applies to recipients, and consequently, I am more sympathetic with those who are forced by circumstances to become recipients.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, I enjoyed working and travelling with my colleagues and most of the Members opposite. From the many hours that we worked together, I came to realize that although there are many areas on which we could agree, there are fundamental differences between Members on this side of the House and Members on that side of the House, when it comes to finding solutions for the less fortunate in our society. I am not saying, Mr. Speaker, that we are right and the Members opposite are wrong in the approach to be taken, but the fact does remain there are fundamental differences and the report bears this out.

Although a multitudinous number of problems were brought to our attention by many individuals and different organizations, two basic themes were raised over and over again. The first of these was the question of work and welfare and the second was the concern over the complex proliferation of income security programs and the host of agencies dealing with financial support and social services. The Committee attempted to deal with each in the report.

Many of the people who appeared before the Committee were confused on what the regulations were concerning welfare. They had these mixed up with rules and regulations pertaining to such agencies as Canada Manpower, Unemployment Insurance, Workmen's Compensation and Old Age Security.

Time and time again the Committee was told that so and so was on welfare; that the individual refused to work; that he was healthy and that he should be cut off. However when the Committee investigated these cases most of the time we found that either: 1. The man was not on welfare but was receiving

April 16, 1974

assistance from unemployment insurance or Workmen's Compensation. 2. The man had a doctor's certificate which stated that he could not work. Although from physical appearance one would have concluded that he was able-bodied and should be required to work, or, Mr. Speaker, the committee found that the man was neither on welfare, unemployment insurance or workmen's compensation, but that he had another source of income.

In a few cases the Committee did find abuses and these were reported to the Department. And I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the Department has taken care of these cases.

Mr. Speaker, to say that the Committee wasn't concerned about job-creation programs for welfare recipients as suggested by the Member for Morse (Mr. Wiebe) is simply not borne out by the report. As pointed out by the Member for Prince Albert East (Mr. Feschuk), no less than 15 recommendations in one way or another concern themselves with the problem of creating employment. The Member for Canora (Mr. Matsalla) this afternoon, again, in detail, pointed out that the Member for Morse was wrong in his accusation, that this Committee was not concerned with employment.

A brief perusal of some of the recommendations very clearly shows that this Committee was concerned with creating employment. Let me just refer to a few.

Recommendation No. 3, that a guaranteed annual income and guaranteed employment program be implemented as a goal.

Recommendation No. 29, that in order to encourage the working poor, low wage earners should receive appropriate financial supplements and health benefits based on the needs test that would apply to all recipients.

Recommendation No. 33, that adequate protection to workers be given through labor legislation in order to assist the working poor.

Recommendation No. 34, that the Government consider an expansion of the programs of job creation activities which was initiated by the Department of Social Services in 1973.

Recommendation No. 35, that a program of guaranteed jobs be made available to employables.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on to recommendations 36, 37, 38, 39 and others, all of which, Mr. Speaker, are concerned in creating employment for people in Saskatchewan. I think that the Members opposite simply have not studied the report when they make accusations that this Committee was not concerned with creating employment.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, the recommendations that I have referred to give ample evidence that we were concerned with providing employment for able-bodied individuals. To suggest otherwise, as did the Member for Morse, is an attempt to misinform the public as to the recommendations endorsed by Members of this side of the House who served on the Welfare Committee.

I should like to turn to the recommendation that pilot projects be designed and implemented in order that separation of services might be tested and evaluated. The Committee felt

that the Department of Social Services should take a more active and aggressive role in making its programs and services available to clients. The Committee also questioned the advisability of increasing expenditures indefinitely without questioning the fundamental concept of service delivery and program objectives. In this regard the Committee felt that the focus should be on prevention and separation of services.

Too often, Mr. Speaker, families and individuals are permitted to deteriorate to a state of utter hopelessness and complete destitution. Very often people will seek the services of the Department only as a last resort, only when all other avenues have been investigated, only when they are forced to accept the financial assistance and social services available from the Department in order to keep life and limb and family together.

Mr. Speaker, I recognize that there are some who will take advantage of the Social Services, but I am also one who believes that the majority of the people are honest and trustworthy and that they will not take advantage of the Department.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee felt that separation of services would reduce the alienation of clients by the present welfare system. Furthermore, it would preserve client dignity. It would promote client self-determination and it would allow the client to decide what types of services he needs. Some clients need only financial assistance, whereas others require financial assistance, budget planning and family or personal counselling. Not everybody should be subjected to all the services when only specific ones are required. Therefore, the Committee recommended that clients have some say as to the services they need. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, if we separate the financial assistance from the social services, many more clients will seek the services of the Department before they reach a state where they are retrievable only at extremely high costs to society. Mr. Speaker, prevention not rehabilitation must be the key word in the programs provided by the Department of Social Services. The Department must change its public image so that people in need, both financial and social, will seek its services without suffering the embarrassment that many clients experience today when they first come in contact with the Department of Social Services.

I fully support the Committee's suggestion that the emphasis in counselling should shift the focus to preventive services rather than crisis oriented or after the fact treatment. This shift in focus will benefit society both in financial terms and in the preservation of families and the dignity of many individuals.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I want to turn specifically to some of the reservations expressed by the Members opposite. On page 93 they state:

We have found the recommendations of this report to be financially irresponsible and entirely without regard for the costs to the taxpayer, or for the adequate benefits to recipients in need.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, you cannot on the one hand accuse us of being financially irresponsible when we recommend a guaranteed annual income and at the same time accuse us of not

April 16, 1974

providing adequate benefits to recipients in need. The very reason why we recommended guaranteed annual income and an employment agency was to make certain that those in need would receive an adequate income, something better than mere subsistence.

Also on page 93 of the report, the Members opposite state:

While verbally recognizing the need for a job creation program as a welfare priority, the report completely ignores any job programmes that might serve to lessen the number of recipients.

Mr. Speaker, others on this side of the House and myself, today, have given ample evidence to show how irresponsible and how completely false that statement is. On page 94 the Members opposite state again:

We are also unable to measure the likely withdrawal of financial support from present education and counselling services in order to provide the funds for this guaranteed income plan.

Mr. Speaker, one need only turn to the recommendations pertaining to social worker's qualifications and job performance, counselling, day care facilities, family courts, to only name a few, to see how that statement is completely contrary to the spirit of the report and the actual recommendations contained in it. Nowhere does the report give an indication that education and counselling services will be curtailed or withdrawn in order to provide funds for a guaranteed annual income.

Mr. Speaker, those Members on the Committee who have listened to me argue for counselling and preventive services rather than rehabilitation, will know that I simply would not have supported a report that would have curtailed counselling services.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the Members opposite were grasping at straws when they submitted their reservations. I would further suggest that they do not believe in the principle of a guaranteed annual income for all people. Even though, Mr. Speaker, a guaranteed annual income was recommended by the majority of the individuals and groups, including the church organizations who appeared before us. The guaranteed annual income has received support from the Federal Government's White Paper, "Income Security for Canadians," the Special Senate Committee on Poverty Report, "Poverty in Canada," and the recent "Working Paper on Social Security in Canada."

Let me, Mr. Speaker, at this time read just one paragraph from the Working Paper on Social Security in Canada. On page 4, the report says:

The central, though by no means the sole objective of social security in Canada is an acceptable basic income for all Canadians, whether that income comes through employment, if a person is able to work or through pensions or allowances if a person is unable or not expected to work, for a basic income is essential if a person is to live in decency and in dignity.

That, Mr. Speaker, is from the Working Paper on Social

Security in Canada by the Hon. Marc Lalonde.

Mr. Speaker, almost all people believe at least in the principle of the guaranteed annual income and are prepared to experiment with it. In that regard, I was disappointed that the Members opposite found it necessary to criticize the report and were not prepared at least to support the principle of a guaranteed annual income.

Before I close today, Mr. Speaker, I should like to congratulate the Minister of Social Services for the action that he has taken on some of the recommendations to date. I will certainly not go through all of these but I want to mention just a few.

Since the report has been handed in the Minister has taken action on day care centres. We all know that day care centres, which are not universal free day care centres, are supported by most people in this province.

The Minister has increased assistance to recipients. We know that due to rampant inflation recipients on the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan have suffered drastically in the last year. Raises certainly were necessary and I would hope that the Minister will keep a close survey of these rates and adjust them accordingly.

I was very pleased when the Minister announced a Family Income Plan. This, Mr. Speaker, will be a base for those people on low income and I think will go a long way in implementing a Guaranteed Annual Income.

It seems clear that the Minister is not prepared to let this report gather dust. I would encourage him to implement, as soon as it is humanly possible, the major recommendations and I would request the Attorney General to set up a Family Court system wherein family differences can be settled in a more relaxed, less formal and less legal atmosphere, without the high costs of lawyers. What is needed, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, is an atmosphere where families can come together under the guidance of an understanding sympathetic individual — not the present adversary legalistic, and cold-fact atmosphere of our court rooms.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, I want to say, that it is my firm belief that when all the recommendations have been implemented we shall have a Department of Social Services which meets most of the needs of its clients, which will focus its attention on prevention, not rehabilitation, which recognizes the right of all individuals to a just income and which will safeguard and preserve the dignity of every individual.

Mr. Speaker, I have some further words that I want to say on this report and, therefore, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

Debate adjourned.



## SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON BUSINESS FIRMS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. Engel (Notukeu-Willow Bunch) that: **The Final Report of the Special Committee on Business Firms** be now concurred in.

**MR. R. GROSS** (Gravelbourg): — Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the excellent and comprehensive report into the problems and prospects of the small businessman in Saskatchewan.

Businessmen wherever the Committee went expressed their keen interest in the Committee and for the work that we were doing. For this was the first time that the small businessman had the ear of the Government. Too often in the past, especially under the former administration and under the present Federal Liberal Government, they have not been listened to — to their problems — to their concerns or their needs.

Governments have tended to be attracted to the large glamour styled industries in an effort to promote a large enforced industrial growth economy. Consequently, Mr. Speaker, the small guy has been left in the weeds.

This Committee also noted that there are a number of good programs presently available through federal-provincial governments but because of lack of information on these programs the businessman hasn't really a clue as to what is available and what isn't available.

The Committee feels there is a real need to pull all of these existing programs together and bring forth one totally comprehensive program for the small businessman. In the report the Committee deliberately set out guidelines that could be followed when any consideration is being made for a new program.

We have taken the time to entitle the draft program as it might be considered and we have entitled it "Business Start."

Mr. Speaker, with your indulgence I should like to read the recommendations right from the report to show Members of this Legislature exactly what the Committee was talking about when they expressed the need for a comprehensive program for the small businessman.

I will start with the Business Start recommendations on page 16 of the report. I think it is important to read it out so that everybody is better able to grasp what it is all about.

1. The Department of Industry and Commerce should be responsible for developing a comprehensive program for assisting small businesses. Furthermore, the Department should develop an appropriate organization including determining whether the program requires a separate new organization or is to be part of an existing organization, keeping in mind that there should be a readily identifiable source for small business assistance.

