

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fifth Session — Seventeenth Legislature
29th Day

Tuesday, April 1, 1975.

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

On the Orders of the Day.

WELCOME TO ROSEMARY BROWN - B.C. MLA

HON. A.E. BLAKENEY: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I wonder if I might take this opportunity to introduce to you, and through you to the House, a visitor from our neighboring Province of British Columbia, Rosemary Brown, Member of the Legislative Assembly of the Province of British Columbia for the constituency of Vancouver Burrard. Rosemary is sitting behind the rail on the Government side.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: I think the House may be interested in a little biographical material on Rosemary. You will have noted that her name is in the news as a candidate for the federal leadership of the New Democratic Party. Rosemary was born in the West Indies. She has lived in Canada since 1950. She received a B.A. degree from McGill and a Master of Social Work degree from the University of British Columbia. She was a social worker prior to her entry into politics. She worked for the Status of Women Council of British Columbia in the office of Ombudswoman. She was awarded the United Nations Human Rights Fellowship in 1972 and the National Black Award of Canada in 1973. Rosemary is married and has three children.

On behalf of the Assembly I know you would want me to extend to Rosemary a warm welcome to Saskatchewan.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. D.G. STEUART: (Leader of the Opposition) I should like to join with the Premier in welcoming Rosemary Brown and tell her we, on this side, wish her all kinds of luck. It is a very brave person who would try to lead the national NDP anywhere and we wish her all kinds of success. Be careful, if you choose any of those Members opposite as campaign manager they will have lots of time after June 18th, but be a bit careful.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

LAND SPECULATION IN URBAN AREAS

MR. J.G. RICHARDS: (Saskatoon University) Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Premier concerning what I think is becoming an intolerable situation of land speculation in urban areas. There was a story in the Saturday Star-Phoenix under the by-line of

April 1, 1975

Vern Greenshields and Wayne Lowrey to the effect that in less than two months, two individuals may have turned a speculative profit which on an annual basis implies a rate over 400 per cent. They made \$65,000 at the expense of the public of Saskatchewan with land purchased for the government office block in Saskatoon. They purchased the land at \$350,000 and sold it to the Government within two months for \$415,000. The Minister of Government Services stated in the story that he was unaware of all this. The obvious question to ask of the Government is, given land speculation of this magnitude, and I have other cases which I would like to allude to, Boychuck for example, a piece of . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Just ask your question, you can't make a speech.

MR. RICHARDS: Mr. Speaker, could I ask the Premier whether the Government is prepared at this juncture to do anything about the obviously intolerable level of speculation in urban areas in Saskatchewan at the moment?

MR. BLAKENEY: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the Hon. Member's question, I think the short answer is that we are not contemplating any specific action with respect to the instance he raised concerning the office building at Saskatoon. The matter of land speculation is one that, I think, is attracting the attention of a good number of people. We are certainly attempting to minimize that in residential construction by the assembling of land on a widespread scale around the major cities and particularly around Regina in co-operation with the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation and the city of Regina. I think that has had a significant impact upon the cost of residential lots in this city and elsewhere in Saskatchewan. We have not found any way similarly to regulate the price of building lots which are already part of the capital, they already have been built upon. We simply have no way at this particular time of coping with this particular problem that the Hon. Member raises. If he wishes to pursue the point concerning the particular lot, I would suggest he might ask a supplementary and I will ask my colleague, the Minister of Government Services, to comment on the particular case.

MR. RICHARDS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, I agree with the Premier that the land assembly and Land Bank idea . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, the Member must ask his question.

MR. RICHARDS: The question, Mr. Speaker, is that surely the Land Bank is not performing this function. I have a case from Boychuck of his realizing \$2,700 - 100 per cent increase in the value of a piece of land, a lot purchased from the Land Bank - \$3,300 to \$6,000 in the course of four months. The Land Bank is not serving its purpose. It is not succeeding in the job of preventing speculation by developers.

MR. SPEAKER: Order! I think you must ask your supplementary question.

MR. RICHARDS: The question is implicit in

the statement, Mr. Speaker, to wit that the Land Bank does not do the job. There is a problem. Is the Government prepared, given the immediate case in which the Government has been burned to the tune of \$65,000, given that private people are being burned by speculation, is the Government prepared to move to lease ownership in the city which I think is the only way ultimately to prevent speculation on land?

MR. BLAKENEY: The short answer is, No. The Government is not now prepared to move to a system of lease ownership in the cities. We try very hard to see that the lots find their way into the hands of the ultimate purchaser. The Land Bank referred to by the Hon. Member is not the Land Bank administered by my colleague, the Minister of Agriculture, but the land assembly projects that are carried on by the three levels of government. I think the reference is probably to one in Saskatoon where Boychuck Construction will have purchased from the city of Saskatoon a lot for X dollars and sold it for two X dollars. Those are inordinately difficult to control in all cases and I think that the proposal to have all urban land lease-owned will not satisfactorily deal with that problem. In Britain there are all sorts of properties which are lease-owned and the leases become a subject of speculation just as surely as the title. So that doesn't solve the problem of speculation. Almost all of London is held on a lease-hold basis and there is wild speculation on the value of leases so that doesn't solve the problem. The problem he raises is a very real problem but we do not have an effective answer to it other than the one we are attempting to use of creating more lots and having them effectively available for the ultimate purchaser. Most of them find their way that way but certainly some of the builders do in fact acquire them and speculate in them. While it is regrettable I do not think that we can now see a solution to this particular problem.

J.A.C. STRUTHERS ADVERTISING AGENCY

MR. STEUART: I should like to direct a question to the Premier. In regard to the financial problems of J.A.C. Struthers NDP Advertising Agency, I wonder if he could either confirm the figure that I have, that I am going to suggest which, granted, are ballpark figures and say they are right or if they are not, undertake to give us the figures which I think he should have or should be able to get available fairly quickly.

To begin with we've been able to gather - would the Premier confirm this or give us the totals if it's not right - but J.A.C. Struthers in the calendar year 1974 on behalf of the Crown corporations and the Government of Saskatchewan placed about \$1 million or more of advertising and that, according to the Saskatchewan Association of Broadcasters, they were seven or eight months behind in December, 1974. It would mean that if they are doing that level of business they could be as far behind as \$600,000 in paying to the advertisers on behalf of the Government's advertising they placed. This could mean they would be about \$600,000 behind. Now the Premier said in his letters and in his interview that partly this reason would be that the Government was a couple of months behind . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: What's your question?

MR. STEUART: My question is to confirm

April 1, 1975

these figures. Is the Government two months behind or three months behind? It is quite common, I agree with him, for the Government to be behind. If they are even three months behind that would cut down Struthers' indebtedness or he could be called responsible for about \$300,000. But it would still mean that the J.A.C. Struthers Company is about \$300,000 . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Will the Member ask his question.

MR. STEUART: I want him to confirm this, how far behind when he looked into it or had his assistants look into it or when the Attorney General looked into it or had his assistants look into it, how far behind was J.A.C. Struthers in paying bills on behalf of the Government or for advertisements placed for the Government's Crown corporations? How far behind was the Government and what has he done about it, if anything?

MR. BLAKENEY: Mr. Speaker, I think the Hon. Members will appreciate that I simply do not carry those figures in my head. I simply do not know the level of the total billings that are handled by J.A.C. Struthers Advertising Agency or any other advertising agency. We would be happy to attempt to secure that information, but it is not something that I would have on hand. Nor do I recall how much Struthers was behind, nor do I think I ever knew how much Struthers was behind although I think maybe some members of my staff may have. I felt that was not particularly my province. As I attempted to outline to the Saskatchewan Association of Broadcasters on one or two occasions, neither I nor Mr. Kinzel can give any undertakings on behalf of the Struthers group. While I was not in a position to attend to the matter of the Struthers' accounts forthwith nor in any other period of time since that was not primarily the problem of the Government of Saskatchewan, we did attempt to respond to a request from the Saskatchewan Association of Broadcasters, we attempted to respond by seeing whether we could speed up accounts. I believe we were able to get our accounts or all the major accounts flowing to Struthers paid within a 90 day period. That is what we aimed at and I think we are approximately there. That is about a normal turn around on government accounts. I think in the case of Struthers we did ask that some accounts, if they were large, be followed through so that they didn't experience undue delay. So far as I am aware this had not been a matter requiring attention from the Government for a matter of four to six months. I certainly have not had it brought to my attention since last fall sometime, last September or October. So far as I am aware nothing out of the ordinary has been done since then although it is possible that accounts are still being followed up to see that they do not get delayed. But I think that nothing particularly unusual took place other than an effort to see that our payments to the Struthers' firm went out within the 90 day period.

MR. STEUART: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Wouldn't the Premier agree if the company was behind five or six or seven hundred thousand dollars in payments to advertisers, to the media, newspapers, radio and television where they were the sole agents in that regard of the Government, would the Premier not agree that this was a matter of some concern? Obviously he thought it was when he got involved in it and I don't disagree that he should have become involved in it. Would the Premier

undertake to give us within the next day or two, how much - and I am sure he could find out - Struthers were behind? I think that is a legitimate question, he is paying them the money; how much the Government was behind; how much Struthers were behind say as of the 31st of December? We know how much money was involved and I think a good question is then, what they were doing with it? I suggest they were behind \$200,000 or \$300,000 and that is more than was needed to build up their business, they are not in a business where they have to pay for inventory and I think that the question should be asked and should be answered publicly. If they are this far behind and there is some evidence they are, what was happening to the money, what were they doing with the money?

MR. BLAKENEY: Mr. Speaker, I will undertake to give you the figures of what the Government owed to Struthers. I don't know how long it will take but I certainly will try to find it. I will not undertake to give you what Struthers owed to anybody since I am not necessarily privy to what Struthers owed to the broadcasters or whether Struthers' figures or the broadcasters' figures are right. If you want to get that information you get it either from Struthers or the broadcasters because that is not within the knowledge of the Government of Saskatchewan.

AN HON. MEMBER: It should be.

MR. BLAKENEY: Well maybe it should be but I have a different view of our responsibility. I tried to point out to the broadcasters that, while I was prepared to assist them, it was not my problem what Struthers owed them or what their dealings were with Struthers. And I made that as clear as I could. They, in their correspondence, felt the other way. They said to me, "Needless to say, we do not share your opinion as to the Government's position in this matter. We find it difficult to believe you do not share the moral responsibility to say the least." I want to say very frankly that I don't think that the Government of Saskatchewan has any responsibility to see that anybody who deals with the Government, be it Struthers or a construction company or other, pays their bills on time. Other than such assistance as we can to facilitate accounts through the Government, we can not be the guarantor of all the accounts of people who do business with us. I made that clear to the broadcasters. It was our position then and it is our position now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STEUART: . . . difference. This is an NDP invented company and I think the Premier, and will the Premier . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! We can't debate here. You can ask a question but we can't debate.

MR. STEUART: Mr. Speaker, just a minute. The Premier took that correspondence, handed it out to some of the Press yesterday, at least the CBC announcer was waving it on the television cameras, and I think it's a breach of the privileges of this House that he doesn't table it. I ask him now to table it so the Members of this House have the same opportunity to pursue it, to have a

April 1, 1975

closer look at it as have the members of the Press. Would he now table it?

MR. BLAKENEY: Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to table my correspondence to the broadcasters and I will tell this House that my letter to the broadcasters will be the whole letter. It will not be a piece of paper contrived by taking a piece out of one letter, a piece of another letter, photostating it and giving it to the Press as Members opposite did yesterday in a very disreputable manner.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: I will refrain from commenting or the sort of conduct whereby people take a selection from one letter, a selection from another and photostat it and give it to the Press as a document that is presumably to be relied on. I will present . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: Mr. Speaker, would he table the letter and never mind . . .

MR. BLAKENEY: . . . exactly as you did with the Prime Minister's letter.

MR. STEUART: Don't talk about your morals or your ethics in this House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order! The Premier is on his feet and we can't have cross-fire this way.

MR. BLAKENEY: Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. STEUART: Let's talk about his morals . . .

MR. BLAKENEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm attempting, I know with some difficulty to table the letters and I have here, Mr. Speaker, a letter that we sent to Mr. Fisher on June 17, 1974 - a letter which Mr. Kinzel sent and a letter which I sent to Mr. Fisher on September 19, 1974. These are my letters to Mr. Fisher. I do not propose to table Mr. Fisher's correspondence to me. You already have that, so I judge from seeing that the Press got it from Members opposite, and I think that while I'm entitled to table my end of the correspondence, I'm certainly not going to table his. And, that, I think, tells the story sufficiently well and these, as I say, are the full letters and I have not excerpted or extracted from them. I offer the full letters.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. J.G. LANE: (Lumsden) Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to direct a question to the Premier.

Is the Premier aware that, notwithstanding the deep financial troubles J.A.C. Struthers were in and the fact that they were on the verge of being cut off by the Saskatchewan Association of Broadcasters and they were seemingly in arrears of six to eight months on the payment of legitimate funds, is

the Premier aware that in December 30, 1974, J.A.C. Struthers happened to have the funds to purchase a new office building at 3100 Dewdney in the city of Regina? Does the Premier not feel that he now has a moral responsibility to investigate J.A.C. Struthers and find out what happened to the money he has had paid to J.A.C. Struthers and why the long delay in payment to the Saskatchewan Association of Broadcasters or the broadcast industry?

