

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fifth Session — Sixteenth Legislature
19th Day

Friday, March 12, 1971.

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. SPEAKER: — Before we proceed with the Orders of the Day I wish to introduce to all Members of the Legislature the following groups of students situated in the galleries: from the constituency of Nipawin represented by Mr. Radloff, 31 students from the William Mason High School, Choiceland, under the direction of their teacher Mr. Semchuck; from the constituency of Kinistino, represented by Mr. Thibault, 60 students from the Birch Hills and Crystal Spring Schools; from the constituency of Arm River, represented by Mr. McIvor, 47 students from the Hawarden School, under the direction of their teacher Mr. Peter Reese; from the constituency of Milestone, represented by the Minister of Welfare (Mr. McDonald), 22 students from the Yellow Grass High School, under the direction of their teacher Mr. A. Wagner, principal; from the constituency of Cannington, represented by Mr. Weatherald, 37 students from the Lampman High School, under the direction of their teacher Mr. Agyeman; from the constituency of Regina Centre, represented by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Blakeney), 45 students from St. Luke's School, under the direction of their teacher Mr. Joeressin; from the constituency again of Kinistino, represented by Mr. Thibault, 41 students from the school at St. Brieux. We also have 66 students from the Blaine Lake School Unit who will be in the galleries between 3:00 and 3:15 and they will be divided as follows: from Marcelin and Leask Schools from the Shellbrook constituency represented by Mr. Bowerman and from the Blaine Lake and Hafford Schools in the Redberry constituency, represented by Mr. Michayluk. They will be in our galleries later.

We also have 11 grade 12 students in the galleries from the Glentworth High School, from the constituency of Notukeu-Willowbunch, represented by Mr. Hooker. They are under the direction of their teacher, a former Member of the Legislature for the constituency of Notukeu-Willowbunch, Mr. Klein.

I am sure that all Hon. Members will wish to extend to all of the students, to their teachers and to their bus drivers, a very warm welcome to the Legislature of the Province of Saskatchewan and to express the very sincere wish that they will find their stay here informational and enjoyable and they will all have a safe trip home.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

ANNOUNCEMENTS

APPOINTMENT OF MR. LESLIE DONNELLY

HON. C. L. B. ESTEY (Minister of Industry & Commerce): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I wish to announce to this House, the appointment of Mr. Leslie Donnelly

of Regina as Director of Homecoming '71. Mr. Donnelly's appointment will be effective Monday, March 15th.

As we all know Mr. Donnelly has been associated with Homecoming '71 since its inception and now occupies the position of Chairman of the Advisory Board for Homecoming '71. Mr. Donnelly has also been long associated with the tourist industry in our province and in my opinion we are very fortunate to have a man of Mr. Donnelly's calibre consent to take this important position.

SOME HON. MEMBER: — Hear, hear!

HOMECOMING '71 GRANTS

HON. W. R. THATCHER (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, late last year the Government of Saskatchewan, as the House knows, decided to allocate approximately \$1.6 million for the purpose of making Homecoming grants on a matching basis with the local governments. It was the original intention of the Government that there should be one project in each area or community. And such a policy continues to be the objective of the Government. However, the former director authorized a series of multiple projects throughout the province and the Government wishes again today, as we did one week ago, to state where there are projects which have been authorized, or where commitments have already been made by the local government, such commitments will be honored.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. W. R. THATCHER (Premier): — I may say, Mr. Speaker, that the 11 Homecoming Zone Chairmen are being invited to come to Regina, very shortly, by the Minister in Charge to discuss programs with the new Director.

MR. A. E. BLAKENEY (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I want to comment on the two announcements just made. I think we will welcome the appointment of Mr. Donnelly, while regretting the circumstances which required a new appointment.

We have no reason to believe that Mr. Donnelly will not bring skill and dedication to the task of Director.

We also welcome the Premier's announcement which is very clearly a reversal of the policy announced one week ago in this House by the Premier.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear;

MR. BLAKENEY: — We are, of course, pleased that the Premier is now prepared to honor commitments made on his behalf, not only by the previous Director, but by the Minister, who is still the Minister (Mr. Estey). So the question is not whether commitments were made by the Director but whether they were made by the Director with the full knowledge and consent of the Minister, as they were.

I want to go one step further and say that in my view the Government should honor multiple projects, whether or not they

had been approved up to this time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear;

MR. BLAKENEY: — This is not what the Premier has said up to now, "only those which have been committed."

HON. D. G. STEUART (Provincial Treasurer): — Commitments that have been made by local governments. Allan, you need a good lawyer on that side to straighten things out!

MR. BLAKENEY: — Commitments had been made by local governments, to whom may I ask? The point is this; what is needed is a clear statement by the Government to the effect that the previous policy advocated by the Director and concurred in by the Minister is the one which is going to prevail and not one which was changed, adapted, bent or whatever was done last Friday by the Premier. I think that the people who have done all the work throughout this province need a clear statement by the Government that multiple projects are permissible. Never mind in what category they fall, multiple projects are permissible.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

DIRECTIVE TO PARKLAND AND BLAINE LAKE SCHOOL UNITS

MR. G. R. BOWERMAN (Shellbrook): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac). It has been brought to my attention that two of the larger school units in my constituency, the Parkland Unit and the Blaine Lake School Unit, have received a directive from the Saskatchewan School Trustees' Association to the effect that boys wearing long hair will be suspended from school beginning Monday. I should like to ask the Minister of Education to advise this Assembly what authority the Saskatchewan School Trustees' Association has to effect an edict of this kind.

HON. J. C. McISAAC (Minister of Education): — Mr. Speaker, I have not seen but I have heard, of one policy as far as one of those units is concerned, but I have not seen anything written in this connection. I can assure him that I am sure that the Boards are acting within the prerogatives and the sections of The School Act dealing with these matters.

MR. BOWERMAN: — Another question, Mr. Minister, I am wondering where the Government and you as the Minister of Education stand with respect to the law which you say is apparently in effect. Where are you willing to stand in regard to supporting this in the Saskatchewan School Trustees' Association?

HON. J. C. McISAAC (Minister of Education): — First of all, Mr. Speaker, I think we shall have to look and see what policy or directive was set out and then we

shall decide where we stand. But as I say it is a matter of local autonomy in this sense. Any regulations with respect to dress and attendance in school are the prerogative of the local Board and there are various sections in The School Act that will support that.

MR. W. S. LLOYD (Biggar): — Mr. Speaker, this is a follow-up question to the Minister. Will he make a statement to the Legislature, if not today but at an early date, as to the circumstances under which a school board is entitled to suspend the youngsters from classes. It is extremely important that this be made.

HON. J. C. McISAAC (Minister of Education): — Mr. Speaker, I think again I could make such a statement, but it covers, as the Member well knows, a large number of sections in The School Act, but I shall be glad to review and to give to the House, either to distribute or make a statement on those various sections that relate to a board's authority to make rules governing the conduct of students and the dress of students in the school.

HON. W. R. THATCHER (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, may I make a supplementary statement. I think as far as the Government is concerned, we don't care whether the young people have long hair, short hair, or no hair at all.

MR. W. J. BEREZOWSKY (Prince Albert East-Cumberland): — Mr. Speaker, I hope that if the Minister of Education finds out that there is that kind of possibility of taking away the personal rights from students, that he will bring in legislation to correct this situation.

MOTIONS FOR RETURNS

RETURN NO. 107

MR. A. E. BLAKENEY (Leader of the Opposition) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 107 showing:

Copies of all correspondence between the Government of Saskatchewan and Parsons and Whittemore Inc. or any company known to be a subsidiary of Parsons and Whittemore Inc. concerning the establishment of a pulp mill in the general area of Doré Lake, Saskatchewan.

MR. STEUART: — Mr. Speaker, he has everything that he needs pertaining to the mill. He has all the documents signed. And as for all copies of all correspondence, there are many letters of correspondence that we had between myself and Parsons and Whittemore that are confidential and will remain confidential. We have tabled in this House every document upon which we shall ask the Legislature to base their decision as to whether they support the Bill that I introduced today, to allow the Government to assist the Athabasca Forest Industries Limited to establish a pulp mill in Saskatchewan. They have every document. There was a tremendous amount of correspondence back and forth. Some of it is of a confidential nature and you don't develop a

complex of this kind without that type of correspondence. You don't develop a complex of this size without having some confidential information on behalf of the company. I wouldn't have the right to table some of the correspondence that the company has written to me in regard to the internal operations or other things that they may wish to be treated as confidential.

I should think that the Hon. Member, would withdraw this motion. If he is not prepared to withdraw it then I must ask the House to defeat it.

MR. W. E. SMISHEK (Regina North East): — Mr. Speaker, I want to query one aspect raised in the motion that is before us and that is concerning any correspondence or documents relating, not only to Parsons and Whittemore, but to other companies. The Premier and the Provincial Treasurer have stated on several occasions in this House since this Session opened that a number of Canadian companies were invited to build the pulp mill in the Doré Lake area.

I have in a previous debate asked the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) and the Premier to provide this Legislature with any correspondence, any documents, any statements which would support the Government's statement that in fact negotiations were entered into and invitations were extended to Canadian companies to build a pulp mill in the Doré Lake area.

Mr. Speaker, until and unless this Government is able to produce any correspondence and the invitations that were extended to Canadian companies to build a pulp mill. . .

MR. STEUART: — It's got nothing to do with this motion.

MR. SMISHEK: — It certainly does, Mr. Speaker . . . copies of correspondence between the Government of Saskatchewan and Whittemore and Parsons or any other company. Mr. Speaker, we shall not be able to substantiate, or the Government will not be able to prove that in fact anyone else was invited to construct a pulp mill.

HON. A. R. GUY (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — Mr. Speaker, I am surprised that there is a Member on that side of the House who can't read. If he would read the motion he wouldn't be wasting the time of the Legislature here this afternoon. It says, very clearly, "or any company known to be a subsidiary of Parsons and Whittemore." You are dealing with Parsons and Whittemore. You are dealing with the subsidiary of Parsons and Whittemore. You are not dealing with another company and anybody who can read would know that.

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, the Provincial Treasurer has indicated that all documents with respect to the Athabasca mill have been filed. Obviously none of us has had the opportunity to work through that vertical foot or so of material, to know whether or not all the documents have been filed. We have on many previous occasions heard representations from the Provincial Treasurer that all material was known and had been made public. We were assured of that in so many news reports by the Provincial

Treasurer. Some people may have been convinced by his statements but any suggestion that this was the fact was completely demolished when in 1971, earlier this session, he filed with respect to the Prince Albert Mill, documents dated 1967, 1968 and 1969.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — So much for his representations that all the facts are known.

