

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Third Session — Eighteenth Legislature**  
**54th Day**

**Friday, May 6, 1977.**

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

**WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**MR. M. J. KOSKIE:** (Quill Lakes) Mr. Speaker, through you and to the House I should like to introduce 17 Grade 12 students from Leroy High School.

They are seated in the West Gallery, they are accompanied by their teacher Mr. Bellamy and their bus driver Mr. Norman Ostig. I want to welcome them to the Legislature and to the city of Regina. I plan to meet with them later.

**HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. N. H. MacAULEY:** (Cumberland) Mr. Speaker, I want to welcome a group of students from the far northern half of the province through you to this House. The leader of the group is Mr. Parsons. I hope that they are going to enjoy the proceedings here this morning and I am sure that they are going to enjoy what has been said here and I will see them later this morning.

**HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. F. J. THOMPSON:** (Athabasca) Mr. Speaker, along with my colleague I should also like to welcome the group from the northern co-op school and I hope that this will be an interesting morning for you and an interesting day and I look forward to meeting you also after the Question Period.

**HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. G. McNEILL:** (Meadow Lake) Mr. Speaker, also with my colleagues from the North as I have lived at Green Lake and in the North I would like to welcome these 50 students and their guides with them. I hope that their trip to Regina has been interesting and educational and I wish them a safe journey home and I too, will hope to be with my colleagues to talk to you later on.

**HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. E. C. MALONE:** (Regina Lakeview) Mr. Speaker, I should like to join with the Members opposite in welcoming the delegation from the North. I know that they have come a very long way to see our deliberations today. I hope that they will find them educational and enjoyable and that they enjoy their stay in Regina.

**HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

## QUESTIONS

## THE MEDICAL PROFESSION ACT — BILL 51

**MR. E. C. MALONE:** (Leader of the Opposition) Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the real acting Premier, the House Leader in connection with an incident that arose yesterday in connection with Bill 57 — the Medical Professions Act the amendments to it. I wonder if the House Leader could clear the air a little bit. We had a statement by the Premier which is quite clear and unequivocal at a press conference that this Bill would be withdrawn from this Session and that it may not even be introduced at a later Session of the Legislature. Yesterday we were advised by the Minister of Health that as far as he was concerned this Bill was still before the Standing Committee. I am wondering if the House Leader can tell us today whether or not this Bill will be proceeded with and if so when?

**HON. R. J. ROMANOW:** (Attorney General) Mr. Speaker, the Bill is before the Standing Committee on Law Amendments and Delegated Powers. I am sure that the Member will realize that it can only be dealt with by the Committee acting or not acting. I presume that that decision will be made by members of the Committee in due course.

**MR. MALONE:** Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. As the House Leader is well aware the Committee is made up of a majority of Government Members, are you able to advise this House today as to when that Committee will be meeting again?

**MR. ROMANOW:** Mr. Speaker, I of course am not the Chairman. I am a Member of the Committee. I should like to meet with the Chairman, I have not had an opportunity to do so yet but I am now talking out loud without having had direct consultation with him. I hope that he would reconvene the Committee sometime early next week. Middle of next week at an appropriate, convenient time.

**MR. MALONE:** Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the House Leader would indicate then whether he would undertake to advise us Monday or Tuesday as to whether this Bill is going ahead or not going ahead after consulting Mr. Allen, the Chairman of the Committee.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, I will take the next question, the Member for Indian Head-Wolseley.

**MR. C. P. MacDONALD:** (Indian Head-Wolseley) Mr. Speaker, I want to ask a supplementary to the Minister and ask the House Leader why he is trying to mislead the House, the Government makes the decisions on whether or not a Bill will be proceeded with in this House. It is their decision whether it will be dropped on the Order Paper, it is the Government's decision whether it will be called on the Order Paper and please don't blame the Committee on Law Amendments and Delegated Powers. Is the Government intending to proceed

May 6, 1977

and pass Bill 51?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order! I will take the Member for Nipawin.

### **CHARGES MADE TO INDIANS ON RESERVE ROADS**

**MR. R. L. COLLVER:** (Nipawin) Mr. Speaker, I would direct a question to the Attorney General. There is considerable concern on many of the reserves pertaining to the fact that the RCMP are now charging the Indians on reserve roads with such charges as failure to have a driver's licence and failure to have proper lighting on their vehicles or stop signals on their vehicles. Is it true that the Attorney General has as a result of a recent court decision instructed the RCMP to make these charges on reserve roads, not those roads that are designated provincial highways, but those roads that are Indian roads on the reserves?

**MR. ROMANOW:** Mr. Speaker, I will take notice.

### **THE MEDICAL PROFESSION ACT — BILL 51**

**MR. E. F. A. MERCHANT:** (Regina Wascana) Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Mineral Resources, which is really a follow-up to the question asked by the Member for Lakeview and a reply given to me yesterday by the Member when he was the Acting Deputy Premier. I asked, as Mr. Speaker will recall, the then Acting Deputy Premier if he would peruse the transcript and I now ask the Member whether he would not agree with me that these are quite unequivocal words by the Premier when the Premier said at that press conference:

Our position with regard to Bill 51 is firstly, we will not proceed with it at this session and secondly, whether or not we will proceed with it in the future will be determined later but we certainly make no decision to go ahead at the next session.

And I say to the Member that I have here a transcript of the words by the Premier and would the Member not agree that those were quite clear unequivocal words and I ask why the Government is shilly-shallying around with this . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, order! I will take the next question. The Member for Nipawin.

### **CHARGES MADE TO INDIANS ON RESERVE ROADS**

**MR. R. L. COLLVER:** (Nipawin) I would address this question to the Attorney General in the absence of the Minister of Highways. Is it the intention of the Government of Saskatchewan to commence immediately in light of the Attorney General's lack of response to my earlier question to commence immediately maintaining and keeping up on behalf of the Government of Saskatchewan the reserve roads in the Province of Saskatchewan?

**MR. ROMANOW:** I don't know how to respond to that because the question is based on an assumption that the maintenance of roads on

reserves is such that requires some degree of speciality or some degree of special attention and care. That may or may not be the case. Personally I am not aware of the situation. I just simply say that all I can do is to take further notice of that question and check with the Minister of Highways and get an indication of the reserve road situation throughout the Province of Saskatchewan, our obligations to them, if any, the cost-sharing operation to it and give the Member an answer at a later time.

**MR. COLLVER:** A supplementary question, then, Mr. Speaker.

If, as the Attorney General has suggested that he is going to take notice of both sets of questions, would he, at the same time, look into the possibility of whether or not he believes or the Government of Saskatchewan believes that it is reasonable that such as I said in my earlier questions, such minor offences to have of no driver's licence, should be able to be charged on what presumably is a federal road, as a matter of fact, more than that, it is a federal responsibility. But an Indian road on Indian reserve land and that the RCMP are, in fact, charging . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order! I will take the next question.

### **APPOINTMENT OF GENERAL MANAGER FOR SEDCO**

**MR. G. H. PENNER:** (Saskatoon Eastview) A question to the Minister of SEDCO. I understand that SEDCO has just very recently appointed a new general manager or executive director. Would the Minister inform me whether that is correct?

**HON. N. VICKAR:** (Minister of Industry and Commerce) Mr. Speaker, there will be a press release in due course.

**MR. PENNER:** Mr. Speaker, that doesn't answer my question. I asked whether my information is correct?

**MR. VICKAR:** Mr. Speaker, that is correct. A new general manager was hired and a press release will be issued in due course.

**MR. PENNER:** A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Next question.

### **MEDICAL PROFESSION ACT — BILL NO. 51**

**MR. R. H. BAILEY:** (Rosetown-Elrose) Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Health.

Mr. Minister you have introduced and brought in Bill No. 51 and there has been some discussion as to whether there is complete party agreement opposite, in regard to that Bill. Be that as it may, because of the opposition to the Bill, it would sound as though there may be a chance that the Bill may be, by a government decision, pulled. I want to suggest Mr. Minister that there is considerable opposition to Bill No. 104, which is The Vehicles Act. Would you agree then, at this time, to pull

May 6, 1977

that Bill as well because of the opposition to seat belt legislation?

**HON. W. ROBBINS:** (Minister of Health) I am not responsible for seat belt legislation, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure that the Member knows that. There is some validity for criticism of the other Bill that you refer to that has to be taken into consideration.

### **SALE OF LAND BANK LAND**

**MR. J. WIEBE:** (Morse) January 1, 1978 is the point in time when some Land Bank land could possibly be available for sale. I just want to ask the Minister: is it true that the selling price for Land Bank land, after January 1, 1978, will be the particular going market price at that time?

**HON. E. KAEDING:** (Minister of Agriculture) Yes, Mr. Speaker, that is the intention.

**MR. WIEBE:** A supplementary question then, Mr. Speaker. Is it true then that a son of a father who sold his land five years ago to the Land Bank at a price of \$100, if he wishes now to buy the land will have to pay the highly inflated price of between \$250 and \$300 and acre for that particular land?

**MR. KAEDING:** Yes, Mr. Chairman. I am sure that the father and son agreement will be handled the same as all the others.

**MR. WIEBE:** Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In the event that the son is able to purchase the land will there be any assistance given to him by the Government or will he have to come up with the cash immediately in order to purchase that particular land?

**MR. KAEDING:** Mr. Speaker, he will have the option as every other Land Bank lessee has of continuing to lease or to make the purchase. If he wishes to make the purchase he will have to make his arrangements through farm credit corporations or the normal mechanisms that we have for purchase.

### **SENIOR POSITIONS IN SASK FOREST PRODUCTS**

**MR. G. N. WIPF:** (Prince Albert-Duck Lake) Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister in charge of Saskatchewan Forest Products.

A few weeks ago you said that two people from management positions had resigned but you stated they were not senior management positions. I understand one was manager of finance and administration and the other one the manager of the woods handling or something. Have these positions been filled as of today?

**HON. J. R. MESSER:** (Minister in charge of Sask Forest Products) No, not permanently.

**MR. WIPF:** Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. When do you expect to fill these two positions and do you consider these two positions important enough to be filled? Also is there going to be a general manager appointed for this management group in the Prince Albert area?

**MR. MESSER:** They will be filled in due course.

### **GENERAL MANAGER OF SEDCO**

**MR. PENNER:** Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister in charge of SEDCO.

Would the Minister indicate to us who the new general manager is? Why it was an Albertan that was hired? What is the salary going to be?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, order! I will take the Member for Swift Current.

### **CHANGE IN TITLE RE SEDCO MANAGER**

**MR. D. M. HAM:** (Swift Current) Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce.

I note in light of the hiring of a new manager for SEDCO I note that the new position or title is general manager while the previous position was managing director. Why this change in title?

**HON. N. VICKAR:** (Minister of Industry and Commerce) Mr. Speaker, with reference to the questions that are asked about the position of the new appointment. The new manager will be having a press conference and a press release next week and explain that situation to you. The board made the decision to make the switch in the title of the position.

**MR. E. F. A. MERCHANT:** (Regina Wascana) A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask the Minister whether his view of the parliamentary process is that government is handled by press conferences two or three days after the matter is breaking before you?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order! The next question.

### **SASKATCHEWAN CHICKEN MARKETING BOARD**

**MR. L. W. BIRKBECK:** (Moosomin) Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Agriculture. In light of the fact that the Saskatchewan Chicken Marketing Board is marketing or selling chickens at 53 cents a pound to numbers of over 500, on the one hand, and on the other hand selling to the present retail outlets at 87 cents, is it, Mr. Minister, this Government's intention through that Board to go into the retail distribution of chickens?

**MR. KAEDING:** Mr. Speaker, I don't tell the Chicken Marketing Board

May 6, 1977

what to do, they make their own decisions and whatever decision I they make is fine with me as long as they stay within the powers of the National Products Marketing Act.

**MR. BIRKBECK:** A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

For a government that through boards wants to stabilize prices, how can you, Mr. Minister, justify this undercutting of the prices in this province by the Chicken Marketing Board? Furthermore, Mr. Minister, you would be aware that you are not in competition with Manitoba, as it can be purchased from Manitoba cheaper than it can be purchased right here in Saskatchewan. What do you have to say about that?

**MR. KAEDING:** Mr. Speaker, I simply reiterate what I said earlier that whatever the Marketing Board decides they want to do, they are the people who are marketing on behalf of producers. I think that if you have a quarrel with that decision you should take it up with the Marketing Board.

**MR. BIRKBECK:** A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. If the Government of Saskatchewan . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order! I am going to chicken out on this one and take the next question.

### **HOTEL FIRES IN REGINA**

**MR. MERCHANT:** Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister in charge of the Department of Labour, also in charge of the Fire Commissioner's Office.

