

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Fourth Session - Seventeenth Legislature**  
**56th Day**

Tuesday, April 23, 1974.

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

**QUESTIONS**

**ANNUAL REPORTS FOR YEAR END MARCH 31st**

**MR. E.F. GARDNER** (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to direct a question to the Government, perhaps in particular in this case, to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer).

I am wondering if there is any possibility of us getting the annual report, particularly for the Land Bank and perhaps some of the others, with the year end March 31st? I presume they have been working on these reports and we've had some three weeks past the March 31st deadline. I am wondering if there is a possibility that these might be available?

**HON. J.R. MESSER** (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to be able to accommodate the Member in his request. I believe that the information is now being compiled. It may be that it is completed. If it is I will have no argument about providing it. It may not be in the form as we have normally found annual reports, but I would have to investigate to see whether it would be possible for us to have it in its final form, put together and printed. I just can't say at this point in time. I know because of a conversation with one of the Land Bank Commissioners a week ago that the information was being compiled, but I can't say whether it is completed at this time.

**ORDER-IN-COUNCIL — CROP INSURANCE PLAN**

**MR. GARDNER:** — I just might suggest on that that it would certainly be a help to us and to all of the Members in Estimates if this could be provided.

I should like to ask a separate and different question of the Minister of Agriculture. I noticed an Order-in-Council, dated March 29, 1974 and I'm not sure if I read this properly, and the proper significance of it. It seems to be setting up a fully fledged Crown corporation for the operation of the Crop Insurance Plan in the province and this is fairly significant fact and I haven't seen any mention of it in the Press. I wonder if the Minister would clarify what is actually meant by this Order-in-Council.

**MR. MESSER:** — It is in fact doing what the Order-in-Council says, setting up a Crown corporation under The Crown Corporations Act and we hope that it will give the crop insurance system more flexibility in carrying the coverage to farmers in Saskatchewan for their crops.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE — PUBLIC SERVANTS

**MR. A.R. GUY** (Athabasca): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I wish to direct a question to the Minister in charge of the Public Service Commission. I saw a report in the paper the other day where political organizers from British Columbia and Saskatchewan were campaigning in the Prince Edward Island election and I should like to ask the Minister if there are any public servants from Saskatchewan who have taken leave of absence to go to Prince Edward Island?

**HON. A. TAYLOR** (Minister of Social Services): — Mr. Speaker, I can only answer, none to my knowledge.

**MR. GUY**: — A supplementary question. Would it not be normal to suggest that public servants from Saskatchewan going down to Prince Edward Island would take leave of absence in the normal way, or is it a practice of the NDP to let their civil servants run wild throughout the country without any knowledge as to where they are or know what they are doing?

**MR. TAYLOR**: — Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member knows that it is the practice of this Government to be above-board and if any civil servants want leave of absence they must ask for it.

## ADJOURNED DEBATES

### MOTIONS FOR RETURNS

#### RETURN NO. 180

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

(1) Whether the following are employed by the Government of Saskatchewan: Don McMillan, Iona Hartwell, Erna M. Stirner, E.A. Anka, L.D. Oszcewski, Valerie Rose, Jerry F. Bigham, K.E. Mackie, R.C. McMahon, Ian Potter, Sylvia Baker, Irene Banks, E.J. Reed, David G. Abbey, B.A. Hindel, Kenneth Pontikes, R. Meldrum, W.H. Horner, V. 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.

**MR. C.P. MacDONALD** (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, I just want to add a word or two.

The subject matter of this particular Resolution refers to advertising or public information from the Legislative Assembly and Mr. Michayluk or the Member who originally moved this took great pains to point out that the Opposition had spent something like \$800 to issue a publication to the public of Saskatchewan, and took great exception to the Opposition spending \$800. This is very strange from a Government that has turned around and spent something in the neighborhood of many millions of dollars in public advertising. You know, I think of one particular TV ad that I investigated on the Automobile Accident Insurance Fund on one television station in the Province of Saskatchewan, was

\$550 for one particular ad. And then the Member turns around and criticizes the Opposition for doing its job of turning around and passing out information and reporting on the Session to the people of Saskatchewan.

I think of Service Printers and I don't go through and review all the things about Service Printers, nor will I go through the Commonwealth issue again. But, Mr. Speaker, I do want to take a moment and talk about the exclusive media centre, established for the NDP, down in the basement of this building. It's a very, very strange thing that during the Session that where every backbencher in this House is an individual Member and has equal rights and equal responsibilities and yet for some reason the Government has turned around and established . . .

**HON. R. ROMANOW** (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order, if I can, I'll state my Point of Order as briefly as I can. I note that the Member now is speaking about the media centre. I would say with respect, Mr. Speaker, my Point of Order is that this is not relating to the topic which is the consideration of employees of Executive Council. Nor, Mr. Speaker, can it be said that it is in rebuttal of anything that has been said today. I think the earlier comments made about advertising could be in some form of rebuttal to the Member for Redberry. But certainly the media centre is new material which in my respectful submission to you, Sir, is out of order and I would ask that you so rule to the Member.

**MR. MacDONALD**: — Mr. Speaker, on the Point of Order, I want to point out that the subject matter of this Resolution is related to public information and reporting of an individual Member to the constituency of the Province of Saskatchewan. I want to point out that the Member who originally introduced this motion talked about no. 1, the cost of mailing by individual Members of this Session, he talked about the subject matter of mailouts of individual Members of this Session. I suggest to you, Sir, that the exclusive media centre downstairs, which is being set up and operated, strictly from the beginning of the Session until the end of the Session, and is there for the private use of Government Members to send out public information about matters that concern this Session, is of the exact same subject matter and I am merely replying to the Member for Redberry when he introduced this particular motion. I can appreciate that the Attorney General is sensitive and the Government is sensitive about this very sensitive issue.

**MR. SPEAKER**: — The Point of Order raised, I believe that when the Member for Redberry introduced this motion on strict interpretation, a lot of his statements in debate were not in conjunction with the motion and I believe that it makes it impossible for me to rule that replies or comparisons are out of order. So as long as the Members relate themselves to expenses and publicity, due to the type of an introductory speech we had on this motion, I think I shall have to allow the debate.

**MR. MacDONALD**: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I think, Mr. Speaker, if there is any one thing that should be of major concern to Members, all Members of the House, is the establishment of this exclusive media centre downstairs. In fact, it is rather interesting, members of the Press have complained that

after attempting to interview a Cabinet Minister or individual Member of the Government, that they have a great deal of difficulty. They have to stand in line while members of the exclusive media centre stand up and take pre-recordings which is not legitimate news.

**MR. D.W. MICHAYLUK (Redberry):** — On a Point of Order, I don't think that the interview of any of the reporters which are here representing the news media has anything to do with the question I put on the Order Paper. My question was the misinformation which this legislative report contains and the number that were sent out under the franking privileges by the Leader of the Opposition. It has nothing to do with the media centre or with the reporters interviewing Ministers or the Members of the Legislative Assembly. My concern was the misleading information in this pamphlet and the number that were sent out under the franking privileges.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I think the Hon. Member will realize that Motion for Return No. 180 does not mention franking privileges, it does not mention pamphlets but his speech did. And if Members in introduction of motions bring in extraneous material, others replying have the same right to answer him. So I have no alternative then to say that the Member is in order.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker, On a Point of Order again, exactly what you said, you said they have a right to reply to it. Where was the media centre mentioned or even alluded to that there can be a reply? There was absolutely no mention by anybody on this side. This is brand new material.

**HON. E.L. TCHORZEWSKI (Minister of Culture and Youth):** — Mr. Speaker, on the Point of Order, I think the Member has pointed out and rightfully so, that he did in fact have an Order for Return on the Order Paper dealing with franking privileges and the pamphlet which he just showed us in this House is a pamphlet that was sent out under the privileges that are provided through the franking privileges. He related to that specifically, Mr. Speaker, and therefore he was in order and you were correct, I submit, in your allowing that discussion in his statement of the other day. I think what the Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) is bringing up today is not related to anything like the pamphlet which is related to the franking privileges and therefore he is out of order in bringing in that kind of new material.