I now come to the motion at issue. It asks for correspondence between the Government of Saskatchewan and Parsons and Whittemore, correspondence between the Government of Saskatchewan and Parsons and Whittemore. The Provincial Treasurer says, "No". Why? Because it is confidential and he doesn't have the consent of Parsons and Whittemore. Why would correspondence between a government in Canada and Parsons and Whittemore be confidential? I can understand that it might be so. I would have been prepared to accept that argument, had not the Government in effect denied it in this House a week or two ago. The Government opposite decided firstly, that it was perfectly proper to file correspondence between the Government of Manitoba and Parsons and Whittemore . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — The Government opposite had no difficulty getting consent from Parsons and Whittemore to file correspondence between it and the Government of Manitoba. The Government opposite decided that it did not need the consent of the Government of Manitoba. I don't know why it should now take the position that the Government of Manitoba's correspondence can be filed without its consent, but somehow the Government of Saskatchewan should not file this sort of correspondence.,

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — If in fact they could get the consent of Parsons and Whittemore with respect to correspondence between the Government of Manitoba and Parsons and Whittemore, as I am sure they did, there is no reason why they equally couldn't get the consent of Parsons and Whittemore to the filing of this correspondence. I am very sure that Parsons and Whittemore, that New York firm, wouldn't want to play favorites as between one province and another. Since the Government opposite has decided that correspondence between Provincial Governments and Parsons and Whittemore in this country are public documents and ought to be filed and indeed can be filed without the consent of the province concerned there is no reason why this principle ought not to be applied and we ought to have a look at all the correspondence between the Government opposite and Parsons and Whittemore.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — I am inviting the Government opposite to be consistent, to do in respect of Saskatchewan what it suggested was entirely proper in respect of Manitoba and file this correspondence as it filed the other.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

Motion negatived on division.

RETURN NO. 108

MR. G. R. BOWERMAN (Shellbrook) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 108 showing:

With respect to the purchasing of patented lands for the construction of Provincial Highways: (a) the number of parcels of lands that were purchased where the values exceeded \$249 per acre; (b) the number of parcels of land that were purchased where the aggregate total of land, damages and other considerations exceeded \$249 per acre; (c) from whom each purchase was made; (d) the land location of each parcel; (e) the total aggregate amount paid per acre for each parcel.

HON. D. BOLDT (Minister of Highways): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to point out to the Member from Shellbrook that he should withdraw this question and put the year on it. You haven't got the year on it and one year would represent at least one week's work for one employee, so if you would withdraw it and give us a year or two years, we might consider it. Let's not go back to 1905.

MR. SPEAKER: — I must draw the attention of all Hon. Members that this is a motion, it is not a question. A question can be withdrawn by mutual agreement between the questioner and others. A motion can only be withdrawn by leave of the House.

MR. BOWERMAN: — I wish to comment . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Well, if you do, you are going to close the debate.

MR. J. E. BROCKELBANK (Saskatoon Mayfair): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to move, seconded by the Member for The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer), an amendment to the particular Motion for Return that is before us:

That the following words be added after the word "Highways" in the second line:

for the fiscal year 1969-70.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

RESOLUTIONS

RESOLUTION NO. 2 — THE WAR MEASURES ACT

Mr. I. H. MacDougall (Souris-Estevan) moved, seconded by Mr. F. K. Radloff (Nipawin):

That this Assembly commends the Government of Canada for

its prompt action in controlling terrorism in Quebec by the use of regulations under The War Measures Act and by subsequent passage of The Public Order (Temporary Measures) Act — 1970.

He said: — Mr. Speaker, I shall try not to be too abrasive in order to get the co-operation of all Members of the House. I should like all Hon. Members to approve Resolution No. 2 unanimously, commending the Federal Government for their action in proclaiming The War Measures Act last October.

The proclamation of the Act came in the face of a deadly emergency in the Province of Quebec. For some Members opposite, it would be the easy way out of a thorny situation, Mr. Speaker, since they won't have to justify the stand taken by their Federal counterparts in Ottawa during that critical period in our history. Mr. Speaker, what was the background of the implementation of The War Measures Act? Well, I suppose you could say it started back in 1962, when the FLQ was first formed. They were then a group that was basically a nationalistic group dedicated to removing Quebec from Confederation. Their Manifesto combined some Marxism, some Maoist slogans and Socialist doctrine. Much of what they spout off would not sound out of place at a meeting of the Wafflers of the NDP.

The devils of Quebec society are the big shots, the capitalists, the money makers, Drapeau, Bourassa, Trudeau and so on. Numerically, the FLQ are not large. Hard-core FLQ numbers, according to informed guesses, range between 100 and 500 persons. They are set up in cells, not necessarily related, but with the same objectives in mind. At first they staged bombings and dynamiting of various institutions. Mail boxes were their favorite target. Several people were killed in a series of dynamite blasts. Up until 1966 only the goons were involved, then a few intellectual, well educated, articulate revolutionaries entered the FLQ and suddenly they became a dangerous force.

Now when several of these revolutionaries were brought to trial for their acts of sabotage and terrorism, a couple of chaps from the International Federation of Human Rights were on hand to monitor proceedings. From last June on, the FLQ adopted guerilla-style tactics and now the stage was set for the James Cross and Pierre Laporte kidnappings. Mr. Speaker, the FLQ had the audacity to try to obtain their ends by one of the most senseless, cruel acts in Canadian history. First, James Cross, British Diplomat, was captured and held for ransom. This was a dreadful happening in view of the fact that Mr. Cross was of the diplomatic corps from another country. Then came the capture of Mr. Laporte, who was captured, tortured, held for ransom and subsequently tragically assassinated by those evil men.

What were the demands of the FLQ? Well, I can refresh your memory. They demanded the release of some 20 so-called political prisoners. These thugs and jail birds were in jail for past acts of terrorism which included robbery, bombings and murder. The FLQ demanded that the Government deliver the 20 criminals, together with their wives and children plus \$500,000 in gold bullion, plus free transportation by government aircraft to Cuba or Algeria. On top of that, the Government was to broadcast the FLQ Manifesto and re-instate some 457 LaPalme Mail truck drivers. What could the Government of Quebec do? What

were the alternatives? The Government of Quebec could knuckle under and give in to the demands of these desperadoes or they could take a firm stand, come what may, knowing two men's lives were at stake. The Government of Quebec chose the only course they could have taken. They had to remain tough with the FLQ. Premier Robert Bourassa and his Cabinet had to make a decision which you nor I would ever want to have to make. Here were two men, personal friends or colleagues, both respected and loved, captured by desperadoes and held for ransom. To give in to the terrorists would have meant a total break-down of democratic government all over the country. Indeed, to have given in might have had international repercussions with elected governments everywhere. To try to intimidate a duly elected body by kidnapping and holding the hostages for ransom, any public officials, is totally against all that freedom loving people stand for.

Mr. Speaker, there are those who said, "It can't happen here." Yet it did! We Canadians have tended to feel quite immune from terrorism which is commonplace in other areas of our world. Our complacent attitude was shattered when we observed a handful of zealots holding a government and the entire social order up for ransom. There are those who blamed the system under which we live, but since when do we have to submit to a vocal minority who would strike terror into the hearts of the citizens in order to gain their own ends? If people want government duly elected by a majority of the people, to govern this country, then let us live with their decisions. Majority rule has been our traditional form of government. While some may not agree with the policies of the government, they have an opportunity every four or five years to try to convince the public to follow their ideas and in so doing replace the government of the day.

Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister, Mr. Trudeau, in my opinion showed himself to be a courageous, strong leader, when he acted to proclaim The War Measures Act. He read the mood of the country correctly and he won the support and the admiration of the masses of Canadians when he announced on nation-wide television that The War Measures Act would be invoked.

All of us, I am sure, felt heartily grieved for Mrs. Laporte and her young family. The senseless assassination of Mr. Laporte rivalled the Kennedy murder some years before. The world looked on, while Canada hung her head in shame.

Mr. Speaker, there was one element in Canada other than the FLQ that was out of step with the rest of Canada, and that organization in my opinion, was the NDP. With the exception of one or two of their members, who supported the Government position, the rest of the NDP Members of Parliament in effect, saw fit to become sympathizers of the causes of the FLQ. Why would T. C. Douglas, David Lewis, Les Benjamin, John Burton, etc., give comfort to a common enemy under the guise of being the great protectors of civil liberties? I can only comment that they did so for political reasons and political reasons only, and they should be condemned for it. It shows Canadians exactly why they continue to be in the Opposition perennially and why they are unfit to govern. Even Ed. Schreyer disagreed with his peers in Ottawa but can we say the same for the Leader of the Opposition in Saskatchewan. No, Mr. Speaker, as I followed his comments in the Leader-Post, he did what we should expect of him, he shifted feet so fast it confused his followers. He indicated he half-heartedly supported The War Measures Act,

but preferred Tommy's solution, a new act instead.

Now, Mr. Blakeney knows, as all of us do, that the Federal Government had no other means to control the crisis other than The War Measures Act. He knows full well a new act takes time to be drafted, let alone passed through the House of Commons. The NDP would not likely have passed a new act very readily in any case, as they would have played politics with the situation as they always do, and the resulting delay would take too long, and this was an emergency. Oh, they said it could have been handled under "beefed up existing laws," but I think the vast majority of Canadians felt otherwise.

Mr. Speaker, there are many screwball people in the world espousing many screwball causes. When one examines the causes one also finds that most of the leading screwball forces just happen to be Socialists. One of the most recent casts is the personality of Miss Devlin of Northern Ireland. This would-be Joan of Arc seems to be some kind of nut. On the one hand she claims to be a devout Irish Roman Catholic, on the other hand she says she is an avowed Marxist. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, how can this be? Marx' insisted religion is, "The opium of the people." Yet this little imp, avowed Socialist, or worse, is invited by one of the television networks to comment on the FLQ, the murder of Mr. Laporte, etc. Her answer was that she did not condemn the FLQ, rather she condemned the conditions which caused these revolutionaries to commit their terrifying acts. Imagine that little witch telling Canadians, one and all, she condoned the violence and the killing which took place in Canada last fall because it was anti-establishment. All I could say to myself when I watched that TV interview was — how typically Socialist! I often ask myself why the NDP take up dead-horse issues and rag them to death. Human rights, they howl. Well what human rights did the FLQ give Mr. Laporte? Why were the NDP Members of Parliament in Ottawa opposed to the Government implementing The War measures Act, Mr. Speaker? Why would T.C. Douglas and his gang become so terribly concerned about civil rights when Quebec and Canada were rocked by the actions of the FLQ?

Why should we extend to these outlaws the courtesies and protection they seek when they do not respect the laws of the land in the first place? I wonder how justice would have been handled behind the iron curtain.