MR. BLAKENEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if Hon. Members will accept the proposition that I do not know what real estate that the J.A.C. Struthers firm buys, owns or otherwise deals with, nor do I know whether they were indebted to the broadcasters, eight months in arrears or eight weeks in arrears or eight days in arrears, on December 31, 1974. I have no evidence that they were in any arrears at that time. We received no communication following that date from the broadcasters and I see no reason whatever why I should examine the affairs of a private citizen, whether or not he purchases property, where he got the money simply because Members opposite wish, by a series of innuendoes, to suggest that there was a degree of impropriety which they have singularly failed to find any evidence to support.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LANE: By way of supplementary, is the Premier aware that J.A.C. Struthers Advertising Agency, one of the two with whom the Government opposite has done business of over a million dollars, has not filed its annual return to the companies' office for the year 1975, has not paid its annual licence fee to carry on business in the province of Saskatchewan for the year of 1975 and technically cannot carry on business in the Province of Saskatchewan this year?

MR. BLAKENEY: The Premier is not aware of that. The Premier is aware of the fact that he practised law and on a number of occasions regrettably was late in filings which were due, as I recall on March 1st and today is April 1st.

AN HON. MEMBER: January 1st.

MR. BLAKENEY: Pardon! January 1. You mean they haven't renewed their annual licence. Is it their annual licence or their Form L you're complaining about?

MR. LANE: Annual licence.

MR. BLAKENEY: Well, that's right, all right the annual licence is due prior to that. I can see that point. But I have no knowledge of this, nor should I be in any way expected to have knowledge of this. If the Hon. Member feels that a gross impropriety has taken place, I wish he would announce it as I'm sure there are a considerable number of companies in this province who are or may have been in arrears in filing. I hope that he's not suggesting that the Government check the record every January 2 and decline to have business dealings with any who don't or have not filed.

April 1, 1975

FAMILY INCOME PLAN ADVERTISEMENT

MR. GUY: (Athabasca) Before the Orders of the Day I should like to direct a question to the . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Is the House prepared to permit more questions?

MR. GUY: I'm going to give the Premier a rest, I'm going to direct a question to the Minister of Consumer Affairs because I'm sure that as the Minister of Consumer Affairs he must be aware that the Canadian Advisory Board puts out a manual of general guidelines for advertising and there's a code, and I'm just going to be very brief, there are just two statements I want to read here:

Testimonials and endorsements should represent the honest present opinion of a competent endorser and it is assumed that in the absence of a statement of the contrary that a testimonial represents that the endorser is a current user of the product and that the endorsement reflects a genuine viewpoint of experience.

I'm sure the Minister is aware of that. My question is: in the recent television ads on the Family Income Plan the woman appearing in the ad, Mrs. Hanna, suggests she has a husband, that she has children eligible for the Family Income Plan, that her family qualifies for assistance under the Plan and are in fact receiving financial benefits. All of this is completely false and the ad does not provide the viewer with a statement informing us of that as set out in the code. Will the Consumer Affairs advise the Department of Social Services to cease the running of the ad so that the Government of Saskatchewan will at least be upholding the minimum standard of advertising ethics that is expected of the private sector?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. E.L. TCHORZEWSKI: (Humboldt) Mr. Speaker, the code that the Member refers to is a voluntary code of the advertising industry. We have nothing to do with that particular code. It is up to them to enforce it as they will. The points that the Member mentions about the advertising of the Department of Social Services, I don't know whether they apply under that code in that it specifically refers to, if I can remember correctly, to the use of personalities such as athletes and people with notable names.

MR. GUY: A supplementary question. I wonder if the Minister would look into it because it's a guideline that's based on the Better Business Bureau Code of Advertising that's been accepted by all areas of the media. It's been accepted on some of the speeches the Minister has made and will he look into it and if he finds that it applies to this ad, will he ask the Government to cease from any further placing of the ad on television?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: I certainly will be discussing this with the Minister of Social Services and checking to see whether the

comments that the Member makes have any pertinence to the situation.

RESOLUTIONS

RESOLUTION NO. 14 - CONDEMN THE PERFORMANCE OF THE MINISTER OF HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION.

MR. J. WIEBE (Morse) moved, seconded by Mr. MacDonald (Moose Jaw North) That this Assembly condemn the performance of the Minister of Highways and Transportation for the deterioration of the highway system and his lack of concern for providing efficient and safe highways in Saskatchewan.

He said: Mr. Speaker, just a few brief comments regarding this Resolution. I don't think that a lengthy speech is required not lengthy details as to the conditions of the highway system in Saskatchewan as the highways speak for themselves, and I'm sure each and every Member opposite is aware of the deterioration of our provincial highway system in this province.

It's with a great deal of regret that a resolution of this nature is necessary in a province such as Saskatchewan. One has only to look at the condition of our highway system and in turn the Government's 1975 construction program to realize that something definitely is wrong in this province.

As I mentioned in my earlier remarks, Mr. Speaker, I don't believe the provincial highway system, in the history of this province, has ever deteriorated more than what it has during the past four years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WIEBE: Everywhere that you travel, everywhere that you travel in this great province the results are the same; poor maintenance and slow construction. The past three years and this 1975 Budget have definitely proved that point. The NDP hold our provincial highway system in a very, very low priority.

It was an unbelievable program which the Minister of Highways presented about a week and a half ago. In that program he listed the highways which he hoped some work would be conducted on this year, and yet he had a footnote to that highway program in which he stated that he doubted very much whether that highway program would be completed in 1975. One must ask, why will that highway program not be completed. It's not because of the lack of funds although I think when you go back to the basic root of our problem, I think that is the initial cause. The cause is that we do not have any contractors left in this province who are capable and able to perform that work. It is our understanding as well, that this province has received no bids on contracts from contractors in Alberta nor from contractors in Manitoba because in those two provinces the governments, one happens to be NDP, the other Conservative, hold highways at a very high priority in their province. According to this year's budget it means that there will be 30 per cent fewer highways constructed, 30 per cent less work done in this province than was done in 1971.

April 1, 1975

Again we must ask ourselves why, what is the cause? I think we have to say, and there is no doubt that, in effect there are 30 per cent fewer contractors in this province today than there were in 1971. What happened to those contractors? Why are they no longer in Saskatchewan? Why are they no longer bidding for the jobs to do the work on our provincial highways? Basically it can be answered, first, by the attitude of the Minister of Highways in that during the 1971 campaign he stated on numerous occasions that if they become the government, they would definitely not spend as much money on provincial highways as what the previous Liberal Government did and that's one political promise that they are certainly carrying out. Each and every successive year our highway budgets have not taken into account even the cost of inflation so that, in effect, each and every year we were building fewer miles of highway than what were being built in 1971.

Again we just have to go back to 1963, the last full year of the then CCF-NDP government. The NDP highway construction budget at that time was only a meagre \$13.8 million and that's not very much. It took the Liberal government just a matter of three years to increase that budget to \$42 million. Highways in this province, Mr. Speaker, were built that all people of Saskatchewan were proud of and that is not the case today. It was a record of building long lasting quality highways, a record by a government that put a high priority on superior maintenance of these highways. Again let me say that highways were built that the people of Saskatchewan were proud of. Highways again, which put a strong emphasis on traffic safety and superior maintenance.

The Member for Hanley mentions - have you been on highway 14 lately? No, I haven't been on highway 14, and the fact that he's mentioned it must certainly prove that that highway must be in pretty poor shape. Now why is it in pretty poor shape? I don't know whether a Liberal Government built that highway or not. It could be that they did and I hope it was a Liberal Government that built Highway No. 14. But you have been the government for four years and you have not maintained that highway. You have had four years to keep that highway in top notch shape and you haven't done it, that's why it's in such rotten shape today and that's the trouble with 90 per cent of our highways in our province today. You people have completely ignored, completely ignored adequate maintenance of our provincial highway system.

All you have to do if you want to look at highways, is look at the one from Shellbrook to Big River. It's getting to the stage now where it's impossible to drive on that highway. What's the Minister of Highways doing in that regard? Again, I say he is doing nothing. Our highways are deteriorating.

I mentioned the other day, highway No. 19, a highway that certainly should have some work done on it.

MR. ENGEL: How much wheat is hauled on it?

MR. WIEBE: Regardless of how much wheat is hauled on it, so there is a lot of wheat hauled on it, let wheat be hauled on it. It's a provincial highway and because it's a provincial highway anybody can use that highway.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WIEBE: . . . whether it's a farmer, school bus, or a person on a bicycle. It's a provincial highway and because it's a provincial highway, it should be maintained and kept up to the standards so that everyone can enjoy driving on that highway in a safe and comfortable manner. And this is another reason for I this Resolution, Mr. Member from Woodrow or for wherever it is, Notukeu-Willow Bunch.

AN HON. MEMBER: You won't be there long.

MR. WIEBE: So there are some grain trucks that happen to be using that highway, so there happen to be school buses. It happens to be in the provincial highway system. Now if there is a certain amount of traffic on that highway and that highway not withstand that type of traffic, certainly any government in it's right mind would ensure that that highway be in such a condition that it could bear that kind of traffic. Here again, a prime example why this Resolution is necessary and why it s important to improve the standards and the maintenance of our provincial highway system.

Again, let's talk about highways. I didn't want to get into this but the Members opposite seem to feel that their highways are in fantastic condition in this province. Yet, let's look at highway No. 1, our major highway. This is the highway that the majority of our tourists use. This is a provincial highway which they gauge, I think, the criterion as to what the rest of the highways in Saskatchewan are. No. 1 highway from Swift Current to Rush Lake, what kind of shape is that in? The Department of Highways played around with it a bit two years ago, they burnt off the top of it and they decided eventually we're going to fix that up. I've never seen a highway as rough as that one. Let's look at highway No. 1 between Moose Jaw and Regina. You're bouncing along like an old Bennett buggy along that particular stretch of highway, again no work being done.

Let's look at the stretch between Herbert and Valjean. You know it's taken this Government four years to construct 33 miles of highway and they are still not finished and I predict, Mr. Speaker, the NDP will not complete it this year, it will take a Liberal Government, after June to make sure that I that stretch of highway is completed. These are just a few examples, Mr. Speaker

Another area of concern are a few pictures which I have. I don't want to table them, because I'd like to send them back to the person who sent them to me. If someone wishes to have a look at them he can. But one picture deals with a bridge that's being constructed across the North Saskatchewan River between Sonningdale and Maymont on highway 376. This picture was taken in the fall of 1974. First of all we must ask ourselves why is this particular bridge being built at Maymont. I understand that there is another bridge being built, a little bit further on down the North Saskatchewan River and yet from the traffic count on the ferries that cross at these two points, the traffic count is much greater at the ferry that's going to be built, hopefully this year, than the bridge that was constructed last year.

April 1, 1975

Why was a ferry crossing given priority with a lower crossing rate than the other one? Could it be that the lower ferry crossing area just happened to be in the Minister of Highways' constituency? It happens to be in the constituency that is represented by Mr. Kramer and Mr. Kramer happens to be the Minister of Highways. But one nice thing about this picture and about the bridge at Maymont is that the people in that area are calling it Kramer's ailing bridge. Now why are they calling it Kramer's ailing bridge? The major reason is that part of the criticism which the Minister of Highways stated about a bridge that was being built, I believe in Mr. Comer's constituency awhile back at Nipawin, he said that the then Minister of Highways didn't know how to build bridges because it was going to fall apart, the people weren't going to be able to drive on it, they were having problems with the type of soil, it was a poor area to build a bridge. Well, that bridge is in operation, they are driving over it and it hasn't fallen down. That same type of soil condition is evident at Kramer's ailing bridge now at Maymont.

So, Mr. Speaker, it's rather strange that the Minister of Highways who knows so much about bridge construction, who is prepared and willing and able to criticize a previous Minister of Highways for building a bridge in a wrong location, all of a sudden uses his superior knowledge in bridge construction to build a bridge in another location that happens to be in his own constituency, that's even in worse shape than the one that he was criticizing. Maymont ground conditions are much inferior to ground conditions at Nipawin. I wonder if any traffic will ever cross that particular bridge at Maymont.

Mr. Speaker, another example of the Government's inactivity in our highway programs is shown by the attitude or the priority which this Government and the Minister of Highways placed on our grid road system in Saskatchewan. We are fortunate in this province to have 125,000 miles of roads, more than any other province in the Dominion of Canada. Yet 113,000 miles of those roads fall under the responsibility of the local ratepayers in the various rural municipalities throughout Saskatchewan. We have taken into the highway system a smaller percentage of roads than any other province in Canada and yet Saskatchewan has the good fortune of being very flat, it is much cheaper to construct a mile of highway in Saskatchewan than in any other province. Yet we have taken on to ourselves, as our responsibility as a Provincial Government, fewer miles in proportion than any other province in Canada.