In light of the fact that there have been two very serious hotel fires in Regina recently and the Wascana Winter Club burned down and all of these things have happened in a week, is there any special attention being paid by the Fire Commissioner's Office to the problems of fires in Regina and is there any suspicion of arson in the case of, at least, the hotel fires.

**HON. G. T. SNYDER:** (Minister of Labour) I can't tell the Member whether any judgment has been made with respect to the possibility of arson. I think that at this point the Fire Commissioner's Office believes that the three fires, in rather speedy consecutive order, are more a matter of coincidence than anything else. I think I would have to inform the Member that as late as yesterday afternoon I was in touch with the Fire Commissioner's Office and they were still waiting for some of the embers to die down. A complete investigation is being undertaken by the city fire department and the Commissioner's Office will involve itself upon request and if there is any indication of arson, or if there is a loss of life. Generally that is when the Fire Commissioner's Office becomes involved. But at this point in time no indication has been offered to me that there has been any indication of arson.

**MR. MERCHANT:** Further supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Over the past two or three years it has become apparent in comparing Regina and Saskatoon that Regina has a far worse record in terms of major fires than Saskatoon, which would either be due to arson or more likely due to faulty wiring and so on. These matters are under the control of the municipality and in due course under the control of the Fire Commissioner's Office. Is the Fire Commissioner's Office looking into what appears to be a problem in the administration in Regina since the Regina operation has far more fires, or does the Fire Commissioner's Office simply write this off as part of Mayor Baker's urban renewal program?

**MR. SNYDER:** I don't believe there is any indication . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, order! I will take the next question.

### **MARK-UP FOR WHOLESALE DRUGGISTS**

**MR. D. M. HAM:** (Swift Current) A question for the Minister of Health, Mr. Speaker.

Is it true that the Government of Saskatchewan on July 1, 1977 will not be allowing drug wholesalers a mark-up in the sale of drugs to retail outlets?

**HON. W. A. ROBBINS:** (Minister of Health) I will take that as notice, Mr. Speaker.

### **LEGISLATION AFFECTING WESTERN DEVELOPMENT MUSEUM**

**MR. G. H. PENNER:** (Saskatoon Eastview) The Minister has given the House an indication about 10 days ago with regard to a question put about the authenticity of the Orders in Council as they relate to the legislation affecting the Western Development Museum. My question to the Minister is: can he give us an indication when his response is going to come before the House? I would have thought the lawyers could have looked at it and arrived at a conclusion, as we did, in a short period of time. How much longer will it be?

**HON. E. TCHORZEWSKI:** (Minister in charge of the Western Development Museum) Yes, Mr. Speaker, next week. I have been away for two days on a very important business matter and I just got back today. I did some checking and I am told that, and some time next week I will have it for you.

### **DELAY IN NEGOTIATIONS RE SCHOOL BOARDS**

**MR. R. H. BAILEY:** (Rosetown-Elrose) Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Education.

Mr. Minister, for two years running now the negotiations between the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation and the Government team have been a long, long extended process, and at the present time they are now in their eighth month. Would the Minister not agree that the make-up of the negotiation committee, in itself, is the reason for this long delay in reaching negotiations?



May 6, 1977

**HON. E. TCHORZEWSKI:** (Minister of Education) Well, Mr. Speaker, I would not agree. The negotiations may be taking, in the Member's view, a long time, but the negotiations are indeed progressing. The length of negotiations does not necessarily reflect on any major difficulty. Negotiations are not always what one would call an easy exercise, but they are an important exercise in the collective bargaining process. I don't directly answer to the Member's question, no, the make-up of the team, I don't take that as being the reason for the length of the negotiations.

**MR. BAILEY:** Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

Is the Minister aware of the difficulties that must be faced by school boards and teachers as well with the negotiations arriving as late as they do in the school year, is he aware of the difficulties faced by school unit boards and city boards in Saskatchewan with the lateness of negotiations?

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** I don't know what difficulties the Member speaks of, Mr. Speaker. If he is aware of some difficulty, I would welcome him telling us what they are. School boards, obviously, have set their budgets. They, in their budgets, have set what they anticipate likely to be some salary increases. They do that on the advice of the Saskatchewan School Trustees' Association which provides them with that advice based on the advice that they get from their representatives on the bargaining committee. I can't see any other way in which that can be done otherwise.

**MR. BAILEY:** Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is the Minister of Education aware that for the first time this year that the five-man government team have voted against the four-man trustee team, and therefore negotiations are not functioning as intended originally with the school Act?

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** Not true, Mr. Speaker.

The Member, as usual, overstates a situation. The circumstances in the bargaining committee, as reported to me, are good. They are meeting this week and everybody is discussing it from an objective point of view and I don't see any great problem as alluded to by the Member opposite.

**MR. PENNER:** A question to the Minister of Education.

In his response a moment ago he indicated that school boards are basically relying on the Saskatchewan School Trustees' Association to give an indication as to what percentage to put in their budgets for salary increases. Would the Minister indicate to us what advice he takes and what amount of money he placed in his budget with regard to salary increases as they were then transferred out to school boards in the province?

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** One of the reasons why we want and ask school boards to give us an idea of what they are looking at from a budgetary point of view is so that we can in the department and the Government have a better idea of what we need to be looking at from the point of view of operating grants. Now that's ongoing

(and the Member will know being involved with school board work) that that exercise in fact does take place and taking into consideration that proposition and the information which we get we establish our budget.

### **LACK OF OVERTIME PAYMENT TO NURSES IN THE NORTH**

**MR. G. N. WIPF:** (Prince Albert-Duck Lake) A question to the Minister in charge of the DNS.

I understand that in the last few months nurses working for the DNS, working overtime, have been refused their overtime pay. Can the Minister explain why, or what is the problem in the DNS for not paying overtime to their nurses?

**HON. G. R. BOWERMAN:** (Minister in charge of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan) Mr. Speaker, I understand that the nurses in the Department of Northern Saskatchewan are employed by the Public Service Commission and their agreement is the same agreement that applies to all public service employees working under that SGEA agreement.

**MR. WIPF:** Supplementary then to the Minister in charge of Public Services.

Can you explain why the nurses in the North have not been paid overtime, and maybe the Minister of Labour can inform this House if he has been contacted on this problem?

**HON. G. SNYDER:** (Minister of Labour) Well if you are directing the question to me with respect to why someone isn't being paid the required amount of time as defined by the Labour Standards Act, then I suggest that the appropriate route is for the employees to relay this information to the Labour Standards office. If there is a violation of any description the Labour Standards officer will be in a position to make an assessment, make a determination as to money owing or any violation under the Act. This is the appropriate way to proceed.

### **ADJOURNED DEBATES**

#### **SECOND READINGS**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. MacMurchy that **Bill No. 104 — An Act to amend The Vehicles Act (No. 2)** be now read a second time, and the amendment thereto moved by Mr. Ham.

**MR. R. L. COLLVER:** (Leader of the Progressive Conservatives) Before the question, Mr. Speaker, and I am assuming the question at this point is on the amendment, I should like to make a few brief remarks about a plebiscite on this issue.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I should like to refresh the Member's mind on this matter. He has spoken on the debate and he must confine his remarks strictly to the amendment which is before us, which in essence deals with the six month hoist.

May 6, 1977

**MR. COLLVER:** Well, that's a delay of the Bill and I would suggest to you that perhaps in order to delay the Bill for six months that during that period of time the people of Saskatchewan could be informed of the benefits of the wearing of seat belts and at the conclusion of that six months time a plebiscite or vote could be placed before them and they could get an opportunity to express their views and allow their views to be made known.

There are three points of view, I think, that should be brought to the attention of this Assembly prior to . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** I must interrupt the Member again to correct something that I said. The Member adjourned the debate before and therefore he is re-entering the debate now and has the latitude on both of them concurrently, the motion and the amendment, and this will be his final opportunity to speak. I am sorry that I ill-advised the Member before.

**MR. COLLVER:** Thank you for your advice, Mr. Speaker.

There are three points of view that I think should be brought to the attention of the Members opposite most especially because I understand the Members opposite may have had difficulty in coming to some decision pertaining to this particular Bill and I should like to make this suggestion to them. Representative government demands really that the people be aware of the issues and the concerns of the Legislature prior to the enactment of legislation. Unless a particular emergency arises, in which the Legislature must deal with that particular item or conversely, in which the facts are so complex and complicated and the time element is so short before action must be taken that the people quite simply can't be informed then the I representatives have to make that decision in between elections.

This particular piece of legislation, the compulsory wearing of seat belts was not included in anyone's platform in the last provincial general election. There was no mention of it in the NDP platform, there was no mention of it in the Liberal platform, there was no mention of it in the Progressive Conservative platform.

Two years have elapsed since the last provincial general election. During that period of time perhaps some new information may have come to light, on the other side the information pertaining to various jurisdictions which have enacted compulsory seat belt legislation was available in June of 1975 to all three parties but they did not include that in their platform anywhere. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, the people of this province did not have an opportunity to choose whether or not a particular party's platform which would have included the wearing of seat belts on a compulsory basis should be enacted by the Saskatchewan Legislature.

We have a number of examples over the year, and I notice that the Leader of the Opposition on a recent date poked fun, if you want at the suggestion that the people should be allowed to vote on this particular issue. I make the suggestion to the Leader of the Opposition that there have been many examples in which the Liberal Party of Saskatchewan and indeed the NDP have come forward in this Legislature and opted for a vote by people on a matter of particular concern to them. I suggest for

example the suggestion by the Liberals that the hog producers be allowed an opportunity to vote on whether or not a marketing commission should be established prior to the establishment of a marketing commission, is one such example.

The suggestion on the part of many Members of the Liberal Opposition that cattle producers if any marketing board is ever to be established should have the opportunity to vote on the issue prior to the establishment. In terms of the Federal Government, we see a plebiscite among the rapeseed producers before material legislation was brought forward or is to be brought forward on behalf of the rapeseed producers, that they were given an opportunity to vote on the question because it was of particular concern to them as producers of rapeseed.

The same thing with regard to feed grains. The same thing, in fact, on a local basis was allowed by this Assembly, not only by Members on this side of the House but by Members on the other side of the House over the years, as it related to such issues as for example, mixed drinking. This allowed local option and local people to decide whether or not they wanted to have mixed drinking in their area. Such suggestions as time zones were given the option of local people being allowed to vote on whether . . .

**MR. KOSKIE:** . . . potash . . .

**MR. COLLVER:** Yes, if the Member who is yelling across the way would remember that during the debate on the potash issue every speech we gave in this Legislature we said, withdraw the Bill or call an election, precise words. Everyone will recall that is exactly what was said. The potash legislation was not mentioned during the previous election and we suggested that that was even more serious and that the Government should call an election on that issue or withdraw the Bill. They had not presented it to the people, who had no opportunity to discuss and had no opportunity to vote on it.

On this particular issue we believe very strongly that the people of Saskatchewan should be given the opportunity to allow their views to be known on whichever side of this issue they feel they come down on. There are a great number of people in this province who for one reason or another are very concerned about the compulsory use of seat belts. They are not concerned most of them about the use of seat belts. I think almost everyone in the Province of Saskatchewan would agree that it has been proven and shown that the use of seat belts saves lives and prevents injuries, almost everyone. But whether or not it should be of a compulsory nature by the Government, there is a very divided opinion in our province.

I suggest two things. I suggest that because there has been in the past mention made of various jurisdictions in which percentages of use have been increased, such as in the Province of Ontario, the use of seat belts increased to 60 per cent of the population as a result of the introduction of compulsory seat belt legislation. Therefore we see that 40 per cent of the people of Ontario are disobeying the law.

I suggest to the Members opposite and to Members to my right, that if there was a period of time in which the issues could be presented directly to the people of Saskatchewan, I suggest to the Members opposite and to the Members to my right

May 6, 1977

that if there was this period of time in which the safety councils and those engineers who have proven beyond reasonable doubt, certainly in my judgment that the wearing of seat belts does save lives and does prevent injury. If they had an opportunity to present to the people of the province prior to a vote by the people of the province on this issue, I suggest to you that it may well be, that at the conclusion of such a period of time, the people of the Province of Saskatchewan will vote in favour of the compulsory wearing of seat belts. As a direct result of that instead of getting 40 per cent of the people of Saskatchewan breaking the law, we may get 90 per cent of the people of Saskatchewan wearing seat belts and a very small percentage breaking the law.

I suggest to you that if the people are convinced before the legislation rather than imposing it upon them and getting their backs up as it were, after the legislation is forced upon them, I suggest to the Members opposite that this would have a beneficial effect in terms of the use of seat belts in our province. Furthermore, if the people of the Province of Saskatchewan during this period of time decide against the Government of Saskatchewan imposing compulsory seat belt legislation, then I suggest to you that is our system. That is what the people of the province are entitled to. They are entitled to make their views known and to us as representatives no matter what our personal views may be on an issue of this kind. It is incumbent upon us to represent and reflect the views of the population of Saskatchewan and to find out during that period of time what the people of Saskatchewan really want. Do they want the Government to impose compulsory seat belts? If so, then I suggest to you they will co-operate more fully with the law, which is at best, extremely difficult to enforce after the implementation. They will co-operate with the law far better than any other jurisdiction in North America.