**MR. J.C. McISAAC (Wilkie):** — Mr. Speaker, on the Point of Order, surely the Member for Milestone in referring to a media centre for the use of MLAs and Members is also talking about legislative news. It's a franking privilege under a different frank, I don't know what you call this one. But it is the same thing under a different name. And surely it's just as much in order as the Member's reference to a legislative report or any other kind of report by Members.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I would suggest to Members if they want Motions for Return and the Member for Redberry was discussing the franking

privileges or pamphlet sent out, then a Motion for Return should have referred to those matters, not be referred to in a speech. But this Motion for Return No. 180 does not mention franking privileges, it does not mention pamphlets sent out by Members, but his speech did. And therefore it's not proper rules to allow one Member to make a speech and not allow others to rebut, so I have to allow the Member to proceed.

**MR. MacDONALD:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I hope that settles it. I want to get back to the subject matter.

Perhaps the thing that should disturb the Members of this Assembly and the people of Saskatchewan, that the Government would use taxpayers' money to establish down in the basement of this building an exclusive media centre which has as its specific purpose to disseminate NDP propaganda to every radio station and newspaper and small newspaper in the Province of Saskatchewan. And the most insidious part of it, Mr. Speaker, is that it has been established for the exclusive use of the NDP Members, not the Government. It is a part of the democratic tradition of this House that every Member is on equal status, that the only Members that belong to the Government are the Treasury Benches. It is also inconceivable that the Government should turn around and treat one segment of this House differently than the other segment, or one side of this House differently than the other side.

Mr. Speaker, the backbenchers are not part of the Government they are exactly the same as Members on this side of the House and to establish for \$2,000 a week on exclusive services for them, to disseminate, Mr. Speaker, I say it's an insult to the Press. Here we have in the Press gallery 12 or 15 press people from all over the Province of Saskatchewan who have a responsibility to report . . .

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — You're blind.

**MR. MacDONALD:** — Blind yes, yes they're not blind to you. You're blind, that's right, because you don't have confidence that they are going to report your NDP propaganda, you want to report to the constituents of Saskatchewan exactly what you want. Mr. Speaker, I say it's an attack on the credibility of the Press and also it's an insult to the people of Saskatchewan, that the NDP should organize a propaganda machine to disseminate the kind of information that they want, Mr. Speaker, under the guise, yes, under this disguise.

Mr. Speaker, it was rather interesting, the newspaper report "Exclusive Media Centre use May Cause Controversy." It was rather interesting the man who made the comments, Mr. Jack Kinzel. "Oh, no," he said, "we don't want, this is not for the Government or the Opposition Members, why we give them \$24,000 a year to run their office." Twenty-four thousand dollars, whereas it takes the Executive Council under the Premier probably \$750,000. And when the Member for Redberry says it's inaccurate, we begin to find more and more people everyday, for example, the other day we found Mr. Bruce Lawson, \$1,400 a month. The Leader of the Opposition had three additional ones the week before. We are beginning to think it's hopelessly inaccurate. We've got to do a complete revision of it. We certainly can't keep up to the number of new civil servants being hired by the Government.

But, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that this exclusive media centre is perhaps the worst thing that this Government has done in contempt of the Legislative Assembly, as contempt for Members of this House, as contempt for the Press and the fact that they were restricted to the use of the Government Members, is the worst aspect of it. And I'm going to suggest to the Members of the Government and the Treasury benches that they immediately cancel this service, push it right out. And to think, Mr. Speaker, that the taxpayers of this province are having their money used to set up this kind of thing.

Mr. Speaker, I have many other things to say on this and some of my colleagues have, so I beg leave to adjourned the debate.

Debate adjourned.

## **ADJOURNED DEBATES**

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

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

That this Assembly congratulates 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.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I was a little disturbed. It was my impression that we had voted the other day, because I was a little disturbed to look at the Order Paper today and see under my name a resolution congratulating the Government of Saskatchewan for something. I suspected that something had been left out some place.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not going again into too many details on the Land Bank or too much information on it. One or two speakers did mention the fact that we have said publicly that we would review some of the transactions of the Land Bank and I might say that this was our chief reason for asking in this House, on several occasions that we be provided with information about those transactions where leases have been granted to someone who didn't have the most points under the allocations system. I think that this is very important information to have because anyone who is granted a lease with the most points under a fair allocations system, of course, is assumed to be the most deserving person and we would have no objection to that particular person obtaining the land. In fact, when we become the Government we will immediately offer to sell these people the land at very reasonable terms, a long term basis and certainly a reasonable rate of interest. There is no doubt about this part of our platform. However, in those cases where someone has got the lease that didn't have the highest number of points under a fair allocation system, then, we would want certainly to look at those transactions to indicate if the proper person did receive the lease. I think that this is very important that this information be made available to the people in the province. As you know this has been denied by the Minister of Agriculture that

we are just not going to be supplied with this information.

If there are cases throughout the province where political interference has occurred in the transfer of the granting of these leases, I think it is for the advantage of everyone involved to know about this. If this information had been provided to us it would certainly have solved many of our problems.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that I feel one of the biggest issues throughout rural Saskatchewan is still the Land Bank program as put forward by this Government and we all know that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) has said on a number of occasions that he wants to change the land tenure system in the province. He has made this statement in public on numerous occasions. It's been reported in the Press and he goes on to explain this. He doesn't believe that farmers should have the burden of owning their own land; they shouldn't have to tie up their capital in land and that this burden of ownership shouldn't be placed on the farmers of the province.

Now this is just a difference in philosophy of course to the Liberal philosophy. We don't believe that land ownership is a burden. I would think that this is one of the key issues at this time in rural Saskatchewan. The people of the province, the rural people, particularly farmers are going to have to make this decision certainly before another election. They are going to have to decide if they want the land tenure system, the new land tenure system as proposed by the Minister of Agriculture and the NDP whereby the farmers of the province will be tenants; where the Government will own the land and the farmers throughout the province will simply rent this land from the Government.

You will recall that they have already spent and budgeted about \$50 million to purchase land. Even at today's prices this is buying a lot of farm land in the province.

I would think that the people certainly at election time, the farmer, is going to have to make this decision. Which does he prefer? It is a pretty clear-cut decision, I believe that the farmers will have to make. They are going to have to decide on the one hand do they want the change in tenure system that the NDP and Mr. Messer are proposing or do they want the traditional system whereby the young farmer gets an opportunity to buy and own the land that he is going to farm. That he is going to own it and have the opportunity to pass it on to his children and his grandchildren in the future or is he simply going to be a tenant for all of his working life on the farm and walk away with nothing when he retires at 60 or 65. I would think that this has boiled down to a rather simple issue as far as the rural people are concerned. We have people in this province who have come to Saskatchewan from central Europe, from the British Isles, from many places, they came here for one reason only and that is to have an opportunity to own their own parcel of land.

I think that when those people sit down and try to make this decision, it is going to be a fairly easy one for them. They, in many cases, or their ancestors left parts of the world where they didn't have an opportunity to own their own land. Where they had a land tenure system similar to one that the Minister of Agriculture is now promoting in Saskatchewan. I don't think they're going to choose the change in land tenure system that the Minister proposes, I think they are simply going to say we want the traditional system where a young person has

the opportunity to buy and own his own land. I don't think that they are going to feel that it is a burden to own your own land and have your own farm in your own name and pass it on to your heirs if you so desire.

In closing the debate I would just say that I am pleased at the comments that have been made by Members on both sides of the House because it does get the issue in the proper perspective. It gives us an opportunity to see the basic difference in philosophy. We can see the land tenure system as proposed by the NDP as opposed to the land ownership system that we propose and I feel that this is a fairly clear-cut decision that will have to be decided by the rural people in Saskatchewan, certainly at the time of the next election.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division:

**YEAS - 31**

Blakeney	Michayluk	Faris
Meakes	Byers	Owens
Smishek	Thorson	Mostoway
Romanow	Whelan	Gross
Messer	Kwasnica	Feduniak
Snyder	Carlson	Comer
Bowerman	Engel	Rolfes
Kowalchuk	Robbins	Lange
Brockelbank	Tchorzewski	Feschuk
MacMurchy	Matsalla	Flasch
Pepper		

**NAYS — 12**

Coupland	Grant	MacLeod
Loken	MacDonald (Milestone)	MacDonald (Moose Jaw)
Guy	McIsaac	Wiebe
Boldt	Gardner	Malone

**ADJOURNED DEBATES**

**REPORTS OF COMMITTEES**

**FINAL REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON WELFARE**

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

**MR. H. COUPLAND** (Meadow Lake): — Mr. Speaker, I just have a few more words to say on this Committee. I don't know whether we did that much good. A lot of the things were implemented by the Government before we wrote our Report.