We should be, instead of taking 200 or 300 miles a year into our highway system, implementing a program to increase that mileage to at least 1,800 to 2,000 miles a year of grid road. That should be an objective for the provincial highway system.

AN HON. MEMBER: Ask SARM about that.

MR. WIEBE: Yes, let's ask the SARM about that and I'm sure that if you asked any municipality in this province and offered to take one of their major grid roads into the highway system they would gladly do it' they wouldn't hesitate one moment. If you can name one municipality that would not gladly give their grid road, over to the Department of Highways, I'll say you're wrong. There is not a municipal council in this province that will not go along with any suggestion that their grid roads be

taken into the provincial highway system. Okay, name some municipalities, name some municipalities that don't want a grid road taken into the highway system.

Well, Mr. Speaker, in order not to delay proceedings I believe that the situation of the highway system in Saskatchewan is quite evident to each and every one of us. I'm sure that I'm going to have an opportunity to make further comments on this particular Resolution because I'm sure that someone on that side of the House feels an amendment coming on and I'm sure that they are going to introduce an amendment that's going to give all the praise, honor and glory to the Minister of Highways for the wonderful job which he is not doing in this province.

I look forward at that point to speaking again on the amendment and at this time, Mr. Speaker, I wish to move this Resolution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. P.P. MOSTOWAY: (Hanley) I would like to say a few words in regard to this Resolution and the amendment, and I would like to point out certain things to the Hon. Member who just sat down.

First of all let me say that as far as I'm concerned I have just as good a reading of the highway pulse of the people of Saskatchewan as that Hon. Member, and in no way can he convince Members in this House that our highway program is not equal or better than the highway program of the Liberals.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MOSTOWAY: But I just want to be a little more specific, Mr. Speaker, I want to mention a few stretches of road. One concerns highway No. 14. Now, I can recall when the Liberal regime was in power, they spent a lot of time on that particular highway, the Yellowhead route.

AN HON. MEMBER: They just staked it.

MR. MOSTOWAY: Oh, yes; well, they went through the stakings I think since 1964. But I want to tell you I had occasion to speak to some of the men who were working on that job, and as far as they were concerned, it was a big laugh because they were really taking the Liberal Government. It seems that whenever it came to roads, and there's a good reason for that, I think most Members are aware the sky was the limit, but they never got value for the money they spent.

Now in regard to highway 14, let me tell you what kind of a road the Liberals built. Why, it was so good that just a few years ago in around the Elstow and the Colonsay area, the people couldn't even drive on the thing. They had to drive on the shoulders of it, because when you drove on it, you got seasick, there were so many bumps in the thing. Let me also tell you this Government, I believe a year or two ago, had to put some hard surface cover on there to patch up the bumps and the waves that were put in that highway when you fellows formed the last government.

I also want to mention another specific one and that's the

April 1, 1975

stub highway from highway No. 14 at Elstow to Allan. Now to accommodate the big potash company which operates in that vicinity, the Liberals allowed them to make a detour of about, I would imagine, two miles, and they didn't even have the decency to make sure that when that company built that road around the slag heap in the area, they didn't even have the decency to see that the people of Saskatchewan would get full value for their money because the company was responsible for that terrible detour. They did a terrible job, and when the Liberal inspectors came out, they said, "That's fine with us."

I also want to mention highway 11, running from Saskatoon to Regina. I remember travelling on that highway when the Liberals were in power. It's a wonder I got out of it without having been involved in an accident because they piddled around on that road for years and years and years. It came out to an average of four miles per Liberal year. That's what they did on highway 11 in and around the Dundurn area. When our Government was elected, 33 miles were done within the space of just a few years.

That's progress for you. I don't think I'll get into any more specifics, Mr. Speaker, but I just want to say that I have some other information which I want to bring to the attention of this House at a later date, and I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

RESOLUTION NO. 20 - MEDIA CENTRE

MR. C.P. MacDONALD (Milestone) moved, seconded by Mr. Wiebe (Morse):

That this Assembly recommend to the consideration of the Government of Saskatchewan that the Media Centre of the Executive Council be immediately eliminated, due to its partisan political operations and biased news reporting in the guise of legislative news.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I think that this Resolution today takes on same very added significance when we consider the events of the last few days and the Struthers affair and the misuse of public funds by the NDP in attempting to get re-elected. Mr. Speaker, I should like to suggest this afternoon that before we consider the aspect of the exclusive Media Centre perhaps we should consider in a package, all the things that have been done by the NDP with public funds to attempt to assure their re-election. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that had this happened in Ottawa with a responsible press media that they would have been driven right out of the House of Commons with the actions they have taken on and done in these four years.

Mr. Speaker, let me give you an example. Let me start with Service Printing. I would suggest to you that had the Federal Government or any national political party in any other province in Canada attempted to channel public funds to a firm like Service Printing Company, their own public corporation, that, Mr. Speaker, it would have had a dramatic impact upon the public moral consideration of that political party.

Mr. Speaker, last year if you can believe the public accounts from government departments, \$51,000 was channelled

into Service Printing. This does not count Crown corporations. I might suggest perhaps it was \$70,000. Mr. Speaker, when you consider that that is more than 50 per cent of the total allocated budget given to any political party in Saskatchewan to fight an election against that Government by their own Election Expenses Act it takes on an added importance.

Mr. Speaker, let's enumerate a few other examples. Let's take advertising in their own political newspaper through government funds. Mr. Speaker, I picked up the Saskatchewan Commonwealth, the latest edition and I find that there are five government ads in this one newspaper. One from the Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan, one from the SAIL, the Saskatchewan Aides to Independent Living, Mr. Speaker, one from AWARE, that's three, one from SaskTel, that's four, one almost full page from the Public Service Commission, Mr. Speaker, that's five in the latest edition of the Commonwealth, two months prior to an election campaign.

Mr. Sneaker, I also turned around and then phoned the Leader-Post to ask what it costs for a half page ad and the last one on the Public Service Commission, Mr. Speaker, in the Commonwealth is almost a complete page. I'm not going to suggest that perhaps the Commonwealth charges quite as much as the Leader-Post but I'm not sure. One-half a page ad in the Leader Post costs \$992; one-quarter page ad in the Leader-Post costs approximately \$500. Mr. Speaker, those ads are in various sizes and dimensions, but I suggest that the man who sits in the public gallery, the Speaker's Gallery and takes notes for the Commonwealth and the entire staff costs of that newspaper, to write it, to produce it and put it down and publish it and circulate it in the Province of Saskatchewan is paid by the tax payers of Saskatchewan through government ads in that newspaper.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MacDONALD: Let's look at the third thing, Mr. Speaker, they turn around and they establish their own government advertising agency, J.A.C. Struthers. Now I don't think I'll go through all the resurrection, but I ask the people of Saskatchewan to be aware of what has happened to Mr. Struthers advertising agency in the last four years. For example, he went broke, he started up in 1971. At that time, Mr. Speaker, he received \$80,372 in the first year the NDP were the Government of Saskatchewan. The second year 1972-73, according to public accounts, they received \$308,640. Last year, Mr. Speaker, 1973-74 they received \$626,611 and this year from what we can gather it's over a million dollars. I'm going to tell you, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to have 15 per cent of a million dollars for doing absolutely nothing. It was rather interesting to hear the Premier's defence of the advertising agency.

First of all they took hundreds of thousands of dollars of taxpayers' money, gave it to Struthers Advertising Agency not for services provided by Struthers or by services provided by the Saskatchewan News Media but, Mr. Speaker, they took this million dollars and all they were was a broker. They didn't provide any services. All their task and function was to take that from the government and facilitate the payment to the media. This was their sole function, to facilitate the payment to the media. In return for the placement of those ads, they got something like 10 to 15 per cent as a brokerage

April 1, 1975

fee. That was not for services. There's absolutely no excuse To suggest that the government which turns over a million dollars of government money not, Mr. Speaker, for services provided by Struthers is a rather strange attitude for the Premier of Saskatchewan to take.

Mr. Speaker, on top of that there have been serious accusations that the work was done not by Struthers, that the production was done by the Government Information Services in various departments and that in reality there was double billing. The second thing we find that they fail to pay the debts with the money that they were the broker for to the media and have the utilization of those funds and have to be bailed out by the Premier and the Attorney General. That's number three, Mr. Speaker. Number four, they are building a team of political organizers within the Government's civil service at the taxpayers' expense.

Mr. Speaker, we have had two questions in the last couple ! of weeks; one relates to Brian Coulter. Brian Coulter, as you know, Mr. Speaker, had just returned from Alberta, he was given a little vacation after his very arduous task of attempting to elect Grant Notley. Mr. Coulter is the same man who was in Nova Scotia, the same man who sat in here and was campaigning in the Lakeview by-election.

On top of that a second question was asked about Mr. Clare Powell, who is already now on a leave of absence and already now preparing the NDP election campaign. Now one of the interesting things that came out of the statements of Mr. Glen Knight was that there is an advertising committee of the NDP within the city of Regina and three people are on it, Mr. Powell, Cam Cooper and Bob Reid, the latter a very strange one, the Queen's Printer. And I wonder about Mr. Brockelbank. Here is a man who works in the department that allocates printing to the various printing firms in Saskatchewan, including Service Printing and here this man is actively involved in the preparation of the NDP election campaign. There are three more civil servants, Mr. Speaker, in fact we have a list and the only people on that advertising committee are NDP civil servants.

On top of that, Mr. Speaker, here, for example, I have a very interesting list of people. For example, Murray Koski, defeated NDP candidate in 1967 participating on panels at their annual convention. Gerald MacDonald, Department of Education, defeated NDP candidate, 1971. Roy Borrowman, special advisor to the Premier, NDP convention balloting chairman. Sharon Simmonds, NDP convention panel secretary, executive assistant to the Minister of Agriculture. David Minor, Commissioner of the Land Bank, former NDP provincial vice-president. All participating, Mr. Speaker, at the NDP annual convention. The entire NDP political structure, Mr. Speaker, I can go, for example, Barbara Turnbull, Crimes Compensation Board, NDP constituency executive, Saskatoon. Labour Standards, Harry Apps, NDP federal candidate, Prince Albert. Ed Wallace, Electoral Officer, executive assistant to Eiling Kramer. You can go on, Mr. Shillington, special assistant to Mr. Romanow no longer there - NDP defeated candidate, Moosomin. We could go on and on. Practically the entire NDP political machine in Saskatchewan is fostered, nurtured, supported and organized by civil servants at the expense of the public taxpayers' money in this province, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, here I have in my hand a clipping from not necessarily refuted to be a right wing newspaper. It is called the Carillon and the editorial calls it, "The Incestuous NDP", talking about civil servants participating in the NDP organization and its entire structure, Mr. Speaker. I could go, Mr. Speaker, and talk about other things but I want to yet on to some of the other things.

AN HON. MEMBER: Tell us about the Resolution.

MR. MacDONALD: I am coming to the Resolution. Mr. Speaker, the next one, spending millions of dollars in Government advertising, millions, Mr. Speaker. I want to tell the public what is going on in advertising in Saskatchewan. Here, Mr. Speaker, we have some public accounts. In the advertising for the Department of Agriculture I want you to listen and this is just with Mr. Struthers, and Dunskeys is not included. It doesn't include Crown corporations. In 1971-72 my friend the Minister of Agriculture placed \$2,123 with Mr. Struthers. In 1972-73 \$5,200. In 1973-74, \$34,000. A jump from \$2,000 to \$34,000 in three years with Mr. Struthers and that isn't counting this year, Mr. Speaker, where you and I know what is going on with Government advertising.

Let me take another one, Executive Council.

MR. MESSER: Tell them about the program.

MR. MacDONALD: I am going to come to one of the programs. Executive Council in 1971 Mr. Speaker, \$1,691, now that is kind of a modest figure. In 1972-73, \$55,000. In 1973-74, \$67,683. From \$1,691 to \$67,683 in one government department. Let me take another one, Public Health, and you know Walter, he sure likes the Commonwealth. I know where his ads are coming from, there are three of them in here. Public Health in 1971 spent \$7,591 with Mr. Struthers. This year, Mr. Speaker, two years later, \$87,931.

Let's look at the Public Service Commission and this one is kind of understandable. They have hired so many civil servants in Saskatchewan they really need to get into this Government advertising. In 1971-72, \$6,720; \$17,000 in 1972-73; \$30,000 in 1973-74.

Let's look at Social Services, Mr. Speaker. I want to talk about this one. Just two years ago in 1971-727 they spent none; last year, 1973-74 they spent \$54,805 and that doesn't take in this Family Income program, Mr. Speaker. Do you know what this Family Income Program costs? The Family Income Program, according to the Minister of Social Services had 58 or 60 ads in excess of \$50,000 just for placement. Production costs, according to the Minister or at least my colleagues, I was not here, indicated that that was almost as much.

MR. SPEAKER: I think the Member should get to the Resolution.

MR. MacDONALD: Mr. Speaker, I am getting to the Resolution and I am going to relate it all. Don't worry, Mr. Speaker, it is very

April 1, 1975

important.

