

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Fifth Session — Sixteenth Legislature**  
**21st Day**

**Tuesday, March 16, 1971.**

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

**WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Before the Orders of the Day I wish to introduce the following groups of students situated in the galleries: from Balfour Technical School from the constituency of Regina South East represented by the Member, Mr. Baker, 133 students under the direction of their teachers, Messrs. Wahl, Hardir and Weichel; from the constituency of Morse represented by the Hon. the Premier, 42 students from the Brownlee High School under the direction of their teacher, Mr. Waldie from the constituency of Melfort Tisdale 112 students from Star City.

I am sure all Hon. Members would wish to extend to the students, their teachers and the bus drivers an extremely warm welcome to this Legislature, and express the very sincere wish that they will find their stay here enjoyable and educational and we wish to every one of them a safe trip home.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear;

**ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**FOAM LAKE BANTAM HOCKEY TEAM**

**MR. N. E. BYERS:** (Kelvington) — Before the Orders of the Day, Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I draw to the attention of all Members of the House the fact that last Saturday the Foam Lake Bantam Hockey Team, joined by three or four players from the town of Kelvington, captured the provincial championship in Bantam B hockey competition. This fine team of young athletes have had a very successful year under the direction of their able coach, Constable Barr. On their road to capturing the provincial Bantam B hockey crown I believe they edged out Bantam teams in the towns of Canora, Watrous and Maple Creek. In their final encounter, a two game, total point wrap-up series they edged out Nipawin in the first game six to five and in the second game five to four to win the provincial championship in the Bantam B Competition. I hope that all Members will join with me in offering their congratulations to this fine young hockey club in their achievement and the wish that they will have continued good luck in their athletic achievements in the future.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear:

## STUDENT TEMPORARY EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM

**HON. D. G. MacLENNAN:** (Minister of Labour) — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I wish to make a brief announcement relating to the Student Temporary Employment Program. I am now pleased to report that following consultations with employers and students' representatives the Government has decided to widen the scope of the STEP program to include all categories of unemployment. The program will offer incentives in the form of Government subsidies to farm and non-farm employers to encourage them to hire students for temporary summer jobs. The amount of the subsidy will represent 50 per cent of the salary attached to each approved job filled by a student up to a maximum monthly Government contribution of \$150 per student. The subsidy will be paid for a maximum of three months in the period May 1st to September 30th. At the expiration of the subsidized three-month period it is hoped that employers will be in a position to keep their employees on independently until classes resume in the fall. As you are aware, Mr. Speaker, the sum of \$1.5 million has been added to the 1971-72 budgetary appropriations of the Department of Labour for this purpose. In addition the Government will employ students in Provincial Government departments, agencies and Crown corporations in connection with which, of course, regular Government salaries will be paid. It is anticipated that a maximum of 4,400 student jobs would be provided under the program including 1,600 in Provincial Government service, 1,000 on farms, 1,000 in private businesses, 400 in institutions and 400 in the service of local governments.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. D. G. MacLENNAN:** (Minister of Labour) — This assumes that the various employer groups will make full use of the program. I would urge the Members of this Legislature to use their influence in encouraging employers to employ students this summer and thereby provide our young people with the opportunity of acquiring financial resources to continue their education this fall.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. W. G. DAVIES:** (Moose Jaw South) — Mr. Speaker, just a brief comment on the remarks of the Minister of Labour. I am sure the Members of the House, on this side of the House anyway, will welcome the announcement that the plan will now widen the category to include other kinds of employment which, as everyone knows, in the initial stage was restricted to the rural areas, as I recall the announcement. I think this is something we can welcome. I should have hoped that the \$150 maximum could have been extended in the light of the fact that many not very high earnings would be in excess of \$2 an hour. This it seems to me, would contain employment in a rather low earning range. I frankly think that the Minister's estimate of 4,400 is optimistic but no doubt we may question him

about this later. I should hope, however, Mr. Speaker, that the specific details of this plan will be released to the public and particularly to the Members of the Opposition so that we may have a chance to examine this program.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

### **MOTIONS FOR RETURNS**

#### **RETURN NO. 110**

**MR. E. KRAMER:** (The Battlefords) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 110 showing:

(a) the names of persons operating in Saskatchewan forests on Crown land in logging and sawmill Operations outside the Saskatchewan Timber Board; (b) the amount of lumber that has been produced by these operations; (c) the amount that has been received in stumpage or royalties.