I suggest for the benefit of Members to my right that for many years the NDP suggested that the proposal by the previous Liberal administration for a plebiscite on a drug plan which was the policy of the Liberal Party of Saskatchewan for many, many years, too many years, which was never brought into effect. It was never brought before the people to allow them to vote on whether they wanted to have a drug plan. I suggest that during this next six month period, that all organizations including the Government of Saskatchewan who seem to be convinced of the benefits of compulsory seat belt legislation take it as a serious matter and go out and convince the people of these benefits, explain these benefits to the people. Not after they have had it forced upon them, but before the legislation.

There is one issue that came before the Canadian House of Commons, Mr. Speaker, of recent date, which was a very similar kind of issue, in which most people in our country had a very strong and emotional opinion. That was the issue of capital punishment. This issue . . . if you will let me finish perhaps I will get to that, this issue was very strong in the minds of the people of Canada. And in fact very strong in the minds of the people of Saskatchewan as well. No one could really tell exactly what the wishes of the people of Canada or the wishes of the people of Saskatchewan were in this area, but it became increasingly apparent to more and more of us who were involved in attempting to represent people, that more and more people were in favour of the reinstatement of capital punishment. Those individuals who went against that apparently very large majority to vote in favour of the abolition of capital punishment against the wishes of their constituents will pay the price, I believe, in the next federal election. Will pay the price — 16 out of

16 NDPs, the vast majority of Liberals, less than 20 per cent of the Conservatives. Those individuals who went against their constituents, I suggest, will pay the price because the people of this country are becoming increasingly fed up with autocratic, bureaucratic, centralized government. They want the opportunity to make input into government. The only possible way on an emotional issue such as the compulsory wearing of seat belts is to allow them the opportunity to vote on the issue.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to every Member of this Legislature, that he vote in favour of this amendment. I would suggest to every Member of this Legislature that he allow the people of Saskatchewan the opportunity to express their views before the legislation is enacted and to allow the safety councils and others which are concerned about the wearing of seat belts and concerned about the saving of lives the opportunity during this period of time before the plebiscite goes before the people and try to convince them to co-operate fully with the implementation of the law. If we do that, I believe we will in fact save far more lives than what we might do if we impose this law on the people of Saskatchewan before they are allowed to express their views.

**MR. M. J. KOSKIE:** (Quill Lakes) Mr. Speaker, I hope that the press, in fact, today take cognizance of what has been said by him who would seek out to be leader of this province. I hope that the press will take notice of what the Leader of the Conservative Party is saying here today. I think I am going to ignore him. I want to talk on the issue as was discussed in the House yesterday. It seems to me that to make a contribution to this debate I want to set the record straight, that every Member here has agreed that seat belts are useful, that seat belts save lives and every individual here who entered the debate said he agreed with seat belts.

I presume if all the Members have agreed to that, I presume that they will also agree that if we reduce injuries, if we reduce deaths overall to society, that means we will reduce the cost of insurance, the cost of hospitalization, we will reduce the time that is lost from work. So there is a basic economic gain for all of society.

Mr. Speaker, I could appreciate if the Opposition opposed seat belts on the basis that seat belts alone will not introduce highway safety. But, Mr. Speaker, they cannot use this argument because this Government is introducing a comprehensive safety package which includes many ingredients.

Seat belts are but one ingredient. Let's take a look at the package of Safety '77. An improved school safety program for children from kindergarten to Grade Twelve. A pilot project to test for an informal and educative kind of traffic court that is designed to change individual driving habits. A roadside breath testing for alcohol impairment will be phased in as police obtain the alert machines. Treatment facilities ranging from driving while intoxicated programs counselling to an inpatient rehabilitative care unit will be expanded to meet the extended increase of .08 convictions. Funds will be made available to municipalities to correct or prevent roadside safety hazards. An inspection program will begin operations to upgrade road worthiness of vehicles. Funds will be available to community groups for special projects. There will be separate inspection programs for all school buses and semi-trailers. Speed limits will be reduced during the process of

May 6, 1977

metric conversion. Finally seat belt legislation will be introduced.

This is a package that the Government is presenting to the people of Saskatchewan. Not in isolation seat belts, mandatory seat belts, but a concern for the lives of people, concern for the rising cost of insurance, a comprehensive package. The Opposition know that if they delete seat belts from our safety program that it will seriously detract from our overall comprehensive safety program. I say that their rejection of seat belt legislation is a rejection of our total program. That is what they are really working at. undermining the Safety '77 program. For without all the ingredients of our package, the program's effectiveness is in jeopardy.

You know, Mr. Speaker, whenever the Opposition cannot come up with any rational reason for opposing our programs, you know what they do? They come up with the catch-all reason. We oppose your legislation because it is going to reduce individual freedom they say. The history of Saskatchewan abounds with examples. They opposed medicare on the basis that it was intrusion on individual freedom, on individual relationship, they said. They were wrong. They opposed the introduction of Government Insurance because it was of a compulsory nature. Again they were proven wrong.

On this issue of mandatory seat belts they know they are wrong. But they in their desperate hope to gain some political marks are prepared to undermine this comprehensive program, Safety Package '77.

I want to say that I listened to the Member for Qu'Appelle, a fellow member of the legal fraternity. I have no more appreciation for his logic than the other Member for Saskatoon Sutherland. Now one Lane is as bad as the other. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that the Hon. Member for Qu'Appelle introduced some alternatives. Let's take a look at these alternatives. First he said that if anyone involved in an accident and is injured and is not wearing a seat belt, he said we should hold them partly responsible. In other words, if he doesn't wear his seat belt, he wasn't at fault in causing the accident and gets injured, then just because he wasn't wearing a seat belt, we should make him partly responsible. He suggests that we apply the principle of contributory negligence.

Let's analyse this suggestion, let's go down the lane of logic, and we will realize that the Member's suggestion is unadulterated nonsense. Let me give you an example. Let's suppose we put into practice his suggestion. Let's suppose a young man, with a wife and five children goes out and is driving without his seat belt on. Suppose he gets injured, or gets killed. There is his wife and five children to consider. They come to court and on his proposal, because he didn't wear a seat belt, the court cuts off a portion of the coverage. In other words, where they would ordinarily get \$100,000, under the proposal on contributing negligence, the court could reduce the amount to say \$50,000. Now, doesn't that make a lot of sense to a wife and five children? Who for instance is going to look after them, if that is all they are depending on? Utter nonsense.

I say the Member for Qu'Appelle had another argument just as illogical. He suggests that insurance rates should be adjusted. In other words, a reduced rate for those who wear seat belts, an increased rate for those who do not wear seat

belts. Now the only problem with that is that he didn't tell us how SGIO would determine the category in which to place the individual. Are you going to send out a questionnaire and ask them, "Do you wear seat belts, often, several times, many times or not at all?" Administratively it doesn't work, it's Tory rubbish!

Mr. Speaker, mandatory use of seat belts is an essential part of the Government's safety package. A key ingredient. We are not just moving on mandatory seat belts as I indicated. I think that the people of Saskatchewan will accept any minor inconvenience of strapping on a seat belt for the overall benefits gained individually and collectively for the people of Saskatchewan.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. A. N. McMILLAN:** (Kindersley) Mr. Speaker, I have a few brief comments to make, first and primarily as the representative of the people of the Kindersley constituency and secondly as a Member of the Liberal Party of Saskatchewan.

My comments first, I would like to place before the House as comments that the vast majority of the people of the Kindersley constituency have asked me to place before the Government with respect to mandatory seat belt legislation. Regardless of my personal views on the legislation, I have the responsibility to see that the feelings of those people are heard in this Legislature. Their overwhelming reaction to your proposal has been negative, for whatever reasons, you have then the responsibility in the first instance as a responsible parliamentary democracy to give serious consideration to their feelings. Many of those people are, I suggest, exceptionally afraid of having to strap themselves in their car, they are not convinced of the merits of wearing seat belts. They are pleased that government have made the provision of seat belts mandatory made them available for everyone. I tell you here and now that many, many of them are not prepared to wear them under any circumstances. The significant thing of course is that the vast majority of them don't want the legislation mandatory.

I have received petitions of over 50 names that were gathered in one half hour on just going down the main street in or of my towns on a Saturday afternoon by one of the local business people. The response has been immediate and it has been, what else can one say but overwhelming. On that basis alone, I will be opposing your legislation and I would hope that you would have second thoughts about it.

Secondly, and in many respects, just as important, I suppose are my personal feelings on the issue. I think you people in the so-called democracy that we live in are making a serious mistake. Aside from that you're displaying tremendous inconsistency in your approach towards legislation affecting people. I'll give you the one specific example. Your argument, and your only argument for the merits of having mandatory seat belt legislation has been that the cost to the taxpayer is a burden on all of us. I won't argue with that. I suspect that any increased costs as a result of people not wearing seat belts is a cost to the taxpayer and is unquestionably to some degree going to be a burden. That may be the we have to pay for our freedom, and it is no question it is a burden.



Your Members have risen on many occasions and given us impassioned pleas to bring this in because of the hardship that people not wearing seat belts bring on the people of Saskatchewan. I would like to point out the inconsistency in your argument, with one example. That is the field of alcohol and its use in Saskatchewan. The comparisons are remarkably equivalent. Alcohol and the consumption of alcohol by people in Saskatchewan is a freedom which people in this province enjoy, it's one which was taken away from them many years ago and re-instituted shortly thereafter, because it was unworkable. That fear many people have with your seat belt legislation.

There is far, far, far more reason for you people, based on the argument that you have given us with regard to seat belts for you to bring in prohibition than there is to go ahead with mandatory seat belt legislation. Turn to your Minister of Health and ask him what the cost is to the people of Saskatchewan because of alcohol abuse and alcohol related problems. You talk about seat belts reducing some of the carnage from traffic accidents, try eliminating alcohol from traffic accidents. Take that factor out and see what happens to your accident rate, to your hospital bills, to your insurance bills and to the amount of personal suffering that is a result of car accidents. Eliminate that one fact, that freedom that people of Saskatchewan have. You won't do it.

Turn to the Minister of Health and ask him about the hospitals in Saskatchewan and what percentage of their cost, the cost of operating our medical scheme as a result of alcoholism, alcohol related diseases or accidents related to alcoholism. Ask the Minister what percentage, he has a pretty good idea. The percentage is so significant in comparison with the costs as a result of people not wearing seat belts as to make your argument a joke.

Ask your Minister of Industry and Commerce or your Minister of Labour about the costs to this province through business loss, the industrial alcohol problem. Talk to your other Ministers, the number of man-days lost in Saskatchewan, negative contributions to our production as a result of alcoholism or alcohol related diseases or injuries. Ask them. The cost in that field alone is tremendous compared to your suggested costs as a result of people not wearing seat belts. That argument that you have given us, and the only argument that smacks of any reality is minuscule compared to the argument that could be made for prohibition in Saskatchewan.

Yet, what is your Government's reaction? An awful long fight we had in this Legislature and Members of this Legislature who were in favour of raising the drinking age, a tremendous battle they had to bring an increase in the drinking age. Members of your own Government stood and defied your front benchers on that vote, you couldn't hold your own people on that vote. They felt that strongly about it. Yet here you are quickly and casually introducing mandatory seat belt legislation restricting a freedom that the public doesn't want to give up to save what, your estimated failures of \$75 million. One could only expect that if you are to be consistent in your approach towards social legislation, or legislation dealing immediately with people's freedoms, one would only expect you to be back perhaps in the fall session with a piece of legislation to prohibit the use of alcohol in Saskatchewan. There, you can make your flowing debates on that, put your Minister of Health on his feet to tell the people of Saskatchewan, if in

fact we lose \$75 million as a result of people's abuse of alcohol. Maybe \$175 million, maybe \$200 million a year in health costs, related costs alone. Maybe 15 to 20 per cent of our hospital costs.

Talk to the Minister of Industry and Commerce about the loss of revenue to this province through industrial alcoholism and alcohol related problems, go talk to industry about it. There's your argument. If you have a leg to stand on this issue, then you are negligent in not bringing in the prohibition issue, the two arguments are identical, the two situations the same. A personal freedom you are eliminating from people. You are effectively saying to the people of Saskatchewan that they don't know what is good for them, and you are going to pass legislation in their best interests. If that's the case, and you are to be consistent as a government, I expect to see you back here in the not too distant future with prohibition legislation.