There are a few things that I am concerned about and one of them is that I am very much concerned about the build-up of the bureaucracy in Welfare.

It seems to me today it takes 25 to 30 people to do the same job that one did not more than ten years ago. This is very evident in the Meadow Lake area. On top of that the system has been changed so that a great number of recipients received their cheques direct from Regina. They are on the payroll as Welfare officials call it.

I am very concerned, Mr. Speaker, about the rapid trend towards the welfare state in this country. While the Members opposite who were on the Committee recommended a guaranteed annual wage, I have to oppose it. If, Mr. Speaker, I could be assured that it would do away with all the other social crutches such as our welfare system as we know it today, unemployment insurance and many others, I may be able to go along with it. But I am certain that it would be just one more agency added to the backs of the taxpayer. I think the way we should be looking, Mr. Speaker, and if we want to guarantee anything, I think we should be guaranteeing job opportunities for all the people of Saskatchewan so that they can take their rightful place in society.

This new program that has been brought out to help the low income people might be all right. I sincerely hope that it can be used for that purpose and not just another extension of the welfare system.

I know a lot of people who are on low income. They are there because they are sincerely trying to earn their own living. They are a proud people who are not going to go and ask for help, even though they may be entitled to as much or more if they were on welfare. A lot of those same people would be very insulted if we went to them and said, here, we will give you a hand out. They would possibly appreciate more if we were able to channel them into a little better job rather than give them a little extra money for income.

By and large, Mr. Speaker, while I think the Committee was a good thing, I just don't think we came out with the right type of recommendations. I think of doing away with the hardship clause which virtually allows everybody in Saskatchewan whether they want to work or not to apply for welfare. I don't think this to my way of thinking is good. If a person is able-bodied then he should be entitled to earn his own living and I don't think the taxpayer should be asked to carry the load.

I think of a write-up I noticed in the paper at Thompson, Manitoba where a fellow had turned down quite a few jobs, one of them they said at \$10,000 a year. They went to the appeal board and the appeal board said that the welfare had to pay him. I just don't think that is right in this country. I don't know just what the answer is. If a fellow won't work as in this case, then he should go hungry I suppose, and he would finally get back on the track and start to earn his own living.

The easier we make it for people to be on welfare I think the rougher it is going to be on the country.

For those reasons, Mr. Speaker, we do have our reservations.

Debate adjourned on the motion of Mr. MacDonald (Milestone).

### **FINAL REPORT OF THE 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 on the Special Committee on Business Firms** be now concurred in.

**HON. W. ROBBINS** (Minister of Finance): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a few comments with respect to the Special Committee on Business Firms.

I was pleased and privileged to be a member of this Special Committee. I wish to make it crystal clear to the Members of this House that I have no particular bias in relation to either private or public enterprise, and I frankly think that if members on the Committee did exhibit biases one way or the other this was detrimental in terms of results that might be obtained in terms of that particular Committee.

I should like to make some reference to comments of the Member for Lumsden (Mr. Lane). I am sorry he is not here this morning.

I note in an April 20th edition of the Star-Phoenix, Mr. Lane is quoted as saying that there was a correlation between the days on which the Committee held meetings in Regina and Government caucus meetings. He said on those days Government members left the meetings early, explaining they had to attend the caucus meeting. I specifically deny that that ever happened in my case. I never left a Business Committee meeting to attend a caucus meeting. I admit that there were caucus meetings called following the Business Committee meetings but I invariably stayed through the Business Committee meeting and did not go to the caucus meeting while the Business Committee was meeting.

I note that the Member for Lumsden makes comments with regard to expenditures of various members of the Committee. And as reported in the Star-Phoenix I note my name is also included here as receiving \$2,285. He also points out that he himself only used \$1,520. There is a simple explanation for that, he missed one-third of all the meetings. It is pretty hard to run up an expense allowance if you don't attend the meetings.

Secondly, I would point out that a goodly number of the meetings were held in Regina and obviously a member having to come a fair distance had mileage costs where the member who lived in Regina wouldn't involve himself in mileage costs.

I would also like to point out that I believe the Member for Wascana made the comment that every member in their own way made a contribution to the Committee and its meetings, and I am sure that is true. But I suggest that the Member for Lumsden made his biggest contribution when he wasn't in attendance.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. ROBBINS:** — I am not critical of the Hon. Member for Moose Jaw North (Mr. MacDonald) whom I did think made a very reasoned and useful contribution to that Committee. Frankly I think he made a much better contribution when the Member for Lumsden was absent.

I should like to make a few comments with respect to the financial aspects of our Committee meetings and the points that were raised by business enterprises across the province.

First of all, I think I should state, Mr. Speaker, that I am convinced that the business community very much appreciated the opportunity of attending Committee meetings and presenting their views. Personally, I would much prefer to see many more viable individual business operations in this province. I think all of us realize that there are a great number of the limitations that apply to general business operations and individual business enterprises as related to the agricultural industry. If the agricultural industry isn't viable it is pretty difficult to have reasoned viability among business firms that are operating in their rural communities. All we need to get in our agricultural industry is a surplus of products which are not saleable at a particular time or a limitation of production by reason of the fact that we have drouth or hail or insect damage and the businesses which service that industry find themselves in grave difficulty.

I think that is something that we all realized on the Committee and I think that is something that is not readily or quickly changed.

Presentation and briefs made to our Committee clearly indicated that the major problem for the independent entrepreneur lay in the field of financing. While business people in the larger centres have this problem, it appears particularly acute for business operations in smaller centres. Specialized financial requirements in the field of risk equity and working and inventory capital are needed.

A goodly number of people appearing before our Committee felt interest rates were unreasonably high. The Committee met with a number of representatives of a number of financial institutions to discuss business financial problems. These representatives contended that there was no shortage of capital but they clearly indicated that viability, management capability and risk involvement factors meant that capital may well not be available to those contemplating business operations without an adequate plan or with insufficient managerial skills.

That is not an easy problem to solve. It is easy to state it but it is very difficult to find the solution for it.

The Committee found that a considerable amount of criticism was expressed relating to the Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation. A good deal of that criticism fell into two categories — the length of time required to process applications and to provide an answer, whether that answer was negative or positive and the inconvenience related to location of office and personnel in Regina.

I note, Mr. Speaker, that the Member for Lumsden was quite critical, suggesting that the members of the Committee pushed the idea of business representatives throughout the province. I make no apology as one person who made that suggestion and no one suggested to me that I make that suggestion. I simply made the suggestion as I felt it was reasonable; that we might have business representatives located in various locations of the province, who would act somewhat like Ag Reps do in relation to the farming industry, and that these might be useful. I see

April 23, 1974

nothing wrong with a member of the Committee making a comment such as this to which business people often responded quite favorably. Although the Member for Lumsden pointed out that no one in the business community particularly raised that item, they certainly responded to it quite favorably.

We recommended that a specific group be made responsible for those enterprises which would require small loans. The Committee felt that loans to smaller businesses should be restricted in size and they suggest what they felt was a reasonable ceiling. The fact that that ceiling happened to correspond with the amount of money that was available to people on FarmStart loans, shouldn't I think, create any problems for anyone.

Decentralization of small loans administration was specifically requested and, again, this was done on the basis that we felt it would speed up the processing of those applications that might come to that agency. We feel that the regional offices should be permitted to grant a moderate level of loans perhaps up to \$20,000 without reference to the central office. We considered the difficulties in obtaining financing for smaller businesses and we came to the conclusion that they definitely required special assistance.

We suggested that loans to smaller enterprises should carry the lowest interest rates, with provision of up to 90 per cent financing from provincial sources, presumably through SEDCO or some such agency.