Earlier, I mentioned the concern of the International Federation of Human Rights, another leftist organization who attended earlier FLQ trials. What was their main concern? When I see organizations who set themselves up for human rights causes, they become suspect as being left wing groups, almost without fail. The NDP unquestionably are great 'cause' seekers. This time, however, Mr. Speaker, they were out of step with Canadians everywhere and I rather suspect, if there had been an election last fall, there wouldn't have been an NDP Member left in Ottawa. I think it was to their everlasting shame to try to play politics at such a serious time in the history of this great land. Mr. Speaker, I think a lot of Canadians, particularly those who fought for our freedoms in two world wars would be far more inclined to mete out much speedier justice. Thank God we had a firm hand in the Trudeau administration. Thank God the Government considered the human rights of the vast majority of Quebecers for a change.

The NDP, nearly to a man, feared for the rights of Canadians. I can only say that we did not notice any particular change in our status while The War Measures Act was invoked. What exactly did the NDP think was going to happen to us? No, Mr. Speaker, all other political parties, Conservatives, Socreds and Creditistes supported Mr. Trudeau's move. Yes, even Ed. Schreyer supported Mr. Trudeau.

Now with this motion which I am about to move we shall give the local boys a chance to register their approval.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: — I wish to draw the attention of all Hon. Members to a fact in connection with this motion. This Resolution is a matter concerning the imposition of The War Measures Act and the Public Order Act. I hadn't thought about this when the motion was launched though I should have done. I draw to the attention of all Members that matters awaiting the adjudication of a court of law should not be brought forward in debate. It is possible that matters that are before a court of law in the Province of Quebec might be brought forward in this debate and in fact I think they were just touched upon. It is improper to do so. I draw your attention to the fact that people who are before a court of law have a right to be judged by a court of law that is judged by jury and not by Members of Parliament or of Legislatures.

The debate continues on the motion.

MR. W. A. FORSYTH (Saskatoon Nutana South): — Mr. Speaker, every time a person accepts a freedom he should ask himself what he is paying for that privilege. Conversely every time he gives up a freedom, he should ask himself what he is receiving in return. It is in this context that I feel one should approach the world-wide phenomenon of conflict between forces of social order and dissident groups who wish to change that order by employing the tactics of violent confrontation. Those who want the freedom to revile and physically assault police officers, those who seize the freedom to make a mockery of our judicial system, should ask themselves if they are willing to accept the accompanying responsibility of providing protection for themselves and their families. Those who assail their democratically elected representatives with insults and filthy slogans should ask themselves if they wish to give up the freedom of the ballot for the responsibility of rule by riot.

We hear a great deal about suspected infringements of the rights of people who have openly advocated the violent overthrow of the same institutions which guarantee those rights. How often do we hear of the infringement of the rights of those who have been defamed and even murdered in the defence of these institutions? The National Leader of the Opposition party was quick to fly to the defence of those who were suspected of supporting the Black Panther Movement in the United States, but let the people of Canada never forget that he did not even bother to stay in Ottawa at the time of crisis when his own parliamentary system was threatened by a subversive minority in Quebec.

There is no doubt in my mind that the Government of Canada

had no finer hour than when it reacted rapidly and firmly and rationally by invoking the only power that it had to curb the activities of a fanatical group of assassins and kidnappers, a group who threatened the security of millions of Canadians. Equally commendable was its obvious distaste of having to assume the responsibility for such broad powers as those contained in The War Measures Emergency Act, and the rapidity with which it moved to replace those measures by a less drastic piece of legislation.

We must never forget the martyrdom of Pierre Laporte. He died that we might learn again that eternal vigilance is the price of freedom. I am not ashamed to stand in this House and be counted on the side of law and order. Inasmuch as justice, like truth, defies absolute definition, it can be said that we shall never live in a completely just society. However, we must never cease to strive for justice just as we must never give up searching for truth. This process of search and striving is a basic element of any meaningful social order. It can only flourish in an atmosphere of law and order. Reform we must have but it will not come about under the auspices of anarchism.

I am grateful for the privilege of living in a society which gives me the opportunity of debating and supporting a resolution such as this.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. W. S. LLOYD (Biggar): — Mr. Speaker, to begin with it is interesting to contrast the approach to this problem of the two speakers from the Government side who have just spoken: the Member from Estevan (Mr. MacDougall) and the Member from Nutana South (Mr. Forsyth).

With respect to the Member from Estevan I think it should be regretted, Mr. Speaker, that he chose to use the kind of intemperate language which he did use. I think it must be regretted that in discussing an item of this kind about which there is very considerable difference of opinion he should resort to the kind of insulting innuendo that he did with respect to those of us who disagree with him.

He was talking about what happened in Parliament and as he spoke I remembered an incident of which I've read in Parliament. I think it is worthwhile noting this for the sake of the Member from Estevan. This was I think one of the finest moments in the Canadian Parliament. It occurred during the time of another deep crisis in Canadian life. It was the occasion of the declaration of war before the Second World War. The Government had laid before Parliament its recommendation that Canada join in that war effort. Most people across Canada and most people in Parliament agreed. One man stood up to oppose, that man was J. S. Woodsworth. He had on this occasion differed with his entire party, he stood alone in that entire House to oppose that resolution. The important thing that happened was the action of the then Prime Minister of Canada, Mr. McKenzie King. Prior to Mr. Woodsworth speaking, Mr. King got up and drew attention to the fact that Mr. Woodsworth would be speaking. He said, "Most of us will disagree with what he has to say, all of us will respect his right to say it and the sincerity with which it will be said." As a result that House listened with a respectful silence to what was said. I ask for a moment, and I think it is important, to contrast that kind of an approach

to a discussion of that kind, to the kind of approach which the Member from Estevan and those who follow that line of thinking has suggested today.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the Resolution and I say without hesitation in the beginning that I share the deepest regret and the greatest abhorrence of the murder of the Hon. Mr. Laporte and the kidnapping of Mr. Cross. I think that there are some other things at stake and I do not think that either the Members who have spoken stated all of the options or have considered fully all of the implications. I rise, Mr. Speaker, to oppose the Resolution; I rise to ask every Member in this Legislature to examine his conscience as we vote on it? I rise to ask every Member in this Legislature to think about the character and characteristics of the Canadian nation which we hope to build. I ask each Member of this Legislature to think about that which we usually refer to, fondly and reverently, as the principles of British justice. Frequently we say, I think, the "sacred" principles of British justice. I rise to raise the question: does democracy defend itself by destroying democracy? Because that, in part, is the question which we do face. I rise to remind this Legislature of a statement by someone, I think Pastor Niemoeller of Germany, who related some words to this effect: when they came for the Jews I didn't object, when they came for another group I didn't object, when they came for another group I didn't object; he concluded by saying when they came for you there will be no one left to object.

This Resolution, I submit, Mr. Speaker, asks us in this country to welcome handcuffs in order to prevent our hands from shaking. The Resolution asks us to commend the use of handcuffs for that purpose.

Secondly, may I suggest, contrary to what has been suggested, we in this party, or those of us who oppose the action, did not then, and by no means since, stand alone in opposition to this law. Very recently the president of the Canadian Labour Congress, the largest organized labor group in this country, spoke strongly about it in a presentation to the Government of Canada. May I suggest that organized labor has a tradition with respect to civil rights of which it can well be proud. A few months ago I heard the president of the National Farmers' Union speak out against it in much the same way. I suggest that when we on this side find ourselves in the company of organized labor and organized power, we are in good company indeed.

I recall, contrary to what was said by one of the Members opposite, the very courageous stand taken by a young Tory Member of Parliament on this question. I refer to the stand of David MacDonald, Conservative Member from one of the Prince Edward Island constituencies. There are others who have taken a stand of the same kind, Mr. Speaker, I want to refer to some of those others.

I have here, for example, the magazine, Saturday Night, the December issue. I read the opening paragraph:

In the great October crisis of 1970 Canadian democracy was tested and found wanting. The Trudeau Government was revealed as totalitarian in spirit. People were discovered to be hysterical. The press was shown to be sycophantic. And later looking back from just this

distance it already seems a profoundly shameful moment in our history. Professional historians writing with more detachment 20 or 30 years from now may rate it as even worse than that. They may see it as a time when the basic freedoms of Canadian life began an inexorable process of erosion.

Other journalists joined in taking a similar position. On October 18th the following telegram was forwarded to the Prime Minister of Canada:

To Prime Minister Trudeau and the Cabinet:

On the basis of available information and despite the brutal inhumanity of the FLQ, we feel your imposition of The War Measures Act and curtailment of civil liberties was an unjustified over-reaction and an affront to legitimate dissent.

I won't read the whole list of those who signed but it includes such well known people in Canada — June Callwood, journalist; Robert Fulford, editor Saturday Night; Peter Gzowski, one-time editor of Macleans' Magazine; Ron Haggart, Toronto Telegram columnist; Jane Jacobs, one of the best known commentators on urban problems in Canada; Eli Mandel, poet, professor, the pride of Estevan to some extent since Mr. Mandel came from Estevan originally; Abraham Rotstein, editor of the Canadian Forum. By no means, Mr. Speaker, did we on that occasion stand alone.

The name of Mr. Douglas has been brought into this debate. May I just read in this regard a comment in the Toronto Star of October 24th by the well known columnist, Anthony Westell. He said:

NDP Leader, Tommy Douglas, knew whereof he spoke when he said that Canadians who are clamoring to support The War Measures Act now, in the heat of crisis, will think again within six months of the liberties they pawned. When they do think again they will remember that the NDP stood alone on the issue, the right position for an Opposition party.

Mr. Speaker, I have said that we did not stand alone on that issue. May I refer to some of the effects which have gone unnoticed insofar as those from the Government side who have supported the Resolution are concerned. I refer again to the same issue of the Toronto Globe and Mail of Saturday night and read its summation of what happened at that time.

In Montreal, that first terrible week of The War Measures Act, hundreds of Canadians were arbitrarily denied their rights, their right to liberty, their right to counsel, their right to know why they are being held in jail, their right to communicate with relatives and friends. They were deprived by an order of the Federal Cabinet of all the personal rights that hundreds of years of history had bestowed on them.

Mr. Speaker, I submit we cannot pass too lightly over an act which has that kind of implication. That kind of action this Resolution asks us to approve. That kind of action this Resolution urges us to commend.

It is, I think, a cardinal principle of justice that people

are innocent until proven guilty. This act which we discuss today, in fact, stood that principle on its head. Let's think for a moment of what this action of the Federal Government permitted in our Canada in 1970. It permitted arrests without warrant. It permitted imprisonment without charge and the possibility of holding a prisoner in jail for 90 days until even the trial date was set. It permitted keeping that person in prison, arrested without warrant and without charge, without communication with the family or without a chance for consultation with a lawyer. It permitted being held in jail without the opportunity even to get bail without certain special extraordinary procedures. All this, Mr. Speaker, was possible simply on the basis of actions which a person was suspected of having taken. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, these actions might have been taken days before or weeks before or years before. This action could have been taken for something that a person did which was legal when it was done — it became illegal only with a stroke of the Prime Minister's pen taken in the middle of the night and in complete secrecy.