**MR. NELSON:** (Yorkton) Childish!

**MR. McMILLAN:** Childish argument the Member says. How childish an argument is it to stand up in front of the people of Saskatchewan and say, you people are too childish to know what is good for you. You are too immature, you are too unintelligent, you are too uneducated, you are too ignorant. That's what you are saying to the people of Saskatchewan. People who brought the prohibition legislation in found that out in an awful hurry.

People in this province are paying for the price of their freedom, the right not to wear seat belts. They pay for that dearly. You don't pay for it any more than anyone else in Saskatchewan does. The Member keeps making reference, and I have heard this argument from Members over here, what about life vests in boats. While the Government has made it mandatory for people to carry lifejackets in boats in Saskatchewan, but it is not mandatory to wear them. Anyone that thinks otherwise I suggest is mistaken.

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** Yes, it is.

**MR. McMILLAN:** I have yet to see one instance under any circumstances where any prosecutions or charges have been laid for not wearing a lifejacket in a boat in Saskatchewan. I would be interested in seeing if the Minister could prove to me otherwise.

I say your arguments are inconsistent, your only argument is inconsistent. You people are scared to go to the people of Saskatchewan and say to them in an overt way that they are too unintelligent to know what is good for them. That's your argument here. You are too scared to do that. So what do you go on the other hand, you go with an inconsistent argument, about the cost, the burden to the people of Saskatchewan. You picked the wrong issue to go to them on that one, your Minister of Health knows that. Why he is convinced that you can sell this argument to them in a reasonable and acceptable way, I don't know. Perhaps you accept the precedent that you feel has been set in other provinces. I am convinced that the only proper approach that we can take in a society that respects individual freedoms is an educational approach.

May 6, 1977

The arguments have been made that well, that's no good, people don't listen, they can't be educated. Again you insult the public of Saskatchewan. I suggest to you, you have a responsibility as a government to point out to people that there are potential dangers and problems and costs related to not wearing seat belts. Bring in an education program, point out to people what the alternatives are and what the benefits are, and let them make up their own minds. If they choose not to eliminate their freedom and their neighbour's freedom, then they are choosing to pay the cost of that freedom, they have done that willingly or otherwise over the past few years and I suggest they will continue to do so.

I say your arguments in favour of mandatory seat belt legislation are at best inconsistent and can't be considered a merit as far as bringing it in in that light. I stand here on behalf of the people of Kindersley constituency to tell you to reconsider and I say, personally, your approach is wrong, your legislation is wrong and should be withdrawn.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

### **WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**MR. R. KATZMAN:** (Rosthern) Mr. Speaker, may I beg leave to introduce a group of students.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to introduce to you and the rest of the Members of the Assembly a group of Grade Eleven and Grade Twelve students from Waldheim High School, they are with their principal Mr. Lobe, Mr. Epp, and their bus driver, Mr. Stark and their chaperone, Mrs. Epp. I'll be meeting with them later in the rotunda. I hope you have had a good day and enjoy your visit.

**HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

The Assembly resumed the interrupted debate on Bill No. 104.

**MR. R. N. NELSON:** (Yorkton) Mr. Speaker, I am continually struck with the hypocrisy of the two parties opposite, continually struck with their hypocrisy. In Quebec a Liberal Government brought in seat belt legislation, here in Saskatchewan the Liberals defend freedom that was denied by a Liberal Party in Quebec. Hypocrisy, Mr. Speaker!

In the Province of Ontario, the Conservatives brought in a seat belt law that denied the people the freedom. Did they hold a plebiscite? No, they did not. But the hypocritical Conservatives of Saskatchewan, what do they do? They demand a plebiscite. A denial of the freedom of the people of Saskatchewan, they say.

They talk in terms of laws that are not kept. For this is the reason they say we should remove a law. Should we remove the law on heroin? Should we remove the law that prohibits LSD? Should we hold a plebiscite on LSD? Should we hold a plebiscite on marijuana Mr. Speaker?

The Member for Kindersley talks about whether or not the people of Saskatchewan are unintelligent. He too then, would I suppose, ask us to remove the law that prohibits LSD. Is

that what he is asking? I say that that is what he must be saying, that's what they are all saying. The Member for Kindersley talks in childish terms of prohibition, when he knows that it won't work. But doesn't he know that there are steps that are being taken? The Member for the Quill Lakes read a few of the things that are being done, positive steps in Safety '77. I would like to read them to him again.

A pilot project to test is an informal kind of educative traffic court designed to change individual's driving habits, a roadside testing program for alcohol impairment, treatment facilities, ranging from driving while intoxicated programs, counselling and in-patient rehabilitative care that will be expanded to meet the expected increase of .08 convictions. These are components of Safety '77. Fine, but why worry about a prohibition law that can't be enforced. Mr. Speaker, two years down the road, I am going to be very pleased to read back to some of these gentlemen across the way, the speeches that they have just made. I will be very pleased to read the lists of names of those who voted against protection of the people of this province.

They talk in terms of freedoms from seat belts, and yet the Liberal Government of Saskatchewan brought in legislation in regard to hard hats for motorcycles, as has been mentioned before. I would like to quote to you a few lines of some of the people who have spoken to me on a door to door survey that I have taken. "Freedom," said one Lady, "is bunk where society has to pay for that freedom." "Freedom is bunk" said the lady, "where the rest of society has to pay for that freedom".

More and more people, Mr. Speaker, are coming to agree with that stand. More and more people are saying to me today, "I wear my seat belt, why should I pay for the fellow who refused to wear his when he is in an accident?" People are saying to me, Mr. Speaker, "Put the law, that way I will wear it." People are saying to me, "Put the law in, because without that law, I will not break the habit of not wearing my seat belt." I've been told it and I can give you the names of the people.

I can take you to a place in Yorkton where a lady who came from Australia nailed us for not making seat belts mandatory for children, because they have that law in Australia. I said to her, "Look, it is not possible, you have a small chap sitting in the back seat looking at the back seat all day." She said, "Look, from the time our child could sit up we put them on. Secondly, she said, now that they are older they simply raise their arms and wait to be buckled in. You are doing harm, doing harm to the children of Saskatchewan by not making it mandatory for children to wear their seat belts." If these Members opposite, Mr. Speaker, believed in the high principles that they are now talking about they would attack us for not going far enough with the law. Instead they attempt to create a situation where people will disobey the law by attacking us for bringing it in instead of going along with the law as was done in Ontario. I say, Mr. Speaker, that they are showing to the people of Saskatchewan the utmost in irresponsibility.

Their principles, Mr. Speaker, amount to winning elections at any price, even at the price of fifty to one hundred lives per year and thousands of crippling injuries. Mr. Speaker, I heartily approve of this law and shall be voting for the whole Safety '77 package.

May 6, 1977

**MR. E. C. WHELAN:** (Minister of Consumer Affairs) Mr. Speaker, two traffic safety committees carefully studied counter measures to avoid deaths or to curtail deaths on the highways. These committees met continuously, first under the guidance of the Liberal Government of the day. I was a Member of that committee, then under the Government of Allan Blakeney.

I want to read to Members of this House the all member decision of that committee, by both parties. I just want to read a couple of paragraphs so that you will know exactly what the committee thought about.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** Who chaired that Committee?

**MR. WHELAN:** Arthur Thibault. It's under the heading, seat belts, and I recommend it as good reading for all Members of the Opposition. I quote:

Although the evidence before the Committee incontrovertibly demonstrates the effectiveness of wearing seat belts in reducing death and injury to the occupants of motor vehicles involved in accidents, and although it is impossible to determine precisely the magnitude of this reduction it has been reliably shown that the expected reduction in deaths and injuries would be in the order of 30 per cent.

In Saskatchewan in 1973, 75 of those killed would have survived and 2,300 of those injured would have escaped unharmed. In addition the severity of the injuries received would have been reduced in similar proportions.

Paragraph 20, number 7 is one that, I think, all Members of the House should take note of:

The Committee believes that the wearing of seat belts even in the absence of any other counter measures taken to combat the traffic safety problem can have the greatest single impact on securing reduction in death and injury. No other counter measure possesses this great potential in minimizing the losses suffered in motor vehicle accidents than many vigorous and extensive campaigns of public awareness of public education undertaken in this province and in several other jurisdictions throughout the world have proven that although education may influence and change attitudes towards seat belts it does not effect changes in behaviour. Most people still do not wear their seat belts.

I could go on and give you details of the other conclusions of the Committee.

Members on the other side of the House suggested that we call the people of the Department of Industry and Commerce, none of them suggested that we call the organized consumers to give evidence. The Hon. Member for Yorkton just pointed out that the consumers are not satisfied with this legislation, they think there should be seat belts in the back seat of the car and they should be compulsory, and they should be buckled.

They indicate that when we say that children under five shouldn't wear seat belts that this is not safety and should apply to all children. Right from the time they are born they should be wearing some sort of seat belts, the CAC says.

**MR. MOSTOWAY:** Did they come out with a minority report?

**MR. WHELAN:** Yes they did, but I want to point out that the best Members of this committee, and look at the people that were on it, Gordon Grant and Dave Boldt, who was on the committee believed that if something was right and he knew the facts he made an independent decision.

This legislation before us will require leadership and courage. A negative vote will say loud and clear when the evidence is in that the Members opposite voted for more death and more injuries on the highway. That is what it will add up to.

It also says something else, it says loud and clear to me that all of the Liberals and Conservatives are advocating that no one should get on a airline. That no one should ride an airline any more because after all it is compulsory if you get on a airline you have to wear a seat belt. No more air travel, they are going to be driving automobiles or walking from now on.

Seat belts save lives. I recall vividly the Federal Department of Transport hiring some very bright young engineers who did careful analysis of every accident that took place in a certain radius around the city of Saskatoon. They arrived on the scene took pictures of the victim or the injured operator or the person who was in the automobile sometimes before the police arrived on the scene of the accident. I recall vividly the pictures that were taken of the windshield and then the face of the injured victim. The quiet evidence that came to the committee in 80 or 90 slides that were exhibited proved to the committee that, (1) if you didn't have a seat belt you left a large bulge in the modern type windshield. (2) If you were going at a certain speed generally the face of the victim has had two cuts in the eyebrows, a broken nose and most of the teeth missing and a slit in the chin.

There is also one other thing about seat belts. If you have a seat belt, if you are wearing a seat belt and are the driver of a vehicle you have a better chance of controlling the vehicle if it leaves the road. If you don't have a seat belt and you are thrown from the driver's seat you have no control whatsoever over the vehicle. I remember one witness appearing before the Traffic Safety Committee and telling us very carefully what happened when a large bus was crossing the Golden Gate Bridge in the state of California. A truck ahead of the bus was carrying some large timbers, they were about five or six feet in length and they were eight by eight timbers. One of them fell off and caught the left wheel of the bus. The driver was sitting behind the wheel but he was not strapped in. When the timber caught the wheel of the bus, the steering wheel whipped around, threw him out of the seat, the bus plunged over the railing into the water and all passengers including the bus driver lost their lives. They were drowned in the water. Of course in the State of California you now have to have a seat belt and you have to be strapped in if you are driving a bus. But I think it proves a point beyond a shadow of a doubt that

there is a value, not only from the point of view of saving your body from being thrown into the windshield but also keeps the driver behind the wheel of the vehicle.

The two committees that sat did so I think without any prejudice, without any bias, objectively. They were trying to save lives when they wrote their recommendations. They saw films, they looked at the records in British Columbia, they looked at the records that were being developed in other areas where seat belts had been introduced. You can only come to one conclusion that this may be tough legislation but you have to have courage and you have to give leadership if you are going to save lives and prevent injuries in traffic accidents. That is what this legislation does, that is the conclusion that the Committee came to. I am sorry that the Members opposite are not going to support it because there is a real need. It is not only on behalf of our neighbours and people in this province who are going to be injured, you yourself may be in an automobile when one of your friends, if not wearing his seat belt may suffer serious injury as a result. I am certainly going to support the legislation.

I think it represents a key part of the Traffic Safety '77 Program but also represents a lot of work, a lot of thought and a tremendous effort by two traffic safety committees that sat in this Province and did so with courage, with conviction and with the best interests of the people of this province at heart.

**MR. G. H. PENNER:** (Saskatoon Eastview) Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I may be permitted to make a few remarks with regard to the Bill. The Minister who just took his seat . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** I recognize the Member for Saskatoon Nutana.