In providing venture capital we felt and recommended that a buy-back provision should be available to the principals involved or to other business people who might be interested in an operation.

The Committee concluded that deferral of interest and principal for the first 18 months of the life of a loan, was a reasoned arrangement to assist in overcoming start-up difficulties and we recommended that approach. Interest would not be forgiven but would accumulate during the deferral period and the term of the loan would have to bear relationship to the life of the depreciating asset.

We were particularly interested in finding a method to assist in transfer of ownership. This problem is not unlike the problems related to intergenerational transfers of farm land in this province. It is obvious that despite the fact that the Opposition is opposed to the Land Bank this is at least one means of creating transfer of land from one generation to another, which is a very severe problem in this province. A similar situation occurs with respect to the business enterprises in those rural communities serving agriculture and our proposal was designed to assist transfer of ownership from the owner who might be wanting to retire because of health or age and turn the enterprise over to a younger person.

The difficulty, of course, is similar in that the younger person has grave difficulty in raising the necessary capital to enable him to enter that particular line of enterprise.

We also suggested a business whose gross revenue was below \$250,000 may well be classified in today's market place as a relatively small business. Such businesses would merit the lowest available loaning rate, which would decline as the size of the community decreased. Now that seems a bit unusual but the proposal was made specifically to meet, what we felt, was a

rather unusual situation. The rate would of necessity bear reasoned relationship to current borrowing costs.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think any member of the Committee felt that this Special Committee on Business Firms would have all the solutions by any means in relation to business problems, but I think that it did serve a very useful purpose in going about the province and providing the opportunity for business people to come before that Committee, to present their problems and make some suggestions with respect to what they felt might be solutions.

The only regret that I had in relation to the Committee was, and I say so specifically, was the actions of the Member for Lumsden (Mr. Lane). I felt that the Hon. Member for Lumsden from the beginning, did his utmost to be critical in terms of the Committee; to bring in a lot of political considerations which should not have been there, and I, for one, did not approach that Committee with any political bias whatsoever and I wish to make that crystal clear, Mr. Speaker.

I certainly support the Final Report and I am hopeful that many of its recommendations will be exceedingly useful in increasing the viability generally of independent business enterprises in this province.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. A.W. ENGEL** (Notukeu-Willow Bunch): — Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion I should like to say that I appreciate the remarks of the Committee members who took part in the debate. I think it is obvious for those who listened as to who did all the work in this Committee.

The Members on the Government side stood up and reaffirmed the positions they took when we were writing our Final Report. They talked about what the report contained and what particular areas of interest that they had and the areas that they really wanted to see implemented.

I won't comment that much on what the Member for Lumsden said. I believe he tried to raise a smokescreen to camouflage his own activities in his work in the Committee. The Member who just took his seat, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Robbins) did a good job in clobbering that Member in the remarks he made. I feel it is too bad that the work of this Committee was frustrated the way it was by members, and I will say that members on both sides got quite political many times.

When we look at the committees that were set up by this Government during the last three or four years, I served on two committees, the Agricultural Committee and this Business Committee, and when I think of topics like the Committee on Highway Safety or the Committee for Liquor, they had topics that had general appeal to all members. I really appreciate the fact that these committees didn't get involved in that kind of political hassle like we had.

When we got involved in this Committee, for a long time most of the public and particularly the Members opposite felt that when you talk about business you are somehow talking about something that was just in their own ball park on that

side of the House. I think that it is too bad that they had this attitude and that they tried to convey this kind of an attitude while they were out in the country. I feel that we have proven beyond a shadow of a doubt, that that image is not true any more; that the NDP are not the enemy of the businessmen.

I think that by this Final Report of the Business Committee we have proven that we are concerned about the problems that they face; we have given the businessmen a fair hearing and we have looked for solutions to their problems. The Members who have spoken have outlined and have done a very good job as to what they feel the solution should be.

When I look back over the comments of the Member for Moose Jaw North (Mr. MacDonald) and I just want to refer to two comments that the Member made regarding our Business Committee and the Final Report. The one statement that he made and I am reading from the transcripts:

The report was nothing more than a collection of papers.

I think that in itself indicates how much work and how much of his homework he really did. It is too bad that he didn't go into the collection of papers and study the material that we were summarizing and become more personally involved. The second comment I would like to refer to is the one he made regarding the meeting that was to be held at Moose Jaw. He said that we wrote a letter to every person who had an E&H tax collection responsibility and notified them of the meeting. He was partly right in that case. I did write a letter on behalf of the Committee to everybody that had an E&H tax, but this letter — and I have a copy of it here before me that is filed with the Clerk's office and he let me use it for this purpose — said this letter was written and it states that:

The Committee was soliciting briefs and letters from interested organizations and individuals regarding the problems faced by, and the need of services of business firms.

If you wish to submit a brief or a letter you should indicate your intention to the undersigned before August 15, 1972. I would encourage you to appear personally before the Committee in order to present and discuss your brief. If you are able to do so would you indicate this to the Committee.

The Committee is prepared to hold public meetings in various centres in the province during September and October in order to achieve the fullest representation. The number and location of these meetings will depend on the number of parties indicating a desire to make oral presentations to the Committee.

When the Committee had to decide where to meet Moose Jaw wasn't on the list. I will agree with the Member that I phoned, but if he thinks that I am that powerful like he mentioned in his debate here, that by a phone call we got that many out, all I did was to phone the city to see if they had any intentions in the Chamber of Commerce and he said that they were sincerely interested in a meeting. By the number of briefs they had and the volume of material that we received in Moose Jaw, I for one, feel that it was a very worthwhile meeting. I think that the Member for Moose Jaw North did an injustice to his fellow

businessmen in that city for inferring that it wasn't a worthwhile meeting and that the views that were raised there were not worthwhile. I think that he was wrong in that aspect and I feel that we received very much valuable information and some follow up work from the people at Moose Jaw.

I, for one, support the recommendations of the Final Report, Mr. Speaker. I believe this is a blueprint for long range development in this province.

We advocated a change from natural growth to an industrial based economy and I think that if these changes follow through like the Minister of Finance has assured us that as one in the Treasury Benches will work for that end, that we will see that kind of a growth take place.

We pointed out, and I am summarizing here, that the small businessmen required more help than larger firms. Another area that I want to mention is that the improved economic conditions that we are facing right now have not, in general, been felt by many of the small businessmen who find themselves in short supply, possibly by design.

I should like to reiterate the tourist potential that this province has. This is a good Report, Mr. Speaker, and I would encourage every Member of this House to support this motion, that the Final Report of the Business Firms be now concurred in.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to.

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

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

**MR. G.B. GRANT** (Regina Whitmore Park): — Mr. Speaker, I had an opportunity earlier to commence speaking on this and then time ran out and I wasn't present when the opportunity afforded itself again.

As I mentioned in my opening remarks, I really don't think the public is concerned, too concerned, about the slaughter on the highways. My reason for saying this is that there seems to be very little publicity given to it. Death is not nearly as startling as it was 25 years ago and there are so many catastrophes in today's society that two or three people meeting their demise on the highway doesn't seem to attract the public attention that it did previously.

Even though this may be the case I wouldn't suggest that we, as legislators, ignore it.

This Committee was set up under three headings — education, engineering and enforcement. We were given an opportunity to indicate our preference as to which of these sub-committees we would like to work on and I had no difficulty in picking the enforcement one because I feel that is probably the most important aspect of trying to overcome the disregard that the driving

public have for their fellow drivers and pedestrians.

Education certainly must play a role and I think that it is an ongoing role that we have to recognize here. It is certainly a helpful role, but let's not kid ourselves, it is a very slow process. The results are going to be discouraging, frustrating. When you think of the few people in Saskatchewan who have availed themselves of the opportunity of taking a defensive driving course, it would indicate the attitude of the average driver, that they feel that this is not really necessary that they are pretty good drivers. Also I think there is an inherent daring in a man's makeup that education is going to have difficulty in overcoming. If it wasn't for this daring attitude of mankind Christopher Columbus would probably never have discovered this continent nor would people have landed on the moon. So I think it is part of our makeup and part that we can't do without. It is necessary but hopefully we can do something about keeping it under control.