Here, Mr. Speaker, we underline the fact and the need for such a program, a program where businessmen can readily identify with assistance for their organization. Farmers presently have programs such as this, they have FarmStart. They can readily identify a program with problems they are facing in their

industry.

2. The small business assistance program should provide loans up to \$60,000 with a scale of interest rates that decreases as the size of the loan decreases.

Some of the rationale used in picking a figure out of the air such as \$60,000 was that SEDCO told us that a great number of SEDCO's loans are made to the businessman in the \$20,000 range. It is their feelings and our feelings as a Committee that \$60,000 would cover the vast majority of business-type consumer loans.

3. The lowest interest rate would be the rate at which Crown corporations are able to obtain funds from the Provincial Government; thereby limiting the subsidy to the cost of administering these loans.

We felt that this was necessary that the province take into a sharing arrangement or paying for the cost of administration but we didn't feel that it was necessary to provide grants to the small businessman.

4. The small business assistance program should be decentralized by establishing regional offices that also provide Industry and Commerce business advisory services.

This is an important recommendation, Mr. Speaker, it is important that the arm of whatever program might be established is decentralized because it is impossible for a small businessman to come in from a rural area, come into Regina or Saskatoon and be expected to be able to make a loan in decent form. It just doesn't happen. We found in the Committee, time and time again, that the small businessman has not the polish or the esteem that a large businessman might have and consequently he cannot see himself coming into Regina and going up into the ivory tower of the Saskatchewan Power Building and sitting down and rationally trying to explain his problem, what his program is and what he wants. Too often he has been turned off by that process. There is a tremendous need to go out and decentralize this program.

5. The Regional Offices, staffed by small loans officers with previous lending experience, should have authority to approve loans up to a specified ceiling.

The reason why is because we have found throughout the Committee hearings that the present loaning institutions, both provincially and federally, have had too long a turnaround time in order to process a loan. By decentralizing not only the offices but by decentralizing the decision-making power we would have a chance to speed up this turnaround time and a lot of loans could be approved on the spot provided the loan that was being undertaken was a feasible one.

6. The term on small business loans should be up to 20 years providing that appropriate security is available.

Too often we heard businessmen under-financed and financed for too short a period and were not able to meet their commitments and consequently went under.

7. A new venture capital corporation should be created

for the purpose of providing equity capital to small manufacturing and processing industries.

We felt it important in the Committee that the Business Start program have a venture capital or corporation attached to it or would have access to one so that the fellow with the idea, the fellow with the good product would have some kind of opportunity had he not a cent of his own.

8. Provision should be made for the buy-back, at fair market value, of the equity held by the venture capital corporation.

We felt that this provision was a good one. If the fellow's good idea did pan out and it was a success he could then buy it back from the venture capital corporation.

9. The total equity, fixed and working capital financing and any other form of assistance should not exceed 90 per cent of the financing required for the start-up or operation of businesses.

We feel that by opening the guidelines up to 90 per cent and allowing the businessman only to have to put up 10 per cent was a fair and just proposal and it would surely succeed in businessmen being able to enter into business.

10. The small business programs should provide for financing for change of ownership and make it widely known that financing for this purpose is available.

Again, Mr. Speaker, in the Committee we found as we travelled the province a great number of young people wanting to start up a small shoe store in a small community or start up a local bakery or whatever it was, and it was a family transaction, and too often the father could not afford to set up his son, or his daughter. But he had no place to turn to. He couldn't afford to put up equity or back the note. A program like this should emphasize the problem of change of ownership and show preference to a family organization or a family firm.

11. Firms applying for loans may be permitted to defer payment of principal and interest for the first 18 months of the loan.

A very important recommendation in that it would give the person wanting the loan a proper time to get set up and get rolling.

12. A broader program of finished product inventory financing than presently exists should be developed.

13. Credit unions, banks and other financial institutions should be encouraged to make more fixed and working capital loans as well as financing finished product inventory by providing a Government guarantee of up to 90 per cent for such loans.

14. Recommendation 1 from page 31: (a) the present program of cost-sharing of market studies should be expanded; (b) for small, locally owned firms, the province should contribute up to 90 per cent of the cost of a feasibility of market study.

15. Recommendation 3 from page 32: (a) an immersion course on basic business principles and practices be available to persons without previous business experience who wish to start a new business.

A very important recommendation, Mr. Speaker, because far too often we have people wanting to get into business having no real practical knowledge of what it is all about. An immersion course would be helpful and it would teach them very basic accounting principles. And maybe more often we would find businessmen wanting to get into business not wanting to after having taken the course because they might realize all the problems they might be up against.

(b) The venture capital corporation consider requiring an applicant with minimal business experience to complete an immersion business course prior to receiving any assistance.

Mr. Speaker, we worked very hard on this Committee and particularly on the Business Start program. I feel it is a good one. I think it's a program that the Government must identify itself with. I think that the business community will be very happy to see such a program inaugurated.

However, Mr. Speaker, I think it is rather unfortunate that Members opposite and in particular I must single out Mr. Lane, not so much Mr. MacDonald, for his very negative response to that particular program. Somehow he said it was politically popular but he didn't know if he should go along with it. Mr. Speaker, I make no apologies if it is a politically popular program. I think it is an excellent program. I think it is a program the businessman has been waiting for.

Mr. Speaker, the report dealt with many other important issues in other important areas. We dealt with the tourism aspect of the province. We made several recommendations — the report is now tabled for everyone to read.

We also talked about bulk buying concepts and the need to make financing more available for bulk buying concepts. There was also the need for incentives for expansion of industry into rural areas. One way we thought might be an incentive if we provided low interest loans at lower rates of interest for communities outside of a certain radius of major centres and thus provide more of a decentralization of industry.

We also talked about a very important 'Buy Saskatchewan' campaign. We thought that we should have a 'Buy Saskatchewan' label provided to manufacturers or small processors and have a label readily identifiable with the 'Buy Saskatchewan' theme.

We also talked about terms of Government purchasing. That the Government should show some preference toward Government purchasing for products manufactured and sold in Saskatchewan such as an innovation agency. Such an agency that would be responsible for new ideas, when a new idea is born, taking that idea and getting it to the proper people in research who could handle it, and do a good job of researching it and come out with a more palatable program or product whatever the case may be.

Transportation was a fairly important article in the report. I think we stressed it adequately. The people talked about the

April 16, 1974

need for a better trucking service throughout Saskatchewan. In many areas we found the trucking people who had small private operations just were not satisfactory, they were not providing the service that was required and many instances were shown to us as a committee of the problems that people were facing. People have ordered parts in the spring through the private trucking line and never received any response until the fall.

There was also talk of the need for a regional air carrier to provide better air service throughout the province. It came up a number of times throughout the hearings that Saskatchewan is sadly lacking of such a service. It was sad, indeed, to note that the people brought it up many times that they were looking for a better regional air service.

Freight rates, of course, Mr. Speaker, highlighted most of the problems that we heard from the business community in Saskatchewan. Time and time again they told us of the discrepancies in the freight rates from eastern Canada to western Canada and it was a great problem. There was also considerable amount of debate on rail line abandonment as we went throughout the province. People expressed their keen concern about plans that are afoot for rail line abandonment. Surely, Mr. Speaker, anyone in his right mind would understand that if rail line abandonment is to take place, it would mean the death of several of these communities, a death of many businesses, a death of many small businessmen.

Mr. Speaker, I have very briefly gone through the report, outlining what I think is an excellent report, outlining in particular the Business Start program, which I hope the Government will see fit to introduce a number of the recommendations and combining them into one single program. I trust that all Members have read the report and look forward to its introduction with some very positive answers to some of the problems and prospects of the small businessman in Saskatchewan.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

Debate adjourned.

### **PROGRESS REPORT ON HIGHWAY TRAFFIC AND SAFETY COMMITTEE**

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

**MR. D.W. MICHAYLUK** (Redberry): — Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me as one of the members of the Intersessional Committee on Highway Traffic and Safety to have an opportunity to participate in this very important debate on the Progress Report tabled in this Legislature.

As a Committee member I can only say that it is my sincere hope that this Assembly very seriously studies this Progress Report in that it represents, what I feel, is a very comprehensive innovative look at a very important issue.

At this stage, Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the Hon. Member for Kinistino (Mr. Thibault), Committee Chairman also the vice-chairman, the Hon. Member for Whitmore Park

(Mr. Grant) on the manner in which they both conducted all the public hearings. I was truly proud of our chairman during the Committee's stay in Phoenix, Arizona, when we stayed there for some four or five days to study their Alcohol Safety Aid Program. I would also commend all the Committee members, on both sides of the House, who up to this stage it appears to me worked only with one motive and that is, Mr. Speaker, to come up with recommendations that may solve some of our highway traffic problems. Although I do realize, Sir, that solutions may only be partially solved.

There is no single committee which is going to succeed in coming forward with all the answers. However, I feel that to date the Committee was successful, thanks to many concerned people. The concise cross-section of opinion on recommendations and observations presented in this Report, reflects the views of many sectors of our population and people. The decision of this Legislature to appoint this Committee, also indicates the growing public concern with respect to highway traffic and safety.

The Committee, through its deliberations, found very quickly that we were dealing with a very complex issue, an issue to which intense discussions must be given.

Mr. Speaker, in the not too distant future a final Report from this Committee will be tabled in this Legislature. From that Report I am hopeful that the recommendations will be included in the statutes of this province. As I mentioned a few moments ago, Mr. Speaker, this particular report is far-ranging, as far as the recommendations are concerned.

With the advent of technology many changes have taken place in transportation over the past several decades. Left behind are the 30-mile per hour cars, the Model T and the Model A and the Overland Whippet. Today, we are living in the age of unprecedented variety as far as automobiles and other vehicles of transportation are concerned. With the new models on the line almost daily, society finds itself faced with conditions very different from days gone by, when not only was it a luxury to travel by automobile, but it was even a greater luxury to own one. That situation, Mr. Speaker, will never again be prevalent. Therefore, governments through their elected representatives have the responsibility to ensure that programs and policies are geared towards education and safety are put into effect.

There are many factors involved in any program that could be directed towards improving traffic safety and education in today's society. As a Committee, Mr. Speaker, our deliberations would have been made much easier had it been able to capture the imagination of all Saskatchewan people. However, such was not the case, although we had many briefs and many presentations. Regardless of the issue it seems that today's public has a built-in resistance to come forward with comments and recommendations. The initiative had to come from the Committee and while we were successful in attracting many briefs and individuals and group viewpoints there are some who might argue that our studies were not broad enough.

Discounting that possibility, Mr. Speaker, I sincerely feel that to date our Committee has succeeded in bringing forward for discussion, the types of recommendations which will have a very favorable impact on highway and traffic practices in Saskatchewan in the months and years ahead. Time does not permit me to

April 16, 1974

comment on all the points forwarded in this Report. However, Mr. Speaker, I do want to spend a few moments commenting on the education aspect of the question at hand.