**HON. W. A. ROBBINS:** (Minister of Health) I should just like to make a few brief remarks with respect to this Bill. I certainly support the legislation. The argument that compulsory seat belts somehow destroy the freedom of the individual to me is a very fatuous argument. I ask the Members opposite why they don't drive their cars on the opposite side of the road. Obviously you would have to have rules. Those rules have to be applied in a rational and reasonable way. I note that they argue that we should have an education program, actually this province has been engaged in an educational program with respect to the utilization of seat belts for about 25 years, from 1952 on yet the utilization of seat belts is in the range of 14 or 15 per cent on average. Ontario where a Conservative Government introduced mandatory seat belt legislation, within a year got an average utilization of about 68 per cent. I know that there are some fears in the minds of certain people who argue that if they are trapped in a car that catches fire or if they go into water they will suffer drowning but if you look at the accident record in Saskatchewan with 286 people killed in 1975 in automobile accidents, less than one per cent were in that category; less than three persons, and it is obvious that if one is tossed about inside an automobile you are probably unconscious by the time the automobile catches on fire if you are not wearing your seat belt and you are in serious trouble. In every jurisdiction

in the world where compulsory seat belt or mandatory seat belt legislation has come into effect they have had a dramatic decrease in the number of injuries and deaths on the highways. I would like to conclude by just citing one example.

We have an example in the Province of Saskatchewan and obviously, I can't name the individual. We know that not using the seat belt has cost this province to date at least \$3 million. That individual was a young person, who did not wear a seat belt and was involved in a serious car accident. He went through the windshield, suffered very severe brain damage, was confined to the hospital in North Battleford and set the place on fire, incidentally he set five fires in that hospital. That person has now to be confined in a forensic unit and is costing us \$2,438 dollars a month because he must have constant supervision. He is 27 years old. If he lives the average life span of a man in Saskatchewan which is 70.36 years he will cost us another \$1.5 million. I think the evidence is clearly that although it might cause some assumed infringement of freedom; it is necessary that this seat belt legislation be carried.

**MR. PENNER:** Mr. Speaker, just a few remarks to the question. I think all of us are aware, most of us have seen the slides that the Member spoke about just a few moments ago showing the dramatic effect of people thrown about in an automobile or thrown out of an automobile if they don't have seat belts on.

The question is not whether or not people ought to wear seat belts. Anybody with an ounce of sense realizes this, that the statistics are overwhelming in support of the fact that seat belts save lives and reduce injuries and that just clearly is not the question. The question is do you need to pass a law in order to achieve the objective and the objective is to get people to wear seat belts and our position is, No, you do not.

The Minister of Health said that there has been a Safety Program going on since 1952 with regard to seat belts. That has been a pretty lousy campaign if it has been going on since 1952 because there were a very large percentage of cars in 1952 that didn't even have seat belts. To suggest that that is a reason why we ought to now pass a law doesn't make any sense at all. He knows as well as I do that any kind of intensive program with regard to educating people about the value of seat belts has been very recent, any intensive program. And people are beginning to catch on to that. They are beginning to realize, driver training programs are in high schools, and some of these students up here in the gallery have been involved in driver training programs where from the moment you get into their automobiles they strap themselves in, and that is a good way to go about it because hopefully they will be a group of drivers who will feel naked in an automobile if they haven't got their seat belts on.

You see that the point is that there are a number of people in Saskatchewan who are opposed in principle to the concept of legislating that and it is going to harm the Government's and indeed this Legislature's chances of achieving the objective because they are going to be turned off because a law was passed. It is going to divert the issue from wearing seat belts to people annoyed that a Government



went and passed a law. That a Government hasn't got enough . . .

**MR. KOSKIE:** Freedom in Ontario.

**MR. PENNER:** The Member talks about Ontario. The Member very carefully neglected to mention that the decrease in deaths in Ontario was not what the people in the departments told the Legislature in Ontario that it would be, nor did he mention the fact, that in Ontario there was a reduction in speed limits, and there is very little indication of the extent to which the reduction in injuries was related to the reduction in the speed limit not just because of the compulsory seat belts legislation. And the Member also conveniently forgot to mention that a large percentage of the people in Ontario aren't wearing them despite the fact that there is a law. And so you get a feeling of contempt for the law and it is our view that the law ought not to be put in that situation.

I should like to hear the Minister of Highways' views on this thing. I should like to hear the Minister of Highways' (Mr. Kramer) view with regard to seat belts as opposed to reducing the speed limit. Let's talk about the effect of reducing the speed limit in the United States, the positive effects that has had on carnage on the highways. Let's do everything that we can possibly do in an educational program and recognize that it is going to take some time to make certain that people understand the risks that they take when they do not wear seat belts.

**MR. J. WIEBE:** Mr. Speaker, just some very, very brief comments in regard to this particular legislation. The comments are brought about by some of the comments made by the Minister of Health. There is no doubt in the minds I think of everyone sitting in this Chamber that seat belt wearing is the proper and the best thing to do. But the problem goes back to should we legislate compulsory use of seat belts, or should we begin a much more intensified program of educating the people to the value of seat belts prior to making it mandatory for them to wear it? And the reason why I say this, you will find and I am sure the Government has found by surveys and representations which they have received from people living in our major cities, that the majority of these people are in favour of the compulsory aspects of seat belts because they know through the advertising campaigns that have been conducted, that there is value to fastening up your seat belt.

You go out into your rural areas, where because of the type of work people do in the rural areas, they are not as susceptible to the television media as those living in the city are, and here is where you have the major objection to the compulsory wearing of seat belt legislation. And why are they opposed to it? The Minister of Health mentioned, I believe that reason that they are afraid of what would happen to them in case they were in an accident and their car caught fire, or they happened to end up in a body of water. Certainly, these statistics show that this amounts to a very, very small portion, a very, very small portion of the total accidents in the province. But the people are not aware of those figures. The people are not aware of the odds or the chances they are going to have to be involved in that particular kind of accident. But they still have the fear in the back of their minds that this could happen. And any time you legislate a law that will instil fear in the minds of

the people by obeying that law, in my mind, Mr. Speaker, it is a bad law and it should not be introduced.

I am sure if the Government undertook a proper advertising campaign to ensure to the people in Saskatchewan, what the figures are in terms of death by fire in a vehicle or death by water in a vehicle or the advantages of seat belts, you would soon have, I believe, the majority of the people in this province convinced of the fact that seat belt wearing is a good thing. People have no fear of wearing seat belts when they enter an airplane because they are convinced in their own mind that they are safer by doing it. They have to, yes, they have to, but they don't object to it, Mr. Minister, because they know in their minds and as far as their personal life is concerned, they are better off by travelling with a seat belt around them in an airplane, but they are not convinced of that in a car. This is exactly why I say any law that legislates or instils fear in the individual by obeying that law is a bad law and it should not be passed, and that with other reasons, Mr. Speaker, is the reason why I am not supporting this particular legislation.

**HON. E. KRAMER:** (Minister of Highways and Transportation) Mr. Speaker, I was surprised when I listened to the speeches yesterday. I was surprised, startled, disappointed and in some cases looking across there, somewhat disgusted and angry. I see the official Opposition being led around by the nose because of the Tory strategy. There was a time when that caucus over there, I am sure last fall, was prepared to support the legislation in the interest of human lives, and in the interest of safety and for the good of the total community. When political opportunism raised its ugly head over there, when the Tory Opposition indicated they were going to vote for further carnage on the highways, and in the cities, these people huddled into a corner, and decided they too had better appeal to ignorance and fear and that fabulous, that mythical thing called individual liberty and freedom. This is always the cry of Neanderthal man crouching in his cave and crying I won't go out because it's better here. That's the attitude of Liberals and Tories and it has always been the attitude.

Go back, these people admit today that medicare is good. Go back even further, you see I've been in this Legislature for 25 years and I have never seen this kind of a cowardly performance where human lives are at stake. I've never seen this before, that's why I stand here with some disgust. I stand here angry because when I see people who are school teachers, they are now school inspectors, who should have an affinity and should have an empathy with children and human life. I don't worry too much about the lawyers or the rednecks. I don't worry about them because they argue quite often for argument's sake, and will make any kind of an argument, they are trained to defend even the worst criminal and try to save his life even though he should be hanged. But the teachers, I am disappointed, that they say more education is needed. Mr. Speaker, we should be educating more, certainly that is an argument, but you can only do this for so long.

What are the figures? Take a look; we have been educating. I agree with the Member that said that it couldn't have been a very good program. Since 1952 we have been encouraging people to wear seat belts. In the last two years the Federal Government and the Provincial Government have co-operated in a program to try to convince people that they should voluntarily

May 6, 1977

wear them and it has had some results. It has had some appreciable results. We went from eight per cent of the people who were users because they have good common sense. I had a deputy minister back in 1962, Wilf Churchman, who never would get into a car even to go a block without having his seat belt on. I developed the habit then and then I kind of fell by the wayside. Four years ago I started wearing it, I can't get into my car without buckling my seat belt now, but that is beside the point.

Let's see what has happened, let's take a look at what happened with the education program which has been a good one, paid for by the Federal Government through the federal Department of Health, the Hon. Marc Lalonde and the various provincial governments co-operating right across Canada.

Three years ago our death rate on highways and streets and urban roads, was 315. It went down to 286 the year afterwards and this may not be a completely valid statistic, no statistics are. Last year down to 261 or 265. This is our final figure. I say that some of that was the impact of the education program because seat belt use went up, Mr. Speaker, from eight per cent use to 22 or 25 per cent in some instances. You could take an average of urban and rural of about 15 or 16 per cent. Lives have been saved. We started a seat belt survivors' club last December. I signed the 83rd certificate yesterday. In order to become a seat belt survivor and qualify you must have survived an accident while wearing seat belts. The evidence that has been brought forward in most of these letters, some of them are not too impressive, but most of the letters, at least 75 per cent, indicate that these people have had the shock of their lives when they discovered how much the seat belt helped. I can't for the life of me understand why people will play politics for their immediate political advantage. There will be some strong objectors. I know of people who have told me, no way, if you push that law, no way will I ever vote for you again, people who have voted for us in the past. They've told me this. I accept that, and I said okay, if that's the way you feel and are prepared to throw everything else aside just for that little emotional idiosyncrasy that you happen to have within you, then so be it.

Sometimes you have to take your courage in your hands and do what is best when you know lives can be saved and I say to those few people who sit opposite, I hope, I hope that during the next year that the speeches they have made and that will be recorded and will be put out over the air, speeches that say this is an impossible law to enforce, do not provide the incentive for some young person to go out and blithely flaunt the law, that's what you are doing. Never has there been a time when there should be unanimity as there was in Ontario, as there was in British Columbia. Never before in the interest of saving human lives. To those people who say you should be doing this, you should be doing that, that kind of idle prattle about prohibition from the Member for Kindersley is ridiculous. They choose to ignore the evidence that was brought forward by the legislative committee the other day. Again, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Regina South got up and pontificated on human liberty, human dignity, about us not trusting people. Mr. Speaker, I am saying that they are playing with words, for cheap immediate political advantage.

I'll take the long view as we did in 1948 when we brought in hospitalization. As we did in 1948 when we brought in compulsory automobile insurance, yes, accepted now through most of Canada, in the progressive parts of Canada and envied in other

provinces. The start was made here and it was compulsory legislation, Mr. Speaker, because it was for the good of all of us. The Neanderthals again opposed those measures. It doesn't matter whether they were Liberals or Tories, it's the same philosophy. You might as well lump them all into a bucket and why don't you get into the same party because that's where you belong.

Mr. Speaker, I am saying to these people who ignore the facts, even that Liberal Opposition, when they were in power, passed legislation that it be compulsory for people to wear helmets when they are on motor bikes. Mr. Cameron ignored that; the Member ignored that challenge yesterday from this side, others have ignored it. Passed by a Liberal Government, infringing on the freedom of every motorcyclist according to them. He chose to say we protect children with the hockey helmets, but he did not justify their inconsistency. Mr. Chairman, the fact is that there are rules regarding motor bikes, and that law was passed by the Liberal Government in the late '60s. Similarly laws concerning life jackets, saying no one has ever been fined for not having their life jackets on when in a boat; that's not true. Charges have been laid and fines have been paid, but they ignore the things they choose to ignore across the way and choose to play with human lives for political advantage. This is forever the argument of the reactionary, the irresponsible, the person who will choose any argument in order to gain some immediate cheap political advantage, and I say shame on them, shame on them.

Evidence comes from all over the civilized world that this legislation will save lives. The Minister of Health brought forward evidence about just one case where if a seat belt had been worn that instead of this young man being a drag on society, he probably could have been contributing to society rather than as a cost to society. Those people who exercised their freedom in not wearing their seat belts, the 80 paraplegics that we have as a result of accidents, are going to cost an average of \$200,000 to \$250,000 for the rest of their lives. That burden is on us. It was their privilege, but it becomes our social responsibility. It is the social responsibility of the people across the way to change their minds and support something that is for the common weal.

Mr. Speaker, there was some more idle talk across the way about speed limits in Ontario. Yes, there was a reduction of speed limits in Ontario and we know from the people who have studied that argument, what the impact is. It is about fifteen to one in the actual saving of lives, speed limits as opposed to seat belts. We will be reducing the speed limits along with this Bill as well.