MR. SPEAKER: Order! I am suggesting to the Hon. Member that debates that took place in this House at this same Session on a different occasion cannot be quoted in this debate and I think the Hon. Member is quoting debates from other occasions in this Session.

MR. MacDONALD: Mr. Speaker, you are absolutely right, but what I am trying to say is that the Family Income ads cost over \$120,000. One ad, most of it politics, and do you know how much the Attorney General is giving to the Saskatchewan Liberal Party and the Progressive Conservative Party to go out and fight this election, \$125,000. That is for all the advertising, all the Leader's tours, all the mailing services, the setting up of the central campaign headquarters. And one ad for the Family Income Program is costing more than they allow for the Saskatchewan Liberal Party and the Progressive Conservative Party to spend in their whole election campaign. Mr. Speaker, this is a real crime.

Next, they set up a teletype service and I was in Melfort, there last Thursday, up in Mr. Messer, the Minister of Agriculture's country. Jack the Ripper I was going to say, Mr. Speaker. I got up there and I happened to be talking to the radio station and I got in on some of the teletype service story. And the reams of government information and propaganda pouring out of that and he said we don't have the staff or the services to really edit this and so they start using it indiscriminately, Mr. Speaker. I don't know how many thousands of dollars that cost.

I want to talk about the Information Officers. Do you know, Mr. Speaker, for example in 1971, in the Information Services with the Executive Council there were seven employees and the total cost was \$143,000. In 1975, there are 12 employees and the cost is \$286,000, just doubled, and, Mr. Speaker, the funny part of it is that in every other Government Department there are also civil servants being placed just like Mr. Glen Knight.

Mr. Speaker, let me go on to another. Serious accusations, number eight, have been made about Cabinet Ministers using government equipment, government facilities, civil servants on government time to prepare and edit political propaganda for the NDP. That is number eight. Now, Mr. Speaker, page Glen Knight. They try to say, Mr. Speaker, this is not done on Government time. Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, executive assistants, civil servants, leaves of absence, advertising committees with the equipment and everything and then suggesting this is not being done on government time. And yet Mr. Knight says it was done on government time.

Mr. Speaker, number nine, appointment of NDP supporters into every position of authority and responsibility in the Province of Saskatchewan. We had a very interesting brief presented to us the other day. It was from the Human Rights Association and they indicated to us that there had been more than 800 appointments in the last three years to government boards and committees and surveys and such - 800 people, Mr. Speaker. The Human Rights Association is going to send us that brief and send us the information. Because it is going

to be rather interesting to find out exactly what the cost of those 800 people are. Number two, the thing that really concerns the Human Rights Association is that there was only one token representative from all the minorities in Saskatchewan and that was a token one that was just given, but the majority of them were NDP political supporters.

Now, let me come, Mr. Speaker, to the real meat of this Resolution and that is, to talk about the exclusive Media Centre. This, Mr. Speaker, we can call point number 10. Well now, Mr. Speaker, what is the exclusive Media Centre and how does it work? Well, first of all, Mr. Speaker, it is supposed to operate from within the Legislature. This Legislature I always had the understanding belonged to all the Members and I find, for example, that the blues (Orders of the Day) are being handed to the NDP from this Legislature which really bothers me too because I think I am a part of this Legislature and we should determine how the funds are spent.

Well, Mr. Speaker, how does it work? First of all the NDP turn around and hire a group of civil servants and put them on salary. That is number one. Their exclusive responsibility in this exclusive Media Centre downstairs, is to look after the personal political advertising under the guise of news of the NDP backbenchers. Not all the Members of the Legislature, just the NDP backbenchers. They certainly do need it, just the NDP backbenchers. Number three, Mr. Speaker, they have use of government facilities. The equipment, the room downstairs, everything else, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the NDP backbenchers to project supposed news from this Legislature on behalf of the NDP candidates.

Mr. Speaker, every time you go out in the hall I remember, I haven't run into them this year because I don't recognize them yet, but last year every time you walked out in the hall you would see these fellows with a microphone standing there with a backbencher from Gravelbourg and a backbencher from Saskatoon, all over, getting interviewed, and about things that not necessarily had any indication of their responsibility or their contribution within the Legislature itself. And their job, Mr. Speaker, this exclusive media is to funnel back to Swift Current, to tell the people in Maple Creek that the Member for Maple Creek is doing an adequate job in the Legislature even if he only speaks once for five minutes in the whole session of the Legislature. To stand up and turn around and transmit back to Gravelbourg that the Member for Gravelbourg is making an important contribution to Saskatchewan even if he only speaks once in the whole session. Mr. Speaker, it is under the guise of legislative news which is the most hideous thing about it. Mr. Speaker, it is flooding the media and all I can suggest that this is one of a total package of how the NDP are using government funds or taxpayers' money and with one specific objective in mind to bring about the re-election of the NDP.

Mr. Speaker, we could go on, we could talk about the Minister of Agriculture sending out leaflet after leaflet and letter after letter, talking about the Federal Government and everybody else and no relation to provincial policies or agricultural policies. We could go on and talk about all kinds of incidents and examples where the NDP are using the taxpayers' money in this province for one purpose and that is to ensure their re-election.

April 1, 1975

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure and I want to say to the Members opposite, I hope that none of you will try to stand on your feet and try to amend this Resolution because it is a very simple one. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that all of you will examine your consciences because you know when they talk about Service Printing, if the people of Saskatchewan could see you snicker and giggle and laugh because you are pulling the wool over their eyes, you wouldn't be re-elected. So, Mr. Speaker, I now move this Resolution No. 20.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. R. ROMANOW: (Attorney General) Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to speak too long with respect to this Resolution. Come to think of it the Member for Milestone didn't speak too long with respect to this Resolution either. He spoke on every other topic other than the Resolution which is before us with respect to the matter of the Media Centre.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that it is sorely tempting for a Government Member who is in opposition to the Opposition Party to rebut the comments made by the Member for Milestone and the Liberals about patronage, about Liberal advertising and about expenditures on advertising, about ministerial directives, about advertising, about ministerial interference in advertising policies and sums of money which have been spent.

I think perhaps there will be a more appropriate time to do that. The point that concerns me is when the Members opposite, totally bankrupt of any ideas or policy alternatives to the people of Saskatchewan, seize on what purports to be an issue in their minds and try to make it up into a major issue. I think that all this points out to the people of Saskatchewan is the bankruptcy of the Liberal Party. To have the Liberal Party, one of their major spokesmen in the Hon. Member for Milestone, for 15 or 20 minutes talking about the Commonwealth, how irritated he is about the Commonwealth, how upset he is about the policies and the reporting and the job done by the Commonwealth, only pinpoints the bankruptcy of the Member for Milestone and the Liberal Party in this particular area and in the entire area. To have them repeat at length, ad nauseam, repetitiously again how the business of Struthers and the business of advertising, is not only repetitive and boring but it's contrary to fact.

I could, as I say, talk about, perhaps as a rebuttal, expenditure of Liberal advertising. Just to give you one year which I have completed a little survey on, 1969 to 1970, \$834,474.51, without a cent being attributed to Crown corporations and we are not even getting to the election year, Mr. Speaker, which was 1971. I could get into the question of advertising firms, for example in Ottawa, where according to the chairman of the Treasury Board, 11 Federal Government departments and agencies of the Liberal Government hand out more than \$20 million worth of advertising last year alone to, without tender, advertising agencies directly associated with the Liberal election campaign last summer.

I don't think that is the type of situation that the people of Saskatchewan expect of us as parliamentarians. They don't expect from the Member for Milestone or the Leader of the Opposition, or what up to now has been the major alternative political party, to get up and try and make an issue out of a

puff of air that has been manufactured, a puff of air manufactured mainly in the figments of imagination of the Member for Lumsden (Mr. Lane) and the Member for Lakeview (Mr. Malone). Now, maybe I am wrong. Maybe the people of Saskatchewan do expect that this is the way the Liberal Party should be functioning, but I want to tell the Members opposite that for me to rebut on this particular occasion, the particular recitation of 800 appointments and whatever happens to be with their appointments, with what they did, with the fact that they had every defeated Liberal federal candidate almost around on the job. "Oh, nonsense," the Member for Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) says. Just take a look at the list. There's an Order for Return that is being amended about federal candidates, both NDP and Liberal, and you'll have the answer down on that fairly shortly and just take a look at that list. But what function does that serve? What function does that serve to you? What function does that serve to me? What function does that serve to the people of Saskatchewan? Now what the Member opposite does, he gets the entire speech and he makes this type of recitation and uses arguments of this nature.

Take for example, the teletype situation, the teletype thing, the TWX teletype thing. The Hon. Members says that Information Services has a TWX. I'll bet you right now that if you were elected, God forbid, in the next election you wouldn't do one thing to change the TWX operation and you condemn it now. You wouldn't, nor should you. You wouldn't amend the TWX because that is what's needed on Information Services. I don't expect the news media to pick up a TWX teletype and use it like John Babbitt. They don't. They use what they want to use and they will do their own covering and reporting. But there are many agencies that find the items that are there of benefit and I say that a government that reports its activities to the people of the Province of Saskatchewan is a good government by and large.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: I say to the Member, when he raises an issue such as the Media Centre he is a mile off base. He is a mile off base on what the electorate want. The electorate of this province is not going to elect or defeat you on whether or not there is a media centre operating, or whether or not there is a J.A.C. Struthers, or a Dunsky or a McLaren's advertising agency which does work for you or does work for us. They aren't going to pick or choose you on that basis. They are going to do it on what you stand for and I'll tell you that in four years the Liberal Party have not told the people of Saskatchewan where they stand on any major policy issue.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: Oh, yes, sure, you can shrug it off as a political statement and that's fine. You know we all do politicking and we all do speaking in the country but I can tell you that you ask any person in the Province of Saskatchewan what the Liberal position is, what they would do for example in any given area, agriculture, and nobody in Saskatchewan can tell you what they are going to do. Nothing. They know more about what the Conservative alternative is than they know about the Liberal alternative. Why? Because the Liberals when they are in the Legislature have resolutions like this and try to alarm the

April 1, 1975

people of Saskatchewan that the Government of Saskatchewan is appointing people who are sympathetic with the policies of the Government to major programs of the Government. Now whom do you think we should be appointing to the Hog Marketing Commission, the Member for Morse (Mr. Wiebe)? Whom do you think we should be appointing to the Land Bank Commission? Whom do you think should be representing the Land Bank Commission with respect to the public of Saskatchewan, a member of the Liberal Party who is out to destroy it. Well, they think that the people of Saskatchewan are so naive, or so gullible as to think that this is an issue. Well, as far as I am concerned from a very crass, narrow, political point of view, keep it up because the electorate is going to turn you off.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: I remember one thing about the Liberals, from 1944 to 1964, which was said about them. They were so good in Opposition that people decided to leave them in Opposition and that is exactly what is going to happen now. You people don't give alternatives and you don't act like an alternative and why would you when you introduce motions of this nature, when you introduce these shenanigans that have been going on for the last two days. Now, furthermore, you are not only that but you are 100 per cent off base on the Media Centre. Media Centre, Mr. Speaker, is set up under the provision of funds to maintain a caucus office, provided in 1974-75, provided to the Liberals, provided to us. The Media Centre is paid for by caucus members out of that caucus office on our side and we don't tell you how to run your caucus and we don't expect you to tell us how to run our caucus.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: Absolutely no Executive Council funds are being expended for the purpose, absolutely no funds are being expended for it, the personnel that are employed are directly responsible to the NDP caucus out of the funds voted for by the Legislature in this regard. Oh, no, but not the Member for Milestone, not him, but not only the Member for Milestone because I don't want to be personal too much, it is symptomatic of the Liberal caucus. If they can get a characteristic or a fact and bend it somehow to try and make it out in the worst way possible, they'll do it. So that is what he does. He doesn't mention that to the people of Saskatchewan about the Media Centre, oh, no, not him. He talks about it being interviewed and he drags in all the appointments. He drags in all the advertising agencies. He drags in all of these things without any type of commitment to the truth whatsoever.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: Now, I don't know the Liberal Party opposite. They can continue, obviously, because someone will get up right away and they will say in the course of the debate, oh, well, the Attorney General, doesn't want to talk about J.A.C. Struthers advertising all operations. You bet I want to talk about it and I am going to talk about it and I am going to talk about it a lot. I am going to talk a lot about government advertising, and government memos when the appropriate time comes up. Yes,

they will be coming up on Estimate; and I'll have the opportunity. And I am definitely going to talk about it and I invite the Members opposite to talk about it. I want to tell the Members opposite, if this is all they have in going into this election, is this type of an issue, they should be ashamed of themselves, absolutely ashamed of themselves.