At the outset, I feel that history shows us all very clearly that we have failed properly to educate our citizens in this field. As more and more people are driving more and more automobiles, education has not in any way kept pace with this phenomena. There are more vehicles on our roads today than in any time in the past, yet there has not been a corresponding increase in the education programs, which are so necessary if we are going to succeed in even holding down the number of accidents and this resulting from the increased dependency society has on the automobile.

Many of the improvements which are needed are beyond the powers of the individual, however, they are not beyond the powers of this Government. And it is for that reason, Mr. Speaker, that I hope that this Legislative Assembly treats this Report as a high priority.

The psychology of the human being is one factor which has traditionally been responsible for a minimum public outcry with respect to increasing the emphasis on education. Every time a person picks up a newspaper and reads about another traffic fatality, the feeling is, that is too bad, however it will never happen to me.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, that feeling is prevalent until that sad day when that same person learns one of his family or a close friend is killed in traffic. Then, and only then, this issue takes on a different meaning and makes personal impact because of the unfortunate circumstance.

Mr. Speaker, for too long, yes for too long, that comfortable security we have has been on the line each time we step behind the wheel of a car, yet our odds for survival on the roads would be improved immeasurably if we could take our car onto the road backed with the assurance that our participation in an education program would make us all better drivers.

The question arises again, when should driver education begin? Mr. Speaker, I think that we are deluding ourselves into a false sense of security if we are content to ignore this driver education program until we approach the driving age.

Most school jurisdictions within the province have access to driver education programs. However, as a government we must address ourselves to the reality, that for the most part, these courses are not sufficient. We must recognize the fact that a youngster entering the first grade will, in the future, spend much of his adult life behind the wheel of an automobile, an automobile which can, in an instant determine life or death for many people.

Why is it then as a society we not place greater emphasis on proper education to ensure that each person is prepared to deal more rationally with any eventuality which might arise as a result of his operating any vehicle?

That answer has never been clear. No one can say for sure why it is that we have been dragging our feet, so to say, for such a long period of time. However, I feel that past inaction

should further expedite the resolutions contained in this Report which are geared to changing this pattern of apathy and create a public awareness.

Let us briefly examine the school curriculum itself, with the exception of school patrols and cursory attention to teaching our younger students the meaning of various traffic signals and the like, our educators today are not emphasizing the complexities involved in traffic safety. Our school system does not contain the necessary mechanisms to permit teachers to embark on any comprehensive program which I feel is needed to better prepare all students for later life when they get that first driver's license.

I am also of the opinion that attitudes must change with respect to the driver training courses which are provided in our school system. Perhaps making these courses credit courses, would improve the situation, however, I feel that further changes must be made as well.

It is fundamentally important that the people who are on the instructing end of such programs are people who have a commitment, who have an enthusiasm and who do have a sincere dedication to the philosophy of such courses. Today's student should not be blamed for any carefree attitudes he might have with respect to existing courses, because I feel it is today's educators and the people responsible for the curriculum who must shoulder responsibility for the success, or lack of success, of programs which are in effect at the present time.

Just recently we have all heard a considerable amount about defensive driving courses. As a member of this Committee, Mr. Speaker, my driving habits and my awareness of other drivers, took on a different aspect after taking a defensive driving course. I am sure that any person who has taken such a course similarly recognizes the value of such training. However, is that enough? I, personally, feel that greater emphasis must be placed on these courses and I am of the opinion that these programs should be compulsory and constitute part of a driver training program. The participation in a course like this, Mr. Speaker, is a cheap price to pay when one considers the alternative.

With rising fatality rates on our roads today, it sometimes makes me wonder how big a sledgehammer is needed before we, as a government, are going to come to grips with this very serious problem. Without a doubt it is too easy for an individual to get a driver's license. When one considers that what we are doing when we give someone a license to give him the legal right to drive a lethal weapon, which is all the automobile is. I feel we have not done everything in our power to ensure that he is adequately prepared to deal with the machine he is in charge of. A machine, and drivers who are responsible for over 250 deaths on our roads and highways each year.

Yes, public information and education programs are vitally important as well. I feel strongly that as a result of our Committee work, we have reawakened the public conscience and now that we have captured their attention, we must not tone down our initiatives; we must not lessen our educational thrusts and we must not vacate our responsibility to legislate change in this area.



April 16, 1974

Individuals and groups have shown their interest and have given their support to our initiatives and we must reward that interest by following through on some of their suggestions and recommendations we heard in their briefs. Mr. Speaker, in today's media conscious society, I think we have a natural vehicle to launch such an education program.

The mere expenditure of thousands of dollars in advertising might not be the answer. However, the expenditure of public money is warranted if that money is spent in such a way that it is going to awaken the public from its apathy and spark understanding with respect to the whole area of highway traffic and safety.

Our Report also deals with recommendations regarding deterrents and penalties for traffic offenders. Basically, I am in agreement with those recommendations as I feel our legal system has, in the past, been too lenient with offenders. However, I feel just as strongly that we must better prepare our drivers before sending them on the road and we must also make provisions for ensuring that violations will not be repeated as casually as many of them are today.

The Report also notes the seriousness of the use of alcohol and its repeated relationship to traffic mishaps. We recognize the high ratio of alcohol related accidents and I am pleased, that as a government, and as a society in general, we must finally be obligated to do something about it.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, harsher penalties might be a deterrent to some, however, we must treat alcohol in a different light, and we must recognize that stiff penalties are no guarantee in solving these problems and accidents, unless we are prepared to do something to help that person who has an alcohol-related problem and drives. Only by tackling the problem at the base will we be able to make positive effects.

And, Mr. Speaker, this relates as well to driver education and traffic education. Let us not delude ourselves into believing that it is good enough to launch educational programs only when a person reaches the age of 16.

Mr. Speaker, let us not think for a minute that crash courses are good enough either. Statistics show us clearly that we have not succeeded. Statistics show us as well that we have not done all we could have to improve a serious situation.

This Report recognizes the shortcomings we have gone through in the past and it measures up to the public expectation. Mr. Speaker, for the past few minutes I have attempted to present my arguments in favor of the action this Progress Report proposes. I feel that for the first time in the history of this province, a Committee of the Legislature has taken a hard look at this problem, along with other committees, and I hope that we have met that responsibility. There is more that has to be done. The success of any program or the success we have in reducing accidents and improving driving habits of our people rests with the people themselves. However, just as important, we must never forget that it is government that must make the changes. It is government which must show the leadership and it is government that must promote a philosophy if we are going to be successful

As a member of this Committee, Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that all Members of this Assembly give their full support to this important topic and join with our Committee in bringing in the types of recommendations which will have a very positive impact on the whole area of highway traffic and safety in the months and years ahead.

It is with great pleasure that I accept this Report.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. D. BOLDT** (Rosthern): — Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee I want to say a few words regarding this Progress Report. I think this is one of the committees that the Government set up where there is no division of opinion. We have just witnessed a debate this afternoon and evening, one on the Special Committee on Welfare where committee members have different opinions and there are different philosophies regarding welfare in the province and there is nothing wrong with having different opinions, we have different parties. We also find that there is quite a difference of opinion regarding the committee that was set up on Business Firms. However, I want to say of this Highway Committee, the speeches that I have heard I have to agree with. I am not here to knock some of the opinions down that other Members have said. As a member of the Committee I have appreciated every individual's concern and expression regarding highway safety. When one talks about highway safety of all the concerns that were brought to our attention, the main concern has always been, of all committees and briefs, regarding alcohol. And it is not strange that even last night in the debate that I would agree or that the Attorney General would agree with me and I would disagree with some of my colleagues on this side of the House. In most cases when the Coming of Age Bill has been amended, the lowering of the drinking age or the legal age, usually there has been what we call a free vote because there are differences of opinion in each party. I think it is good when governments introduce controversial legislation that Members be given an opportunity to vote as their consciences dictate rather than what the party says.

I am sure as a member of the Committee that all Committee members showed a great deal of concern for traffic safety. A good deal of interest has been shown by some groups and some individuals representing the public. However, I have a feeling that a very small, and I say very small, minority of the public are really concerned about highway safety. I am also concerned about all government action and inaction regarding highway and street safety, not only provincial governments but municipal governments as well. Far too many individuals in public life pay only lip service to safety and fail to implement the necessary legislation to help curb accidents and death on our streets and highways.

I am also somewhat concerned about the Government's involvement at this time in new measures and legislation aimed at better traffic safety before the Committee has made its final Report. I agree, however, and realize that the Government has the right to make expenditures as they see fit, even if these measures will in the final Report be opposed by the Committee. I am not saying that they will be, but they could be. I believe the Committee perhaps has lost some impact it might have had if the Government had at least waited to hear our final recommendations. As an

April 16, 1974

example, the Committee has considered insurance premiums, but at no time did we consider that the Treasury, through a sales tax on gasoline, should assist in carrying the high cost of insurance and today I notice that the Bill has been withdrawn so I don't know if the Committee has had an influence or not. I hope it has.

I am sure the Committee members are concerned about the various departments of Government and agencies embarking on their own little safety program which I am afraid will do very little to help curb accidents. We must co-ordinate all our efforts. I am sure that the recommendations of the Committee when it brings in its final Report will have this as one of its recommendations.

In reference to the activities of the Committee I think it is fair to say that almost without exception we were busy with assessing the seriousness of the driver under the influence of alcohol. A great deal of emphasis was devoted to education and the Hon. Member for Redberry (Mr. Michayluk) stressed this point. I really cannot disagree with him on this, but I am not sure that education is the answer. As a matter of fact I am almost convinced that in many cases education is not the answer. It certainly is not the only answer. I base my assumption on the fact that a great deal of information and education has been directed towards the use of tobacco. The literate and the illiterate do not seem to take advice from our educators, from our doctors, nor do they take advice from the Government. It is true that some citizens have given up smoking because of this education but statistics indicate that the number of smokers in Canada increase from day to day. The accidents related to alcohol do not indicate that the public has benefitted from education. Accidents related to alcohol fall among even our most educated citizens. Even my good friends, the lawyers at times drive while under the influence of alcohol. Nobody needs to suggest nor would they agree that they need more education. Despite the fact that they know what the law says in this respect, they are about as guilty as any other segment of our society. I think all governments must get tough and I mean absolutely ruthless when dealing with the impaired driver. It has been proven to me and I am sure all members of the Committee that impairment takes possession at the blood alcohol content at about .04 per cent.

The committee has been told that about 80 per cent of the convicted drivers who have their operators' licences revoked do drive without an operator's licence. It has been stated and reported to us by the police that if you drive without an operator's licence the chances of you being picked up are one in 70,000. That's the reason why they are driving. Some of the ideas expressed by Committee members, I believe, would eliminate this problem. The answer is not a jail term or a huge fine or both, I believe the law must clearly state that once the operator's licence is revoked, the individual must not operate a vehicle. It has been suggested by Committee members that on the offence of no operator's licence, that is, after the operator's licence has been revoked and he does drive, the registration and licence plates should be turned into the Highway Traffic Board. A policeman can always identify a vehicle that hasn't got a licence plate on it. This, in some cases would create extreme hardships in the family. We all realize that but that is what the law is for, to protect those who keep the

law and those who break the law it must accept harshness. My argument for the support of this proposal is that if this were the law all members of this particularly family would make sure that the convicted driver would not get behind the family wheel.