**MR. WIEBE:** Two and one half miles.

**MR. KRAMER:** All right, two and one half miles per hour, but let me tell you where the impact is and let me tell you people what the impact of speed limits are as opposed to seat belts. If we could persuade 100 per cent of the people to buckle up tomorrow, there would be 100 lives saved because seat belts cover 100 per cent of the people who are driving cars whether it be urban, rural or on the highways. Twenty-five per cent of the accidents occur on our highways, that leaves a 75 per cent rate where the speed limits are already under 50 miles an hour, or 50 miles an hour or under in rural and urban areas in Saskatchewan and that's where 75 per cent of the accidents occur, don't forget that.

**MR. BAILEY:** What about the deaths?

**MR. KRAMER:** Deaths are somewhat higher on the highways because of the speed, that's true, but I'm talking about the incidence of accidents, Mr. Speaker, as they occur statistically in Saskatchewan, and there are a number of deaths, don't fool yourself that they don't occur at 25 and 30 and 35 miles an hour because some people are ignoring the speed laws. The laws that can't be enforced some say. Well all right under speed laws we statistically are catching one in every 7,000 speeders now, but we don't withdraw the law because of that. In fact, they are saying we should even reduce the speed limits. I say we should be enforcing, and I say to the Attorney General and the law enforcement people here and in the rest of the country, that we should be enforcing the laws we have now, but if we double the police force, that's an expensive procedure, Mr. Speaker, we would probably catch two in 7,000, rather than one.

The whole thrust of Safety '77 is to try to persuade people to accept their social responsibility as citizens and in that we have failed miserably until now, at all levels of government. Most of all we have failed as parents, most of all as teachers, because, we have continually catered, more than catered, to the status quo. We have idolized speed, violence and everything else that goes with it, even to the extent of putting a 'tiger' in your tank. So you buy a Cougar, and go and put a tiger in your tank; so when a 16 year old goes and gets his first licence, you wonder why he goes out and kills himself, probably after he's through watching Starsky and Hutch do impossible things on television.

We create a psychology in our children, in front of that idiot box and the advertising, Mr. Speaker, everything is directed at violence and speed and the impossible. This is where the main problem lies. Safety '77 is trying to counteract this. This is why I would have liked to have had total support. Not cross fire politically. We should have a total effort on the part of all political parties as citizens and human beings with the best interests of everyone in mind. We can't afford to wait. The Opposition said that we should continue to wait and educate and persuade. Well the Minister of Consumer Affairs (Mr. Whelan) indicated what happens. The study made by the joint committee indicated what happened when people are left to their own devices.

The funny thing about people is that the average human being needs a little nudge. One of the best arguments that was put forward, was by the Member for Morse just a few minutes ago, when he was talking about airplanes. He said, everybody knows they have to wear belts. I wonder how many people would buckle up on that aircraft if the little stewardess didn't come along and say, "Your seat belt's not fastened, Sir, you put it on." Nobody argues and they do what they are told.

Well, apparently that was offered as an argument as to why we shouldn't proceed with nudging people. There are a number of things about the regulations that will probably have to be adjusted. I believe what the Member for Morse, Mr. Wiebe says, that rural people are not too anxious to co-operate and have fears and worries. I think farmers when they are in and out of their trucks during harvest, going down farm back roads could well be exempted, unless they are on a market road or farm market road or a highway where the traffic is heavier.

Certainly I believe that elderly people could be exempted if they are obese, crippled, arthritic or whatever and can already get a doctor's certificate, not requiring them to wear seat belts. There will be other exceptions. I agree with the Minister of Health who says we should be moving with seat belts for all adults and seat belts for all children. That would be best and I wish, I just wish that some of you people who shrug, could have been at the first meeting of the seat belt survivors club. We brought the first eight club members in and presented them with certificates. There was a young couple, in fact, the Member for Rosetown probably knows them. He is the administrator of the hospital in Rosetown.

**MR. BAILEY:** I'll be right back.

**MR. KRAMER:** Well, I can't wait for you, I'm sorry. The administrator and his wife and their infant child, eight months old, were in an accident last fall, fortunately their child was in one of those so called impossible seats in the back seat safely strapped in. They hit a patch of ice, rolled the car two and a half times, a total wreck. The mother and the father stepped out of the car, got the child out, the child didn't even waken. No injuries and they stepped out of a total wreck. Now this young man stood up with tears in his eyes when he spoke, accepting his certificate, he said unfortunately a friend of mine didn't have the same happy experience. He and his wife got into a collision. She was holding the baby in her arms, the worst possible place in the front seat, and the child was crushed and killed. Crushed against the dash and killed. This young man wept because this was a personal friend of his, when he was giving his speech in accepting his seat belt survivor's certificate.

I say that human lives are too important to play politics with, Mr. Speaker.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. KRAMER:** I say that sometimes you have to take your courage in your hands and I ask Members opposite, regardless of what they have made up their mind to do, not to go out and take protest petitions up, saying, you're against seat belts and just sign here please. Why don't you please, go out and carry the message of safety, not only for seat belts, because they are only the tip of the iceberg, they will never prevent accidents, but they will reduce the injury. The costs and everything else are secondary, it's the saving of a life that's important. I don't care about the money. I care about the people. I care about the children. I care very much about the questionable examples that are set by speeches made across the floor, when you could be giving some leadership, because everyone whom you persuade that this law is wrong is exposing himself and herself and their families and their friends to further accidents. I say that this attitude is wrong and I say that Members opposite are wrong, Mr. Speaker, and that is why I have made up my mind that I am for this four square and that is why I am going to be supporting this legislation. Not only supporting it, but going out into the country, during Safety '77 next year as I have been doing in the last year. When people are spoken to and persuaded, they agree with you. They say, yes, it's time to act, not only with seat belts but with all the rest of the things I've been talking about in Safety '77 regarding our social responsibility. This would take too long, take up too much of the time of this House.

May 6, 1977

It seems so ridiculous to me. Arthur Thibault and Professor Shields attended the conference in Melbourne, Australia in February. The Medical Association of Britain presented evidence there. I think I sent that across the floor but apparently it was of no avail.

The medical men of Britain have been keeping a score on accidents and deaths in automobile accidents, those who wore seat belts, those who did not. There were 83 per cent less head injuries among those who had their seat belts in place, 83 per cent less, Mr. Speaker. Still Members opposite say that we should not be taking firm action, that we should continue to persuade people. We have evidence that was taken during the Regina exhibition where we have a cross section of all people attending that exhibition last fall. They were polled re seat belt use. These were 1,700 people attending the fall exhibitions in Saskatoon and Regina, November 1, 1976. The largest group reached through a sample were male farmers, 21 to 41 years of age. Strong support, 41 per cent; moderate support, 22 per cent, 22.6; no opinion, 11.6; moderate opposition, 10.6; strong opposition, 9.5. When asked, Mr. Speaker, and this is the important question, when asked whether they would comply with compulsory seat belt law, 1,684 respondents, people attending the exhibition said they would comply with compulsory seat belt law, all the time, 51 per cent; most of the time, 28 per cent; some of the time, 10.7 per cent; seldom, 6 per cent; never, 3.2. I thought there were more Tories around the province than that, but I guess they apparently have more sense than their leaders.

Comparison with the 1975 results shows a marked increase favourably towards seat belt legislation and recognition of seat belt use as an important safety measure. At this point it appears there is approximately nine per cent of the population who will actively oppose seat belt legislation. The pros on this one survey were 60.4 that were for and about nine per cent against. I believe that that would vary from one part of the country to the other.

I'm not as optimistic. But I say, that in the first year there will be some flak as there has been. I was in British Columbia just last week and I kept my ear to the ground. Well, maybe it's less odious when it's brought in by a group of Social Credit, Liberals and Conservatives who are running the Government there. But in the shopping centres and various places, I asked the odd question about seat belts, walked around the parking lots, and I asked what people were doing about seat belts. Oh, it makes sense; well we don't like it, but it's the law; those kinds of answers. I didn't hear any violent grumbling in BC. When you have evidence, such as the Ontario experience, in spite of the fact that the people across the way are saying that it didn't work as well in Ontario as they thought it would, but when you find proof in the first nine months that 200 less lives were taken on the road and thousands less injuries with less crippling, I say that that compulsory legislation in Ontario was worthwhile. The evidence is there. I say that the Liberal Opposition and the New Democratic Opposition, when the minority Tory Government there had the intestinal fortitude to bring legislation in, were a lot more humane and a lot more responsible in Ontario than Opposition Members in this House.

I say to the Members opposite that in spite of their cry, the phoney cry for phoney freedom that always emanates from across the way when there is something worthwhile being brought

forward for the public good, that we will proceed. I can remember when the compulsory automobile insurance was brought in, the Member for the Battlefords at that time, it was Alex Connon, 1947, 1948, received a letter, a very vicious letter from a former supporter, saying that, look, you are making me do this and I'm agin it and you've lost my vote. Unfortunately this same gentleman about three weeks later, got into a collision. A piece of glass went into his eye and he lost it. He was paid compensation by the insurance corporation and I still have the letter which said:

Dear Mr. Connon: I am sorry I wrote that letter. This insurance is terrific. I never thought I would get that kind of treatment. Apparently I can see better with one eye now, then I could with two a month ago.

I say to the people opposite, please open both eyes. Please open your heart as well, to those people who may be influenced by your actions. I hope that no one near and dear to you is injured or killed during the next year or two because of the leadership that you have failed to give.

Mr. Speaker, I support this Bill and I indicate that I will not be supporting the amendment which would nullify what we are trying to do and cause further loss of life in Saskatchewan if the Tories got their way.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

## **WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**MR. J. WIEBE:** (Morse) Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to introduce to you and through you, 31 Grade Eight students from the public school at Wymark who are sitting in the east gallery. They came in this morning by bus and it's my understanding that they had a little bit of governor trouble, driving at 35 miles an hour, which is not the best, with the result that they were a little bit late. They are accompanied today by their teachers, I understand Ray Finlay and Sandy Stevenson and their chaperones, Alex Gater and John Jansen. I hope that they have a much more trouble free day during the rest of the afternoon on and that they enjoy their stay in the gallery. Welcome here.

**HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

The Assembly resumed the interrupted debate on Bill 104.

**MR. W. H. STODALKA:** (Maple Creek) Mr. Speaker, I would like to offer a few remarks on this topic. We've gone around and around the circle and it becomes rather repetitious. I should like to congratulate the Minister on the last 80 per cent of the portion of the speech he gave. That portion of the speech was much more convincing than the first part in which he used a bit of sarcasm and ridicule which I don't think are the mechanisms that convince people. Myself, I'll give you my own position on this matter. I think the evidence definitely does support the advantages of wearing seat belts. There's no doubt about it. I personally have always advised people of that. The Minister may not agree, but I have not gone out and solicited petitions or anything else like this. Anybody whom I talk to, I try and convince that seat belts are a necessary thing and should be used. But when it comes to the compulsion angle I have some reservations about it. I can assure



May 6, 1977

the Minister that if the legislation passes, that I will do my utmost to convince people and to try and convince them that they should be wearing seat belts and I shall wear them myself.

I take offence though with the Minister, maybe he's been around the Legislature so long, when he can always bring the political element into this debate. He thinks that every decision has to be something political. I think he uses the term, cheap politics. I'll assure you it's not cheap politics in this instance.

The way I handled this particular matter, is I wrote a letter to all the constituents in the Maple Creek constituency. I asked them and I told them and I indicated in that letter that I wrote to them, that I would be bound to the way in which they replied. I asked them and I invited comments. I got comments for, I got comments against it. But I can assure the Minister, that the comments were for and against. I have received a substantial amount of mail, more mail on this topic than I received on anything else before. Yes, it even exceeds the amount of mail that you received on abortion by about ten to one. The majority of the mail I received, the vast majority indicated to me that I should not vote for seat belts, or the mandatory wearing of seat belts and, of course, that's exactly what I am going to do. I will not vote for it, because I indicated to the people in the area that I represent that I would abide by their wishes. We're often criticized as politicians that we do not accept the wishes of the people whom we represent. There is no ulterior motive of a Liberal Party or anything else like that. This is the wishes of the people. I presume the Minister doesn't believe what I say, but there is no ulterior motive. That's the sole reason that I am voting against the mandatory use of seat belts.

You use an argument again about teachers and their part as it relates to children. Now if the legislation was so concerned about children, remember most children ride in the rear seat of a car. The only ones who usually ride in the front seat are the small ones. Your legislation provides that if they are under five years of age, they don't have to wear that seat belt in the front seat. Anybody in the back seat of the car, of course, doesn't have to wear it either. So if there's such great concern about children, why hasn't it been mandatory to have all passengers in the car, wear the seat belt?