The arresters of these people might come singly or they might come in groups; they might come as they did by day or they might come by night. They required no warrant, all they required on which to act was suspicion. This action, I submit, gave to the Government and the police and the army, an opportunity to do what they wanted, to whom they wanted, at anytime they wanted — all of this without the usual process of law designed to protect human rights and to support human dignity. This could happen and could have happened to any of us. Somebody mentioned over there that it can't happen here. Mr. Speaker, this did happen here in Canada. Thinking that this can't happen here is an opiate in which we infrequently indulge. Now, all of these effects this Resolution asks us to approve, asks us to commend. The threat and the suppression by this action is not just to persons. The threat and suppression is to ideas; it is to freedom of thought and freedom of speech and freedom of assembly. This kind of threat and suppression we are asked to support and to commend.

This action furthermore gave to the Government and to others the power to smear all dissent as criminal. I ask this Assembly, whether this indeed is a right or a power that we want to give to any government — the power to smear all dissent as criminal. And indeed it was used for that very purpose in respect to the Montreal municipal elections at that time. That we are asked to approve and that we are asked to commend.

Why was all of this done? We have heard much about an “apprehended insurrection.” I suggest that that apprehended insurrection was not proven then and I suggest that it has not been proven since that time. I quote from still another article in this same issue of Saturday Night. This one was written by Peter Riley who will be familiar to many people who have viewed CBC or CTV Television programs. Peter Riley had this to say:

During this time the Government was playing ducks and drakes with the truth both in the House of Commons and in all kinds of extra-parliamentary leakage through reporters. Every day there was a fresh alarm, a plot in Quebec; a plot in Montreal; a plot in the Minister's office.

Mr. Westell had some comment on it also reported October 20.

He speaks of 'no evidence that the FLQ was capable of insurrection within the meaning of the law'. He refers to the Government's main speaker, John Marchand as making such statements which were so extravagant as to be unbelievable: "These people have infiltrated every strategic place in the Province of Quebec." Those statements were in reference to arms stolen and what this means. There have been subsequent reports, Mr. Speaker, to show that there have been more arms stolen in the Province of Ontario or in the Province of British Columbia or from Canadian Forces' Stations in Germany than there have been in Quebec. I submit that what has happened here was that there was a technique of fear shamefully used to create hysteria among the Canadian people in order to obtain support for Government action and this has to be regretted.

Let's note just for a moment if we think it can't happen here, Mr. Speaker, what really did happen in the application of these legal procedures. We know now that during the month of October there were some 450 people arrested. By March, only 62 of these had been charged. I ask the House to contemplate the immensity and the enormity of the story told by those figures. 450 people arrested, months later, only 62 of those charged. Well, let's see, not just the impact of the mass situation. Let's see how it affected a few individuals. Take the social worker in Hull, Quebec, who was arrested for no other reason than that he was organizing help for those in jail and particularly for their families — he may still be in jail, I don't know, he was for sometime afterwards. Take the student at Carlton University, who had his home searched within the first hour. They found nothing in the home, they nevertheless hauled him off to jail and he stayed there for six days. He stayed there for six days incommunicado. He was interrogated finally only for a period of ten minutes before being released.

Take the couple in Montreal, who were arrested suddenly and their two little children, one of them five years old, one of them three years old, were left alone until someone in the family joined them — an example of haste and thoughtlessness which is hard to believe in Canada in 1970. The couple were released several days afterwards.

Take the doctor, who admittedly was a peaceful separatist but was arrested suddenly and taken to jail. No law against being a separatist at that time then or now. This doctor wasn't allowed to refer his patients, some of them seriously ill, to another doctor. He wasn't allowed to telephone anyone from jail. After several days, during which he was interrogated for three hours, he was released.

Mr. Speaker, the pages of Canadian history unfortunately are much too full of incidents of that kind. Let's not say it can't happen here. Let's not say that this kind of action and the opportunity for a government or a police force or an army to take this kind of action should be condoned and commended in this Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, there are some reasons for opposition to this Resolution beyond the concern for immediate human civil individual rights and freedoms. There is danger, I think, when we develop too much confidence in this kind of action. There is danger of believing that we have cured something by legislative measures and unrestricted use of police or army forces. In doing that, we may well forget the real nature, the continuing

character of difficulties in our society. We may overlook the conditions in which some violent, evil plants do grow, and in which wicked ideas gain support or, at least, acquiescence is obtained to these cruel and abhorred acts to which we all object. Let no one suggest that they over there object more than we do or feel more strongly against them than we do simply because we take a different position in this Resolution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear:

MR. LLOYD: — There is, Mr. Speaker, we need to remember, an almost classical pattern by which violence in society develops. I want to review that pattern for a moment. You have people with problems, problems which hurt and some with which people suffer. These people are unorganized and inarticulate and everybody passes by. The problems go on and the suffering continues and the hurt festers. Secondly then, these groups form organizations, sometimes. They pass resolutions and they present petitions. The resolutions and the petitions get 'sympathetic consideration'. There is more material in more pigeon-holes in more offices and there is more suffering and there is faster and faster festering. After that, some of the organizations will take stronger and more dramatic and more forceful protest to draw attention to the difficulties. Finally, may come violence, first usually to poverty and eventually and unfortunately sometimes to people and the lives of people. That's a regrettable situation, it's a regrettable pattern, but history verifies that pattern in thousands of written pages. The efforts to circumvent this pattern are development by negative legalistic action, by the insensitive use of force, particularly by destroying other rights, has, in the main, been unsuccessful and abortive.

I suggest that to endorse resolutions of this kind encourages people to overlook, to forget about, and not to be guided by the real facts of history; invites them to ride rough-shod over the rights of many innocent people. To endorse resolutions of this kind encourages us to do more to allow a continuation of those things which gives the destructive elements in our society a chance to grow, to get support, at least to get acquiescence. More important than that; if we put our faith in resolutions condoning this kind of activity, we are likely to discourage people from using the creative capacity of society and its democratic institutions to correct faults which cry out for correction. Terrorist groups, Mr. Speaker, don't flourish, terrorist groups don't flourish when social justice and economic opportunity and individual dignity are the rules of the game and the ethics of a society. That is the important thing for us to remember.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear:

MR. LLOYD: — To think, Mr. Speaker, that we can solve problems of long-time, deep-rooted, widely-spread nature by actions such as supporting this Resolution, produces another danger. It invites us to take our eyes off other violence and removes these other acts of violence in our society from our conscience. Let me note, some of the other forms of violence which we ought to protest and ought to act on. I think of unemployment. Particularly in the Province of Quebec, I think had it not been for this festering sore of continued and hurting unemployment

in that province, some of these events might well not have been. I think of inadequate, indecent housing too frequently at extortionate costs. This too can be found in the Province of Quebec as well as in other parts of Canada. I draw attention to the violence to farmers when they are forced off farms and chased into the overstuffed bowels of large urban centres there to live, or perhaps only to linger, unsatisfied and probably unemployed.

There was a study made by a committee appointed by the President of the United States a few years ago. This study was directed at determining the cause of violence in American cities — and they've had plenty of it. One of the reasons which this study advanced for violence in American cities was the failure to deal with the problems of rural poverty. I submit there is real violence and I submit anything that takes our eyes off that kind of problem is to be regretted indeed.

I think of the violence to old people trying to maintain an already eroded standard of living on an increase of 42 cents a month. I think of the violence and the unnecessary suffering and premature death because we fail to support research into the cause and cure of disease; because we fail to make the healing arts fully available to all. Our objective must be to apply our very considerable Canadian competency and the benefits of our great store of rich resources to removing from Canadian society those blots and blemishes such as I referred to — the blots and blemishes of unemployment; of indecent housing; the violence of displacing farm families; the unnecessary suffering and premature death. And we must not be sidetracked by believing that we have cured the kind of conditions which produce these and produce their own forms of violence by merely supporting resolutions such as that before us.

Let me, Mr. Speaker, suggest some further support for the logic and the emotion of the thesis which I have tried to put before this House this afternoon. On October 9th, 1968, the Prime Minister of Canada was a guest in this very city. He spoke on these Legislative grounds at the time of the unveiling of the statue of Louis Riel. I think it is instructive in the light of the attitude of the Member for Estevan (Mr. MacDougall) for example, to read again, to listen again if you will, to the words which the Prime Minister of Canada, the Rt. Hon. Mr. Trudeau used at that time. Here are some of them:

For me (he said) this is the lesson of Louis Riel. A democratic society and system of government while among the grandest of human concepts are among the most difficult to implement. In a democracy it is all too easy for the majority to forget the rights of the minority and for a remote and powerful government to ignore its protests. It is all too easy should disturbances erupt to crush them in the name of law and order. We must never forget that (added Mr. Trudeau) in the long run a democracy is judged by the way the majority treats the minority.

One final quotation, Mr. Speaker, as support for our position on this particular Resolution. It comes from an editorial in the Toronto Globe and Mail, Thursday, November 5, 1970, and I read it lest there is a suspicion that we in this group stand alone on this point: The Globe and Mail said this:

We have not yet been convinced that it was necessary for the government to impose The War Measures Act although we do accept that Mr. Trudeau may have reason to believe that the well-being of the country precludes his presenting now all the evidence on which he acted. And we are even less convinced that it is necessary to continue the suspension of rights under a temporary Act.

Mr. Speaker, that sums up the position which I have tried to take. We are not convinced that it was necessary for the government to impose the War Measures Act and even less convinced that it is necessary to continue the suspension of rights under a temporary Act. Let there be no doubt about it, that's what the Act is — a suspension of human rights.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, this is Canada 1971. In particular, Mr. Speaker, this is Western Canada. We in Western Canada have a great tradition of respect for freedom. We in Western Canada have a considerable history of groups which have actively dissented from the majority. Many of our original settlers, your neighbors, in some cases, your fathers, came to this part of the world to escape oppression.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LLOYD: — Not infrequently that oppression was the oppression of arbitrary and authoritarian government. They came here to seek out freedom for themselves and families, here in this new country. They wanted to build new institutions. More important than that, I think they wanted to develop some new rules of human relationship. For the most part we can be proud of what has been done. We must never forget that much remains to be done. We dare do nothing in this House or elsewhere in the country to endanger the doing of that necessary remainder.

I admit there is danger in freedom but I urge, Mr. Speaker, that while there is danger in freedom, there is much greater danger in allowing freedom to be eroded.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LLOYD: — There is danger in damaging this plant which is sometimes fragile but one which is of priceless and infinite worth.

Mr. Speaker, this may very well be, may I recall, my last address of any length in this Legislature and I regret the conditions which make this kind of discussion necessary. If it is necessary I am grateful to be able to express the point of view and the hopes for Canada that I have attempted to put before this House this afternoon.