A good deal more could be said about the abuse of alcohol but I do not think that the consideration of the Progress Report is the place for it. All I want to say further on this subject is that it was a mistake for the previous government to reduce the drinking age from 21 to 19 and it has also been proven to me without a doubt that it is a mistake of the present Government to have reduced the drinking age to 18 year olds. All records indicate that more and more of our young drivers are involved in accidents while under the influence of alcohol.

The use of safety belts has had top priority from briefs received by the Committee members. It appears that the Federal Government might move in the direction of compulsory use of the seat belts. I personally believe that most drivers in Saskatchewan would readily adjust to this recommendation if it were recommended by the Government. After all it is compulsory for car manufacturers to install seat belts but why must a consumer pay an extra \$100 for this safety feature if it is generally not used. It has been estimated that maybe 2 per cent of the Saskatchewan people use seat belts. A brief was received from a ladies' organization in Saskatoon which made reference to safety belts for children. I felt that this brief merits more consideration. Small children are often the victims of a minor accident which need not have happened if proper seats were installed in family cars.

The Department of Highways, over the years, has done a marvellous job in eliminating dangerous intersections, realignment of the road system, traffic and numerous other safety measures. But we find that a good majority of our highway traffic accidents occur on urban and rural municipal roads and streets. The Committee has been made aware of these shortcomings and municipalities must also be urged to implement programs that produce more accident-free streets and roads.

I am convinced that all Committee members are very sincere in attempting to reduce our traffic accidents. We all hope that regardless of which party will form the next government and when I say this, I believe that the final Report will be closer to the next provincial election and that the present Government will not have time to implement the recommendations, but I do hope that whoever is the government, that the government of that day will have the responsibility to act. All Committee members I am sure will want that government to act and we believe that if the Committee recommends and the government will act, that we will have the support of the public on the recommendations that will be made.

I am pleased to support the recommendations in the Highway Traffic Report.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. A. OLIVER** (Shaunavon): — Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure to rise in support of the Progress Report on Highway Traffic and Safety.

I felt that as a Committee man on this worthwhile project,

that I had a number of responsibilities.

1. To seek out causes of the carnage on our provincial highways and recommend to the Legislature corrective measures.
2. To find educational methods to better inform the public on traffic safety.
3. To focus attention on the need for an abrupt change in the attitudes of our drivers.
4. To map out an ongoing Highway Traffic Safety Program which should be constantly updated by a permanent committee of this Legislature.

The procedures of the Committee, I think, are to be commended. I want to congratulate the chairman, the Member for Melfort-Kinistino (Mr. Thibault). Highway traffic safety to him has become almost an obsession and for some people this may be a bit difficult to understand. But once you have attended a funeral as the result of a highway traffic accident, as the Member for Melfort-Kinistino has, where a family of six has been wiped out; where you see a mother with her little baby cradled in her arms buried in the same coffin, then and only then will the people see the absolute needless waste of life that is happening on our highways and also become obsessed with the desire to immediately correct the situation.

The Member for Melfort-Kinistino also stated a little while ago that he was going to be on the French station on an open line show tomorrow. This shows that he is definitely concerned and is pressing forward with his ideas to do something positive to reduce the high death rate on our highways.

I should also like to congratulate and thank the vice-chairman, the Member for Whitmore Park (Mr. Grant) and I should like to congratulate the staff for the work they done for us.

The Committee worked in a completely informal atmosphere. This definitely worked to the satisfaction of all Committee members and we got the most out of each member. As the Member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) said it was completely non-political because there was a sincere desire of all Committee men to stop the slaughter on our highways.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe that highway traffic safety is a matter of attitude and the only difference between a live motorist and a highway statistic is the proper driver attitude. Driver behavior is directly linked to his attitude or frame of mind at the time he gets behind the wheel. If he is tired he unwittingly commits errors; if he is angry he is impatient and aggressive and the aggressive driver is a dangerous driver. However, if he is happy he is most likely to be courteous and more attentive. It is unfortunate though, Mr. Speaker, that we cannot legislate good attitudes. Attitudes must be taught at an early age and by parents. Children imitate their parents and heroes, but they don't differentiate between good and bad attitudes or habits. Never believe, Mr. Speaker, that children cannot see the sheer hypocrisy of the behavior of their parents and other adults. They know when it is a 'do as I say and not as I do' type of thing. The formation of attitudes have many reasons and it is very difficult to analyse one specific cause

for a change in attitudes without examining the individual's entire environment. But I should like to take one aspect of that and that is the area of traffic safety.

There is a sore need for a change in the general public's attitude towards the rule of law. We can't legislate attitudes but we can provide, through legislation, the opportunity for an improvement in attitudes. One such method is by providing a desirable atmosphere in our schools. Kindergarten classes should include some of the very rudimentary elements of traffic safety. A kindergarten through grade twelve traffic safety program which is recognized as a credit course would have a desirable effect in lowering the deaths on our highways.

Such a course must be given more priority in the classroom timetable than health is now, where the general safety program is taught. Some schools limit their traffic safety program to essay and poster contests. The more progressive elementary schools have developed school patrols but that appears to be the program and nothing else.

In the matter of driver education, Mr. Speaker, I have done a fair bit of research into this since my son was involved in driver training last year and I found a large number of inadequacies. Driver education has not had any meaningful priority in schools. It has been restricted to noon hour and after school instruction. Classroom instruction is carried on under very difficult conditions. The children are crowded into classrooms, they are constantly being interrupted by other students who are picking up their lunch boxes, ball gloves, etc. and they have to compete with noon hour sports.

Instructors are not all skilled in organization, presentation or classroom management. Instructors often find themselves without the full support of the teaching staff, they are treated as intruders.

I have made a number of personal visits to classrooms where this is being taught and I was shocked by one particular person sitting up on the desk, the teacher's desk, reading from the first edition of "Sportsmanlike Driving," in a monotone voice. I don't have the first edition, but this is the second edition of it. It is very difficult to use such an old text; it is difficult to keep the students' interest when you have pictures of old vehicles, old style clothes and hair styles. But I did find that in the Sportsmanlike Driving, there wasn't enough defensive driving in it at all. However, a number of new books are now being used. One is written, perhaps some of the members of the Committee will remember him, by Mr. Greening. The second was Driver Education and this one is the recommended one which has a lot of defensive driving in it.

Now, the total course has sort of evolved over a number of years. The testing program has also been improved. There are a number of tests which are divided into three sections. It is unfortunate that the tests were set up with multiple choice type questions, fill in the blank type of thing and only two or three essay type questions at the back. However, they have progressed to a better type of examination. I'd like to read to the House one such question, and I quote from chapter two, number 2: "The text also suggests that good drivers have a number of characteristics. List these. What ingredients do you lack?" That type of question, which would let a student

April 16, 1974

compare the known good characteristics with himself and he would self-evaluate and therefore become more aware of what are the proper characteristics of a good driver.

It is unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, that some owners of driver training schools are taking advantage of the lack of proper supervision over both the classroom and in-car instructions. Now, it is bad enough to chisel the public and the student out of a few dollars but to send an improperly trained student out on the highway where, through the lack of being properly trained, he is either killed or he kills someone else, Mr. Speaker, is nothing short of being an accessory to murder.

The Department of Education requires 20 hours of classroom instruction and these are not being adhered to. An average of ten 45 minute periods, which is eight and a half hours of classroom instruction is given, that is if the student attends every day, but if he misses a class he is just out of luck and there is no way he can catch up.

The student though usually gets his full four hours of in-car instruction. This is the minimum amount required by the Department of Education as well.

Mr. Speaker, I have talked to a lot of people and I found that the parents were complaining about the instructors. Some of these complaints were completely unfounded, but I did find that they were falling into two categories. One is what I call the penny pincher. This is where the instructor would drive around for 20 minutes and then stop for a coffee or a coke and chat for another 20 minutes. Coffee and coke are, of course, a lot cheaper than gasoline. They become great pals with the kids and in return for the favor the student usually initials the driver attendance sheet. Here they have the number of lessons the date, the driver and the students' initials at the bottom declaring that he has had that time in the car.

The second group of complaints about instructors fall into the, what I call slap and tickle. Now it is difficult to know exactly how serious this complaint is. Parents complain but will not substantiate their complaint, due to fears of what local gossip mongers would do to their daughter's reputation.

Some parents refused to allow their daughter to take driver training fearing she would not be able to control the situation if it arose. But, Mr. Speaker, the case of the dirty old man, is, in my opinion, negligible. Slap and tickle cases though are not restricted to male instructors. But these are even more difficult to substantiate, because it is hard to differentiate between what are actual facts and the fictitious bragging of a teenage Casanova.

I found most of the instructors though to be of good moral character and in most cases sincerely devoted to their work. I found that the complaints of the instructors were very interesting. They complained of classroom conditions, the lack of co-operation with the teaching staff, cramming the course into a few weeks and orders from the owner of the driver training school to reduce the in-car training time to save a few dollars. They had a great fear of losing their job if they complained to either departments. In many cases it is the owner who is the problem and not the instructor.

The students also had something to complain about. They complained that there is too much technical information in the course to cover in such a short time. There were very heavy reading assignments. Other school work has the priority because the driver training course isn't a credit course. Some have boring instructors. One of the hardest things, I think, for the girls who took the course was to watch the films while they were eating lunch. If you have ever watched the film 'Signal Thirsty' which is a real blood and guts one, showing actual accidents, and to try and eat while that thing was on the screen was a little bit too much. It is not conducive to good digestion.

They complained about being too tense while driving in the car with the instructor, but most thought the instructor was a poor classroom teacher, but was a very good in-car teacher. The instructors gave them confidence in most cases and helped them overcome nervousness.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to move on to the learner's licence itself. In section 66, subsection (5) of The Vehicles Act, it states and I quote:

Notwithstanding anything in this Act the Board may issue a learner's licence to a person who (a) is 15 years of age, (b) who is enrolled in a high school driver training program under the direction of the Provincial Government, (c) has completed at least eight hours of classroom instruction in such a program and (d) has written and passed the driver training examination.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the eight hours of classroom instruction then becomes the maximum instead of the 20 hours that is required by the Department of Education. It clearly becomes evident that if an owner of a driver training school is interested solely in making money and not in training student drivers he is going to take the option of teaching fewer hours as permitted by the Traffic Board, because there are fewer punitive measures that can be taken by the Department of Education than by the Traffic Board. This is reason enough for better co-ordination between all departments involved in traffic control and safety.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the qualifications for a learner's licence states that he has to be either 16 years old and passed a driver examination, or 15 years old, enrolled in a high school training course and has passed the driver's exam.

This is where the sheer hypocrisy of our adult world shows up in issuing learners' licences. The instructor signs this application, stating that the student has had at least eight hours of classroom instruction, when in fact, in many cases it is less than two hours, before the licence is issued.