**HON. J. R. BARRIE:** (Minister of Natural Resources) — Mr. Speaker, seeing that there is no particular year shown in this Return, it would mean a tremendous amount of work because we should have to go back to the year 1905 when the province first was formed and lumber operations were carried on.

I should like to adjourn the debate, Mr. Speaker.

Debate adjourned.

#### **RETURN NO. 117**

**MR. J. E. BROCKELBANK:** (Saskatoon Mayfair) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 117 showing:

1. Whether Saskatchewan Telecommunications sponsored a promotional advertisement on CFQC radio, at approximately 8:48 a.m. January 28, 1971.

2. If so, the content.

**HON. G. B. GRANT:** (Minister of Health) — Mr. Speaker, in connection with this motion I should like to move an amendment that would make it more in accordance with the circumstances. I would move, seconded by the Hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Coderre):

That the word 'promotional' in the first line of the motion be struck out and the word 'informational' be placed therein.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

**RETURN NO. 118**

**MR. J. E. BROCKELBANK:** (Saskatoon Mayfair) moved than an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 118 showing:

1. Whether the Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan — Saskatchewan Medical Care Insurance Commission sponsored a promotional advertisement on CFQC-TV between 6:30 and 7:00 p.m. November 14, 1970.

2. If so, the content.

**HON. G. B. GRANT:** (Minister of Health) — Mr. Speaker, in the case of The Medical Care Insurance Commission we don't try to promote the volume of business we do so I should like to move, seconded by the Hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Coderre):

That the word 'promotional' be deleted and the word 'informational' be substituted therefore.

**MR. BROCKELBANK:** — Mr. Speaker, in order that the Minister may be perfectly correct I should like to move a subamendment:

That the word 'a' where it appears in the second line (Votes and Proceedings) be removed and be substituted with the word 'an'.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Now I draw the attention of the Hon. Member to the fact that he cannot move an amendment to a previous part after the motion has been moved to the second part.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. SPEAKER:** — A subamendment must be relevant to the amendment, it therefore has to seek to amend the later part of the motion.

Amendment agreed to.

**MR. BROCKELBANK:** — In order to keep the Minister completely in order, Mr. Speaker, I should like to move an amendment:

To change the word 'a; in the second line where it appears

in the Votes and Proceedings to the word 'an'.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Well, has the Member got his motion properly written out?

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

### **RETURN NO. 119**

**MR. J. E. BROCKELBANK:** (Saskatoon Mayfair) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 119 showing:

1. Whether the SHSP-SMCIC sponsored a promotional advertisement on page 12 of the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix, November 14, 1970.
2. If so, the number of similar advertisements that were run.
3. The cost of each insertion.

**HON. G. B. GRANT:** (Minister of Health) — For the same reasons as quoted earlier to be more factual and also to be grammatically correct I would move, seconded by the Hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Coderre):

That the words 'a promotional' be deleted and the words 'an informational' be substituted therefore.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

### **RETURN NO. 110**

**MR. E. KRAMER:** (The Battlefords) — Mr. Speaker, would it be possible to assist the Minister to adjourn No. 2 if I was to move that the words 1969, 1970 and 1971 be added after the words 'Timber Board'.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — The Member has asked leave to revert to Return No. 110 for the purpose of somebody amending it which cannot be by him because he moved the motion. We revert to Order for Return No. 110.

MR. KRAMER moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 110 showing:

(a) the names of persons operating in Saskatchewan forests on Crown land in logging and sawmill operations outside of Saskatchewan Timber Board; (b) the amount of lumber that has been produced by these operations; (c) the amount that has been received in stumpage or royalties.