I oppose the Resolution, I do so sincerely and I do so with all the emphasis that I can muster.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. L. P. CODERRE (Minister of Public Works): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate I have a few words of qualification before I get to the main part of it. I regret really, hearing the hon. gentleman now

leaving this House almost advocated violence in his last speech to the Legislature. Going so far as to say that the ballots by which people over the centuries have instituted a democratic society may now be superseded by violence, if you do not believe in what the governments are doing, what the state is doing, what society is doing, that we have a right of expressing ourselves without ballot. Surely if someone takes it upon himself to get what he wishes with violence then it must be met and stopped. I was truly sorry to hear the Hon. Member (Mr. Lloyd), somewhat condone the actions of the FLQ in Quebec.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Shame, shame!

HON. L. P. CODERRE (Minister of Public Works): — From what he said, he believes that if a minority is unable to get what they want that the only way they should get it is by violence.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Shame, shame!

HON. L. P. CODERRE (Minister of Public Works): — It seems, Mr. Speaker, that the Hon. Member happens to be at the right places at the right time where they do advocate violence. I hate to say this in this House but during the Chicago riot where was the Hon. Member? In Chicago, I believe the whole text of his speech meant that he believes that we should let organized criminals loose in our society without exercising some form of restraint at times. He says you shouldn't handcuff people. No, let them continue their crime until they are proven guilty in court and then you go look for them and lock them up.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I did want to hear the hon. Gentleman in his last speech to this House at least bow out in dignity and not advocate violence.

MR. SNYDER: — You are sick. You are sick!

MR. BOWERMAN: — You are mentally sick!

HON. L. P. CODERRE (Minister of Public Works): — Mr. Speaker, Canada has its share of rabble-rousers who have made it a profession to incite people to riot, who have advocated the burning of private and public property, who have attempted to tear down the cornerstones of the democracy which has taken us so long to build. Reluctantly, Mr. Speaker, we have to put up with that type of people.

Canada, Mr. Speaker, is a resource wealthy nation, rich in natural resources which must be used for and developed for the benefit of all. More people will provide more financial resources to develop our natural resources. More people will provide a larger domestic market. We need to add to our population through immigration. We need people who will try to help us build this country but, riot and near revolution tend to discourage people from coming to our country. However, Mr. Speaker, we all know that Canada has been settled by people who have been considered as undesirables in their own country. But all these groups have fitted well in our society because they wanted the right to practise and to develop a democratic process which was so dear to them. Some of them live in their own communities, practise their own ways but they have added to the life of Canada.

The Mennonites for instance, Mr. Speaker, are conscientious objectors but they are very good citizens. All these groups, Mr. Speaker, were considered undesirable possibly in their own country for reasons which did not apply to Canada. Thus we are able to accept them as citizens and they have benefited this country greatly.

Loyalists, Mr. Speaker, the United Empire Loyalists, for example, who were unwelcome in the United States because they expressed loyalty to the king. This did not apply to our Canada.

The Hungarians were recently undesirable in their country because of political beliefs. They were made welcome in Canada. The Hutterites came to Canada because of the religious persecutions in their country. In Canada they are free to worship as they wish.

Other groups, Mr. Speaker, the Doukhobors did not fit so well in the country — one small branch, the Sons of Freedom, have been a great deal of trouble but at the same time Doukhobors came to Canada in 1889 and the Canadian Government could not have known the trouble which they have caused since that time. But many of them have made a good contribution to Canada. However, Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Royal Canadian Legion I have very, very strong feelings for this country of mine and I recognize the rights of individuals to have their own opinions as long as they follow the democratic process that this nation was built on. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, any time that there is a threat to these people, to my family, to my friends, my community or my country, and a threat which is a threat to me, I expect the authorities to protect all of us by any means at their disposal and I mean 'any means at their disposal'.

What the Government of Canada did in invoking The War Measures Act against criminals, by so doing they were protecting the national interests of Canada and all the people of Canada. If a democratic society hopes to exist it must be prepared to 'deal with armed revolutionaries attempting to destroy the basis of freedom. It must be prepared to deal with any criminals or any elements who are dissatisfied and don't want to use the ordinary democratic process that we have been accustomed to in this Country.

But, No, Mr. Speaker, many of my Socialist friends objectives are, violence, because if you can't get what is available through the democratic process it seems that you must use violence.

All of us in this House, Mr. Speaker, in this country know that there are ways available in this country, the ballot for instance, which is an effective mechanism of change by peaceful means and not by force. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I feel the invoking of The War Measures Act on October 16th was rightly justified. It was very necessary at that time to take action in time of crisis, and, not bringing it into the political forum before action was taken. I think it would have been too late then. We don't know. We can't take a chance. In times of crisis, time is important. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that when the Government of Canada took action and took this step it did so most reluctantly and I believe the Prime Minister said,

These are strong powers and I find them as distasteful as I am sure that most of you do but they are necessary, however, to permit the police to deal with persons who advocate or promote the violent overthrow of a democratic order.

This had to be done. All in this House should know, Mr. Speaker, that there exists in our society serious and dedicated enemies of our civilized democracy, enemies vicious enough to murder in cold blood for their cherished lunacy — if we may call it that — of world revolution, dedicated enough to infiltrate any sick philosophical movement, dedicated enough for us to be ever on our guard.

Who would have thought three or four years ago that this could have happened in our Canada? I see our country, Mr. Speaker, now possibly a little better than I did before. It is possibly a less happy and secure place than I thought it was. But the actions of the Federal Government, Mr. Speaker, show that it is a nation that is not weak and cannot easily be torn apart, at least not by the forces of an enemy that the enemy showed at that time. We have learned through past events that great bodies of Canadians are not against our system and are not ready to accept the idea that it is full of wrongs which cannot be put right. They showed this in the overwhelming support they gave the government when it invoked The War Measures Act. There were exceptions to the invoking of The War Measures Act. These enemies would have liked to have seen this creeping sickness in our nation take a bigger foothold so that they probably could have made greater inroads for their own personal gain.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, this episode is a first step in Canada's recovery of confidence in our constitutional process. I am sure that it was a blow to those who say that our way of life is so bad that any means of change are justified. I believe that violence itself, Mr. Speaker, was a result of our not taking a strong enough stand in the past. We had given in to the burners of taxis, burners or destroyers of buses, of property, occupiers of buildings on several campuses, destruction of tremendously costly equipment. Too much of a pattern of violence aimed at the overthrow of our democratic system, Mr. Speaker, existed. There are some who are prepared to call violence as necessary for social changes. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that our Prime Minister and the Government of Canada reacted strongly and demonstrated in this respect that anti-social forms of behavior would never gain anything for those who supported it. And this, Mr. Speaker, is shown by the fact that 87 per cent of the Canadian people supported the Government in its action.

The October terror in Quebec has shown to us, Mr. Speaker, that Canada is not immune from violence. The emotions of anger, outrage, frustration and fear spread through us all, but we must not let these emotions overcome us. If we do we should be playing into the hands of the revolutionaries. I need not remind you that in this time of crisis, 16 members of the New Democratic Party voted not to approve the invoking of The War Measures Act thereby showing that none of them had any understanding of Canada and its people. I might mention four of the NDPs did vote in favor and three made sure that they were absent. This shows, Mr. Speaker, that the NDP are split within their own ranks. It shows that it is a sick philosophy. It shows that the extremists are within taking their toll. We cannot take chances, Mr. Speaker, with a party that does not care.

The NDP Waffle group say they want peace. They have hoped to obtain this objective with force. How is this possible, Mr. Speaker? You can't have it both ways. I ask the Members opposite, and they have said they are going to vote against the resolution. I feel it is these subversive elements in our society who have spent years propagandizing a leftist society

who are mainly to blame for these events. I recall reading an article, Mr. Speaker, from a Winnipeg paper in which the NDP MLA, Cy Gonick, stated that he did not support the FLQ yet in a small bookshop in Winnipeg, in which Mr. Gonick is part owner and shareholder a poster in the window read, "Freedom for the FLQ." Stand up and be counted. Of course, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Gonick is not in this Legislature, he is in the Manitoba Legislature. I should like to see the gentlemen across stand up and be counted in this respect. Of course, Mr. Gonick called it an innocent sign and assured the public that he was in no way responsible. If he does not believe in the freedom of the FLQ . . . take it down. Stand up and be counted, gentlemen;

I should like to say at the same time there exists the same thing in Saskatchewan, for when subversive elements cause difficulties for authorities such as last year's near riots in downtown Regina, who came out and supported it, our prominent Socialists. Of course, men like Mr. Rands Mr. Blakeney, Mr. Brockelbank, the NDP people, say that they want peace and that is what they have been advocating. But when there are riots or near riots who is leading them? Who is pushing it? Our Socialist friends; These were the people every time. Is this the Party that is protecting the subversive elements now, who in turn are trying to destroy our whole democratic system. Stand up and be counted. Now is the time. We know where you will be, division, revolution or the ballot, because you will never succeed with the ballot. Revolution will be your only course. Stand up and be counted.

Mr. Speaker, it is evident that I will support the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. F. K. RADLOFF (Nipawin): — Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to have the opportunity to second the motion for the Member from Estevan (Mr. MacDougall). It is a very important Resolution. FLQ and' other militant groups are working to destroy our Canadian unity and there are many astounding and unbelievable actions being taken across Canada. I think that it is important that all Legislatures across Canada press for the control of terrorism of all kinds. At this time I am waiting for further information and some facts regarding this matter and I know that Members opposite would like to get the cold hard facts about this matter, so Mr. Speaker, I should ask permission to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

RESOLUTION NO. 4 — SHIFTING OF TAX BURDEN FOR SCHOOL PURPOSES

Mr. E. I. Wood (Swift Current) moved, seconded by Mr. A. Matsalla (Canora):

That this Assembly, mindful of the ever-increasing burden placed on property owners by the steadily-rising cost of education, recommends to the Government of Saskatchewan that it find ways of shifting a significant amount of the tax burden for school purposes from property to taxes more closely related to the ability to pay, in acknowledgment that property taxes should be for property services.

He said: — Mr. Speaker, in the last

seven years there has been a significant increase in school costs and in the amount of property taxation. Total property taxes have risen from \$96,400,000 in 1963 to \$163 million in 1969, a rise of some 69 per cent. In 1963 total school property taxation in Saskatchewan was \$46,888,000, while in 1969 the last year for which we have figures, it was \$83,700,000 an increase of some 78 per cent, Mr. Speaker, in school property taxes.

These, Mr. Speaker, are overall taxes and they do not represent the figures for rural Saskatchewan. I should like to point out, Sir, that the total rural municipal and local improvement district taxes in 1969 were \$68,400,000, or 35.1 per cent of net farm income of \$195 million as shown on the White Paper put out in January of this year. Now this is a startling figure, that, in 1969 rural municipal and local improvement district taxes were 35 per cent of farm net income.