Now at the bottom of that form, D1 is states:

It is an offence to make a false statement on this application.

What kind of an example is the instructor setting when he is supposed to teach the rule of law, but he flagrantly disregards the law at the very beginning of the course. So it puzzled me as to why would an instructor make such a false declaration and jeopardize his job?



April 16, 1974

In Section 70 of The Vehicles Act, there is a matter of dual controls and I quote:

A dual control training vehicle shall be deemed to be driven by an instructor when he is in the driving position of one of the sets of controls.

There is no need for a learner's licence if training is to be taken in a dual controlled car and practically all of these vehicles are so equipped.

The legal interpretation of "the driver at fault" in the case of an accident, is part of this problem. In the case of a student driver who is actually driving the car with the instructor at the other controls he can legally drive the car and be covered by the insurance of the instructor. So the insurance wasn't the reason for falsifying the form. The problem arises when the student has an accident in which he is deemed to be more than 50 per cent at fault.

Section 70 of The Vehicles Act says that the instructor is deemed to be the driver when he is at the other controls and is therefore responsible. The instructor then pays the surcharge on his licence. However, if the student has a learner's licence and has an accident where he is more than 50 per cent at fault, a legal argument can and has effectively been advanced where the student was deemed to be 'the driver fault' and not the instructor, so then the student gets the surcharge on his licence. I am of the opinion that the possibility of having a surcharge on his licence is the reason for the instructor falsifying the application.

I would urge that the Attorney General clarify the term 'driver at fault' and that it be the licenced learner or the instructor, so there would be no need for falsifying the application and breaking the law.

I would also recommend that only the principal of the school sign that the student has had at least eight hours of classroom instruction and not either the instructor or the principal, because it is invariably the instructor who signs it.

This lack of supervision will hopefully be remedied through the re-organization that is taking place in the Department of Education, where the Director of Driver Education will have more direct control over the training of student drivers. It cannot be over-emphasized that in order to have fewer highway deaths, an immediate program of traffic safety must be instigated at the kindergarten level and continued through to Grade 12. The program must have as its main theme, throughout those 13 years, the respect for law and order. It must impress upon the student that a driver's licence is a privilege, not a right.

We must co-ordinate all departments involved in traffic control and safety so everyone will be working towards lowering the slaughter on our highways and not creating little empires in each department.

We, as Legislators, can do a great deal towards this goal if we work together. We should make every effort to become better drivers so we may set an example to others. The time to act is now, before you or one of your loved ones becomes a highway traffic statistic.

Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I support the Report.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. M. FEDUNIAK** (Turtleford): — Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in taking part in this discussion, being one of the members of the Highway Traffic and Safety Committee and looking at the wide scope and variety of problems that contribute to our serious situation, creating ever-increasing accidents and injuries to our citizens in many cases, innocent people.

Mr. Speaker, I decided to relate a report by Mr. Turcott, Wawa, Ontario, given to our Committee by Mr. Green in charge of the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office operations. This report evaluates the results of accidents by the type of cars and trucks that are made, sold and used at the present time. Mr. Speaker, I will use the term cars, but this will include trucks also. Each car manufacturer has a protector put on the front and back of it in order to protect the vehicle from damage of the body, which is called a bumper. In reality they are deliberately made of light weight metal, on the car maker's theory that the progressive crushing of the metal will save the occupant. Today's beautiful automobiles are loaded with luxuries and gadgets of every kind and description. Luxury interiors, carpets, automatic transmissions, power steering and brakes, wipers, defrosters, roll down windows, music, even seat warmers, all at the touch of a button. Yes, they are loaded with everything that is, except safety.

Mr. Speaker, as more and more thousands of cars crowd our highways every year, the total of deaths and injuries have mounted right along with them until we are now killing and injuring more people on our highways and in traffic than in any war ever fought. We gasp when an air crash kills 300 people, but more than twice that many are killed on a Memorial Day, or weekend holiday, that is United States records, and we shrug it off, and wait for another holiday statistics. But no one, not the Government, nor the car makers, nor the public, do anything about bringing it to a halt. Least of all do the car makers. They may not exactly relish the dead and the injured statistics, but every bashed up car means another sale or at least a host of expensive repairs, either of which adds up to a nice fat profit.

Mr. Speaker, whatever happens to these bumpers, they are supposed to protect the body of the car and thus its occupants. They are still there sort of, more or less, but over the past decade or so, car makers keep putting them on for looks rather than safety. Many of them have been recessed below or around the grill and headlights, apparently so that the repair bill will be higher. For what other reason could they be there? This does not improve the safety of the car. Modern cars are especially constructed so that they will collapse like an accordion upon impact. But where is the motor, transmission, etc? Why, right up in the front seat with the driver or what's left of him.

Mr. Speaker, this report refers to it as controlled collapse. Head on collisions bring the greatest death tolls and destruction. With the great wide, flat front end on 95 per cent of today's cars, it is inevitable that two cars coming together, even if a few inches apart, are doomed to a high, hefty repair bill, even if the occupants do escape serious injury. Whiplash and back

injury are the most common complaint. So the car makers decided the sudden stop caused by bumpers and their resultant crash energy were to blame. The insurance companies were howling, so what to do; how to protect the occupants at least partially while still making a real good wreck of the car? So they hit upon controlled collapse, for example, making the cars of lighter weight materials so that the crash would be spread over a wider area and controlled by the progressive crushing of the steel metal from which the car is made. The occupant might not quite be done for but they are making very sure the car will be.

Every day news headlines prove that controlled collapse does not save lives, two-car crashes often take five lives. Triple fatalities, "Seven Members of Family Killed in Collision," "Three Teenagers die in Head-on Crash." The police reported the front portion of one of the cars that were driven by the impact into the other, into the front seat. The right front wheel and the motor and transmission were tucked up almost underneath the dash.

Why hasn't the public and the government shown more concern? The United States government did bestir itself when one automobile executive admitted that their bumpers were safe in a crash at two miles per hour. "Terrible," said the government, "Human lives should be rated more highly than that." We are going to pass legislation that bumpers must be made safe at five miles per hour. Utter nonsense! Half of today's drivers take off faster than that from a standing start. While anyone caught driving five miles per hour on the highway would be arrested for obstructing traffic. That is where most car accidents happen.

Mr. Speaker, doesn't it strike anyone as ridiculous that car makers boast that their cars will do 120 miles per hour and the highway speed is 60 miles per hour and the car bumpers are safe at five miles an hour. Why all the power and speed with safety practically ignored? Even so the car makers are objecting and whining that safety and anti-pollution regulations will be hard to implement and will cost too much. How much cost is too much when human lives are at stake, especially when you read the profit figures of our car makers, millions and millions of dollars.

Mr. Speaker, why must we worry about dispersing the crash energy. Even more important, why should there be a crash at all? Why not point up the front and back bumpers of the cars into a V shape, add rollers, free rolling, and cars will simply roll past each other literally unscathed. Mr. Speaker, save the car and you save the people inside, is our concept. One that works and that has been proven. These roller bumpers were tried out in 1970 in 10 head on collisions at speeds of 5, 10, 20 and 25 miles per hour. Each car had no damage to either car or occupant. The prototypes used were very old cars, with crude looking bumpers constructed merely to prove the theory was correct. Both drivers B.A. Turcott and Bud Lindgren, who designed and built the bumpers, stated that there was no sensation other than a slight thump as the cars collided and drove past each other. In fact the faster the speed, the less the impact was felt.

The cars had no tendency to veer off the road, spin out of control nor roll over, they simply moved over and kept going. In 1973 three somewhat similar pointed nosed cars, but without the rollers, were tried out in England where the maker

demonstrated its superiority safety wise, by driving between two oncoming cars, 18 inches apart, and all three were travelling at 50 miles per hour all came out with only minor scratches.

Mr. Speaker, these conventional flat fronted controlled collapsible cars would have ended up total wrecks with the drivers seriously injured if not killed. Every other type of convenience is pointed at the front, ships, submarines, space craft, snowmobiles, even skis and snow shoes for lesser air resistance, speed and fuel saving. Why should cars be such huge flat front monstrosities? Literally lethal weapons when it is so easy to make them safe. The actual length of a car with turning bumpers will not exceed that of many of today's prestige cars, though some will criticize their appearance. But this can be practically eliminated by proper engineering in having the bumpers incorporated right into the frame and engine hood. They wouldn't look much different from some 1974 prestige cars, with their so-called safety bumpers front and back. All cars should have reinforced safety bars along the sides, roofs made noncollapsible and padded dashboards for complete protection. Without doubt, appearance does greatly affect saleability. They have twice appealed to the Federal Government for financial assistance to aid developing and improving our model and twice have been refused.

Government safety engineers admitted that the design was sound as far as the head-on collision was concerned but questioned the amount of damage that might be caused by collision at an intersection. Actually there would be less damage than that caused by the flat fronted model in use today, for the rollers would deflect the car to the sidesweep effect, which is more easily controlled and less likely to cause serious injuries.

Similarly, a pointed bumper equipped car striking guardrails, a bridge or a concrete wall would be deflected and has a good chance of rolling out with minimal destruction to property or persons.

Mr. Speaker, the shortages of metal now facing all countries may bring home to the governments and car makers alike, that mankind can no longer afford the huge mountains of wrecked cars which disfigure the countryside from one end to the other, largely the consequence of that controlled collapse type of thinking. Perhaps this shortage will shake up the governments to enact and enforce regulations for safer cars, which will save material and, incidentally, human beings. It will have to be enforced, for as one Detroit automobile engineer said, "Safety is a dirty word around here."

Mr. Speaker, another contributor to our serious financial problem as a result of ever-increasing automobile accidents, is the fact that nothing has suffered from inflation as much as cars and car repair costs, the prices of which are outrageous. It has been proven that a car built completely of repair parts at today's price would cost \$30,000.

Mr. Speaker, I have only dealt with one of the many problems in regard to highway traffic and safety. I am sure that other Members on this Committee will be dealing and will be covering every aspect of it. I hope that our Government will take a good look at this proposal regarding the turning bumpers on cars and do everything possible towards making car manufacturers built in all these safety features in all the cars as

April 16, 1974

soon as possible.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. F. MEAKES** (Touchwood): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to support this motion to adopt the Progress Report on Highway Safety Committee, I do it with a great deal of pleasure. It is a good Committee to work with.

I first must compliment the chairman the Hon. Member for Melfort-Kinistino (Mr. Thibault) for his able chairmanship. Throughout the committee work he has shown his skill as chairman and his patience and his understanding as a human being towards the other members of the Committee.

I also want to pay tribute to the staff that we had working with us. They have made our job much easier.

I want to compliment all members of the Committee. As the Hon. Member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) said tonight, we represent both sides of the House, but we have managed to work together in harmony; we may have had our disagreements but it wasn't on political lines, it was on just the straight difference of opinion.