In the field of engineering I feel that it is somewhat adequate. I can't see our province spending untold sums to try and build highways adequate for the loose nut who may be driving a vehicle. I think most of us recognize that under adverse conditions we slow our vehicles down and exercise caution. And the better we build our highways probably the less necessity there is for this slowing down, but at the time there is going to be more disregard for the necessity of slowing down.

A province with only 900,000 people and the greatest number of miles of road of any province in Canada, I think must recognize its limits as far as engineering improvements are concerned, because there will always be someone who will exceed the safe driving standards of the road. There is always a country road that certainly was not intended to accommodate the foolhardy driver.

The four lane highway is about as safe a structure as can be made but in spite of that man seems to be able to overcome those safety features and either cross the median or ran into someone who has either stopped or slowed down ahead of him. So it would seem to me that enforcement is most effective means of overcoming some of our problems. I believe that it is a quick educator. I can't think of anything that will educate people as quickly as enforcement. I think it is an effective deterrent. If it wasn't for the potential penalties there would be many more violations, I think, of our highway traffic laws. The most of us are law abiding citizens either through background or education or because of our fear of penalties.

I think we all get a little tired of watching the crowds gather around the pubs and drinking places particularly on Friday and Saturday nights and if we really wanted to slow down the drinking driver or at least the drinker getting into his car and driving, there would certainly be a great field there for picking up people. And this is the sad part that our society doesn't seem to recognize fully the dangers inherent in over-drinking and driving and they pour out of these drinking places, particularly on the weekend nights and no doubt there are a good many of them over .08. But for some reason the police enforcement, the law enforcement officers, do not make it a point to check on the people coming out of these places. I don't know whether the Liquor Commission would be enthused about it being done either because it would probably have a deterrent effect on



the consumption of liquor. We seem to be a mixed up society when we encourage people right and left to drink and with no prohibition on them leaving these establishments and getting into their vehicles and driving away. I would think that an occasional drive and picking up people coming out of these establishment would have its effect and I would hope that something might be done in this regard.

Mr. Speaker, as I indicated previously, I was pleased to be on a non-political committee but even the Highway Safety and Traffic Committee can turn out to be very political. Because I think the important factor is just how far the Government or we, as legislators, are prepared to go on recommendations that might emanate from that Committee. I realize that all Committees get pretty enthusiastic about their work, the Business Committee, the Welfare Committee, the Liquor Committee and all the other committees that have been set up, all get carried away a bit with the importance of their work and the remedies that they propound. We saw evidence in this House of the Chairman of the Liquor Committee being very frustrated and disappointed in the lack of action by the Government on some recommendations of that Committee, and I fear that this may happen in the case of the Highway Safety and Traffic Committee. The true meat of this Committee and the results will depend on whether the Cabinet Members, particularly, and the Government opposite give this matter priority No. 1 or priority No. 73. I don't expect that they will give it priority No. 1. I think that I am a little bit too realistic to expect the Government is going to place this ahead of all the other priorities. I would hope that it wouldn't be priority No. 73. I would hope that it would land somewhere in between. I think the Government Members, the frontbenchers particularly, should make their feelings known to members of the Committee as to their reception of this Committee's recommendations or feelings and I am glad the Attorney General is coming in because I believe he and his seatmate are the important ones as to what may result from the Highway Safety and Traffic Committee. Because if the Cabinet is not receptive to take some action we have wasted our time and we are not going to even begin to cure some of the hazards on the highways. As I said, Mr. Attorney General, I would hope some of the frontbenchers, the Cabinet Members, would make their feelings known to the members of this Committee and in particular the Chairman, so that he won't become overly enthused to the point where we feel that the final recommendation should be priority No. 1 over all other priorities of the Government.

As I pointed out, the field of enforcement I think is a very important one. I have voiced my opinion in this Legislature before that I think that we live in a too permissive society but I realize I don't have too much support. I think Mr. Boldt would support me but I don't know whether I have too many other ones or not. But I think the example that was cited in the paper the other day would bring out the point that I wish to make. I believe the chap's name was Papp, I'm not sure, but it was reported in the Press that he was finally caught on 13th Avenue after a 60 mile an hour chase, endangering the lives of several people including the lives of pedestrians and motorists, as you can imagine going down 13th Avenue at 60 miles an hour. When he was apprehended he was found to be inebriated which was bad enough but he was also driving while suspended. Now, personally, I think that for a chap like this the only way to get the message over to him would be a public horse whipping and if no one else would undertake to do it if I can borrow Mr. Pepper's bullwhip,

I would be willing to do it myself. I don't think an irresponsible individual such as that who would drive while suspended at 60 miles an hour on a city street, inebriated, has any sense of responsibility whatsoever. I doubt very much whether education or rehabilitation is going to help that chap. But I dare say that some real penalty that will make him suffer physically might make him a little bit more considerate the next time. I don't know.

I feel that we must zero in on two categories. The drinking driver I think should be shown no mercy whatsoever. I think the suspended driver who insists on driving should be treated the same, no mercy whatsoever. I think there is some merit in speed reductions. It certainly has been evident in the United States and the reduction in highway speeds show a reduction in traffic fatalities. I don't know why everybody is so 'hell-bent for election' to get from here to there and when they get there they find that they really don't have to get there as early as they thought they did. They have nothing to do and have nothing to do with their time. In some cases it's spent imbibing and they would probably have been better off if they spent a little more time driving on the highway at a more conservative speed. I don't expect that the Government will receive this too enthusiastically but I nevertheless feel very strongly that the highway speeds are too high if we are concerned as legislators about highway deaths. If we are not then leave them the way they are.

Mr. Speaker, I want to conclude on a word of explanation about a program that I believe the Hon. Member for Touchwood (Mr. Meakes) referred to as ASAP, which is the Alcohol Safety Accident Project carried on in Phoenix. This came about as a result of studies in the United States by the National Highway Traffic Administration of the Department of Transportation. They felt that they just must take corrective action against the problem of the drinker who insists on driving. There are 35 projects set up in various states and the one in Phoenix seemed to attract the most attention as far as were concerned and probably the most attention throughout the world because a lot of states and jurisdictions have visited that activity to see the results of it. The overall objective of the program was to achieve significant reduction in alcohol related crashes resulting in fatalities, injuries and property damage. Also the aim was to generate public support and stimulate State and Community programs. The project was financed by the Federal Government for 3 1/2 years by about \$2.5 million and the 3 1/2 years will be concluded this September. It comprised a series of integrated counter-measures involving many community agencies directed toward the apprehension and the rehabilitation of the problem drinkers who insist on driving. The counter-measures include enforcement, judicial activities, rehabilitation, public information and education and finally, the very important one, evaluation of the project.

The enforcement has been increased in the Phoenix area to properly apprehend more of the problem drinking drivers and test new techniques and equipment and hopefully to catch them before they have caused any suffering and damage. They upped the police force, the motorcycle officers and the automobile patrolmen. One important strengthening was in the judicial area where there was additional court personnel appointed and there is a considerable amount of plea-sentencing done. I noticed that a member of our Attorney General's Department, Mr. Piragoff,

the other day made mention of this and suggested that possibly we should be looking at it in Saskatchewan. I presume the Attorney General has it under consideration.

Another very important program in this was a volunteer probation officer program where people suffering from the desire to drink and drive were turned over to a voluntary citizen or a citizen under a voluntary program for a period of several months, hopefully to educate him in new ways and habits. The rehabilitation part of it involved a number of agencies including the university and hospitals. There is an assessment of attitudes and people who are found guilty of driving while intoxicated were required to take a four-night course of instruction, it might even be limited to one night depending on the seriousness of their offence. In some cases they merely were supplied with literature and hopefully received some benefit from that. The general aim was to develop a more responsible attitude towards drinking and driving. I doubt very much whether the ASAP program in Phoenix would have had very much effect on the case that I cited on 13th Avenue last week.

There is considerable co-operation by the public and the media in the Phoenix area. Co-operation is very, very good and the dissemination of public information is quite widespread. The Industrial Engineering Department of Arizona University is doing an evaluation so that probably by the end of this year or early next year they will have a good assessment on the effects of the program and whether it should be continued or extended.