This I don't consider to be an entirely fair figure because the total rural municipal taxes and local improvement district taxes contained in those tax figures, taxes on oil wells, pipe lines and business assessments as well. Now we don't have total property taxes shown in the Rural Municipal annual report by themselves. They show only total taxes whether municipal, school or hospital. But the assessment tables are broken down into so much for land taxes, so much for improvements and so much for business, so much for railways, gas and oil pipelines, etc.

I endeavored to get a picture of what the taxes are at the present time on land and improvements only in the rural municipalities and the local improvement districts. I took the total of the land taxes and improvements, assessments rather, and took this figure as a percentage of the total figure of land and improvement taxes. I come up with a figure that in 1963 there were approximately \$43 million in land and improvement taxes in Saskatchewan which was approximately 13.5 per cent of farm net income in that year. While in 1969 there was \$59 million of land and improvement taxes, which was 30.4 per cent of farm net income. You get my drift, Mr. Speaker, that the total taxes including oil wells and everything amounted to 35 per cent of farm income in 1969, but when you deduct the taxes which were there of oil wells, gas lines, pipe lines, etc., you still come up with the figure of 30 per cent, 30 per cent of the farm income in 1969 which went for taxes on his land and improvements. I think that this is a startling figure.

This shows an increase of 125 per cent from 13.5 per cent in 1963 to 30.4 per cent in 1969. This is a tremendous increase and it is due to two factors: (1) the increase in taxation, and (2) the decrease in farming income. I feel that where we have been talking about taxes and the increase in property taxes, in rather detached phrases, we have to come to grips with a very serious problem when farm taxes on farm lands in 1969 — and I see no reason for any improvement in the last year — that 30 per cent of the farmers' net income goes for land taxes. Now you add to this the fact which I pointed out in an earlier debate, Mr. Speaker, that 11.6 per cent of provincial personal income went for provincial taxes and I see no reason to think that farmers didn't pay their share of this, you have a total of 42 per cent of farmers' income that went for taxes, property and provincial, not to mention federal taxes.

So in these times when the farmer is so hard-pressed he has to pay some 42 per cent of his income for taxes. I think that this is something that this Assembly has to bear in mind. These are startling figures but I believe that they are correct. I think that they will be borne out by farmers' records. You will find that this is a fact of life across Saskatchewan today.

In bringing out the report, Mr. Speaker, in 1965 — the Report of the Royal Commission on Taxation, which was headed by Dean T .H. McLeod — the report had this to say in Chapter 5, paragraph 4:

There is already substantial evidence that the financial pressure of educational programs are exerting some inhibiting effect upon the activities of local councils in developing their own program of community services.

In our opinion it is to be doubted if the total property tax bill can safely be pushed much further without, in many instances, passing the point of tolerability.

If these things that Mr. McLeod said are true, when total property taxes were some 13 1/2 per cent of farming income, then this is much more evident today when property taxes are over 30 per cent of farm income.

I think this study of the Report on the Royal Commission on Taxation is a fairly reliable one. It has some defects I have to admit. It isn't entirely reliable. It made a prediction that in 1971 the population of Saskatchewan would be 973,200 people instead of 942,000 that we actually have. They were some 31,000 out in that regard. I guess they didn't take into consideration some of the things that would be taking place in the Province during the years of Liberal administration, but they did make that mistake, but I don't think that you should hold that against the accuracy of the report in other ways.

One of the arguments against the extensive use of the property tax for the financing of services is its latent inequity. The relationship between property taxation and ability to pay are not always apparent. A professional man living in a comparatively modest house may be paying less than half as much for the education of his children as a farmer at half the income with comparatively extensive holdings. A wheat farmer may have a depressed income but quite a large land assessment, while intensive operations such as a feedlot may be paying almost no tax when they have a good income. A businessman with large premises on which he has to pay business tax may not be making as much as someone operating from a hole in the wall. The amount of property on which a man pays taxes may have little relation to the amount of money that he makes.

There is a continued argument as to the relative equity between urban and rural assessments. This would not be too important so long as there is equity between taxpayers in a given rural or urban municipality as is usual in general municipal taxation. It is with education taxes that the difficulty arises, where a common tax is levied on both urban and rural communities within a school unit. There is the possibility of inequities arising between different units, competing for government grants which are based on assessments.

The Commission says in Chapter 3, paragraph 8:

We have concluded that the assessment system as it works at the present time does not provide an adequately sensitive system of indicators for tax purposes. The capitalized income approach to land assessment is adequate in its conception, but wholly out of date in its construction and desperately out of date in its application.

I know that the Assessment Branch of the Department of Municipal Affairs has, and is, endeavoring to make property assessments as equitable as possible. I think a great deal more has to be done along this line. For instance, I still get many complaints that grazing land is not taxed as highly in comparison to grain growing land in view of the income derived.

I think that the property assessments and taxation are too inexact a measure of ability to pay, to be used in collecting a major portion of our funds for necessary services. Then there is the argument that it is not either equitable or desirable that property taxation should be used to finance education. The position taken is that while services to property can be justifiably charged against property, such a social benefit as education, which in our mobile society may be an ultimate benefit hundreds or thousands of miles away from the property which financed it, it is unfair. Others argue that it is not property that pays the taxes but the income of its owners. This is the position taken in a paper recently put out by Mr. Thorson, the Executive Secretary of the School Trustees Association. In his paper Mr. Thorson appears to agree that property taxation is not the most equitable. He quotes the Local Government Continuant Committee, in his 1961 report, which says:

It is the committee's conclusion that Saskatchewan's property tax is not sufficiently related to ability to pay.

He goes on to show in his paper the weaknesses in our assessment system and refers to the study initiated by the Provincial Municipal Conference in 1969, which was held in this Chamber, into assessment procedures, which committee he indicates is making slow progress. But he takes the position that there is no good reason for school boards to abandon the field and leave the property tax for the exclusive use of municipal councils. He puts up some arguments to support his position, mainly, that if local autonomy in school matters is to be retained, local responsibility for raising funds for education must also be maintained.

The McLeod Report takes a position on this in Chapter 5, paragraph 16. And the position taken is that it recommends at least a basic educational program throughout the province, a basic program to be totally financed from provincial funds rather than by property taxation. It runs as follows:

The idea of the foundation or basic program in education is so well established that it requires little elucidation here. Fundamentally it reflects a social belief that all students should be guaranteed some adequate uniform minimum standard of education opportunities, regardless of where they live. It also implies a recognition of the financial responsibilities of making such opportunities a reality.

It goes on in Chapter 5, paragraph 18.

The province should bear complete responsibility for financing the cost of a foundation program as we have defined it above. The logic behind this recommendation is re-enforced by the tax realities of which we have made repeated mention. Whatever financial difficulties the province may claim, its disabilities are simply those of a total provincial economy and it is against these, the total programs such as the education program, should be measured. The province, at least, has access to funds that are derived from a tax structure which is reasonably equitable in its workings.

They are saying there that provincial taxes as a whole are much more equitable in the way that they work out than property taxation. To continue the quote:

In the matter of financing the cost of education this consideration is of extreme importance.

The report endeavors to show what it considers to be equitable ways in which the necessary funds could be raised by provincial taxes. However, the tax shift which proposes moving away from property taxes to provincial taxation amounts to only some \$17 million. In view of present demands, Mr. Speaker, it would appear that these are inadequate. I maintain that some of these same procedures which are recommended in this report could be used to bring about the desired results.

At the Provincial Local Government Conference which was held in this Chamber in June 1969, the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities delegates brought in a proposal for a shift in the costs of education from property tax to what they called a basic income tax. This would be a tax upon all net income with no exemptions. They maintain that higher incomes are usually the result of better education and those earning higher incomes should pay proportionately for education costs. They claim that this sort of a tax would not keep industry out of the province as taxes would be based on profits rather than on plant and in many instances they would be lower than those which are presently paid by some industrial concerns.

I was personally disappointed at that time, Mr. Speaker, that Premier Thatcher dismissed the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities proposal out of hand with what appeared to be almost no consideration. I thought then, and still think, that there are quite a few points of merit in this plan.

Critics of the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities plan say that the imposition of an entirely new tax structure for education alone would be too complicated and costly. I am somewhat inclined to agree with this conclusion but I believe that there is enough merit in the proposal to warrant a detailed study by government to determine its feasibility.

The Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities men say that they have not looked into all the details as to what may be concerned in such a plan. They feel that even if they did before any government was prepared to accept it they would have to make their own study but they are recommending that the program which they proposed should have detailed study by government and I think in this that they are right.

I believe that the time has come for us to reassess our position in regard to property taxation for educational purposes. Property taxation is not basically equitable and should be used sparingly. The province has other forms of taxation at its command which should be used to finance a desirable standard of education in all parts of the province, regardless of the ability of any area to pay for such a program.

I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that a New Democratic government will give sincere consideration to put into action some plan which will have the desired results, whether it follows the proposals of the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities or the Report of the Royal Commission on Taxation or parts of both.

I so move, Mr. Speaker.

MR. B. D. GALLAGHER (Yorkton): — Mr. Speaker, I listened with considerable interest to the remarks made by the Member for Swift Current (Mr. Wood) and I must say that most of the things that he said I have to concur with. I am in sympathy with the thoughts of the Member and the thoughts in the Resolution. I should like to give a little further thought to the matter and speak on it at a later date, therefore, I ask leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

MOTIONS FOR RETURN

RETURN NO. 96

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Matsalla (Canora) for Return No. 96 showing:

For each of the years 1969 and 1970: (a) The number of eligible Homeowner Grant applications that were received. (b) The amount that was paid on eligible homeowner applications, (c) The administration costs covering Homeowner Grants and how these costs are classified.

HON. A. R. GUY (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — Mr. Speaker, in this motion by the Hon. Member from Canora there is some confusion as to dates because as you are well aware that for the Homeowner Grant, the payments are made during a fiscal year and the grant as far as the recipients are concerned, is on a calendar year. So I should like to move the following amendment, seconded by the Hon. Mr. McIsaac:

That all the words after the word “showing” be deleted and the following substituted therefore:

(a) The number of eligible Homeowner Grant applications received for the year 1969 and for the year 1970 as at March 1, 1971. (b) The amount paid during the fiscal year 1969-70 to March 1, 1971, on eligible Homeowner Grant applications, (c) The administrative costs pertaining to each of the years 1969-70 and 1970-71 as at March 1, 1971, and the classification of these costs.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that this amendment will clarify and allow us to answer the question from the Member from Canora for the information that he is anxious to obtain.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

RESOLUTIONS

RESOLUTION NO. 1 — EARLY & EFFECTIVE ACTION TO FIGHT UNEMPLOYMENT.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution by Mr. W. E. Smishek (Regina North East):

That this Assembly recommends to the consideration of the Government of Saskatchewan early and effective action to fight unemployment, provide jobs and stem an alarming migration of workers and their families from Saskatchewan to other Provinces, as well as accompanying heavy losses to the Province's economy, on lines that would include:

- (1) Publicly financed or assisted public housing, and public assistance for the construction of schools, hospitals, public parks, recreational programs and similar projects;
- (2) Improvement of labor standards protection, including the minimum wage, to assist the buying power of thousands of people on low incomes;
- (3) The institution of special methods to aid industrial development and expand technical and vocational training and upgrading.