I also want to pay credit, Mr. Speaker, to the news media. These representatives have been most co-operative and through them many of the issues have been brought to light to the public. Indeed, I believe that because of that fact that there has been a special committee sitting and because of the good work of the media, the people of this province are more aware of the very complex problems of traffic safety.

Mr. Speaker, I have quite a bit more to say, but I should ask leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

## **ADJOURNED DEBATES**

### **RESOLUTIONS**

#### **RESOLUTION NO. 24 — NATIONAL GRASSLAND PARK IN SOUTHWESTERN SASKATCHEWAN**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution by Mr. T.M. Weatherald (Cannington):

That this Assembly urge the Government of Saskatchewan to enter into negotiations with the Government of Canada and reach an agreement for the establishment of national grasslands park in southwestern Saskatchewan.

**HON. J.R. KOWALCHUK** (Minister of Natural Resources): — Mr. Speaker, I think that is an unfortunate thing that this subject of the grasslands park was introduced as a matter of debate in this House. I think that the Member for Cannington was wrong to bring in the topic at this time, when very definite, purposeful and quiet discussions have been going on with Ottawa regarding the grasslands park.

I think that it is unfortunate that the Liberal Members,

Mr. Speaker, have so little to latch onto that is politically discreditable to themselves that they have to place the whole grasslands park in jeopardy and the parties involved in discomfort and embarrassment.

I think also that it is unfortunate because the Provincial and Federal Governments would rather have had a good down-to-earth discussion regarding this park without the political debate in this House. But, having said that, Mr. Speaker, I don't mind it because as I have indicated, the Opposition have had so little including the Leader . . .

**MR. STEUART:** — Where is it located?

**MR. KOWALCHUK:** — It is not in Prince Albert. As I have indicated the Opposition Members have had so little that they could really get their teeth into and therefore for the sake of some political gain they wanted to discuss this matter of the grasslands park hoping somehow that this obvious support of the park will return to them in the form of votes come the next election.

The Federal Government at Ottawa has, indeed, modified its position in a number of ways regarding the grasslands park. The points of contention are to some extent, the minerals located within the proposed boundaries. Also the matter of taking out these minerals and the time limit when they should be taken out. Also there are the terms of the ranchers leasing the land. Other people, Mr. Speaker, have muddied the water somewhat, so to speak, in that area of concern, some even going so far as to say that it is insignificant and that it concerns some five ranchers or farmers.

No, these kinds of statements are, in my opinion, irresponsible and unfortunate when stated at this time, without knowledge of the real facts. Not that people are not entitled to making their viewpoints known, all people, but the people this Government is concerned about are the people who live there and are making their homes there. Some have been a part of the scene ever since Saskatchewan became a province and some even sooner than that.

We will insist that these people be involved and as you know they have already been involved to a certain point some two years ago. But we will insist that full recognition of the interest of local people be given by the Federal Government in any deal that is made, if any deal is made.

We will also be making a firm proposal in regard to the minerals. A great deal of work has already gone into research, into the amounts and availability of minerals, in the proposed park area.

Of particular concern are the minerals within the core areas, where it is of high priority that the disturbance of the topography should be nil, if we really mean what we say that the core areas become wilderness resorts, where only the hiker and possibly the horsemen would be allowed.

Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House, don't need urging to proceed by the Opposition Members. We are proceeding to deal with this matter of the grasslands park, in what I consider good sincere, honest and yes, hard bargaining. I feel that we

April 16, 1974

have a responsibility as a government of the people of Saskatchewan, to the people of Saskatchewan and especially the people living in that area, as I have already indicated; to bargain for them so that right will be done by them and also to bargain for all of the people of Saskatchewan so that right will be done by all of them as well.

This Government does accept this responsibility, not just to be unalterably opposed because we are dealing with Ottawa, not that. But we must do right by our Saskatchewan people, and basically with the understanding that the ecology of the area, the environmental problems will be understood and protected before any decision is made.

One may well say that what I am saying is deliberately applying the hard line, I say not so, Mr. Speaker. I say, based upon previous agreements with the Federal Government we are being pragmatic and practical. A good example of this kind of neglect of agreement by the Federal Government has been the one national park that we now have in Saskatchewan, Waskesiu in Prince Albert. In spite of appeals by Saskatchewan governments, including Liberal, and including Saskatchewan Ministers and also many other interested municipal associations to the Federal Government to improve and add to the facilities at Waskesiu, for years, Mr. Speaker, it was entirely ignored.

Now, Mr. Speaker, along with the grasslands park, the federal people have indicated that they will do a great deal for the National Park in Waskesiu. I am pleased, that at long last the West is being recognized, not only for its oil, but even for some input into our recreational areas and other interests of that nature. We even have promises of a fair amount of finances to preserve some of our wilderness areas. I feel quite good about that, because if all this becomes a reality it will mean a great deal for the people of Saskatchewan.

It also means, Mr. Speaker, that we are playing our cards well in our discussions with Ottawa. I want to say that my people in my Department have done a great deal of work and research towards the possibilities of the grasslands park being put together and operated by the province. This was done because some eight months ago the possibility of federal participation was very remote indeed. Most of that work has just recently been completed. We are in the process of studying and evaluating our provincial studies. That is one of the reasons why the pace of events has been rather slow. But as I stated before, that with care and diligence and consideration and with consultation with the people directly concerned with the problems of a grasslands park, we are going to proceed with discussions and negotiations with the Federal Government and if, and when, the wishes of the local people and people of Saskatchewan are, in the main met, then we will proceed to make these final arrangements, but not otherwise, Mr. Speaker.

Briefly, let me repeat what has occurred in this history of the grasslands park. A proposal for a grassland park in southern Saskatchewan has been under discussion between the Government of Saskatchewan and the Government of Canada since 1965. Initially the position of the Government of Canada was that all the lands within the boundaries of the proposed park, encompassing some 640 square miles, would be transferred to the Federal Government free of encumbrances without cost of Canada. In addition the rights to the minerals would also be transferred to the Crown.

The earlier policies of the Federal Government also prohibited any consideration for use of the resources or even a phasing out of activity such as ranching within the area. More recently from the discussions carried on between the officials of the two governments, it is obvious that the policies of the Federal Government have softened and the proposed area has also been reduced to 360 square miles.

However, in the interim my Department has completed a conceptual proposal, as I have indicated a few minutes ago, for a provincial grassland park. We are now faced with a decision that if a park is to be established, which approach will be of the greatest benefit to the people of Saskatchewan? We recognize that there is a national interest in setting aside an area of the grasslands, an unique example of the short grass prairie. We believe it is incumbent upon the Government of Saskatchewan in any negotiations with the Federal Government for the consideration of the establishment of a national grasslands park to insist upon recognition of the interest of local people, particularly the farmers and the ranchers who would be directly affected. We also believe that there must be recognition of the interests of all the people of Saskatchewan prior to the transfer of any lands, minerals, interests, or other rights to the Federal Crown for the purpose of establishing a grasslands national park. Even though the proposed site of the area has been reduced from 640 square miles to 360 square miles it is not a simple matter of agreeing that a park should be established.

There are approximately 30 ranching units, not five, but 30 ranching and farming units involved. There are implications to communities and municipalities that must be considered. There are interests in minerals, gas and oil that must be recognized and considered, just to mention a few concerns, Mr. Speaker. It will be on this basis that discussions will continue if and when we can be satisfied that the interests of Saskatchewan can be met. It will then be possible properly to consider the alternatives.

Mr. Speaker, in spite of what the Member for Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) said the other day, the Leader of the Opposition, in closing his remarks, I am going to move an amendment to re-emphasize the importance of recognizing the interests of local people and therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Notukeu-Willow Bunch (Mr. Engel) an amendment thereto:

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

commend the Provincial Government for continuing discussions with the Government of Canada respecting a grasslands park for insisting upon recognition of the interests of the local people, including the farmers and ranchers directly involved, and of the people of Saskatchewan during the course of discussions and negotiations to transfer lands to the Federal Crown for the purposes of establishing the grasslands park.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

The debate continues on the motion and the amendment concurrently.



April 16, 1974

**MR. A.W. ENGEL** (Notukeu-Willow Bunch): — Mr. Speaker, I wanted to get into this debate last Tuesday and the heavy hand of the Opposition muzzled the debate, so I will take the liberty to just say a few words today.

It was ironic that the Member for Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) would introduce a motion like this. He had all kinds of opportunity. The two Members talked on it last week. He had all kinds of opportunity to take action and get involved when he was a Member as a back bencher over here and the Leader of the Opposition was the Minister in charge of Natural Resources. I think one of the key reasons that I am here representing this seat today, Mr. Speaker, is this issue that has developed over a grassland park. I think one of the things that the Member for Cannington had in mind, when introducing this Resolution, was he was hoping that the same fury and frustrations would develop that developed with the ranchers when the Liberals were the Government. There was never a group of people in as large an area that were so frustrated with the government, as when Members opposite were talking grasslands park behind closed doors. When I went down and campaigned in that area, I said, the grassland park is going to be brought to you and discussions are going to be brought where you can get at them and where the farmers could be involved in participation. Shortly after the election in June, that fall, while I was combining I got a phone call message from a prominent rancher in the south country, who invited me down to a meeting with the then Minister of Natural Resources who is now the Minister of Highways (Mr. Kramer), and we had a meeting right on this rancher's place. Of the ranchers involved, approximately 30 or so are directly involved with the leases in the area, and there were 45 ranchers present during that harvest time. They were willing to leave their combines and come to a meeting to talk about such an important program and this development that was going to affect their ranches.

At that meeting the ranchers decided to select a committee to represent them. This committee has had an open door to the Ministers who have been responsible for the DNR, both Mr. Kramer and Mr. Bowerman the Minister of the Department of the North. Since then, with the new Minister, I was really pleased with the announcement of the Minister when he was appointed. I've mentioned this in the past in speeches that I was pleased that the Hon. Member who has just taken his seat has this Department because I know there is a man who is going to listen to the ranchers and going to listen to the concerns they have.

I, too, believe as the two Members opposite indicated last Tuesday that it is important that we have discussions and that we promote discussions for a park. I should like to say that in April of 1972 I invited the ranchers in the Mankota area to Mankota for a meeting. I sent notices out that we were going down there for a meeting.

**MR. MacDONALD** (Milestone): — They both showed?

**MR. ENGEL:** — They both showed, they really did. For the first time since negotiations have started a federal representative was willing to come and talk to the people. He realized that the people were talking to us so one of the federal representatives

came to this meeting, the Regional Director of National Parks here in the West, who is in charge of all the western parks. The Department of Natural Resources sent several people down. I have a memo here that was prepared jointly after that meeting and we sent this memo to Mr. Kramer to inform him of what happened at that meeting. The very first line says the attendance was very good — 350 people were packed into the Mankota hall, 350 (both ranchers according to the Member for Milestone). At this meeting and in a one and one half hour question period the ranchers laid down some guidelines that they wanted to see incorporated in a new park. One of the main motions that they proposed and was supported there was that the ranchers would have grazing rights within a park. We featured a wilderness park as an area where we would include ranching. That was the number one point.