I think as far as our Committee is concerned that it made us realize the extent to which our neighbors to the South are going in their efforts to try to cope with the problem common to many industrial countries besides their own including our own country. Some portions of the program certainly can be adapted to Saskatchewan. I think the Committee felt that it was not practical to incorporate in total into any recommendations that might be emanating from the Committee.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I just want to once again appeal to the Government Members to let their feelings be known to Committee members so that when the Committee does come down with its final report we can be realistic in our report and recommendations. I think it has to take two forms, one is for immediate action and one over a long-term period where the recommended co-ordinating agency, whatever form it might take, would ride herd on the long-range program so that we wouldn't lose sight of the necessity of continually hammering away and also probably eliminate the necessity of periodic committees such as our own, being set up. I feel that with two of these committees now having examined the problem so extensively that there is really no necessity for a repetition of this for a good many years, if ever, providing a co-ordinating and continuing agency is established. Unless the Government is prepared to look favorably on the establishment of such a co-ordinating agency I would feel that the hope of a worthwhile number of solutions to our problems are quite remote. Because legislators have a tendency to forget the urgency of these things once we adjourn and then about three or four years later someone suggests that it is high time we had another committee to investigate it and about all we can do is review the same material that we have had before us in the last year.

I think that covers all I wish to say and thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. A.R. GUY** (Athabasca): — Mr. Speaker, before this debate is closed I wish to say just a few words. I am the last member of the Highway Traffic Committee to speak. I can assure you that my remarks will be brief. What has already been said in the debate has covered very well I think what the Committee is all about, the briefs that we have had presented, the studying that we have done on our own, the trip to Phoenix, the problems that we have been faced with, some of the suggestions that have been made to us by the people who are interested and who have presented briefs to the Committee. But I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this is really only the beginning for this Committee. What we have done to date has not had very much value in cutting down the deaths and the accidents that have occurred on the highway and what it all boils down to is this report is only a progress report and the real success or failure of this Committee will be dependent upon the recommendations that we will be able to put in the Final Report.

I think the responsibility lies very heavy on our shoulders to come up with recommendations that will reverse the present trend of more accidents and more deaths on our highway system. And if we can do this then I suggest that our Committee will have been a success. It is certainly, and I am sure I speak for all members of the Committee when I say this is the intention and the hope of the Committee. However, it is going to be a very difficult task to come up with solutions because these recommendations that we make to the Government today must be I think first of all reasonably acceptable to the public, as we must have the co-operation of the general public in any Highway Traffic Safety program, if it is going to be successful. Any conflict of enforcement with the public I don't think is in the best interest of highway and traffic safety. I have some doubt about the remarks of my colleague who just took his seat about police cars sitting outside of bars and taverns to pick up people as they come out. I am sure that for the first few weeks the number of .08s or whatever it is would increase but I am sure that the conflict that would develop between the enforcement agencies and the general public with that kind of treatment would not, in the long run, do very much to improve the reduction in numbers of intoxicated drivers or impaired drivers on our highways. I think we have to come up with a more realistic approach with the same end in mind of getting these people either educated or in some manner to get them off the highways before they have reached the level when they are not capable of driving their vehicles.

I think that any recommendations must be enforceable. The recommendation or the suggestion has been made that perhaps .08 should be reduced to .06 or even .04, and there is no question in my mind that at .04 and .06 perhaps there are some drivers who are not capable of handling their cars. However, at the present time we have not seen a good job of enforcing the .08 so I can't really see that anything is to be gained by lowering it to .06 or .04 until we come up with a solution to how we are going to enforce the present level of .08. I am sure that if we can get all, and I say all, the .08 drivers off the road and keep them off the road, we will have gone a long way to solving our problems on highway traffic as they relate to the use of

alcohol.

So any recommendations that we make to the Government must be enforceable otherwise we are not going to solve very much of the problem that faces us. I think that the recommendations must be realistic and flexible and I think this is where a great deal of committee work will have to be done in coming up with recommendations that fit these requirements of being flexible and realistic. I hope that we can come up with some recommendations that are new, that have not been tried in other areas or perhaps have been tried in pilot projects and can be refined to fit the situation as it exists here in Saskatchewan.

There is no question that our recommendations are going to require some stern measures to be taken. But I think these measures can only be taken in the context of public education. No matter how severe the law is or how strong the enforcement is, without public education to make the motoring public aware of the hazards that they create when they don't drive according to the law, and the hazard that they face from other drivers, who are not driving according to the law, until that is accomplished I don't think we shall have a long-term solution to the problems of highway traffic and safety.

I think that after all is said and done, Mr. Speaker, that success will only come when the travelling public are concerned and determined to reduce accident fatalities. As I say all the laws and regulations and programs won't help if the public won't co-operate with them. We must convince the public once and for all, that it is in their own best interests to obey the traffic laws, not to drive while suspended, not to drive while under the influence of liquor and all the other problems which we have had related to us as being examples of what create traffic hazards on our roads today.

Mr. Speaker, I have some other comments that I should like to make so I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

## **ADJOURNED DEBATES**

### **RESOLUTION NO. 26 — GUARANTEED MONTHLY INCOME FOR SENIOR CITIZENS**

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

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

**MR. D.F. MacDONALD** (Moose Jaw North): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few words to this Resolution.

First of all I want to say that I completely support the principle contained in the Resolution. I am not sure if the figures of \$350 per single and \$500 for married persons over 65 is exactly the right amount, but I realize that this was the

amount suggested by the Commission and I am willing to accept that figure. I also would be in agreement with possibly of a phasing in of this type of figure, \$350 and \$500. I am not adamant that it be done immediately or that that be the exact figure. But I feel very strongly about the principle contained in this Resolution and I support it.

In my mind the treatment given to our senior citizens by society today is nothing less than shabby. I think that we should have a real concern. I won't concede to anyone that the principle involved in this Resolution is a socialistic program or welfare program. It is a program that incorporates, in my mind, just common decency.

There are some Members of this House apparently who feel that senior citizens do not have right. But in my mind there is no question at all that this Legislature has a duty to provide for better treatment of our senior citizens than is currently being done in this province.

We are talking about senior citizens of this province. We are talking about the people who helped to build this province. We are talking about people who have already made their contributions in this province. We are talking about people who have made possible the way of life that we enjoy today and now many of them live in poverty.

These same people have set the stage for the prosperity that we are today enjoying and in this very day they are not able to enjoy the prosperity which they set the stage for. It is a fact that in this province today we now have financial resources that could provide for adequate treatment of our senior citizens. We now have great revenues from the oil industry; we now have a very buoyant economy; we now have decent prices for our grain and other agricultural products. We do have the financial resources today to provide for better treatment of our senior citizens and I think that we do have that revenue because of the contribution made by many of these same senior citizens that are today living in poverty.

Many of the senior citizens that are in poverty today find themselves that way, not necessarily because of anything that they either did or did not do. In fact some of them are living in poverty because of the things that we are doing today. The NDP Government of this province can take its full share of the blame for causing inflation, that is causing so much hardship to a lot of the senior citizens.

There is no government in Canada that is spending money any faster, and in many cases, not too wisely, that is helping to cause a bad situation for many senior citizens. Many of the senior citizens, as I said, who are living in poverty have made a great contribution already in their lifetime. And at the time they were making these contributions pensions were not available to them. They did not have pensions set up that they could contribute to.

The same person today making the same type of contribution to our society will be building up a pension and will not have to live in the same type of poverty as some of our senior citizens are today. A lot of people who are in poverty are senior citizens today, in fact they thought they had made adequate provision for their retirement. They put a little bit of money

away. I suppose back in 1945 in those years that people retired and had a nest egg of \$4,000 or \$5,000 they thought that that was really something. Four thousand dollars or \$5,000 to them in 1940 or 1945 was a pretty good chunk of money and they likely felt very secure. And the inflation that is rampant today has just wiped out the savings that those people had thought they had put away for their retirement.

Make no mistake about it the inflation that is rampant today is caused by the succeeding generation and no one in this House can be excused of helping to fan the fires of that inflation which is helping to spur on the incidence of poverty of our senior citizens.