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Morse here also notes you don't have any regulations about school buses. Then I was interested in one other comment you made about market roads and farmers on market roads, indicating that you felt, probably personally there should have been some exemption for farmers on market roads. Yet, if I remember the discussion as it went on in this Legislature or some other place, I heard that almost half of the fatalities in Saskatchewan occur on those market roads and those grid roads. Most of the fatalities are related I suppose you might say, to a dust problem. I don't know whether that's statistically correct, but I believe I did hear that figure some place. Certainly I know that in our area that if there is an accident, and if there is a fatality, usually it is connected with a dusty road caused by somebody trying to pass somebody or somebody taking an unnecessary chance. The idea that a farmer as you seem to indicate, should be exempted, is weak. Now I notice the Minister is anxious to get up maybe and change his statement. Maybe I have interpreted you incorrectly, but that's what I thought I heard you say when I was here sitting in the Assembly and listening to the debate.

So, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, as I say I think we have been around this and around this and around this. I would like to indicate that I will not be voting for the mandatory use of seat belts.

**MR. KRAMER:** Mr. Speaker, the record will show the Member obviously misunderstood me.

**MR. SPEAKER:** If the Member has a Point of Order I would hope he would rise.

**MR. MacDONALD:** Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order the Member has had the opportunity to speak in this debate.

**MR. SPEAKER:** That is correct and the Member has the right to correct a statement that has been made.

**MR. KRAMER:** The Member said we should be exempted on market roads and grid roads, that is quite the opposite. I said on the back roads around the farm, but not, and the record will show that, not exempted on grid and market roads.

**MR. R.H. BAILEY:** (Rosetown-Elrose) Mr. Speaker, I should just like to join in this debate and like the Member for Maple Creek, I know that we have been round and round with this debate. I hope the Minister of Highways doesn't leave . . .

**MR. KRAMER:** I will be back.

**MR. BAILEY:** Well, make sure you are, Sir, because I have some commitments to make to you at this particular time.

The Minister of Highways in addressing this Assembly on this particular discussion said that he wanted to see a total effort, and used that word upon occasion, that he wanted to see a total effort to bring down the number of highway accidents and fatalities and I agree with that, Mr. Speaker. I agree with that concept entirely. But when the Government Members stand and call the performance of the Opposition at this particular time cowardly, I want to suggest that it is the Government benches that are proceeding in a cowardly fashion at this time. If you are going to use the concept of total effect then why did you put minimum requirements on those who should wear seat belts? If you want total effect why did you only proceed with certain members in an automobile wearing seat belts?

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have driven some one million miles in the Province of Saskatchewan in my lifetime and I want to say at this particular time that I really have no fear of approaching a car with a driver wearing a seat belt, but I have a great deal of fear approaching a car when the driver is a drunken idiot. That's where the fear is. Now we have been hearing all kinds of statistics. This Government knows, Liberal Governments know, Conservative Governments know and all governments across Canada, I don't care what their political stripe, are very, very cowardly when it comes to dealing with the real issue in highway safety.

May 6, 1977

Let me give you an example. I recall very vividly four accidents at which I have been the first person upon the scene. And this goes back over a number of years. I recall the very first accident which was after midnight, it was bitterly cold. One dead, and I finally had to move the one body and try to get a car and so on. But you know, Mr. Speaker, finally this came to a court of law and by some technicality they couldn't prove that liquor was involved, but two weeks later the driver went out and not only killed himself, but two people in another car. We don't have the courage in Canada to deal with the problem of drinking and driving like any of the European countries. Why haven't we got that courage? You talk about total effort, when the Chief of Police in the city of Saskatoon recognizes that there are some 1,200 drivers on the road without a licence. Is that total effort? Not a chance, that's not total effort. The Attorney General knows and it's certainly not his fault, the number of stacks of unpaid and uncollected traffic offences in Saskatchewan today and those people are still on the road. What is your total effort there?

Oh, we fool around with the .08 and we make convictions and just less than a month ago, I happened to be the witness of an accident and again by some technicality it was thrown out. I have to pay for that vehicle, so do you. Everybody knows it was there, but some little trip up in the court within a two hour limit or something, he wasn't charged. We haven't the courage in this country to deal with traffic offences as they do in European countries. Where is his total effort? And I say this about all political parties.

Mr. Speaker, the Opposition isn't being cowardly. If the Liberals were sitting there or the Conservatives were sitting there, I expect that they would take the cowardly way out as well, because they don't want to deal with the two issues. You ask the Highway Traffic Patrol, ask them what they think about the highway accidents. They will tell you that a goodly number where they can't really prove but they know that alcohol or liquor was involved. It is like walking down a country road where the smell of skunk is so strong that your eyes water, but you didn't see the little beast so you can't prove it was there. We know very well where the real causes are.

**MR. NELSON:** (Yorkton) Throw them in jail.

**MR. BAILEY:** You know the Member for Yorkton made one of the most idiotic presentations on this Bill that I have ever heard. I have never heard anything like it. He mentioned something about the fact that we have to pay for those who won't use seat belts. Well, so do I and I am a teetotaler and I have to pay for the cost of drying out all the drunks in Saskatchewan too. Is that a reason, that's a pretty weak argument. Mr. Speaker, I am all for Safety '77, but to take only one aspect and make compulsory seat belts without effectively dealing with the real cause is nonsense. Seat belts don't cause accidents, why don't you deal with the cause of it? The Minister of Health knows what I am talking about, how much have you spent, Mr. Minister on the Aware Program? A good program, but I dare say the cost of that must be approaching nearly \$1 million. Has it reduced the alcohol consumption in Saskatchewan, has it?

**MR. KRAMER:** Yes.

**MR. BAILEY:** Has it? Have you got figures to show that? Well you should table those figures then because that is not the last report that I heard.

Mr. Speaker, what they are trying to point out here is that they are going to assume their responsibility as a government by passing mandatory legislation on seat belts and all the other things which cause accidents will somehow go away. Why don't we as legislators, why don't we as governments have the courage to get out and deal with the Highway Traffic Safety Program and have the court so that it will make sure that these things meet with fair trial and meet with good penalties, but instead of that we continue to wishy washy around.

My wife was in Norway not long ago and she was telling me about a second cousin of hers. They didn't even as much as dare push their motor bike, be in control by pushing, that's how they respected their laws in drinking over there and driving. That is why they have a much better record than we have, but we haven't the courage, Mr. Speaker, to do so. You know, Mr. Speaker, for the Government to stand and say that the Opposition by not supporting this is voting for deaths, that's what they are saying. They are trying to use the emotional issue that we are supporting death on the highway. I am telling the Government Members right now that they are the ones who are copping out, they are trying to take the easy way out.

Mr. Minister of Highways, I want to tell you that I sat beside the Governor of Oklahoma at a banquet six months after they reduced their speed limits and they enforced them, and I want to challenge you to go back and look at the records in that particular state and see if reducing speed limits in the State of Oklahoma had a far greater statistical result in benefits than any province in Canada. You know that.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Highways says that we are able to apprehend one out of every 7,000 speeders on the highway. I can believe that because of my own personal experience in this Session and I have the records, I didn't bring them down. We leave Swift Current and we set the cruise at the speed limit and we will keep track of the number of vehicles that pass us. Most vehicles pass me on the road and I am not ashamed to admit that, but in one evening alone 102 vehicles passed us and judging by the time that their tail lights went out of sight they were in excess of the speed limit by at least 15 miles an hour. If you are only going to control one out of 7,000 of the speeders, how are you going to enforce the seat belt legislation? If that is the best we are doing with speeders on the highway, how do you think this is enforceable?

Mr. Speaker, this time of the year is very frightening for me. Do you know why, Mr. Speaker? Well this is the time of high school graduation. Some graduations started this week and some started last week, and I am afraid that next Monday I will pick up the Leader-Post or the Star-Phoenix and I will read a caption like this, that the car went out of control. The car didn't go out of control, we all know that, we are mature people. It was the driver who went out of control. Did seat belts do it? No, I agree with the Minister, because we have advertised the cars squealing and turning and speeding and everything else, no matter where you go, but we take the easy way out. What is the easiest thing you can do in highway safety, come on, be honest now, the easiest thing you can do is make mandatory seat belt

May 6, 1977

legislation. Can you name anything else that's easier? You can't name anything else that is easier, not a thing, you know it as well as I do.

I am saying to this Government and I would say to a Liberal Government or I would say to a Conservative Government, if you really want to deal with it, I will be the first person there to go all the way. I agree with the Minister of Highways, I want a total effort. I want these unlicensed drivers off the roads and I want penalties that will be real penalties and real deterrents. We haven't got the courage to do it though, have we? We haven't demonstrated it, not one iota.

Mr. Minister of Highways I have been involved with the student driving training program since it started in Saskatchewan and I am still very much involved with it. I think it is a good program, but show me the statistics.

You know the Minister of SGIO, if he were being honest and I am sure he would like to be, but for political reasons he may not be able to be, where was the break down in the accidents, where was the age group break down, where was the time of the day breakdown, where was the cause of the accident break down? The people of Saskatchewan aren't getting this information, not at all. We are getting statistics that if they had seat belts on this wouldn't happen and that wouldn't happen, and I agree 100 per cent. Why don't we have the courage to go out and deal with the causes of these things? We don't, you don't, other governments don't, so you take the easy way out and you say to everyone it is now law that you must wear seat belts.

Mr. Speaker, in my lifetime I happen to have seen a lot of driving, I have seen a lot of bad driving. I happen to be a teetotaller and I am kind of proud of that, and I also happen to know that you and I, as legislators, joining a group of legislators from British Columbia to St. John's could have the tremendous national impact, not just by seat belts, but by taking some of the European approaches and making them effective in Canada. If you want to save lives, if you want to go the total effort route, you wouldn't do like all other governments across Canada of all political stripes, and take the cowardly way out.

Mr. Speaker, we were said to be on this side of the House hypocritical, hypocritical people and what else, we were trying to make politics out of it. You people didn't have the intestinal fortitude to even say that seat belts are good so therefore everyone in the car buckles up. Why didn't you, because you were afraid of the politics of it. Now sit there and deny that. You can't deny that. And I am not even saying I blame you for that, but let's get to work and agree that seat belts in themselves and the wearing of seat belts to reduce injuries are great. I am not denying it a bit. A man would have to be right out of his mind to deny that, but we have a few out of their minds over there, particularly the ones who keep yapping. I am saying this to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the Members opposite, if you want a total effect I will be the first person on this side of the House to help you derive that total effect on Saskatchewan Highways.

I want the drunks off the highway, I want the idiots that speed off the highway, I want those who are driving without licences off the highway and it would be hypocritical for me to ignore that as is being done and put my vote beside seat belts

and leave everything else alone. No, Mr. Speaker, I will not be supporting this legislation and the reason I will not be supporting this legislation and the reason I will not be supporting it is the failure of this Government as well as other governments to get at legislation that will deal with the real issues and don't come up with the easy way out of things. Mr. Speaker, I cannot support this.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. R. ROMANOW:** (Attorney General) Mr. Speaker, I am going to adjourn the debate because I do want to get to Environment Estimates and I hope that perhaps before 1:00 o'clock we will be close to completing them anyway.

Before I do, I feel that I just have to make one or two preliminary remarks because of the words spoken by the Member for Rosetown-Elrose, supported by the Liberals opposite. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that that speech in my judgment was one of the most contradictory and confusing speeches I have heard in a very long time from the Member for Rosetown-Elrose. Very contradictory. The Member says that he wants to have a total effort in effect in some areas and no effort in other areas, because by him voting against this Bill that is part of his so called total effort. He is saying no effort. Don't even try. Don't even take the ones that are going to buckle up in the front seat as the limited legislation he criticized. Even that's no good. That's no good for him. A total effort in those areas that he thinks there should be a total effort on, for example drunken driving.

He alluded somewhat vaguely to the European methods with respect to drunken driving and for the life of me he never discussed what they were and for the life of me I don't know whether he knows what they are and what they involve. But he also coupled it with what I would say was a direct attack on the courts by his examples. Now if he means by European method a mechanism to avoid the court system in a democratic approach, which is what I take he means, then I, for one, do not support that kind of a method.

I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the Liberal Party under my predecessor Darrel Heald led in many areas with respect to drinking driving, when in 1969 they introduced legislation making it mandatory for a six month suspension when you are caught for drinking driving. That was a first. We supported them. We still support that legislation. That was the toughest legislation of its day in Canada. It still is part of the toughest legislation around. For the Hon. Member to say there is no effort being done on drunken driving, just flies in the face of the facts. For the Hon. Member to say he wants 1,200 unlicensed drivers caught and taken off the road, when we have more policemen per population in Saskatchewan today than at any time in the history of the province, argues that there should be a policeman on every street corner, on every highway, on every road. Nobody wants an unlicensed driver on the road. Nobody wants a drunk on the road. But how are you going to handle it consistent with a democratic mechanism? What are you going to do, are you going to allow the Member for Rosetown-Elrose a police officer, in his judgment to simply say, I think you are drunk and haul him off the road without any attention to democratic process whatsoever? That's the total effort of the people who talk about individual freedom. We hear the Conservatives talking

May 6, 1977

about the need for freedom and the respect for institutions, but they are not prepared to go along with respect for the courts. They are not prepared to go along with the dubious matter of due process. No, they don't want to go and have a trial and perhaps an acquittal. According to the Member, he just wants the guy to be hauled off and that's it, according to something called the European method . . . whatever the European method is.