**MR. G. R. BOWERMAN:** (Shellbrook) — Mr. Speaker, I move to amend the Motion for Return No. 110:

That the words '1969-70-71' be added after the word 'Board' in the third line.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

## RESOLUTIONS

### RESOLUTION NO. 8 — ENQUIRY INTO HOMECOMING '71 PROJECTS.

Mr. A. E. Blakeney (Leader of the Opposition) moved, seconded by Mr. J. T. Snyder (Moose Jaw North):

That a Special Committee of the whole House be appointed to enquire into Homecoming '71 and in particular into financial assistance by the Provincial Government for Homecoming '71 projects sponsored by local groups.

And that such Committee have power to send for persons, papers and records and to examine witnesses under oath; to receive representations from interested parties and from members of the general public.

That this Committee be further instructed to report back to the House with all convenient speed.

He said: — Mr. Speaker, this is a motion that a Special Committee of the whole House be appointed to enquire into Homecoming '71 and in particular into financial assistance by the provincial Government for Homecoming '71 projects sponsored by local groups. It is proposed in the motion that the committee have power to send for persons, papers and records and to examine witnesses under oath and to receive representations from interested parties and from members of the general public, which paragraph Members will recognize as being a common power given to committees. And it is further proposed that the committee be instructed to report back to the House with all convenient speed.

Mr. Speaker, this is a proposal that this House set up a committee. Let us first look into what the motion proposes. Perhaps we can start first by touching upon what it does not propose. It is not my purpose that this House enter into any sort of inquisition into what may have happened with respect to the Homecoming '71 projects and with respect to the Homecoming '71 administration. It is proposed that we set up a committee of the whole House. Now you will know, Mr. Speaker, that this means a committee composed of all Members of this House, a committee on which the Government would therefore have a majority. This would ensure that proceedings were conducted to do the job which was given to the committee and not in any way so as to embarrass the Government with frivolous enquiries. Why a committee, you may ask? Why not a debate in the House? It is submitted Mr. Speaker, that the Homecoming '71 grants are now immersed in a sea of confusion. I suggest that we and the public need to get the facts. Now the facts are not available from any public records; they are not available from any public documents. I suggest that we cannot find out the facts by merely having a debate in this House. I think the Minister, and such other people as the Minister and the committee deem appropriate, could sit down with the committee of the House and give us the story in detail so that we may know where we stand. This can't be done in a debate in the House. I think we all agree with that. There is no way to ask questions to sort out a mass of detail by means of a debate in the House.

You may ask why I am proposing a committee of the whole House, why not a select committee — seven, eight or ten Members of this House on which the Government would have a majority. The answer is because this committee would concern itself with Homecoming '71 projects. The confusion surrounds all of the projects, projects which are distributed all across this province. Almost every municipality in the province has a project and therefore, I think, all Members of the House are interested, both in a personal way and in respect of their duties to their constituents, in the facts which surround Homecoming '71 projects and in the confusion which surrounds them.

Now I am saying, Mr. Speaker, that the Homecoming '71 projects are bathed in confusion and I say that the confusion has been brought about by the way in which the Government has handled the Homecoming '71 grants.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Homecoming '71 has been in the planning stage for several years. Some unkind persons have been suggesting that Homecoming '71 was planned immediately after the 1967 election in order to coincide with the next election. I don't know whether that's true. What I do know is true is that it has been in the planning stage since 1968 or 1969. Yet no legislation has been introduced to set out with some precision what the arrangements are. In retrospect it seems to me that legislation

should have been passed. Members will recall that with respect to the Saskatchewan Diamond Jubilee and Canada Centennial celebrations there was legislation, in fact, a corporation. The Saskatchewan Diamond Jubilee and Canada Centennial Corporations were set up by legislation back about 1963. That legislation gave the framework for those celebrations.