The Government opposite has taken some steps for some people in our society and I think of increasing minimum wages. They have increased the number of holidays for our workers. Now we have a plan for our working poor. We have increased our welfare payments; we have even put on premiums for hogs. These programs are fine for all of these people who will benefit, but the senior citizens are not going to benefit from higher minimum wage, in fact, the same higher minimum wage is going to cause some hardship to many senior citizens who are retired. Certainly the plan for assisting the working poor is going to help a good many people who may need help but, again, it is not going to help the senior citizen as obviously he is not working.

A good many of these programs will simply add to the costs of goods and services and therefore cause more inflation and further reduce the position of the senior citizen.

I think it is important to senior citizens to be recognized and recognized for the contributions that they have made. I think it is the duty of every one of us in this Legislature to make sure that our senior citizens are able to live in dignity. We must do what is within our power and I think that now we do have the power, with the present economy and our oil revenues and so on, we now have the financial resources in this province to provide a small degree of dignity to our senior citizens living in poverty conditions.

We presently provide some degree of dignity to small groups of our senior citizens population. I would bring to mind the example of senior citizens' housing and there are different instances of highrise senior citizens' housing. I would suggest that in these cases many of the people are paying rents in the highrise apartments, for example, of \$50 per month. I would suggest that Governments are subsidizing this to the tune of \$100 or \$150 a month. This is fine for those people who are fortunate enough to get into a senior citizens' highrise or some other such accommodation. But what about the many senior citizens who are unable to get into these subsidized housing units? What about the senior citizens who do not want to live in a senior citizens' home for one reason or another? Do they not deserve to get some assistance also so that they can have some degree of dignity?

Mr. Speaker, I think that it is a shameful act to continue to ignore the senior citizens and the plight that they are finding themselves in. There is one thing that seems to me to be as important as anything else, that the working poor, the person on welfare, the person on the minimum wage has one thing in common with some of the senior citizens, they may be existing in

poverty but they have one thing that separates them, very distinctly from the senior citizens who lives in poverty. Most people have some hope that their condition will improve. The person on minimum wage at least has some hope that he will get a better job or that things will get better, or that whatever conditions exist that are keeping somebody on welfare that these conditions will change. They have hope. The senior citizen has no hope that things will change. He has to exist on what our society is willing to give him.

I would also say that the estimate of \$75 million, I think, was made that this type of program would cost, I think this is far out of line. I don't know what the cost would be but I think that it would likely be closer to \$25 million or \$30 million, taking into account federal contributions and so on. I would also remind this House that this program undoubtedly gets smaller and smaller in future years, most people retiring now and more people in the future will have adequate pensions to retire on. A need for this type of program in the future will cease to exist, I would hope.

I should just like to comment very briefly on the remarks made by the Attorney General when he entered into this debate. I would have to say that I was very disappointed in the remarks of the Attorney General. I believe that he spoke for himself and for the Government. There have been very few comments made by Government Members. They made very little contribution to this debate. The very fact that Members opposite would not second the motion should tell us something about how they feel on this type of thing.

The Attorney General made some mention that this is all right for British Columbia to do, a program like this, because they are wealthy and it is a different situation. Then he went on to say that senior citizens all over this country should be treated equally, not differently. He doesn't take into account the fact that minimum wages are different all across this country; that provisions for holidays for workers are different all over this country; that this Government is going to undertake a program for the working poor, so that the working poor won't be equal all over this country. I don't know why he says that senior citizens have to be treated equally.

We can treat our senior citizens the way we feel that they should be treated. If they are not treated that way in Ontario or Manitoba, well that is fine, but we have a duty and we have the resources now to treat our senior citizens the way that we would like to treat them.

The Attorney General spoke for about half an hour and in my mind he didn't address himself to the question of senior citizens and what the province can do for them, hardly at all during that half hour. He talked about what wasn't done for the last six or ten years. He talked about what Ottawa wasn't doing and what they should do. I would remind the Attorney General that this Resolution calls for the Provincial Government to consider giving the deserved and merited assistance to senior citizens. It does not call upon the Federal Government to give assistance.

This Resolution was for this Legislature to consider what we should do or what we could do or what we should not do. I would have to take it that the remarks of the Attorney General



indicate that the Government opposite is not willing to consider that they have any obligations to senior citizens in this province. I have to say that I was very disappointed.

The Attorney General, in my mind, answered for the Government and that it intends to do nothing, we should blame Ottawa and they are not going to take any action to help the cause of the senior citizens of this province.

Mr. Speaker, I would strongly support the Resolution.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. H.H. ROLFES** (Nutana Centre): — Mr. Speaker, I too would like to say a few words on the Resolution pertaining to senior citizens.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, it is very interesting the way this particular motion was worded. The motion reads:

That this Assembly calls for immediate government consideration.

Unless there is a word missing, it says 'government consideration.' Maybe the Member (Mr. Richards) intentionally worded it that way because last year, as it was pointed out, he did support a resolution which urged the Federal Government to increase the senior citizens' assistance. I think that the Member for Saskatoon University believes that that is the right step to take so that we can have some uniformity right across this country in regard to senior citizens, as we would like to see, for the working poor and those on welfare.

If that is what the Member for Saskatoon University intended, that the Federal Government should give consideration, I wholeheartedly support the Resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I find the remarks of the Member for Moose Jaw North (Mr. MacDonald) rather humorous, because the record of the Members opposite when they were the Government in regard to their assistance to senior citizens is well known. One needs only refer to a few editorials that were contained in the Leader Post and the Star-Phoenix and I am just going to refer to one and I think it very clearly shows the attitude of the Liberals when they were in power. Mr. Speaker, I am absolutely convinced the only reason that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) moved the motion and it was seconded by the Member for Whitmore Park (Mr. Grant) last year, which was identical to the petition presented by the senior citizens as brought into this House by the Member for Nutana Centre (Mr. Robbins), the only reason, Mr. Speaker, they moved that motion was because they felt they could get some political advantage in moving that motion. They knew that they would have absolutely no responsibility for carrying it out and if they were the Government they certainly would do nothing about it.

Mr. Speaker, I believe possibly that this is what the Members opposite feel and I want to read to you what the former Minister of Health said to senior citizens when he was the Minister. When the Saskatchewan Pensioners and Senior Citizens' Association met with the Minister of Health and pleaded with him to do something to assist senior citizens his reply of course was that they would do nothing. The senior citizens at that time pleaded with the Hon. Member that he should abolish

utilization fees on Medicare. His answer was, No. They asked him to abolish hospitalization utilization fees, his answer was, No. They asked him to enable pensioners to get lower bus and rail travel rates and his answer was, No. They asked him to give bigger exemptions on personal income tax and his answer was, No. They asked him to also exempt senior citizens from paying taxes for school purposes and his answer was, No. After the interview the Minister was interviewed and this was his reply: "We said there would be no change."

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this clearly indicates the attitude of the Members opposite. We need only to go to some of the things that they did not do when they were in power. The minimum wage up to May of 1971 or April of 1971 was only \$1.25 an hour in this province. In seven years it had only reached \$1.25 an hour. Since we have formed the Government the minimum wage as of July 2nd, 1974 will be \$2.25 an hour and in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, even that is much too low.

But what do the Members opposite have to say about the increase of the minimum wage? The Member for Lumsden said it is inflationary. The Leader of the Opposition said it was inflationary. What is their attitude towards the poor? Give them as little as you can get away with. Mr. Speaker, when it came to people on Welfare exactly the same thing applied. Give them as little as you can get away with.

Mr. Speaker, how can these Members support a Resolution like this one we are debating today and at the same time when the Welfare Report recommends a guaranteed annual income, the Members opposite opposed it. What does the Senior Citizens' Report say on the guaranteed annual income and I want to read from page 17:

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

Mr. Speaker, a guaranteed annual income would give senior citizens what we are discussing in the Resolution today but the Members opposite opposed that. On the one hand they say they are in favor of helping our senior citizens and yet on the other hand they opposed the very recommendations made in the Welfare Report which would have given our senior citizens a guaranteed annual income. Mr. Speaker, to me this is completely contradictory.

Members opposite, and we only have to listen to the Member for Albert Park (Mr. MacDonald) when they criticize this Government in giving the members of the Power Corporation a 15 per cent and giving the teachers an eight or nine per cent . . .