MR. G. T. SNYDER (Moose Jaw North): — Mr. Speaker, several days have passed since my colleague the Member for Regina North East (Mr. Smishek), moved the Resolution that is before us at the moment and I think to refresh our memory it might be worthwhile to read the Resolution once again:

That this Assembly recommends to the consideration of the Government of Saskatchewan early and effective action to fight unemployment, provide jobs and stem an alarming migration of workers and their families from Saskatchewan to other Provinces, as well as accompanying heavy losses to the Province's economy, on lines that would include:

- (1) Publicly financed or assisted public housing, and public assistance for the construction of schools, hospitals, public parks, recreational programs, and similar projects;
- (2) Improvement of labor standards protection, including the minimum wage, to assist the buying power of thousands of people on low incomes;
- (3) The institution of special methods to aid industrial

development and expand technical and vocational training and upgrading.

Well, Mr. Speaker, as seconder of this Resolution I am pleased to add a few words in support of the proposition which has been advanced in a very complete and very able manner by the Member for Regina North East.

The problem of unemployment in Canada, Mr. Speaker, and in Saskatchewan has emerged as one of the most serious problems that we have been called upon to face in recent times. This phenomenon that we are experiencing today can't be regarded as seasonal or cyclical unemployment because, Mr. Speaker, we are seeing a hard core of jobless forming which represents a group that will make up a category of workers who can expect to be perennially and permanently unemployed unless direct and meaningful action is taken by government.

People in my age category, Mr. Speaker, entered the Canadian labor force at the end of World War II and in most cases have enjoyed steady employment until the last decade and a half when a new age of technology rendered large numbers of these people obsolete. In the railroad industry, an industry with which I am particularly familiar, we have seen entire job classifications disappear from the scene with the resultant loss of many thousands of jobs. The introduction of the diesel locomotive brought about the loss of large numbers of jobs on both Canadian railroads in particular since 1956, Mr. Speaker. It has meant the disappearance of whole job classifications — people such as the boiler-making trade, boiler washers, fitters, fitter's helpers, machinists, ash pit men and a host of other laboring jobs which were associated with the era of the steam engine. Additionally, Mr. Speaker, locomotive firemen have been disposed of and are continuing to be disposed of by the attrition process and there has been additionally a sharp reduction in employment in car departments and a marked reduction in maintenance of way employees who are charged with the responsibility of keeping the roadbed in safe operating conditions for rolling stock.

Other industries have undergone a similar transformation with the age of technology taking its toll in terms of cold blooded centralization which I am afraid has shown little or no concern for the problems of the abandoned community or for the employees or their families.

Unemployment which has been created by this process, Mr. Speaker, I suppose to a degree must be accepted as part of the highly automated age which has emerged since the post war era. I suppose it wouldn't be rational for us to assume the position taken by workers many years ago during the time of the early Industrial Revolution when they attempted to protect their jobs by smashing the machines that replaced their labor. However, I think it has to be recognized by governments particularly that the fruits or the benefits of this new technology must not be allowed to become the private domain of private industry. It is expecting too much I suggest, Mr. Speaker, to suppose that industry will assume a responsible or a benevolent attitude in its search for more efficient methods of production with higher returns to their shareholders. Industry in the private sector of our economy by its various nature, is profit oriented and it would be naive, I suggest, to expect these captains of industry to discharge voluntarily their obligations

to communities and individuals who have been the victims of this new technology.

This is why, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, governments must be diligent in providing certain standards in assuring for instance that upgrading courses are made available to workers who find themselves as part of the labor glut that we have in Canada today. This is why, Mr. Speaker, senior governments in particular must oblige industry to assume its fair share of the cost through the tax base in providing the kind of technical and vocational and upgrading training which displaced workers must have if they are to re-enter the world of work and become useful citizens again.

The measures which are outlined in this Resolution before us provide, I believe, a guide which would go a considerable distance in solving the sad situation which we are confronted with in Saskatchewan today. A large public investment in the kind of housing which is desperately needed in Saskatchewan today would be an immediate stimulus to the construction industry which has been dormant in Saskatchewan for a number of months. In past years, Mr. Speaker, we have seen large private investment in high-rise apartments and homes which fall in the \$25,000 to \$35,000 range. Difficult times in Saskatchewan in recent years have all but nullified this kind of construction and the outward migration of Saskatchewan people has resulted in increasing numbers of houses across the entire province with 'for sale' signs attached to them.

I believe it is a rather cruel chain of events, Mr. Speaker, when we have allowed large sums of money to be invested in Saskatchewan homes which now stand vacant when at the same time we have large numbers of low income people who are living in sub-standard housing and are unable to afford the kind of decent accommodation to which every Canadian should be entitled.

So this is why we in our party have suggested both in 'and out of this Legislature that we need a large public investment in publicly financed or assisted low-rental housing units which will serve a twofold purpose: (1) in raising living standards of low income groups, and (2) to provide the stimulus which would create many jobs in the slumping construction industry.

I believe it is well recognized, Mr. Speaker, that this kind of investment provides more employment than any other activity that can be initiated by government. Similarly the kind of investment that is possible in other activities such as investment in schools, hospitals, park and recreation projects, also have a very high labor content which would have provided a giant stimulus to the Saskatchewan economy when it was needed most.

Instead of a concentration of, this kind of employment-creating activity, Mr. Speaker, this Government chose to sink the second largest share of the Provincial Budget into highway construction. Whether or not the Government received value for dollars spent will no doubt be the subject for another debate. However, I think it is acknowledged that per dollar spent, there is a low labor content in highway construction. Because of the enormous earth moving equipment and other highly mechanized processes in the highway construction industry, very few jobs are created when we consider the vast amounts of money that are spent. Here, Mr. Speaker, was another opportunity ignored by

this Government to direct the flow of capital to job creating ventures in a time of high unemployment.

I don't intend, this afternoon, to speak at great length, Mr. Speaker, but I do want to point out that in addition to the unemployment which I referred to earlier, which had been brought about by the introduction of the new technology, we are presently suffering from the man-made variety of unemployment which was created deliberately by the Federal Liberal Government at Ottawa. When the Federal Liberals embarked on their scheme to create unemployment as a weapon with which to fight inflation, Mr. Speaker, they were warned of the hardships and the human suffering that would be caused. Liberals, both here and in Ottawa, seem content to apply their own remedy without attempting to diagnose the problem. I believe, Mr. Speaker, it will be conceded, that Prime Minister Trudeau's government's so-called war on inflation has to be regarded as one of the principal causes for the present unemployment crisis. With this in mind, I am sure it will be agreed that inflation and proposed remedies for the problem of inflation will have to be regarded as a central issue in the question that we are debating today.

This present unemployment crisis which is destroying lives and breaking up homes and causing untold hardship and misery, is a phenomenon which was man-made, and I am sure that most people will agree that the so-called cure for inflation introduced by a Federal Liberal government has been worse than the disease. The Prime Minister of Canada is quoted as saying, and these are his words, "If people think we are going to lose our nerve, they should think again. We're not." He went on to say that the government will stand by its austerity program even if it means a rate of unemployment of 6 per cent or more. We all know that unemployment in Canada has risen well above that 6 per cent level.

An article in the Toronto Daily Star of January 31, 1970, has some interesting comments to make concerning the Government's war on inflation. It had this to say, and I think the words are worthy of note.

While the government compliments itself on being willing to risk votes in the fight against inflation, the real sacrifices are being imposed on others. There are many thousands of Canadians to whom austerity and deflation means nothing more or less than unemployment. The real indictment against the government's brand of courage is that it is futile. With much patriotic shouting, the Canadian people are being led in a charge up the wrong hill, against the wrong enemy, and are being exhorted all the while to ignore the casualties. It was this kind of courage that persuaded the Polish Army in 1939 to send horsemen against German tanks.

It appears, Mr. Speaker, that the Government of Canada has chosen to ignore some very fundamental facts in their ill-conceived war on inflation. There are a number of special interest groups who will argue about the root cause of inflation and factors which have been initially responsible for rising costs and the resultant loss in the purchasing power of the Canadian dollar. Certain facts in this connection deserve to be remembered. Since the creation by the Federal Government of the Prices and Incomes Commission, a large number of facts have been brought to light with respect to the pressure points of the inflationary spiral which we have experienced over the last number of years.

It has become a favorite pastime in a number of circles, but especially in Liberal circles, Mr. Speaker, where it has become a bit of an obsession, to place the entire burden of responsibility for inflation upon the shoulders of the working men and women of this country. In virtually every instance, Mr. Speaker, pay cheques have been trailing the upward spiral of living costs. I know of no wage earner today, Mr. Speaker, who would not agree that his weekly pay cheque today brings home less consumer goods and services than was the case 10 years ago. Even if wages and salaries manage somehow to keep pace with increased living costs, the net result would be a decreased amount in disposable income because of increased income and other consumer taxes that the wage earner is obliged to pay.

Those who have chosen wage earners as their whipping boy, Mr. Speaker, point out the fact that the average wage in manufacturing in Canada has risen to \$2.75 an hour since 1961, or an increase of about 50 per cent. Here, they suggest, lies the cause of the Canadian inflationary problem. Those who assume this posture, Mr. Speaker, refuse to look any further, and refuse to allow the facts to alter their point of view. The facts are, Mr. Speaker, that profits have outstripped wages in every field. In 1961, corporation profits before income taxes were \$3,427,000,000. At the end of 1968 they had risen to \$5,887,000,000, or an increase of 71 per cent. The trend has continued, Mr. Speaker, with corporation profits exceeding the five billion mark in successive years.

I just ask you today, Mr. Speaker, how could it be possible for an honest, rational government, provincial or federal, to ignore the real inflationary pressures of recent years? In 1969 the Bank of Montreal showed an increase in profits of some 89 per cent. Finance, insurance and real estate profits rose by 47 per cent over the 1968 figure. Massey Ferguson showed profits up by 64 per cent for the first nine months of 1969. Food and beverage manufacturers showed profits increasing by some \$27 million during the first six months of 1969. Steel profits rose by \$16 million during that same period. In spite of the handsome profit the steel companies enjoyed, they still increased their prices by some 6 per cent, with consumer goods generally continuing the upward climb.