Unfortunately we had no such framework for Homecoming '71. That perhaps would not have been very important. I lay no great stress on that, if the Government had followed up with regulations. But unfortunately the Government did not follow up with any regulations covering the Homecoming '71 arrangements. Regulations were passed setting up some zone committees and providing for some grants for these zone committees but when it comes to grants in municipalities, when it comes to disbursing the \$1.6 million on the basis of \$2 per capita, which grants were announced as I recall it last fall, there is no act which anyone can turn to to find out what the arrangements are; there are no public regulations which anyone can turn to, to find out what the arrangements are. Now there must be some ground rules with respect to those grants, but nobody knows what the ground rules are. No one can find them in legislation, no one can find them in regulations. It seems clear to me that the Premier doesn't know what the ground rules are or in the alternative, the Minister-in-Charge of Homecoming '71 doesn't know what the ground rules are. What's a great deal worse — I'm not surprised that perhaps the Premier and the Minister are at odds — but what's a great deal worse is, the public doesn't know what the ground rules are.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, what has led up to this mess? Well, firstly, the Government has failed to set out its ground rules in any Act or any regulations. The Government evidently did set out its policy in a memorandum sent out six months ago. I take this from a report in the Leader-Post and I gather that the memorandum provided that grants to municipalities were to be \$2 per capita. That memorandum apparently didn't make clear whether a municipality could use that money on one project or on several projects. In fact the memorandum clearly implied that two or more projects were permitted. And again, if I may quote from the memorandum, it says in part:

A municipality may apply for an interim payment on expenditures made on approved projects prior to their completion.

A municipality could apply for advance payments for 'projects' prior to 'their' completion. That makes it pretty clear that at that time, at least, the memorandum contemplated a municipality having more than one project. Nothing in the memorandum in any way — in any way — negated the fact that a municipality could have two or more projects.



The former director says that the rules sent out in a memorandum were taken from the rules used for the Saskatchewan Diamond Jubilee and Canada Centennial projects. He says. If I understand his position, that these rules allowed a municipality to have more than one project, that all this was known and understood by the Minister, Mr. Estey, and presumably known and understood by the Cabinet. The former director, Mr. Gardiner, acted on these rules, which in his belief allowed a municipality to have two or more projects. Mr. Gardiner advised many municipalities that multiple projects were permitted. All this was done with the full knowledge and acquiescence of the Minister in charge, Mr. Estey.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — The Minister himself approved multiple projects at Moose Jaw and Broadview.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — And that was known to the former director, Mr. Gardiner. It was known or should have been known to the Premier. There have been public announcements of multiple projects on several occasions. It could not have escaped the attention of the Premier that municipalities were considering and were planning multiple projects. It should not have escaped the attention of the Premier, if it was at all controversial, that his Minister was approving multiple projects. In Regina, for example, it was public knowledge on the streets that two projects were in hand, that two projects were proposed. This will have been known to his Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) as this Minister had some indirect interest in at least one of the projects. In short then, up until March 5, the Government, by its statements, by the actions of its civil servant, the director of Homecoming, by the actions of its responsible Minister, and by its failure to object or even to comment on municipalities announcing multiple projects, clearly and definitely stated its policy as one permitting multiple projects.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — There can't be any possible doubt about that. And on March 5, the Premier announced in this House a different policy. His announcement was very short and I think we should refresh our memories on what he said. He says, Mr. Speaker:

I would like to clarify a misunderstanding which has arisen in some centres in connection with Homecoming '71 grants. Some communities have applied for provincial grants covering two or three different projects. I think the city of Moose Jaw has applied for four.

I don't know why he would be informed about the city of Moose Jaw but perhaps because of his associations there.

It will be Government policy that the Homecoming grant be used for only one project, a single project, in a city or area. Grants to which rural municipalities are entitled may of course be used for a specific rural municipal project or assigned to urban centres in that rural municipality.

Well that, Mr. Speaker, was in effect, a statement of a very different policy.

Mr. Gardiner at that time expressed his total surprise at this announcement. He made this perfectly clear in a number of press statements and I quote only a couple, not because they necessarily set out his position or the position of the administration, but because I think they are representative. I quote from the Leader-Post of March 11:

The Premier's decision to change the Homecoming '71 grant policy was a direct contradiction of all instructions given out in the last six months by Homecoming '71 and approved by Mr. Estey. I cannot help but feel by doing so the Premier has declared lack of confidence in my Minister and myself.

Then again he said:

I told everybody in the province that they could have as many projects as they wished and there was no indication at that time of anything different.