When the Minister of the North came down and was speaking to ranchers at Mankota, he outlined again to the ranchers what our criteria now are for negotiations — and Mr. Weatherald and Mr. Steuart said we weren't negotiating. He spelled out, we won't have a national park federally if grazing isn't a part of the park and if the ranchers living right there want no part of a park, there won't be a park. And then he said, that we want to have the chance to develop our mineral resources that are there because these are two criteria that are spelled out, and then we also wanted some protection for the natural resources.

Now we are facing the possibility of signing an agreement with the Federal Government soon. I understand that we are that close to agreement and I would just like to mention at this point, that on the very day that this motion was under discussion, last Tuesday, this same federal official who was willing to come down to a meeting in Mankota, was in the office which I and the Member for Shaunavon (Mr. Oliver) occupy. He came right to our office and he said, "Fellows this is as far as we are with our proposal, this is what we see could be in a national park." And one of the things he suggested is that we are now ready to negotiate where our farmers are concerned. You may ask, why does he talk to a couple of backbenchers? Because he realized that in this present system of government, the local Member who represents the area is being consulted and does have some say in what negotiations are going to take place. The federal people knew that when the NDP say that the farmer is going to have his grazing rights protected, they knew we meant business and they knew that was exactly how it was going to happen.

Another thing I should like to mention that maybe the Member for Morse (Mr. Wiebe) should say what happened at that meeting, he was there. The former Member for Notukeu-Willow Bunch (Mr. Hooker) was there and they can testify that the ranchers voiced their opinion and they voiced it strongly. One of the things we said when we made this summary sheet was that the questions that were discussed as details of the boundary, ways of handling leases, the kinds of fence that would be erected, how this would affect wild life. These were the general questions that were raised and we summed it up by saying that:

We are of the feeling that this kind of a spending, and job creation and tourist attraction for the southern part of Saskatchewan should receive all the support and co-operation we can give them from every department of

our government. Any other province would give their eye teeth for this kind of a Federal Government commitment.

Now, I am satisfied with the Minister's of Natural Resources statement that maybe these federal people can't be trusted and we've got to get this thing tied down so that we can protect the interest of the local people. Because once a deal is signed is like the law of the Medes and the Persians. It won't be changed. I am happy that you are going to tie this thing down so that we can protect the rights of these ranchers once the park is established. I have a letter on file from a rancher saying he worked in a national park and they were allowed certain privileges and five years later the thing was completely turned around and those privileges weren't there for the local residents. I think we have to keep this kind of an action and this kind of an attitude in mind that maybe there is more than just what is said on the surface so I am pleased that our Department is taking careful pains to make sure that they can get this assured in writing that it won't have any changes.

I am pleased to support the amendment to the motion, Mr. Speaker, that commends this Government for continuing negotiations and I particularly want to commend the Ministers who have been in charge for the way they have supported the Members who represent that area, that the ranchers, the people who are directly involved, their interests will come first.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. J. WIEBE:** — Mr. Speaker, just a few brief comments in regard to this Resolution.

Initially let me say that there is no way that I will support the amendment as presented. The Resolution which was brought forward by the Member for Cannington, was brought forward because we on this side of the House felt that some action must be taken by a very inactive Government and we thought that by this means we could probably bring the Government Members out of their shell and hopefully this could be resolved.

Part of the reason is because the ranchers in that particular area just do not know what is going on. Okay, Mr. Member, let's talk to them. And this is one of the things that surprised me when the Minister of Natural Resources got up here. I thought, with a new appointment, we would finally have a Minister who would have a new, bright, open and non-political look on the Department of Natural Resources. His comments tonight certainly shattered that belief. He stated and the Member for Notukeu-Willow Bunch stated, that we should get down to good down-to-earth discussions. And I agree 100 per cent with that statement, Mr. Speaker, and I say it should be good down-to-earth discussion with the ranchers and the farmers involved in that area.

The Member for Notukeu-Willow Bunch talked about the meeting that was held in Mankota in 1972. I attended that meeting. He mentioned something about 350 people attending that meeting. Mr. Speaker, this is fuzzy NDP arithmetic. That hall could never hold 350 people. I'll say there was a good crowd there but that crowd was around 150 people and not 350 people. And I'll tell you the people of that area are very upset, they were very unhappy. The Member for Shaunavon was there, the Member for

Notukeu-Willow Bunch was there and they said, yes, we will take your concerns under advisement, we will be in touch with you; we will have consultations with you; we will be talking to you constantly. Since that meeting, Mr. Speaker, two years ago, those ranchers and farmers in that area have not heard one single word from the Member for Notukeu-Willow Bunch, from the Member for Shaunavon, nor from this Government. I might suggest to those two Members that they go and spend some time in their constituencies and talk to the ranchers and the farmers that are involved in that area. I met with a group of them here three weeks ago and the comments which I received from them about the actions of those two Members in regard to this grassland park, I am sorry to say I cannot repeat in this House. The ranchers have continually approached the Member for Shaunavon and other Members of the Government, asking them what is going to happen to the grassland park. They have been given the run-around, they have been given no direct answers. In fact many of them have not even received replies to some of the comments which they have made.

Let's look at what is happening down there. We have got now some 360 acres that are involved in this grassland park, or square miles, pardon me. At first, Mr. Speaker, it was 640 square miles and they have now brought it down to 360. They say there are 30 ranchers and farmers involved in this area. What future can they plan for, it has been undecided since before 1972. Some of them would like to build a new house, some of them would like to expand their herds, some of them would like to improve their ranches, but with the uncertainty that is hanging over them it has been impossible to plan. Is there going to be a grassland park or isn't there? Is the Government going to come along and say, No, we won't allow your leases; we won't allow you to run cattle in the park? What future do these ranchers have? These were the questions that were asked of the Members opposite and these were the questions that were not answered by the Members opposite.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. WIEBE:** — Mr. Speaker, because of this it is going to be important that a decision be made and a decision be made quickly regarding whether the park is going to be established or whether it is not going to be established. If the park is to be established it should be pointed out and made explicitly clear that the Federal Government has stated and has agreed that the ranchers will be allowed to continue on with lease and the operations of their ranches if the grassland park goes ahead.

As well, Mr. Speaker, there are other questions that have to be answered. For example, what about the hotel owners or the business people in the small towns like Val Marie and the surrounding areas. If the Members opposite recall that meeting in 1972, the businessmen from these areas said that they would sooner have the ranchers in the area than they would the tourists.

I am sure the Member for Notukeu-Willow Bunch will remember this comment. One of the hotel owners said that he can sell more beer to the ranchers, those 30 ranchers, seven months during the winter time than he will sell to all the tourists that are going to go through that park in the summer months. This is quite true in talking about roads. If we are going to have a road through that park like the Minister of Highways is planning for Cypress

April 16, 1974

Hills Park, I feel sorry for the tourists who are going to be travelling down in that area.

What cities are going to benefit? Certainly Moose Jaw and Swift Current are going to benefit from this park but how about the towns and small rural areas in that particular region?

It is for this reason, Mr. Speaker, that this Resolution was brought before the House. I have many more comments which I should like to make regarding this park, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

#### **RESOLUTION NO. 24 — GUARANTEED MONTHLY INCOME FOR SENIOR CITIZENS**

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

That this Assembly calls for immediate government consideration of guaranteeing minimum monthly income levels for senior citizens of \$350 per individual and \$500 per couple as recommended in the Report by the Senior Citizen's Commission.

**HON. R. ROMANOW** (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few words with respect to this particular Motion, Motion No. 25, moved by the Member for Saskatoon University.

Mr. Speaker, last Tuesday night, this House witnessed a spectacle which I think is best — perhaps for the interests of all politicians — not to emphasize too much. The spectacle of the Members of the Opposition in effect, attempting to deny Government Members the opportunity to speak on this very vital issue.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. ROMANOW:** — When the Leader of the Opposition finished making his speech on this matter, he tried to emphasize the importance of the issue. He tried to stress the need that the Government and Government Members should be talking on this vital issue. When we agreed with that position, in effect, we were denied the chance to give our point of view at that time because of the actions by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and in particular the valiant effort of the freshman Member for Lakeview constituency (Mr. Malone).

I think the one thing we all learned is that the Member for Lakeview can read. We are not quite sure whether or not he comprehended what he read, but we all understand that he can now read.

The result is that in that marathon, the people of Saskatchewan were not given at that particular time, the opportunity to be heard, certainly from the Minister of Social Services who was desirous to speak on the matter at that particular occasion.

The Minister of Social Services will be, of course, saying something to this debate, perhaps not tonight but at some other

opportunity.

One can certainly not say that the Opposition, after some six hours on this Resolution, didn't have a good time to debate it and assess it. When one considers the way that private Member's resolutions come and go on the Order Paper, six hours to be devoted to this Resolution is indeed a lot of time. I regret that it may not be a profitable six hours.

Mr. Speaker, one or two comments were made about the refusal of Government Members on this side to second the Motion. This comment was made by the Leader of the Opposition and the Member for Lakeview and the mover of the Motion, the Member for Saskatoon University. Mr. Speaker, I would not second, personally that type of motion. I would not second a motion which leaves the responsibility of increasing the old age pension, the old age security, either purposefully vague or attempting to pin it wrongly on the Provincial Government. I would not second a motion when the Member for Lakeview and the Leader of the Opposition both understand that the responsibility in Canadian terms for old age pensions always has been, is, and must continue to be, a federal responsibility.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. ROMANOW:** — The Member for Lakeview wouldn't disagree with that if he is seriously suggesting it should be 10 provinces' responsibility, as the Leader of the Opposition is suggesting, then really he is speaking against the old age pension plan for Canada. And I tell you why, because you are going to have, in all likelihood, ten different provinces with 10 different economic situations. Some provinces are in a strong healthy economic situation like British Columbia that can afford to make highly substantial supplement payments to old age pensions. Some provinces like Newfoundland that may not be able to; some provinces like Saskatchewan which are smaller in size and which may not be able to. And what the Liberals opposite would want us to have in old age pensions is a patch work, put together hastily, uneven in terms of old age pensions security across the Dominion of Canada. That is exactly what the Opposition would have us do.

The Opposition would have the old age citizen in Saskatchewan receive one sum and have nine other possible different figures throughout the Dominion of Canada. The Member for Lakeview laughs, but that is exactly what the Member for Lakeview advocated and that was supported by the Leader of the Opposition.

I say that the responsibility for old age pensions in this country is a national responsibility to be shared equally by all Canadians.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. ROMANOW:** — I say that we have a right to share in the opportunities of some of the wealthier provinces in order to equalize the benefits payable to our senior citizens. I believe that in this country of Canada that we can't balkanize the provinces. I don't believe, like the Liberals opposite, that we can have our own little pension plan operated in the Province of Saskatchewan as this particular motion seems to indicate.

April 16, 1974

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order!