**MR. MacLEOD:** — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Privilege, I am sure that the Hon. Member doesn't want to read something incorrectly into the record and, therefore, when he suggests that the Hon. Member for Albert Park criticized the Government for giving 15 per cent increase to the Saskatchewan Power Corporation people, he is totally in error. I have not criticized it, I have in fact been very pleased with it and I am sure he doesn't want to make that mistake.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — That's a debating point and

it shouldn't be raised as a Point of Order.

**MR. ROLFES:** — Mr. Speaker, if the Member for Albert Park would only listen a little more and not be so eager to talk I would have told him that he criticized the Government giving Power Corporation members 15 per cent and at the same time giving teachers only eight or nine per cent. You must wait until I come to the end of a sentence before you know what I am going to say.

Mr. Speaker, the 15 per cent that is given to Power Corporation members gives them on the average about \$1,000 increase per year. The teachers on an eight or nine per cent increase also received over a \$1,000 per year. The point that I want to make, Mr. Speaker, is that the policy followed by the Members opposite when they were the Government on using a percentage increase is simply not acceptable to me and to the Government on this side. When they were the Government they gave hospital workers a six per cent increase. A six per cent increase on \$300 meant an \$18 increase per year. Yet at the same time, Mr. Speaker, they were quite prepared to give doctors a six or seven per cent increase and very often they received a \$2,000 increase. My point, Mr. Speaker, is that we should get away from these percentages and talk about flat rate increases. What I should like to see, Mr. Speaker, is a flat rate increase not just in Saskatchewan but right across this country, so that top people who are making \$40,000 to \$50,000 a year are not receiving \$3,000, \$4,000 or \$5,000 annual increases whereas those on a lower income only receive a small dollar value increase each year. Therefore, I should like to see that a two or three per cent escalator clause as applied to senior citizens is done away with and that we talk about flat rate increases.

Mr. Speaker, I am not sure whether the dollar value is why we should be debating but the principle, Mr. Speaker, to me is that all senior citizens in Canada have the right to a guaranteed annual income and should not be based on the wealth of individual provinces. I don't think any Member in this House would say to the people in Newfoundland or the people in Prince Edward Island, to the people in Nova Scotia, because your economy can't support \$350 per senior citizen and \$500 per couple, therefore, you cannot have it for your people. That's why, Mr. Speaker, it has got to be a federal program, a federal program which is subsidized by the rich provinces and, Mr. Speaker, that is why I should like to see this Resolution amended so that the Assembly urges the Federal Government to implement the program

Mr. Speaker, the Members opposite said that this Government is completely insensitive to the needs of senior citizens. Let me, Mr. Speaker, review for them what we have done since 1971. The budget in 1973 did away with hospitalization and medicare premiums. Mr. Speaker, we increased the Property Improvement Grant for all citizens, including senior citizens. In last year's budget, Mr. Speaker, we gave financial assistance for hearing aids. It paid the nursing component of Level III care for senior citizens. It established a Housing Corporation which gives assistance to senior citizens. We increased our activities in the area of Meals on Wheels and Homemakers. In addition, Mr. Speaker, this budget last year set up a committee to investigate the needs of the senior citizens and let me say if the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Taylor) acts as rapidly on the Senior Citizens' Report as he did on the Welfare Report, the senior citizens have much to hope for.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that it is fair to say that this Government has not forgotten its senior citizens and it recognizes that their plight is serious and that more help is required so that our senior citizens will be able to retire in dignity in the community in which they wish to reside. Therefore, last year I recommended to this House that we cannot just speak on economic terms. We must also take into consideration the recreation facilities, we must take into consideration housing facilities and we must also take into consideration facilities for senior citizens in small communities.

Mr. Speaker, let me make a comparison between what the Budget of 1974 under this Government has done for senior citizens as compared to what the Members opposite did when they were the Government. Benefits to senior citizens under the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan — Liberals paid \$4 million, the 1974 Budget \$6.8 million. Grants to Special-care Homes — Liberals provided nothing in 1970-71, we are providing \$5.4 million. Community Services to the Aged — Liberals \$60,000, we are providing \$850,000. Construction grants to Special-care Homes — Liberals provided \$525,000, we are providing \$990,600 or almost \$1 million. Yet, Mr. Speaker, the Members opposite say we do nothing for senior citizens.

The opposite, Mr. Speaker, is true, whereas they gave a total of \$4.6 million in their last budget, we are giving \$14 million to senior citizens. Over and above the benefits provided by the Department of Social Services are the following, Mr. Speaker: Senior Citizens' Home Repair Program — \$3 million; Low Rental Accommodation for Senior Citizens — \$605,000; abolition, as I mentioned before, of hospitalization and medicare premiums, a saving to senior citizens of \$3 million. In 1970-71 the Liberals charged these same senior citizens \$2 million annually in deterrent fees and if you add the deterrent fees and the medical care premiums together, it cost the senior citizens under the Liberal regime half a million dollars more than they ever received. And they claim that they are in sympathy with senior citizens. I think the record shows otherwise.

Totalling all the programs, Mr. Speaker, all the programs, not counting Low Rental Housing, Property Improvement Grants, our Government is providing some \$22 million for senior citizens.

Mr. Speaker, if we look at nursing homes and special-care homes this Government again is taking some action. In 1973 we provided grants of \$1.80 per day for Level II, \$4.80 per day for Level III. This year the grant will be \$3 per day for Level II and \$7 per day for guests in Level III care. At the same time we will provide funds to pay for 80 per cent of any deficit incurred by a non-profit home this past year. This will allow them time to adjust and to get on to the new system so they can manage to make a break-even position in the coming year.

Mr. Speaker, to say this Government is insensitive to senior citizens is simply not facing the facts. We have taken significant steps to help our senior citizens. We believe that you cannot look at senior citizens' assistance only in financial terms but that you must look at it in its totality. Therefore, we have looked at recreation facilities, we have looked at nursing care homes, we have looked at senior citizens' housing, and Mr. Speaker, I think this Government under the capable leadership of Allan Blakeney can be justly proud of its programs for senior citizens. Mr. Speaker, I would simply suggest that

we continue to urge the Federal Government and I do have some hope in the Hon. Marc Lalonde, and I would suggest to the senior citizens to direct their attention to the Hon. Marc Lalonde rather than to the Members opposite, because I am absolutely convinced that the Members opposite will treat the senior citizens the way they treat the people on minimum wage, the way they have treated people on welfare, they are not concerned with the welfare of these people.

Mr. Speaker, I have some further remarks that I should like to say on this particular Resolution, therefore, I ask leave to adjourn debate.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

Debate adjourned.

## **SECOND READINGS**

**MR. H.H. ROLFES** (Saskatoon Nutana South) moved second reading of Bill No. 115 — **An Act respecting the Canadian Institute of Management.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, for second reading of this Bill I have distributed to all Members of this House the aims and purposes of the Canadian Institute of Management, Saskatchewan Division, and therefore I will not take the time of the House in further deliberations on the principle of the Bill. I think everybody can read the material. So, Mr. Speaker, I will move that Bill 115 be now read a second time and referred to the Select Standing Committee on Law Amendments and Delegated Powers.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

## **WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**MR. E. KAEDING** (Saltcoats): — Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to introduce to you and to Members of the House a group of 35 Grade Eight students in the west gallery. Their teachers are with them, Mr. Sturtz from Bredenbury High School and Mr. Farquharson from Saltcoats. These students come here almost every year, it's almost every year that we have had a group of students from this particular school and I am very pleased to see them come again this year.

It might be noteworthy at this time to mention that the driver, Mr. Russell McNutt, sitting up in the gallery, is a grandson of the former Member for Nipawin, Mr. T.R. McNutt, who served in this Legislature between the years of 1952 and 1956. His great grandfather also I understand was the first Speaker in this Legislature and I think that we should recognize the young man up in the balcony.

I am sure that all of you will join with me in welcoming them here and wishing them a happy day here today and hope that they learn a little bit about the democratic procedure. I am sure you will join with me at this time.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

The Assembly adjourned at 5:27 o'clock p.m.