SOME HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: The Member for Lakeview can laugh at it. He can smile at the whole operation saying that it is not true. The Member for Meadow Lake (Mr. Coupland) you know can do the same thing. Any one of these persons can take the position that somehow this is an issue but, Mr. Speaker, I don't think anybody in Saskatchewan is fooled one iota about the degree of advertising and civil servants campaigning from the period 1964 to 1971. No one is mistaken about that. We all know that. We can all go through lists and names of civil servants if that is the way we want the level of politics to be in Saskatchewan. If that is the situation, the Members opposite say that is the position the Government of Saskatchewan should be taking, well, I don't agree with them. I don't agree with them whatsoever. I say the people of Saskatchewan when they talk about a Media Centre, say that an NDP caucus has got the right to organize its affairs the way it wants to organize. That is what is being done with the Media Centre. We don't tell you Liberal people how to run your caucus. You can organize it any way you want. If you want to set up a media centre out of your caucus allotment, set it up and good luck to you. You may even need the help of a media centre in some of your ridings but don't tell us if we, because of our caucus grant, set up a media centre that somehow that is improper or that we ought not to be doing this, because we are not going to buy that and no one in the Province of Saskatchewan is going to buy that.

Now, we will choose how it is to be done and if a media centre is the approach to be taken nobody can fault us on that operation. None whatsoever, Mr. Speaker. Now, all that I can say again to the people of Saskatchewan . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: Mention election expenses.

MR. ROMANOW: The Member says, mention election expenses. Right, I believe in the principle of election expenses. Obviously the Member doesn't. I believe in the principle of election expenses. I believe in the principle of having ceilings on election expenses.

MR. SPEAKER: Order! I believe the debate on election expenses should be at another time, on another occasion.

MR. ROMANOW: Mr. Speaker, I just want to say this. I agree with your ruling. The Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) alluded in his speech to the fact that election expenses or that the Attorney General was somehow putting a ceiling on election expenses and I want to tell the Member that if he wants to put it in those terms, yes, I will take that responsibility because I believe in responsible electioneering. I think we can all improve that way as political parties. I think the revelation of campaign funds is an absolute positive step. I think the

April 1, 1975

decision of elections not on the basis of what party has got the most to spend on advertising but those on the issues is the way to do it. We have already put an amendment in The Election Act which curtails Government spending during the election period.

MR. MALONE: Big deal!

MR. ROMANOW: Big deal! It is a big deal! In 1971, you people didn't have such a thing and spent thousands of dollars on advertising Crown corporations. That may not be a big deal to you now that you are in Opposition but it is a big deal to the people of Saskatchewan because it has proven . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear,

MR. ROMANOW: Yes, sir, a big deal. Hundreds of advertisements being run and you say, big deal It should be a big deal. You should be ashamed of yourself. I say, Mr. Speaker, that the operation with respect to this business of the Media Centre and the business of election expenses is absolutely related to this. I say, Mr. Speaker, that quite clearly the Members opposite do not understand how the Media Centre operates otherwise this motion I am sure, they being good parliamentarians, would not have surfaced in this manner. Otherwise, I am sure, being the good parliamentarian that he is, the Member for Milestone wouldn't be giving the type of speech which I think he does, because he didn't understand how our Media Centre functions, I think that they need to have some time to consider what I think is our basic proposition of how we run our caucus with our funds is our right. We have heard what you had to say for 30 minutes, through your deputy leader and you will have another opportunity at a later date.

MR. STEUART: Why don't you . . .

MR. ROMANOW: So, I say, Mr. Speaker, with those few words that I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

RESOLUTION NO. 21 - LONG-RANGE PROGRAM FOR GRID ROADS

MR. H.E. COUPLAND (Meadow Lake) moved, seconded by Mr. Wiebe (Morse):

That this Assembly recommend to the consideration of the Government of Saskatchewan to immediately implement a long-range program to bring major grid roads into the highway system of Saskatchewan.

He said: Mr. Speaker, after listening to the discussion on Resolution No. 14 regarding highways, I wonder if I should move this Resolution. Highways in this province have been allowed to deteriorate in the last three years to a point where a lot of our grid roads are better than a lot of the highways. Take No. 3 highway from the Saskatchewan River to the meridian, you can't call it a highway any more. But I will anyway because I am sure there will be a new government sometime later this year and I am sure that they will do a lot better job in the

building of highways.

Before I move the Resolution, Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words regarding grid roads. As we all know there have been some grid roads taken into the highway system throughout the province. I feel that it has been done on a piecemeal basis and I feel that it is time that the Government implemented a program on a long-range basis to take into the highway system those major grid roads that carry a large portion of traffic other than local traffic. Where a municipality or Local Improvement District has such a road the cost of upkeep on the local government for maintaining and upkeep on these roads becomes a heavy burden. We had one such road in my constituency, No. 304, where it was carrying a lot of tanker trucks which were coming in from the West. That LID was just having a terrible time just having to cope with not only keeping up the highway during the summer but with the snow removal during the winter, and the local people were expected to keep the snow off and so on and it became quite a burden. I am happy to say that that one was taken into the highway system under our government, and that took a big load off those local taxpayers. Now I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that there are a lot more cases throughout the province where these grid roads are carrying a lot of traffic other than local traffic and should come under the highway system as bad as it is right now, so that all the taxpayers of the province share the burden for these types of grid roads.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move this Resolution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. L. LARSON: (Pelly) Mr. Speaker, I only want to offer a comment or two on this Resolution. I note that the Member for Meadow Lake didn't sound very enthusiastic about the comments that he made. I note that he really isn't aware of the number of miles that have been taken into the highway system by this government. I note that he really wasn't very anxious to come out very forcefully or strongly on whether or not this is a good program. Just for his information I want to say that there have been 1,023 miles of grid roads taken into the highway system by this government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LARSON: I want to say that the pressure is not for further takeovers. The RMs are beginning to worry and get concerned about the number of miles that have been absorbed into the highway system.

Now I want to say to the Member for Meadow Lake that you can't have it both ways. You can't keep taking these grid roads into the highway system and allowing autonomy for the municipalities. Every time a grid road is taken over by the government you are taking some autonomy away from the municipalities and these municipal men are concerned about this and really aren't that anxious to see it continue.

Now, in view of the fact that he didn't make very many comments I am going to let him off rather easy but I am going to move an amendment. I am going to move, seconded by the Member for Kinistino (Mr. Thibault):

April 1, 1975

That all the words after 'Assembly' in the first line be deleted and the following substituted therefore:

Commends the Government of Saskatchewan for the additions of 1,023 miles to the highway system since 1971 and further commends the Government of Saskatchewan for the establishment of a Super Grid Commission under the chairmanship of Mr. Everett Murphy to bring forward recommendations for an oil grid system for the province in co-operation with the municipalities and the SARM.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

**RESOLUTION NO. 25 - LEGISLATION TO OUTLINE INDEMNITIES AND EXPENSES FOR
EIGHTEENTH LEGISLATURE**

MR. D.F. MacDONALD (Moose Jaw North) moved, seconded by Mr. Wiebe (Morse):

That this Assembly urge the Government of Saskatchewan to introduce legislation, at this Fifth Session, Seventeenth Legislature, that will outline indemnities and expenses which will be paid to Members of the Legislative Assembly during the Eighteenth Legislature in Saskatchewan.

He said Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think this motion which appears under item 10 is a very timely motion, something I feel very strongly about. I hope that it will receive the support all Members of the House. I hope in turn that the Cabinet will take action on the recommendation in this motion and implement the recommendations. It is my opinion that the credibility of politicians is today at an all time low. Politicians aren't respected nor are they believed. This is not a new syndrome on the part of the public, it is a continuing feeling of distrust of the public towards politicians, however this feeling has been intensified in the recent past. I think the eyes of the public were opened by the spectacle of Watergate in the United States. Canadians don't feel that dishonesty and misuse of power ends at the border, not by any means. They have seen evidence of it from every government in Canada. There are numerous current examples, I don't need to recite them here. We have examples in this province, we have them in Alberta, we have them in British Columbia, we have them in Ontario and Quebec, right across the country.

I think a couple of personal experiences are good examples to me of how low the esteem is in which politicians are held. I remember a couple of years ago when my mother-in-law was visiting me from Toronto, we were watching on television the Watergate proceedings. My mother-in-law proceeded to condemn Mr. Nixon and the United States politicians in general, and I asked her, do you think that politicians in Ontario are any different, she said, of course they are not any different' they are crooked in Ontario, they are crooked in the United States, they are crooked all over, they are all crooked. She said this without excepting me, who was sitting right in front of her. This was her general belief. Since I have announced that I will

not be seeking re-election, I have had countless numbers of people remark to me that they don't blame me for getting out of politics, that is the term they use, getting out of such a dirty mean business as politics and government. That sentiment has been expressed to me by a majority of people. I believe it represents the feeling that the public does have towards politicians and government.

I think the spectacle that recently has undermined the confidence of the public is the spectacle that took place in the House of Commons last Christmas concerning the raising of the indemnities of the Members of Parliament. The Canadian public was outraged and I think quite properly so. I am not exactly sure why the public chose that occasion to show their frustration and why that particular event should become such a spectacle. The procedure that was used in Ottawa at Christmas time, was not a new procedure. The same procedures have occurred before in Ottawa and has occurred in every province across Canada. It is the only procedure by which indemnities are set.

There didn't seem to be any public outrage in Saskatchewan three years ago when we raised our salaries or indemnities and expenses by over 50 per cent. I am not sure how large the increase was that we voted for ourselves three years ago. We had included in it fringe benefits and expenses that we had not previously had. But certainly in real value our raise well exceeded 50 per cent. There didn't seem to be a public outrage in British Columbia when they raised their indemnities 400 per cent. They did this by cleverly manoeuvring double sessions and so on. There didn't seem to be a public outrage when the Nova Scotia Legislature raised their salaries by 92 per cent last November 27th. I suspect that the Ottawa spectacle last Christmas occurred and caused an outrage because of three or four reasons.

First of all I suppose it hit all parts of Canada at the same time and at a time when people were concerned about inflation more than at other times in our history. The second reason I think was that the Press decided to make it an issue. I think the third reason that the Members of Parliament in Ottawa weren't smart enough to hide part of their increases like British Columbia and Saskatchewan did. Either they weren't smart enough or they were trying to be too honest. I think the fourth reason is that Ed Broadbent, the leader of the NDP saw a chance for some political advantage and he was willing to break the traditional backroom agreement.

The method of arriving at salaries is by arriving at a backroom agreement. After the agreement is made, the meeting is held in the 'john' and so on, the Treasury Bench finally offers a proposal. If they get the assurance, if the Premier and Treasury Bench get the assurances of support and the promises that only a nominal opposition will be voiced, then, as we did in 1972, the Premier will bring in a Bill and that method avoids any embarrassment to a Premier or the Prime Minister and their governments. This method has been quite successful until Mr. Broadbent decided that his politics and political gain could be enhanced even though it meant breaking this word, the word of his party that was given in the backroom agreement. No matter what caused the spectacle that happened, I think it is clear that the Canadian people want a new method of establishing indemnities for elected politicians. In the past we have tried

April 1, 1975

to hide behind committees and commissions which we establish to recommend indemnities and pensions for MLAs. In fact, it is on those occasions it is often desirable to have a recommendation and then bring in a Bill which outlines indemnities which are a little below what is recommended. This method shows great restraint and responsibility on the part of the politicians when that happens.

We may very well have suggestions in this debate that before we should establish levels of indemnities at this Session we should have a commission or a committee that would report to this Assembly. I suggest that this is unnecessary. We have had a report to this Legislature, it was made three years ago. If it was valid then it is just as valid today. I also feel that when we raised our indemnities three years ago, we largely ignored the report anyway. The basic use of that report was to justify our own positions. We picked and chose what we wanted from it anyway.

A committee report also tends to be rather useless because it tends to report back what the MLAs feed into it, as happened in 1972. What other source of information does the committee or commission have to base their findings on? They only have what the MLAs put into it. How else can they judge what the indemnities should be?

I don't think that anyone or any committee is qualified to say what is the proper level of indemnity. There is no real or honest basis on which to judge what is the proper level. Indemnity levels are purely arbitrary. I doubt if elected members in any province have an easier or harder job than those members from other provinces. And yet indemnities are different in every province. As an example, Prince Edward Island, \$6,000; Manitoba? \$9,600; Saskatchewan - I don't know what it is - it is \$12,500? \$13,500 - it is hard to say; New Brunswick, \$10,500; Newfoundland, \$12,000; Alberta, \$13,500; Nova Scotia, \$14,200; Ontario, \$22,500; Quebec, \$22,740; the grand daddy of them all is British Columbia, \$24,000. They know how to do it up right in British Columbia.

There is no indication that the politician who works at being an elected politician in Prince Edward Island for \$6,000 has any easier job to do than the politician in British Columbia who makes \$24,000 or four times as much. There is no justification for either figure. They are completely arbitrary figures.

I also suggest that if you tried to relate indemnities to the efforts or work load of an MLA and what he puts into position as an elected politician, this again is impossible. MLAs put forth different efforts, they put forth efforts in different ways. I am sure we will agree that some elected politicians in this Assembly do very little, by our definition.