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker, I realize they endeavored to keep us out of this debate last time and by their cat-calls they are trying again to keep us out of the debate this time. But it isn't going to work. Because I am going to tell the Member for Lakeview and the Leader of the Opposition that you people either don't believe seriously what you are advocating about the ten various independent pensions or in the alternative you are playing cheap politics with senior citizens. Either position is absolutely unacceptable in the Province of Saskatchewan.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker, I would not second a motion which is either purposefully vague or which tries to say that this responsibility should be a provincial responsibility.

If we take a look at this particular motion, Mr. Speaker, note that it says: That this Assembly call for immediate Government consideration. What Government consideration? I say Federal Government consideration. I say that senior citizen pensions are a federal responsibility not a provincial responsibility.

Is the Leader of the Liberal Party saying that it is a provincial responsibility? I ask him. I don't think that he is. But I want to tell the people of Saskatchewan that the Liberals simply have no credibility on this issue. I want to tell the people of Saskatchewan that the Liberals have no credibility practically on any issue but if there is any issue where they seriously lack credibility it is right here in the old age citizens' pensions and the responsibility for senior citizens.

Mr. Speaker, we are having the Leader of the Opposition speak on the business of increasing the benefits for senior citizens. This from a man, this from the former Treasury benches, a government that treated senior citizens by putting on deterrent fees in the Province of Saskatchewan.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. ROMANOW:** — To the Member for Lakeview and the Leader of the Opposition to them deterrent fees are a big laugh. To them \$2.50 on senior citizens, 65 years of age, is a laugh. To them deterrent fees are something that they still believe in today, Mr. Speaker. Make no mistake if the Liberal Party should ever be re-elected, the first thing they would do on medicare again, I say, is put on deterrent fees.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. ROMANOW:** — The Liberals never believed in it when they removed the deterrent fees, when they agreed to it, they didn't believe in it. Mr. Speaker, I recall in 1971 when we were still in Opposition we put in a private Member's resolution in effect pleading with the Opposition to remove the deterrent fees and one of the areas that we pleaded with them was particularly for the senior citizens care and the benefits for senior citizens.

The Member for Lakeview wasn't there at the time so he doesn't know what the reaction of the then Minister of Health was. He was in the House to hear the then Minister of Health say that he supported deterrent fees. Do you know why? Because he said it helps us to understand that we participated in our own recovery. He told us that senior citizens of 65 years of age should be able to look after themselves by paying a \$2.50 deterrent fee.

Mr. Justice Hall, and all of the leading officials who have studied this question of deterrent fees, say that when a person quite obviously is older, when his income is reduced, his health is likely to be reduced and impaired, that is the time when he needs financial assistance. What do these great benefactors of senior citizens opposite do? They place on them a \$2.50 deterrent fee.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker, I call the Leader of the Opposition and the Liberal Party's stance on this issue absolutely bogus. No one in Saskatchewan, especially senior citizens will believe for one moment that you are genuinely in support of any intent to improve their position. Actions speak louder than words.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. ROMANOW:** — I remember also, Mr. Speaker, in addition to the deterrent fees, I remember also the Leader of the Opposition when he was the Minister of Finance at that time putting on the tax on meals. Every meal over \$2.00 — again, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Lakeview and the Leader of the Opposition laugh. They laugh at the tax on \$2. They didn't care about it then, Mr. Speaker. Mark my words that if ever the Liberal Party should be re-elected in Saskatchewan they will put that tax back on again to the senior citizens.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. ROMANOW:** — I want to tell you all you have to do is tell the senior citizens' organizations of the taxes on meals, the taxes on soaps and the taxes on the sick and the taxes on the poor, all you have to tell the senior citizens about that Black Budget of 1968 when the Liberals taxed the senior citizens literally to their graves. No senior citizen or organization will accept the Leader of the Opposition's statement that he is for senior citizens.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. ROMANOW:** — I say to you, Mr. Leader of the Opposition, that actions speak louder than words. The senior citizens will support this Government because our actions have proven that we are behind them to ease their particular condition or plight.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. ROMANOW:** — I want to tell the Leader of the Opposition, for example,



April 16, 1974

just a figure or two on this matter of assistance to senior citizens. What about the assistance under this plan. Liberals budgeted under \$4 million; 1974 Budget \$6.8 million approaching \$7 million, under this Government. Grants to special care homes, nothing under the Liberals, nearly \$5.4 million now. That was a program that we implemented not you Members. What about community services for the aged? You know what the Liberals provided? \$60,000. I want to tell this House, Mr. Speaker, that this Government has provided nearly a million dollars in community services to the aged.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. ROMANOW:** — And the Leader of the Opposition and the Liberals opposite have the audacity to accuse this Government of doing nothing in this area. Mr. Speaker, it was the Liberals who did nothing in terms of assistance to the senior citizens.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. ROMANOW:** — I can go on and recite the actions taken by the Minister of Health in removal of the medicare and hospitalization premiums. We removed the medicare and hospitalization premiums. I don't even know if you people welcomed that when we did it for the senior citizens. I bet you opposed it then when we removed the medicare and hospitalization premiums for senior citizens. You opposed it because you believed that senior citizens should be participating in the medicare and hospitalization premiums.

**MR. STEUART:** — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Member could get back to the Resolution. I hate to see a Member wander from the Resolution at a time like this.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I can see why the Leader of the Opposition is kind of touchy about this particular subject. I can see why the Liberal Opposition would want us not to spend very much time in telling the people what they did for senior citizens.

If I had his terrible record, I would also be very touchy about the record and wouldn't want to have the debate.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. ROMANOW:** — I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, when you just want to summarize it generally, you are looking at a total of about \$4.6 million by the Liberals during the Liberal regime, a paltry \$4 million for senior citizens. The Saskatchewan Government in 1974 alone is budgeting over \$14 million for senior citizens in one form or another, Mr. Speaker. Over and above this, a Senior Citizens' Home Repair program, \$3 million. You people didn't introduce such a program, this Government introduced it for our senior citizens.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Over and above that there is low rental accommodation for

senior citizens. You people didn't introduce that, this Government introduced that for the senior citizens. Abolition of hospital and medicare premiums, I have already told the Member for Milestone in this regard. The abolition of the \$3 million for medicare and hospitalization premiums for senior citizens, the Liberals opposed.

The Liberal Opposition, if they had their way — this is the old deterrent fee mentality — again for the senior citizens, would try to do everything and anything that they can to make life a little bit more difficult or to put it in Liberal jargon, so that the senior citizens know that they are participating in their own recovery.

Mr. Speaker, every senior citizen in this province will know the shallowness of Liberal intentions when we bring to mind that phrase 'participation in your own recovery', which the Minister of Health and the Leader of the Opposition as Minister of Finance at that particular stage in the game tried to perpetrate on the senior citizens.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Lakeview is a rookie Member around here. He doesn't understand some of these provisions that were enacted by the Liberal Party. I want to tell the Member for Lakeview that while you may be a rookie Member, while you may not have remembered those particular matters of the debate, you can't escape the responsibility for burdens on senior citizens put upon them by the Liberal Party and yourself.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker, I know now one of the reasons the Liberals decided to jump on the bandwagon very quickly in terms of this particular Resolution and try and put the onus they thought on the Provincial Government. That is to try and get away from the limelight and the responsibility where it lies, directly on the shoulders of Prime Minister Trudeau and the federal Liberals. They know full well that the federal Liberals have had a notorious history of no concern for senior citizens. The Member for Wilkie knows that full well, you have been a Member long enough to remember the old attitude of the 'six buck boys' when Mr. Walter Harris was Minister of Finance, a long time ago. That was the attitude then and you are a Member of the Liberal Party and you have gone down to conventions of the Liberal Party. I know that that policy was explained to you federally, when you attended those Liberal conventions. You accepted it then when you were a Member, a policy of non-assistance to senior citizens in Canada. Every one of you Liberals are to blame for that, the Government of Prime Minister Trudeau has been negligent in respect to senior citizens, negligent and indifferent. A callous indifference by the Prime Minister and the Federal Government. Those Members are more concerned about some of the issues which affect Quebec and Ontario and not the issues which affect senior citizens. What the Leader of the Opposition should be doing is joining hands with us to speak in a united voice to urge the Federal Government to be acting on this particular Resolution. I think, Mr. Speaker, this Resolution of \$350 for singles and \$500 for the couple, is certainly adequate. I think \$500 for a couple and \$350 for the single is long overdue. But I say to the Leader of the Opposition, let's do something by joining hands and telling the federal Liberal Government to get off its butt and act in the interests of senior citizens in the Province of

April 16, 1974

Saskatchewan.

I want to communicate to the Federal Liberals, I want you to communicate to Mr. Otto Lang, the Liberal representative for Saskatchewan in the House of Commons, that you as Liberals object to their callous indifference to senior citizens. That is what I urge the Leader of the Opposition to do, to show your good faith. That is what I urge the Member for Lakeview (Mr. Malone) to do. In fact, I think that the provincial Liberal caucus would really elevate itself in the stature of the people of Saskatchewan if they sent such a telegram as a caucus directly to the Prime Minister. We will support you 100 per cent, Mr. Speaker, in that area.

I say simply to the Member for Lakeview and the Leader of the Opposition, you can't escape your indifference in this matter by trying to dodge it on this particular matter not one bit, Mr. Speaker. The people of Saskatchewan know that all too well.

Mr. Speaker, one of the difficulties in the Liberal Party opposite is that they don't have a policy for senior citizens. I tell you they don't have a policy, period. I don't think there is an area anywhere that the Liberal Party in Saskatchewan has a precise, definite policy.

I was reading a newspaper article the other day called, "The Backbenchers", "McIsaac Aware of Opposition Role" is the headline. I am glad to see that the least headline hunter was charitable to the Opposition and to the Member for Wilkie. He said this about policy, quote:

The Liberal Party is in the process of defining policies and a platform in which to fight the next election. I do not think the absence of specific planks and proposals in any way hinders the job of the Opposition, the philosophy of the party is still there.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I know that the Liberals are hurting on this one. They are hurting internally. They know that their party members are after them because they have no positive program policies. They know it so much so that the Leader of the Opposition in his screed that he mails out to the entire province, has to spend an entire operation explaining that he is, according to this document, quote:

To begin with he said it is the role of the Opposition to oppose. My official title is the Leader of the Opposition.

And he says:

For your information, Dear Friends, we are known as Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition.

And then there is the big screed about the need to oppose, the need to criticize and the act that they don't have any policy.

Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt that he is the Leader of the Opposition. I think he acts well in that role as Leader of the Opposition. In fact, they criticize and they are negative so often, that I say my vote will go for him to be permanent Leader of the Opposition in this Legislature.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. ROMANOW:** — I also want to tell the Members opposite that they have done such a good job of being Opposition that you get my vote as being a part of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition as well. But don't try and tell us that we don't have any policy in this area. We support \$350. We support \$500. We have these programs of \$14 million that you did nothing about. We say that the responsibility is federal. I should like to have the Government give the Members opposite a chance to support that particular philosophy. I am going to have the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Taylor) introduce an amendment to that effect.

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

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 9:30 o'clock p.m.