I believe it is significant, Mr. Speaker, that Liberals, both in Ottawa and in Saskatchewan are ready to apply a double standard, with continuing pressure on workers to sign firm and binding contracts, usually for 24 months or more, well within the 6 per cent guidelines that the government has arbitrarily laid down over the past number of months. At the same time the Government's idea of restricting corporations which are making excessive profits, seems to be to use The Prices and Incomes Commission as a vehicle to draw the matter to the attention of the public. Well, in essence, Mr. Speaker, the Federal Liberal Government in Ottawa, — and the Thatcher Liberals here have attempted to impose wage restraints on wage earners while ignoring the giant drain which is weakening the Saskatchewan and the Canadian economy, a drain that has been the most significant contributing factor to the inflationary spiral which has been robbing the Canadian consumer of his purchasing power, and eroding the standard of living of the average Canadian citizen.

As if it were not enough, Mr. Speaker, to ignore the plight of hard-pressed wage earners, while allowing corporations

a free hand in the market place, the Government of Canada compounded the felony at the height of the inflationary spiral several months ago by forgiving the automobile manufacturers an outstanding tariff debt in excess of \$80 million. This, I suggest, is just another example of the double standards which Liberals apparently are content to perpetuate.

It is difficult to imagine, Mr. Speaker, how any Canadian no matter how blind or biased can accept the free enterprise solution that Liberals federally and provincially have applied to the problems of inflation. The austerity program has resulted in the kind of human misery that cannot be accepted when we consider recent Dominion Bureau of Statistics figures which indicate that more than 668,000 Canadians are suffering the ravages of unemployment with many of them living in deprived circumstances and we are certain, Mr. Speaker, that the 668,000 is not an entirely accurate figure, with more complete figures being more readily available in the near future.

This problem would be difficult enough to bear, Mr. Speaker, I suggest, if there was no alternate solution to the problem of inflation. Our party has consistently advocated measures which would have solved the problem of inflation without the harmful by-products which have accompanied the traditional Liberal free enterprise methods. The suggestions of the New Democrats have been ignored and Liberals have been content to see the unemployment figure rise to something well in excess of the 6 per cent of the Canadian labor force.

During the summer of 1970, Mr. Speaker, members of our party in the Federal House in Ottawa recognized a mounting unemployment problem at that time and they made a number of proposals to the Government of Canada as follows: (1) the government must call a conference of the business interests and organized labor, and sit down with them, not through some third party, and work out a policy by which we can get maximum production without the ravages of inflation; (2) the government must adopt an expansionist policy to relieve unemployment. There can be no excuse for unemployment in this day and age. It has been demonstrated that when you have the raw materials and the manpower, it is quite possible to keep people fully employed; (3) if, after these measures, the government is frightened of inflation or finds it is getting out of hand, the government should consider the feasibility of a comprehensive selective system of restraints on all forms of income, including prices, profits and rents.

Similarly, Mr. Speaker, we, the New Democratic MLAs from Saskatchewan, submitted a brief to the Thatcher Government in January of 1970 and let me quote just one paragraph which I think, under the circumstances, deserves the attention of this Government. The quotation goes this way:

Inflation must be met head on. This means effective and comprehensive controls at inflation pressure points, prices, profits, interest rates and corporate capital investment, supplemented by an income policy embracing all incomes, not just those of wage earners.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the Thatcher administration here apparently discovered the crisis a year later and according to the Leader-Post of February 10, 1971, this year. Premier Thatcher presented Ottawa with a six-point proposal to solve our unemployment problem.

Instead of doing something about attacking the problem themselves here in Saskatchewan, almost a year previously, Saskatchewan Liberals contented themselves with once again crying to Ottawa for assistance after unemployment had reached crisis proportions here. The Thatcher brief to the Trudeau Government was reported in the Leader-Post in this way:

Our people must look to Ottawa for leadership. Jobs are needed now not next June, but now.

Saskatchewan suggested:

1. A massive crash public works program by all governments, particularly by Ottawa.

I wonder how the Provincial Government here followed its own criterion in the crash public works program which has really not got off the ground at this stage.

2. The Thatcher Government recommended to Ottawa an immediate withdrawal of the sales tax on building materials at both federal and provincial levels.
3. Withdrawal of the federal three per cent temporary surcharge on personal and corporate income tax.
4. The extension of the designated area legislation.
5. Temporary extension of unemployment insurance benefits.
6. Dropping of any contemplated tax increases as proposed in the White Paper.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that we must agree that some of these suggestions are very commendable and deserve the attention of the Trudeau Government at Ottawa. But certainly, Mr. Speaker, there are many things that the Thatcher Government might have done here in the Province of Saskatchewan in connection with a crash public works program that might have had some substance rather than the kind of half-hearted public works program that was initiated at a time when unemployment had become an extremely serious factor in our province. How much better it would have been, Mr. Speaker, if this Government had, instead of sitting on its hands and crying to Ottawa and talking about a crash public works program, how much better it would have been if it had taken some direct action along the lines which the Schreyer Government initiated in Manitoba.

In April of 1970, in the spring of the year, Manitoba approved a \$32 million capital supply reserve fund. And in October, the Schreyer Government announced a \$74 million capital works program. A further \$55.6 million program was put into motion to provide 3,600 housing units. This announcement was made only a short time later. The project is aimed at providing housing accommodation for families under the \$5,000 a year level and is designed to raise the living standard of these people as well as providing jobs in construction and associated industries.

Meanwhile, Mr. Speaker, back in Saskatchewan, in the dead of winter, in mid-December, Saskatchewan Liberals began a feeble \$15 million crash public works program. I am sure that it can be expected that only a small portion of this money will be spent

to alleviate the critical problem that we are experiencing as a result of this Liberal Government's neglect and incompetence.

I want again, to draw your attention, Mr. Speaker, to Sessional Paper No. 44, Return No. 29, which was tabled in this House on March 1st. The question that I asked was: the amount that was allocated in the Government's work projects announcement of December 1970 for work on the Saskatchewan Training School at Moose Jaw; (2) of this amount, the total that has been expended as of February 15, 1971.

The Government replied that \$72,000 had been earmarked for this purpose and that as of February 15 no accounts had been paid. On further inquiry, I was told after consulting the Minister and his deputy, that the \$72,000 was broken down into three projects; 1. Sewer improvements to the extent of \$7,000 and on this microscopic job, Mr. Speaker, the design has only been completed. No work of any physical nature has as yet begun. 2. A \$50,000 roof renovation job which Public Works has concluded should not be proceeded with because it is going to take more work and money than they had expected and so they have recommended that this work be not proceeded with. 3. The part of the \$72,000 project which has begun involves kitchen renovations which began some three weeks or a month ago. The amount allocated for this job is \$15,000 which I trust will be spent.

Mr. Speaker, this is a part of the crash program announced with all the trumpets and fanfare by this Government to assist unemployment in Saskatchewan in a time of crisis. Not very impressive, I am afraid.

Mr. Speaker, \$7,000 for sewer improvements, design completed, no money spent. \$50,000 for roof renovations on the Saskatchewan Training School, nothing done, no money spent, no intention to proceed with this work. \$15,000 for kitchen renovations with some progress in evidence in a very limited way.

This, Mr. Speaker, is a pretty sick performance for this Government when we consider the need for an aggressive action by government to combat unemployment in this period in our history. The announced projects at the Moose Jaw Training School which failed to materialize, demonstrates how this Government solves unemployment in its own way by making statements and issuing press releases. Most of the public works programs announced in December have failed to materialize with Saskatchewan's unemployed workers being the losers as the result of this lack of Government action. This is just another way, Mr. Speaker, in which this Government has failed the people of Saskatchewan. I suggest to you that Liberal Governments, both here and in Ottawa, will share the guilt for the misery which the unemployed of this country are suffering. This, in itself, provides yet another reason, Mr. Speaker, why the people of Saskatchewan are looking for the opportunity to replace the Government at the earliest opportunity.

I shall be pleased to support the motion, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. D. V. HEALD (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I have a number of matters that I should like to discuss in relation to this Resolution and I would beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

ADJOURNED DEBATE

RETURN NO. 79

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. W. J. Berezowsky (Prince Albert East-Cumberland) for Return No. 79 showing:

Whether the Government of Saskatchewan or any of its agencies (i) paid, (ii) rebated, or (iii) suspended charges in 1970 for overweight permits in respect of Waskesiu Holdings or any other hauler of timber to the Prince Albert Pulp Company.

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

That all the words after the word "showing" be deleted and the following substituted therefore:

- (a) whether the Government of Saskatchewan suspended any charges which otherwise would have been required in 1970 in respect of overweight permits for the haul of pulpwood to the Prince Albert Pulp Company Limited by Waskesiu Holdings Limited or any other hauler; (b) whether the Government of Saskatchewan rebated any payments received for such permits; (c) whether payments received in respect of such permits represented a part of the cost of pulpwood delivered to the Prince Albert Pulp Company Limited; (d) the amount of payments received in respect of such permits.

MR. W. J. BEREZOWSKY (Prince Albert East-Cumberland): — Mr. Speaker, I was the original mover of that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: — Just a minute, hold on, hold, hold on! Yes, you were the original mover of the motion all right and you can speak to the amendment if you haven't already done so.

MR. BEREZOWSKY: — Well, I don't have very much to say, Mr. Speaker, but I just want to say this: that it appears that the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) never trusts anybody. It doesn't matter how sincere or how clear a resolution or a question is that is brought into the House, all the Provincial Treasurer does is hire half a dozen lawyers to look at my questions suspecting that there is something very hidden and nasty.

AN HON. MEMBER: — You're right!

MR. BEREZOWSKY: — Yes, that's right, I know I am right!

And all that these lawyers could come up with is to reverse the order of the questions. Question (i) they have as the last one now. But there is one point there that was inserted and it might be of some interest and that is, question (c) — whether payments received in respect of such permits represented a part of the cost of pulpwood delivered to the Prince Albert Pulp Company Limited. I don't think I need a lawyer to tell me what the answer is. I didn't have to have the Minister or

anybody else incorporating that into the question because every time you allow overweights — the Minister of Highways can tell us that — when you allow overweight they are going to haul overweight and then the heavy loads will do exactly what they've done to some of the highways in my constituency and in other constituencies of Saskatchewan. They just tear the roads to pieces. That is what has happened to Highway No. 55 east of Meath Park, Mr. Speaker. The proof of the pudding as to what I'm saying is the fact that the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) had to start rebuilding that road last year. I hope that he finishes it. The destruction of the road was due partly to the fact that we have had this kind of situation where overload permits have been allowed. The additional question — whether payments received in respect of such permits represented a part of the cost of pulpwood. Well of course it does, because the public is paying for the pulpwood and indirectly it represents the cost of the pulpwood. Obviously, the Minister has nothing new to offer. He is answering my question and I'm quite satisfied to support the amendment as it is.

Amendment agreed to

Motion as amended agreed to.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:13 o'clock p.m.