I say to the Leader of the Conservative Party (Mr. Collver) who has a smile as if I am trying to misrepresent, that's exactly what the Member said.

I am saying, Mr. Speaker, that that is a contradictory effort to say that you want a total effort and then, in effect say, I am going to vote against it, at least even if he is right admittedly in a partial effort, is certainly inconsistent it not illogical. And that is exactly what the Conservative Party is doing. To argue for individual freedom on this Bill and then make a speech saying that we should do away with the court system, because these 1,200 uncollected tickets are around somewhere, flies in contradiction against the whole operation.

To say that because we have adopted the Ontario Conservative method of legislation is somehow incomplete, we should go the whole method, would you support that? You wouldn't support that either. Look, I am with the Minister of Highways. I received a number of letters and telephone calls from people saying, I am opposed to bringing in seat belts and I am going to vote against you if you bring in seat belts next time around. I know that that's the situation because I have gotten those letters. But I tell you that there comes a time in every political person's career, we are going to have to say, I have to do what I think is right. The Liberals are saying they think what's right is they are going to vote against seat belts. I disagree with them. We say that we are for seat belts. You disagree with us. But to take this kind of 'I'll have a plebiscite approach,' like the Member for Sutherland (Mr. Lane) reported to us in the newspaper, I'm against capital punishment, but if the majority of the people vote for it then maybe I'm going to have to be for capital punishment. I was in the House when the Member for Wascana (Mr. Merchant) asked him the question and that was the response according to the record. That kind of what I say is a contradictory unprincipled approach to basic legislation. The contradictory arguments that there should be a total effort and in effect arguing against every kind of an effort, is an inconsistent and very unsatisfactory attitude, not only on this Bill but by a party that doesn't generally know where it goes.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, that much more has to be said about this and I certainly intend to the next day because I want carefully to examine the record of what the Members' words were and therefore I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

**COMMITTEE OF FINANCE — DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENT — VOTE 9 (cont'd)**

Items 1 and 2 agreed.

**ITEM 3**

**MR. R. KATZMAN:** (Rosthern) Mr. Chairman, is that the area where you will be doing your policy planning and research which affects the Cluff Lake Development, the Eldorado proposed plant at Warman and any other future development where you will be checking into their requirements?

**HON. N. BYERS:** (Minister of the Environment) Mr. Chairman, the answer to the Hon. Members question is, No. The subject he refers to is under Item 8.

Item 3 agreed.

Item 4 agreed.

**ITEM 5**

**MR. R. L. COLLVER:** (Leader of the Progressive Conservatives) Mr. Chairman, what is the Item, the addition \$182,000, 'other expenses' under that section?

**MR. BYERS:** Mr. Chairman, the major increase is for miscellaneous contracts and that is for the Uranium City clean-up.

**MR. COLLVER:** Would the Minister tell us whom the miscellaneous contracts are with, the major ones, and how much for each?

**MR. BYERS:** For the Uranium City clean-up, the Atomic Energy Control Board enters into a contract for the clean-up and then Saskatchewan in turn pays a portion of the total cost of the clean-up incurred by the Atomic Energy Control Board. At the present time the percentage that Saskatchewan will pay is being negotiated.

**MR. COLLVER:** In what order is it — 75 per cent, 50 per cent, 25 per cent, 10 per cent? Surely there must be an idea. I don't want to press too hard on this, but I would like to know how much the Government of Saskatchewan is contributing towards this Uranium City clean-up, approximately, in approximate terms.

**MR. BYERS:** Mr. Chairman, we are trying to get the best deal possible. Our position is that it should be 75 per cent federal and 25 per cent provincial. The federal position is that it should be 50-50 and I am sure that you will support us in trying to get the first proposal.

**MR. COLLVER:** Absolutely. How much did you budget for this amount? You didn't budget the whole \$181,000. Approximately how much is it, so that one could work out the entire clean-up, that's all?



**MR. BYERS:** Well the money in this budget is to cover work that was done last year. The money in this budget is for work that was done in 1976. You may be aware that there are ten buildings or so where some clean-up action took place. I don't want to go into the details of it, but we are still negotiating that with the Federal Government, so this is the figure in our budget.

**MR. COLLVER:** Mr. Chairman, how much did you budget in this number? Whether you negotiated with the Federal Government or not, how much did you budget for that clean-up?

**MR. BYERS:** \$150,000 is in this year's budget for last year's work. We are still trying to get the best percentage deal possible.

**MR. COLLVER:** And that would represent the worst possible position, which was the 50-50 per cent position I would assume, so presumably there could be a little bit of a gain there? That's if you get 75 per cent.

**MR. BYERS:** We always budget expecting the worst and hoping for the best.

Item 5 agreed.

Items 6 and 7 agreed.

## **ITEM 8**

**MR. KATZMAN:** What amount of these allotted funds are for the Impact Study, other than the Bayda Commission?

**MR. BYERS:** I would ask you to repeat your question. What amount is voted for the Impact Studies?

**MR. KATZMAN:** Any Impact Studies you are doing towards uranium or uranium refining, or any other work you are doing in that field. How much of this \$615,000 is for that area?

**MR. BYERS:** Well, Mr. Chairman, to enlighten the Hon. Member on the procedure for assessment, the proponent is responsible for the costs of the Environmental Impact Assessment. The Department of the Environment assumes some responsibility for the evaluation, but the cost of the assessment is assumed by the proponent of the project.

**MR. KATZMAN:** So basically this is just to evaluate what he says, if it is right or wrong then. That's the only involvement of the Impact environmentalists?

**MR. BYERS:** That is correct. Environment assumes the cost of any Boards of Inquiries.

**MR. E. ANDERSON:** (Shaunavon) I would like to ask the Minister, has IPSCO been exempted from Department of Environment guidelines on laws on pollution?

**MR. BYERS:** Mr. Chairman, no way.

**MR. ANDERSON:** Mr. Chairman, through your monitoring no doubt, as far as you are concerned, is IPSCO living within acceptable guidelines of pollution with regard to air pollution and what not?

**MR. BYERS:** Mr. Chairman, the Department of the Environment established that IPSCO was not operating within the guidelines. However, IPSCO, this spring, completed the installation of new bag house filters at the IPSCO plant and IPSCO is now operating well within the air pollution guidelines.

Item 8 agreed.

Items 9 — 12 agreed.

Vote 9 agreed.

**COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE — BILL NO. 91 — An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Telecommunications Superannuation Act.**

Section 1 agreed.

**SECTION 2**

**MR. LANE:** (Qu'Appelle) Mr. Chairman, just one general question of the Act.

We have a series of Orders in Council wherein individuals who had worked in other employment prior to joining the Government, such as the Glasgow Police Department, that have been designated pensionable to previous employment some 30 years ago, was designated pensionable employment.

My question to the Minister is: is Sask Tel under the same provisions as to determining previous employment or do they have any provisions allowing previous employment pension to be a determined part of pensionable employment for Sask Tel?

**MR. BYERS:** No, Sask Tel operates under its own Act and does not do what you say by Order in Council.

**MR. LANE:** Does it have provision for allowing employees who worked in other occupations to join Sask Tel, nongovernment occupations, to add that time to their pension time in Sask Tel?

**MR. BYERS:** I am advised that Sask Tel does not count previous employment.

Section 2 agreed.

Section 3 (54) as amended agreed.

Section 4 agreed.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a third time.

**BILL NO. 48 — An Act to amend The Water Resources Management Act 1972.**

Section 1 agreed.

**SECTION 2**

**MR. LARTER:** Just one question, Mr. Chairman, on this item, I wonder if the Minister can tell me — we are doing different basin studies throughout Saskatchewan — is the area around Lampman on the watershed from the north from Creelman area, is that being looked at very closely? There are farmers there that are having — well one farmer alone has something like 1,200 acres under water now and has to get right out of cattle because of this.

**MR. BYERS:** Mr. Chairman, that really doesn't come under the Bill. If you want to know if that is being looked at I think that would come under the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture.

Section 2 agreed.

**SECTION 3**

**MR. LANE:** (Qu'Appelle)Mr. Minister, I realize the requirements of the particular section of what you are trying to do. Can you give to me the criteria that will be used for the designation of special flood hazard areas? Do you have the criteria established? Secondly, I should like to know what weights you give to the various aspects of the criteria?

**MR. BYERS:** Would you repeat your question please?

**MR. LANE:** I should like to know the criteria you are going to set out in regulations to determine what is a special flood hazard area. Secondly, I would then like to know what weights you give to the various criteria. Do you have a point system or any proposals in that regard?

**MR. BYERS:** Well I think the main criterion that will be applied here is the frequency of flooding for the area that is proposed. Once the area is identified there will then be an examination undertaken as to what works and so on are required before proposing to the local governments what remedial action will be necessary.

**MR. LANE:** Well, will you undertake to supply me with the criteria when they are drawn up, please.

My second question is: I forget the gentleman's name, but there is an individual in Moose Jaw who has been raising all sorts of noise about the deliberate attempts of the Moose Jaw city council to get the Government of Saskatchewan to take over lands by, in fact, causing the flooding or doing nothing to minimize the flooding. I would appreciate your comments on that on that particular individual.

**MR. BYERS:** Mr. Chairman, there have been a great number of citizens in Moose Jaw who have expressed strong views on all proposals pro and con and I don't think I would have the slightest idea of the particular individual whom you are referring to.

**MR. LANE:** Well, the individual has appeared before city council as I think the Minister is aware. The name just escapes me but I could find out. What I would like to receive from the Minister, in due course, or his officials, I would like to have you set out for me your answers to his broad allegations as opposed to any specific ones. If you could do that in due course, I realize it is somewhat technically involved, but if you could answer the main broad allegations that he makes and have your officials forward it to me, it would be appreciated.

**MR. BYERS:** We can provide you with the proposals this particular citizen has advanced. It is no way secret. I want to assure the Hon. Member however that the proposals of this citizen have been considered by both the council and the federal/provincial Qu'Appelle Implementation Board, and have not been accepted.

**MR. LANE:** What I would like to receive from you is your position vis a vis the proposal so that you can give me your answers to his proposals.

**MR. BYERS:** We can do that.

Section 3 agreed.

Sections 4 and 5 agreed.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a third time.

### **BILL NO. 101 — An Act to amend The Liquor Act.**

#### **SECTION 1**

**MR. LANE:** (Qu'Appelle) Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, the Government's position on this particular Bill is somewhat inconsistent. On the one hand the Government has transferred some, I believe, \$65 million out of the Liquor Board into the Consolidated Fund and it is rated as an advance, I believe, to the Consolidated Fund. Now there is no interest paid and in fact what is done is that the Government of Saskatchewan has taken all the retained earnings of the Liquor Board and put them in the Consolidated Fund.

I can't disagree with the actions of the Government of taking the earnings from the Liquor Board and putting them into the Consolidated Fund. That is to be the practice and I think that is government policy to use the earnings. What happened was, prior to the Budget, the Government moved to do this seeing that it was going to have a deficit otherwise. The Provincial Auditor said that you can't do that and brought this to the attention of the public in his report. At that time when the Provincial Auditor drew it to the public's attention and the Assembly's attention, you said it was all right to do it. Now you are saying that you need legislation to do it. So what you are saying is that, in fact, the Provincial Auditor was right. That being the case, in reality we had \$65 million less for the Budget and in fact we did have a deficit.

Next year we would have an additional, I believe, \$65 million if you pass this legislation. But what you have done, I think you are in a very inconsistent position, one time you say that what the Provincial Auditor said is wrong, that you can do this and he says that you can't take the actions that you did and you are now turning around and saying, well the Provincial Auditor was right and we have to implement the legislation. If you were right, why do you bring this in?

**MR. ROMANOW:** Mr. Chairman, I move that we stand this Bill.

Bill stands.

### **DELEGATION FROM YUKON**

**MR. SPEAKER:** Before I declare it 1:00 o'clock, I want to inform the House that on Monday I expect to be having a delegation here from the Yukon. They will be introduced at the beginning of the Session on Monday.

They are here on a working visit. it is a Commonwealth Parliamentary Association exchange with the Yukon. I know that all Members at that time will want to welcome them.

The Assembly adjourned at 1:00 o'clock p.m.