By my definition I might feel that some do very little or do a poorer job, I might also decide that others do an exhaustive job. Work at it eighteen hours a day, by my definition they are working very hard. So which Members should the level of indemnity relate to, the one who works very hard or the one who works very little. And by whose definition should we decide who is working hard and who is working little. Who is working effectively and who is working ineffectively. Indemnities are not salaries and they should never be salaries. It was in fact disappointing in Ottawa when they were discussing

it at Christmas to hear Members of Parliament speak of the long hours that they put in working as an elected politician. Maybe they worked 60 or 70 hours a week, and then they divide this into their weekly pay based on their indemnity and come up and say I am only making \$3.42 an hour, that is not enough. They are looking at it entirely as a salary. That is wrong, they are not salaries.

I agree that indemnities should allow that not too big a hardship is suffered by a politician, any politician, but when indemnities are viewed as a better way of making a living than some other occupation, then I say that this creates a class of professional politicians. Professional politicians find their first and foremost priority to be getting re-elected. And that priority often lends itself to corruption of work and action indeed.

A politician must have as a first priority, serving of the community, not serving of himself or herself or his interests. It may very well be that for the privilege of serving, a person must be willing to make some kind of a sacrifice and all of us will have to make different kinds of sacrifices.

It will also be suggested that this seventeenth Legislature cannot regulate the eighteenth Legislature. And that legislation setting indemnities now would not be binding on the eighteenth Legislature. I agree it would not be binding. The next Legislature could change it, if they felt so inclined. However, I would suggest that it would be with great peril that any political party would change an indemnity after an election that had been set to cover the period which they were elected for. Only under some extraordinary circumstances would they dare to change that kind of legislation. The only fair way that I know of, is to set out indemnities ahead of that period to be served. Prospective Members to this Assembly would then know exactly what they were getting into. They would know exactly, like the contractor who bids a job that takes two or three years to complete. That contractor contracts to perform a job for a certain amount of money that he knows ahead of time and not change it as time goes on. Politicians would know just like a teacher who contracts to work for a stipulated sum of money for the coming year. Similarly, a politician could seek elected office knowing exactly what would be the financial rewards or hardships. Politicians and governments think that winning an election is a mandate for a lot of things but I think it is clear that election to office does not give a mandate to raise their own indemnities. The Canadian public has made it clear that it doesn't give politicians a mandate of this kind. The public doesn't give us as elected politicians the right to put our hands into the cookie jar. Credibility of politicians as I said before is at an all time low. If there is any remedy for this it must come from politicians. I hope that this Resolution might be a start.

I so move this Resolution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. J.E. BROCKELBANK: (Minister of Government Services) Mr. Speaker, I should just like to say a few words on this particular Resolution. I think the thoughts expressed in the Resolution have some merit. I also agree with the Member

April 1, 1975

that this has always been a troublesome issue with parliamentarians for any number of reasons.

I would have thought that the Members opposite would have a more enthusiastic advocate for the case than the Hon. Member for Moose Jaw who is not planning on running in the next election. I comment that this enthusiasm or lack thereof was amply demonstrated when his comparisons attempted to show that there was some logical comparison between the Province of Saskatchewan and the Province of Ontario. We all know that the Province of Saskatchewan's Legislature sits for a brief period relative to the Province of Ontario which sits up to seven, eight and nine months per year. Consequently there is bound to be a difference in the amount of remuneration that is paid to the MLAs,

The Hon. Member's enthusiasm was lacking also in knowing the facts in regard to his case. It is unfortunate that he doesn't know what the remuneration is for MLAs in the Province of Saskatchewan and yet he attempts to make comparisons with other provinces.

The Member drags in irrelevant material in support of this Resolution that has some merit. He suggests to the Members of this Chamber that there was some devious compact arrived at in the backrooms in Ottawa with regard to increases for Members of Parliament and that this backroom compact was destroyed because the New Democratic Party wanted to gain political advantage by not agreeing with the covetous ideas of the Liberal and Conservative Members in Ottawa. Now I think it's sheer speculation on behalf of the Member opposite and has no relevancy to the argument that we see before us in the Resolution.

I do want to say that we in Saskatchewan and CCF and New Democratic Party governments I believe initiated the idea of having a committee outside of the Legislature discuss this subject, receive submissions and give a report to the Legislature. This Legislative body would then make their choices on the basis of the submissions of that outside independent committee.

The Member opposite insults the committees that have been in existence in the past. He is suggesting that those committees are just tools of this Chamber and I don't think that's true. I don't subscribe to the idea that any committees outside and independent of this Chamber is a tool of this Chamber to get the Members of this Chamber an increase in their indemnity.

The Member opposite supports this by saying we did what we wanted anyway. I suggest to the Member opposite that the decision that was handed down by that committee from outside of this Chamber was in their wisdom the proper decision. Had we taken more than that committee has recommended then the Member's comments would have been relevant, that we didn't pay any attention to the committee anyway. The Members of this Legislature, for all their own reasons, obviously took less than the public committee recommended that they take. I object to the Members' any Member of this Chamber saying that the Committee that was selected, at different times under different governments, was a tool of this Chamber and was used as such. I really can't support that suggestion as put forward at this time.

The question that arises here, Mr. Speaker, is what does the public want? I think the public of Saskatchewan or of any other province, or of Canada for that matter, are prepared to pay for good service by their representatives

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BROCKELBANK: From time to time their faith in their representatives is shaken for any number of reasons, some of which the Member opposite mentioned. I think it's a legitimate fact that their faith is shaken from time to time. We've seen it happen over and over again. But that's part of the democratic system. People have a chance to elect their representatives, they have a chance to watch them in action and then they have a chance to make a decision on whether those representatives have adequately represented them, have earned their money for the four years put in on their behalf, or whatever period of time it was.

For those reasons, Mr. Speaker, I think the Resolution does have some merit. I would like further time to consider the Resolution and I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

MOTIONS FOR RETURN

RETURN NO. 14

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. Grant (Regina Whitmore Park) for Return No. 14 showing:

The total number of private business firms presently operating in premises which are provincially owned or leased; and the names, addresses and types of business operated in each case.

MR. BROCKELBANK: Mr. Speaker, when I last spoke on this Motion I suggested that I would have an amendment. I do have the amendment now. I think that it clarifies the Motion slightly and will provide all of the information that the Member requested. The amendment herein offered is self-explanatory. I do now move the amendment, seconded by my seatmate, Hon. G. MacMurchy (Minister of Education) as follows:

Delete all the words after the word 'showing' where it first appears and substitute the following therefor:

The names, addresses and types of businesses operating in buildings owned or leased by the Government of Saskatchewan.

Motion as amended agreed to.

April 1, 1975

ADJOURNED DEBATES

RESOLUTIONS

RESOLUTION NO. 8 – FINANCIAL ACCOUNT OF INTERCONTINENTAL PACKERS

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

That this Assembly urge the Government of Saskatchewan to provide a full annual accounting to this Assembly of all financial aspects of its investment in Intercontinental Packers Limited.

And the proposed amendment thereto by the Hon. Mr. Thorson:

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

Recommend that the equity investments of the Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation be reviewed by the Select Standing Committee on Crown Corporations during the course of considering the latest annual report of the said Corporation.

MR. A.R. GUY: (Athabasca) Mr. Speaker, if I could speak on the amendment it says what we suspected when the amendment was moved, we were in Crown Corporations, the SEDCO annual report was being . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I believe the Hon. Member has already spoken on the amendment. This was brought down on the 8th of March, moved by the Member for Cannington. An amendment was moved by the Minister for Industry and Commerce and the Hon. Member for Athabasca then followed the Member at that time, so he has already spoken.

MR. D.G. STEUART: (Leader of the Opposition) Mr. Speaker, speaking on behalf of the Member who had already spoken. What he wanted to tell the House, I understand, was that we did take this up in the Crown Corporations Committee and they refused to give us the information. I'm sure that the point that the Member wanted to make is that this is typical of the Government opposite. They say, ask questions. If you ask questions, they amend them. They say, ask for information. If you ask for information, they say go to the Crown Corporations. You go to the Crown Corporations, they say this isn't the right place. You come back into the House, they say go to the Crown Corporations. Never has there been a more devious government in the history of this province. I know exactly what you're doing to say. This is proof positive of the type of government they are and I think the amendment should be defeated and the original motion passed and this Corporation forced to expose to the light of publicity their very bad mishandling of public funds immediately.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Motion as amended agreed to.

RESOLUTION NO. 10 - INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S YEAR

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution by Mr. Dyck (Saskatoon City Park):

That this Assembly adopt the principles incorporated in the International Women's Year as set out by the United Nations and urges the Government of Saskatchewan to continue taking actions to improve the status of women in this province.

MR. P.P. MOSTOWAY: (Hanley) Mr. Speaker, I feel I must speak on this Resolution in order to draw your attention, not so much to what has been accomplished but rather, to what must be done in the very near future.

But first of all, I should like to make a few remarks relative to what the previous speaker said on this particular motion. Now it seems to me that he started out by politicking, by trying to paint the picture of the Federal Liberal Government insofar as things pertaining to women are concerned, as being so lily white. I just want to remind the House that the picture isn't quite as lily white as the previous speaker tried to point out. I mention, for example, the case of Judy LaMarsh who recently had the rug pulled out from under her by the Federal Liberal Government, I believe for . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MOSTOWAY: Well, they were able to do it, and I believe for no reason, Mr. Speaker, other than she had the decency to contribute to the best of her ability insofar as Cabinet was concerned. I believe that Cabinet of that day just couldn't take it, and word went out from their Leader at that time to get to Judy LaMarsh, and we all know what happened to her.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MOSTOWAY: I also want to bring to your attention, Mr. Speaker, something in relation to what the previous speaker said, and I think he mentioned five women senators. Well, I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that I believe the Prime Minister probably asked hundreds of women to sit in the Senate. But I firmly believe that most women couldn't be bothered with sitting in this glorious do-nothing, rubber-stamp institution. I feel that most of the women of Canada feel their talents can be put to better use in other areas than in stamping things that the House of Commons has decided on beforehand.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I should like publicly to commend the many women and women's groups in Canada and Saskatchewan who are doing splendid work in a variety of ways; work relative to striving for equal rights for women; work relative to assisting the disadvantaged; and work relative to helping to make this a better province in which to live. Mr. Speaker, we have many such women and women's groups, and it is their prodding of the conscience of Saskatchewan and Canada that we must be guided by if the work that has to be done, is to be done.

April 1, 1975

Mr. Speaker there is no doubt that society in general, particularly in the past, has played down the role of women. As a teacher of numerous classes, I have always been annoyed at the almost complete lack of recognition of women in our text books: to be more specific, our history books have helped in promoting the dominance of men in the past. In fact, were one to walk into most any school library today, one would probably find that this indirect promotion of male dominance is still going on. With this in mind, Mr. Speaker, I say I believe that it is in our schools that drastic changes must be made – changes that will result in a new image of the role of women being presented to school children. To me, Mr. Speaker, this is the most vital change needed - a change in developing young attitudes that will eventually have beneficial results for society in general.

Mr. Speaker, I have no quarrel with the various men we have in such professions as medicine, dentistry and engineering, just to name a few, but sometimes I wonder why mostly all of them are men. Surely those who are in a position to screen applicants who wish to enrol in colleges offering such training would be well advised to allow more women to enrol.

Surely the women of Canada would be just as capable in these professions as the women of certain other nations where the number of women approximates the number of men, or, in some cases, is even higher. Mr. Speaker, I urge these male dominated admitting bodies to re-examine the admission criteria which they now use. Could not more weight be given to such things as compassion and human understanding - things in which women certainly are equal to or superior to men?

Another area on which I should like to make a few comments is property rights as they affect women. I believe the Law Reform Commission of Saskatchewan has already made certain recommendations. While there are some who claim these recommendations do not go far enough, in that past input of women into the accumulation of family property and assets, is not given due consideration, these recommendations are a basis from which legislation can be considered to assist, to some degree, in rectifying the intolerable situation which has existed and still does.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the Federal Law Reform Commission is involved in studying the field of women's property rights with the intention of presenting certain recommendations, also. At any rate, it is my hope that in the very near future, we will see more federal and provincial legislation geared to rectifying the intolerable situation of women in regard to property rights. And here I would hope that such future legislation, federal and provincial, would complement each other. As I see it, Mr. Speaker, the way the situation now stands, women often find themselves in a sort of limbo of inaction due to interjurisdictional squabbling or grey areas where no one knows for sure who should act, or areas where one jurisdiction has power to legislate but no real power to enforce that legislation, or related court orders.

Mr. Speaker, the net result of this situation is that very often women are denied rights which all of us agree they are entitled to. As well, very often, the only ones who really benefit are the lawyers involved.

Mr. Speaker, another point I should like to raise pertains to day care. Now I'll be the first to admit that this government's record is good in this area. But, I also want to point out that more federal and provincial consideration should be given to those women who would want to take advantage of this programme prior to when catastrophe strikes the family unit. Far too often in the past, women had to wait for the catastrophe actually to occur before they could take advantage of day care and upgrading courses. Mr. Speaker, such a situation is not conducive to maintaining socially and economically healthy family units. I believe expanded day care facilities and freer access of women to upgrading courses will greatly assist in the avoidance of many family breakdowns when catastrophe does strike.

Another area I want briefly to touch on concerns the discrimination of women in regard to the Canada Pension Plan. Why has the Federal Government seen fit to exclude homemakers from the plan? Is not the work they do deserving of consideration? Mr. Speaker, I am aware of many organizations, which speak for millions of Canadian women of all political stripes, asking over the past number of years that the Federal Government take action in this area, action which will eliminate the discrimination which now exists.

Mr. Speaker, the situation throughout all of Canada in regard to support payments made to women in marriage breakdowns, is a mess. I believe every Member in this House is aware of situations arising out of marriage breakdowns where it is almost impossible for a woman to collect what is morally and legally due to her, and, very often to her children. Mr. Speaker, the root of this problem lies in the fact that what is really needed is not a hodge-podge of interprovincial agreements, but rather legislation at the federal level to cover every nook and cranny of Canada. The situation as it now stands almost invites those who would wish to escape their legal financial obligations to table hop from one province to another.

And then, almost as if to add insult to injury, I believe that in all provinces, when marriage breakdowns do occur, the onus is on the woman to prove that she has tried to collect support payments via the courts before she can apply for social assistance. Mr. Speaker, at the very time when she is beset by a host of problems, and at the very time when she should be given special consideration, she is expected to involve herself in legal procedure and financial expenditure before she can apply for assistance. But here I have to bring to your attention, Mr. Speaker, the fact that the Saskatchewan Department of Social Services has been quite understanding. It recognizes the plight of these women and has been willing to interpret regulations in such a manner as to assist these women in every way possible.

Mr. Speaker, there are other areas where there is no doubt the cards are stacked against women.

For example, consider the recent case where a number of women, about to take Manpower training, found that the benefits they were to be paid would be less than if they were males. Or, consider, the fact that even though there may be equal pay legislation for women throughout Canada, there is no real legislation directed at equal opportunity for women. Now, the logical outcome of this lack of equal opportunity for women is that the

April 1, 1975

equal pay legislation can be easily circumvented without any laws having been broken. Or, Mr. Speaker, consider recent reliable statistics which show clearly that women have a much greater chance of becoming economically poor than men, particularly in single or single parent situations.

Mr. Speaker, I know full well that much can be accomplished via legislation in improving the status of women, but I am also aware that in many areas, only the common sense and good judgement of citizens can effect an improvement. To this end I urge all citizens and our various institutions to rid ourselves of all feudalistic notions and attitudes relative to women. And if this can come about relatively quickly, I think all can be assured that Canada will become a better nation for it.

Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention, as I stated previously, to give a resume of what this Government has done in regard to improving the status of women in Saskatchewan. Nor is it my intention to go into detail concerning the noble principles incorporated in the International Women's Year as set out by the United Nations.

I feel the women of Canada, and particularly of Saskatchewan, are quite capable of making themselves vocal as to whether or not any particular jurisdiction's record is good or bad. I feel they are quite capable of drawing attention to areas that need improvement, and this they have done. What we need now, Mr. Speaker, is action. I hope it will come soon.

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, I will be supporting the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. G.T. SNYDER: (Minister of Labour) Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few comments on this Resolution because the principles involved touch very directly upon a number of the programs with which my Department is concerned.

The United Nations has declared 1975 International Women's Year and believe the time has certainly come to promote equality between men and women and to recognize the importance of women's increasing contributions in all areas of life. The purpose of this International Women's Year is to focus attention on improving the status of women and to promote an awareness of the changing role of women in society. In some respects, the role of women in Canadian society has been changing at a much faster rate than some sectors of our community have been able to comprehend. In the last ten years, for example, well over one million women have entered the labor force in Canada. Their participation rate - that is the number of persons in the work force expressed as a percentage of the population - has been rising steadily in every working age group except for those women over 55 years of age and here the rate has remained the same over the past few years. At the present time, nearly 40 per cent of all the women in Canada over 14 years of age work outside the home.

In my position as Minister of Labour during the past three and one-half years it has been my task to see that programs are developed which promote the well-being of working people in Saskatchewan. I am speaking of about some 360,000 people

and one in every three of these people is a woman. So you can see that I have a considerable interest in a resolution such as the one we are considering today.

In the course of developing appropriate solutions to the many problems in the labor field, I have been confronted over and over again with evidence that women in the world of work as well as in all other areas, are often subject to discrimination. Discrimination in the areas of equal pay and of equal opportunity. This denial of equal status takes many different forms and reflects some pretty deep-rooted attitudes.

For example, I see that in the working world, women on the average, earn less than men. In 1970 the women who worked earned about an average of 46 per cent of the average income of males. Yet, for the most part, we like to believe that our boys and girls are receiving an equal chance at education and an equal chance at trades training. Obviously then there are attitudes involved which stream the girls into certain kinds of occupations and not into others. Often these jobs are not especially well paid and they do not contain much potential for advancement.

I am quite aware that attitudes cannot be legislated but nevertheless, having recognized that the problem exists this Government has taken a number of constructive steps which, by themselves, will not solve all of these problems but I believe they will go a long way towards creating the conditions where change will be recognized as a right and a good thing for everyone

Back in 1964, the NDP established the Women's Bureau as a vehicle for adjusting at least some of the inequities particularly with respect to equal pay for work of a similar nature. Well, that year the working women of this province, Mr. Speaker, fell upon hard times as the saying goes, along with many of the rest of us. The Bureau during the next number of years was forced to carry on as best it could without adequate resources and without clearly defined functions, until 1971 when the sun broke through again. Since that time we have seen to it that the Women's Bureau administers specific equal pay legislation and it has investigators to ensure compliance with the very practical provisions of the equal pay legislation. Previously a woman was required to file a formal, detailed complaint with the Director of Labour Standards. Now, any district office can receive complaints either written or oral. Since 1973, restitution of nearly \$42,000 has been made to 206 women and one man. I think that indicates some proof that the program is working.

The Women's Bureau is also responsible for monitoring this province's maternity leave provisions - which incidentally are the best in Canada. Women in Saskatchewan are entitled to 18 weeks maternity leave so that they no longer have to quit their jobs to bear a child. Upon her return a woman is guaranteed a position similar to the one which she left. The Women's Bureau also plays an extremely important educational role in providing guidance to students planning careers as well as to older women who may be re-entering the work force after a prolonged absence.

It is my view that these have been very practical contributions toward improving the status of women in the Province of Saskatchewan. There have been many, many more steps taken

April 1, 1975

during the past three and one-half years, a good many of them enshrined in legislation. You may hear some talk of 'tokenism' from some quarters these days but let me say to the credit of this Government, that legislation here is far from tokenism where the rights of individuals are concerned, whether they be male or female.

Allow me then to list some of the legislative changes introduced since 1971 to improve the status of women in this province. These are in addition to the changes in the Labour Standards Act, changes which I have already described.

The Fair Employment Practices Act and The Fair Accommodation Practices Act were amended to prohibit sex discrimination. The Jury Act has been amended so that men and women have an equal right and an equal obligation to serve on jury duty. The Workers' Compensation Act was passed under which benefits for males and females are the same. An amendment to the Married Women's Property Act was introduced last fall as an interim measure while awaiting the recommendations of the Law Reform Commission for a more sweeping revision of marital property law.

In 1973 we appointed a task force to look closely at the recommendations of the Federal Royal Commission Report on the Status of Women and how those recommendations applied to the Government of Saskatchewan. A number of the legislative changes I have outlined were partly as a result of that study. In that same year, 1973, the Saskatchewan Advisory Council on the Status of Women was established to ensure continuing improvement in the whole area of women's rights.

We have commissioned a study on the need for a family court and introduced a Bill in line with the recommendations of the author of that report. A day care program has been developed within the Department of Social Services which includes subsidies where parents require them. A Family Planning Advisory Committee was established in 1974. I have already mentioned the work of the Law Reform Commission.

In the Department of Labour a review of all facets of The Labour Standards Act is virtually complete. One purpose of the review, Mr. Speaker, is to determine which Acts contain protective measure clauses which may be discriminatory. All of these things I think, represent positive action to achieve equal opportunities for women in all walks of life. In addition, we have made available special grants in recognition of International Women's Year and the current budget includes funds to increase those grants - further positive action I suggest.

As the employer of over 13,000 public servants in this province, the Government has a further responsibility to ensure that discrimination does not occur within the ranks of its own civil service. In this respect we have tried to be vigilant. For example, we have approved amendments to the Group Life Insurance Plan for Saskatchewan civil servants to equate benefits for male and female employees. We have increased the proportion of women appointed to boards and commissions to 209 in 1974, compared with a figure of 141 in 1973.

Several senior civil service appointments have gone to women since 1971 also, Mr. Speaker. For example in 1972 the first woman deputy minister in Saskatchewan was named. In 1973, a woman became assistant clerk of the Legislative Assembly.

In 1974, another first, Mr. Speaker, when a woman was named Legislative Counsel for the Government.

We in this Government have made a commitment to the women of this province to acknowledge the importance of women's increasing contribution in all areas of life and to do everything possible to end discrimination against the feminine half of our population. This is precisely then what International Women's Year is all about; and I have no hesitation in supporting this Resolution. When all of us accept and support the changing attitudes concerning women's roles in society, Saskatchewan will benefit as a whole. We cannot afford to ignore the contributions of the past and the potential contribution which women will make through their greater participation in the economic, social and cultural development of this country.

It is with a great deal of pleasure, Mr. Speaker, that I add my voice in support of the Resolution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to.

RESOLUTION NO. 11 - ELIMINATION OF SECTION 8 OF THE CONSUMER AFFAIRS ACT.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution by Mr. Grant (Regina Whitmore Park):

That this Assembly recommends to the consideration of the Government of Saskatchewan that Section 8 of the Consumer Affairs Act be eliminated, due to its provision of excessive discretionary power to the Minister of Consumer Affairs.

And the proposed amendment thereto by the Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:

That all the words after the word 'Assembly' be deleted and the following be substituted therefor:

Commend the Government of Saskatchewan for establishing a Department of Consumer Affairs to look after the interests and concerns of the consumer and recommend that consideration be given to replacing Section 8 of the Department of Consumer Affairs Act by comprehensive Fair Trades Practices legislation to create sanctions against and prohibit undesirable business practices.

MR. D.G. STEUART: (Leader of the Opposition) Mr. Speaker, I hope that this amendment is defeated, I don't suppose that it will be because it was introduced by a Member of the Government, by a minister which is rather amazing when you read the Resolution and then read the amendment. I should like to see this House pass the original Resolution. The original Resolution calls upon the Government to amend Section 8 of the Consumer Affairs Act and take out the powers that they have given to the Minister to close down any business in the Province of Saskatchewan for five days without reference to the courts at his own whim based on his own opinion. This is far too much power to give to any one individual. It stands and has stood ever since it was passed as a threat hanging over the

April 1, 1975

business community of this province. It is typical of the power grab or the power that this Government has taken unto itself, especially to the Cabinet Ministers. And again it is an example of the continuous harassment and the war on business that has been engaged in by the NDP ever since they came to power. The amazing thing about this amendment is that it was introduced by the Minister who is in charge of The Consumer Affairs Act. By the Minister who has been given this almost unprecedented power by the NDP Government. It is an admission that they went too far. It is not good enough for the Premier or the Minister or the Attorney General to stand up and say but you can't point to any example where we have actually closed anyone up, and we need this kind of power. The fact that it is on the Books, the fact that it is there, hangs over the head of every businessman and sets a bad climate, a climate for business investment that is bad enough already in this province without this kind of restrictive power-hungry legislation.

Then we have the sight of the Minister himself coming in and offering an amendment. In effect agreeing that it is taking too much power and in effect agreeing that Section 8 should be amended because that is exactly what the amendment says. It agrees to amend Section 8. What does it offer to replace it with? Something to do with fair trade practice. Now what does this mean? For the Minister to come in and if he wanted to amend this and he has some idea what fair trade practices mean, why didn't he do what he should have done and introduce an amendment to this House, which he has the power to do, and say, we have looked this portion of the Act over, have looked this Section of the Act over and we realize that it is unworkable and we realize that it was badly thought out and that it was passed in haste so we'll change it. We will change it by introducing the following amendment and tell us what fair trade practice means.

As a matter of fact it is an American phrase. I don't know what it means, I don't think the Minister knows what it means and I think that he has got a responsibility before we vote can this Resolution to explain to the House exactly what he is proposing. I have yet to see in any Legislature in this country, including the Federal Government, legislation spelling out what the Minister has suggested in this amendment. So, Mr. Speaker, in the absence of anything concrete or detailed by the Minister telling this House what he means, I hope that the House will defeat the amendment. I hope that they will pass this Resolution, in fact I think the Minister himself should vote for it, then the Government will do what this Resolution asks, take a new look at this Act, take out the powers it has given to the Minister, recognize the powers are too great, too sweeping and too wide and I think actually they may very well be unimportant.

The Minister is coming in now and I don't know whether he has passed out or has any information to make available to the House about this particular amendment he has proposed to this Resolution but I hoped that he would. I am sorry he wasn't here when I spoke earlier. Mr. Minister, what I am saying is that you, as the responsible Minister for this Act, have admitted by introducing this amendment that the portion of Section 8 is unworkable and should never have been brought in, in the first place. So if you want to change it now you have the power to change it, bring in the amendment, explain to us what you mean. You didn't explain it when you spoke, what do you mean by fair trade practices? How would you spell that out in legislation? How would you spell it out in regulations pertaining to the

legislation and how would you enforce it? What does it mean? So if the Minister is prepared to do this and unless he is prepared to do this, then I think the amendment is an admission that the Act is badly written, the powers are too wide, too sweeping. It's an admission of failure on behalf of the Government and it doesn't spell out what he offers as an alternative, so I would oppose the amendment which means absolutely nothing and support the Resolution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

RESOLUTION NO. 18 - GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution by Mr. D. Boldt (Rosthern):

That this Assembly recommend for the consideration of the Government of Saskatchewan that it immediately cease the granting of contracts or provision of government advertising for any firm or publication owned by a political party.

The question was put on Resolution No. 18 and it was negatived on the following recorded division:

YEAS Messieurs – 12

Steuart	Grant	Wiebe
Coupland	MacDonald(Milestone)	MacDonald (Moose Jaw North)
Loken	Gardner	Guy
Weatherald	Boldt	Malone

NAYS Messieurs – 33

Blakeney	MacMurchy	Faris
Dyck	Pepper	Owens
Meakes	Michayluk	Mostoway
Smishek	Byers	Gross
Romanow	Thorson	Feduniak
Messer	Kwasnica	Comer
Snyder	Carlson	Hanson
Kramer	Engel	Oliver
Thibault	Robbins	Feschuk
Baker	Tchorzewski	Kaeding
Brockelbank	Matsalla	Flasch

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

FINAL REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON HIGHWAY TRAFFIC & SAFETY

MR. A. THIBAUT (Melfort-Kinistino) moved, seconded by Mr. Grant (Regina Whitmore Park) that the **Final Report of the Special Committee on Highway Traffic and Safety** be now concurred in.

He said: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, at

April 1, 1975

the outset I want to say that the statements that I make are my own and not necessarily that of the Committee. I will not cover the entire Report as other Members will also be speaking on this subject and by the time that I close I believe that it will have been well covered. It was a great team job and I want to keep it that way.

I also appreciate the fact that the work at all times was kept out of the realm of party politics. Mr. Speaker, the contentious areas appear to be the speed limits and seat belts which will have a short time effect, therefore, I strongly urge the Government to press the educators in our society to join the crusade for traffic safety. The fuel crisis in the United States and the 55 miles an hour speed limit proved beyond a shadow of a doubt that reducing speed limits would save at least 11 per cent of the lives that are lost. Eleven per cent is attributed exactly to the lowering of speed limits.

The use of seat belts in Australia, by their legislation, has reduced the death rate there by approximately 25 per cent. A coroner's jury that appeared before the Committee in North Battleford has said to the Committee that seven out of 13 lives that were lost would have been saved if they had used their seat belts in accidents that he attended. At the International Conference in Toronto one expert said, it was also discovered that 20 per cent of the accident victims would have lived if they had received first aid by competent people who were knowledgeable in the use and practice of first aid. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I believe that first aid must be taught from kindergarten to Grade 12. That's what is being done in some of the countries including New Zealand. I think the first person who comes on the scene of an accident is a very important person, therefore, if everybody had a course in first aid he would be able to save lives when he is called upon to do so.

If we are to reduce deaths on our highways we are going to have to put into practice some of the programs that are recommended in the Committee Report. Australia had about a two year education period before passing the seat belt law. We must also consider how ready the public is before passing our law. Since I tabled the Report in this House I have received three negative answers and the rest were positive on practically all recommendations.

I also want to read a letter to this House that I received from one of the people who listened to the Hot Line, I spent two hours on under fire. The letter comes from an L.C. McFadden, 130 – 110th St., Saskatoon, March 24, 1975:

Dear Art:

Congratulations on your Hot Line performance this morning. I wanted to call in but I could not make it. I wanted to comment on two points brought out.

1. Cost of the Traffic Safety Committee.

2. Objection to a limitation of speed limits.

- (a) If your Committee saves just one life it has justified its existence. Money can be replaced, a life cannot. How much money is spent to locate one downed plane. For example, Bob Gauchie of Fort Smith lost for

59 days.

(b) You may know what I am going to relate. Some years ago Red Book Magazine decided to test traffic safety. Two identical cars certified mechanically O.K. in New York were to drive to San Francisco. Driver A was to obey all speed limits and traffic regulations, drive not more than ten hours a day, book 8 hours of rest and sleep each night. Driver B had no restrictions placed upon him. He was free to get to San Francisco as fast and quickly as possible.

Result:

Both drivers arrived at the check point within an hour of each other. Driver A was relaxed, fresh and free from tension. His car was still mechanically O.K. Driver B was tired and tense. He had to have some repairs to his car, plus a lighter purse as a result of fines. More power to you and your Committee.

(Signed) Mac.

That's the end of the quote.

At the International Conference in Toronto in 1974 the best information available was that two out of every 100 drunks on the road are apprehended. One out of every 7,000 speeding infractions is caught. Even if we double our police force, what effect would it have? The force must be equipped with more up-to-date equipment to be effective.

Speaking about courts, I want to say that when we were down to the International Conference in Toronto, three members of the Committee plus one member from the research staff, myself, Mr. Whelan and Mr. Meakes and Mr. Zenon Topuschak, research assistant, travelled to Toronto to attend the sixth annual International Conference on Alcohol, Drugs and Traffic Safety in September of 1974. While in Toronto, these members arranged to visit the North York traffic court recently set up in that section of Toronto. The Committee's tour was very ably guided by Mr. Howard Morton, Director of the project and Mr. Bill Fletcher, an analyst with the court. The visit was very informative and the members were extended every courtesy by those involved in the traffic court project.

The Committee's recommendation regarding the setting up of separate traffic courts in Saskatchewan incorporates many of the principles and aims of the North York Traffic Court. Mr. Speaker, I personally visited a similar court in Cook County, Illinois. There again the court was geared to educating the offender rather than punishing.

We also attended the Phoenix project in Phoenix, Arizona and there again the DWI (Driving While Intoxicated) is dealt with by the educational approach rather than by hitting his pocket.

What we have today on the surface appears to be more as a means of collecting money for the government and does nothing to improve the driver, Mr. Speaker. As a matter of fact, I believe they're even making matters worse. The traffic courts must be an educational process and must be definitely taken

April 1, 1975

out of the courts such as trying to try rape cases in the same court as the fellow that went through a stop sign.

Mr. Speaker, I'm sure if we asked every driver in the province if he would be willing to spend a few hours, a few minutes to help traffic safety every year - many of them don't realize how little time they save - I'm sure most of them would be willing to take a few hours more throughout the summer. On a 25 mile trip the difference between 60 miles an hour and 55 miles an hour would mean two minutes. Two minutes to be a safe driver. I have a few other calculations made here. On a hundred miles it would take an hour and 48 minutes at 55 miles an hour. At 60 miles an hour it would take an hour and 40 minutes, you would save eight minutes. Mr. Speaker, if you went 65 miles an hour you save 16 minutes. Is it worth the time? I know one of the callers on the Hot Line said he travelled from Lanigan to Saskatoon and said he observed the 55 miles an hour. He said: "I enjoyed it, I saved gasoline," and it was for gasoline alone, the resource that we cannot replace. He said: "I saw parts of Saskatchewan that I never saw before." It has been clearly proven that the faster you drive the narrower your vision gets. If you get the speed high enough all you get is blacktop and anything that gets in the way which you may hit. You slow down a little bit and you see the big picture as explained in one of the pamphlets put out by Saskatchewan Transportation.

I know that Sask Power has done a good job in educating their drivers and they are an example in this province. There's no reason why all the rest of the people couldn't learn to do the same thing.

I also want to offer special thanks today to the news media, newspapers, radio and television. Without their help, I'm sure that our project would be a failure.

We've recommended traffic safety for 1976 but it should be prepared by programs in 1975. Some of the year 1975 should be used to get the program well on its way so that we can have communities and towns and villages co-operating with whatever government there will be at that day, making the program a success.

The educators in our society hold the key to this problem and therefore we should encourage them to do something about it. I'm going to tell you that in this province we're so far behind in traffic safety that we are like the slow horse on the race track. He is one whole turn behind and running to beat 60 thinking he's ahead. I think we had better realize that that's where we are and anybody who has been on the Committee and attended the conference in Toronto fully realizes it.

In closing I want to say that in all problems to do with people there are no easy answers. The problem must be tackled on all fronts. It is essential that the drivers be well informed and have an awareness of their moral responsibility in matters of traffic safety. Drivers must learn to police themselves if we are to succeed in reducing the number of deaths on our roads. In 1974, 318 people were killed in Saskatchewan in traffic accidents. The Committee believes that the great loss to society resulting in traffic accidents can no longer be tolerated and that measures recommended in the Report will significantly improve the present situation.

I want to take this opportunity to record my gratitude for the diligence shown by all members and the staff of this Committee. It was a pleasure to work with members who took their responsibility earnestly and worked together well in the spirit of true parliamentarians.

I will have more to say in closing the debate, therefore, Mr. Speaker, I want to move that this Final Report of the Special Committee on Highway Traffic and Safety be now concurred in.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. G.B. GRANT: (Regina Whitmore Park) Mr. Speaker, I welcome that applause from both sides of the House. It will probably be the last I'll get from either side. I think when the interim report was tabled in the House from this Committee that there was a pretty full and explicit discussion of the recommendations of what we had in mind and the final Report which the chairman has tabled and which he has moved and I have seconded the adoption of, follows very closely that interim report, finalizes some sections of it and unfortunately, leaves a few things left unsolved for future consideration. When one looks at those items for further study, (a) they're not too numerous, (b) they are not of top priority in comparison to some others.

On the occasion when I spoke previously I expressed some question as to just how concerned the public are about the fatalities on our highways. I don't think this is necessarily due to any callousness on the part of the public. I think it is possibly because of the day and age that we live in where communication is so instantaneous and things are so relative that the loss of one or two lives every day on our highways looks pretty minimum when you compare it to the casualties that are occurring either through man's inhumanity to man or through catastrophes caused by nature. Even though there is an apparent lack of a general overall public concern, nevertheless, I think it behoves Members of the House, as legislators to be concerned about it and do something about it.

One of the things that really concerns me throughout the study that we have made over the last year or so was the apparent inability of law enforcement officers, the judiciary and we, ourselves, as legislators to cope with some of the problems that we have. I refer particularly to the individual who insists on drinking to excess and driving and to the individual who flaunts the law when he has lost his licence to drive and drives in spite of that loss and I would hope that when this Report is finally dealt with that the Government in power will have the wisdom and the initiative to see that the recommendations are carried out to the best of their ability, particularly with the provision of funds, sufficient funds to enable a new court system to be established, more law enforcement officers and certainly a stepped up educational program.

I think it speaks well of the concern of the legislators, that with all the recommendations that we finally came up with the Hon. Member for Athabasca and myself were the only ones who had reservations and they only pertain to one particular area. I'm sure that each member of the Committee has some

April 1, 1975

reservations about recommendation on seat belts but Mr. Guy and I felt strongly enough about it to insert a reservation in the Report. I'm a great advocate of the use of seat belts myself, and I think they are good. I'm very critical of the variety of seat belts that we have. The fact that they haven't been designed for any degree of comfort or ease of applying and this is one of the reasons why I signed the reservation. The other one is that the use of seat belts is not universal. There are no seat belts provided for trains or buses, particularly school buses. When you think of the casualties that have occurred with the use of school buses, possibly that's an area we should start in before we start in private vehicles. The other reservation, of course, related to the difficulty of enforcing it and to some degree, the infringement on private, of an individual's right to either avail himself of these provisions or equipment provided for his safety or in his wisdom, deciding not to use them.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think it's necessary to dwell at great length, I noticed the chairman kept his remarks fairly brief and I intend to do likewise. I think I missed during the last 10 or 12 years a worthwhile experience in that I was never on a committee of this type until this one and as a result I think I have a better appreciation of some of the Members opposite than I would have if I hadn't served on the Committee. I think I was fortunate in being chosen to sit on this particular Committee because it was less political than some of the other ones in the past and possibly the experience of other members on the committee work wasn't as satisfying as I found this one. I think we listened to as many people as any committee could have listened to in this area. I don't think any one or any group was denied an opportunity to speak to us and I'm sure that we all benefited from the delegations and individuals who appeared before it. Naturally it reached the point where a lot of them were repetitious because practically every possible angle of highway safety was touched on after you had listened to a few delegations, much the same as this House after three or four Members have spoken. There is really nothing new, just the old points being rehashed and dressed a little bit.

So, Mr. Speaker, I know other members of the Committee would like an opportunity to speak to the Report but at this time I should like to ask leave to adjourn.

Debate adjourned.

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