And again:

I cannot understand the Premier's statements. Perhaps we should abandon the whole thing altogether if that's what he wants.

Now it is pretty clear that Mr. Gardiner was left in a state of total surprise and confusion by this announcement. But civic officials were also left completely up in the air by this announcement. Let me give you a couple of typical reactions. Here is the Mayor of Regina, Mayor Walker. And no one, I think, can accuse Mayor Walker of attempting to make statements to embarrass the Liberal Party. He said this:

Why the Premier made that statement at this time and why this wasn't made long before now is surprising to us.

The Broadview and District Chamber of Commerce wrote to the Premier, and sent a copy to me, in these terms. The letter is dated March 10 — a couple of days after the Premier's announcement:

Since the Homecoming '71 grant program was presented as being suitable for multi-project applications, the Broadview Homecoming '71 Committee proceeded on this basis. Their application for three projects was approved and since that time they have proceeded on these projects and have committed a considerable sum of money and effort. The recent announcement regarding the change in policy to a single project has thrown the Homecoming Committee into virtual chaos. The Broadview Chamber of Commerce heartily disapproves of this change without warning.

Now that's what the position of the municipalities was and I could give you other examples. These are reasonably representative. A couple of days after these events I gave notice of motion to set up a committee, the motion which we are now debating, Mr. Speaker. Following my notice the Premier made a further announcement on March 12, 1971. I haven't been able to figure out just exactly what was intended by this announcement. May I read it, Mr. Speaker, and we shall see if we can figure out what it is saying:

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 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 local governments, such commitments will be honored. I may say, Mr. Speaker, that 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.

Well, that was a new statement of policy, one which I submit is puzzling to anyone who reads it and I ask anyone to say with precision and clarity what the present policy is. Does anybody know? What is the position of the dozens and dozens of municipalities that have multiple projects? In Regina, for example, two projects were planned — an indoor rink for northeast Regina and facilities for the Plains Historical Museum. So far as I am aware neither of these projects have been approved so they don't fall into the category of having been approved? Must Regina chose only one, or are both still possible? The only possible out for Regina is something called, "commitments made by local governments." I am baffled to know what that means. Certainly public announcements have been made, perhaps that is the commitment. Discussions with museum people, for example, may have taken place or they have taken place. But again, so far as I am aware no legal arrangements have been made, no steps have been taken which could be called a legal commitment. Now

just what is the state of these two projects, for example? I am not primarily concerned about Regina, it is an example of 80 or 100 similar situations across the province.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — How many more projects are like the Regina projects in some sort of state of purgatory, not yet finally slain, not yet in the clutches of the evil one, but in a sort of perilous state.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I think we should set up a committee to get the facts and make a recommendation to the Government. I suggest we owe it to the municipal people, to the thousands of people throughout this province who have worked on these Homecoming '71 projects, to get the facts about these projects, to get the facts before these projects are consigned to the garbage heap, and find out whether or not the Government will not agree to a policy which will encompass all these projects.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I should like to see this committee — I would see it as hearing the facts, as trying to go out and get the facts about the projects which are now in some state of being under way. We should also need to get the facts on just what representations have been made by the Homecoming '71 people to local people across this Province — what promises or semi-promises have been made to municipal people. Once we knew what projects had been planned, which ones were now in jeopardy, what representations were made to municipal people on which they were entitled to rely, then we could formulate a grant policy as a committee and submit it to the Government for consideration.

Mr. Speaker, let me make one thing clear. Whether Mr. Gardiner would appear before that committee would be solely up to the committee. We think that he or some senior official of Homecoming would need to provide the committee with details of the nature of the commitments made to local people, the commitments on which they relied and on which they were entitled to rely in good faith.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — We would, Mr. Speaker, support a proposal that Mr. Gardiner appear before the committee for that purpose. But if the Government felt that that was undesirable we wouldn't press the point. We don't want this committee to hang-up on whether or not Mr. Gardiner appears before it.

Respecting Mr. Gardiner, we feel that he has acted in a principled way and has taken a position with respect to the

Homecoming '71 projects which required courage and great personal sacrifice.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — We think that if the press reports are right, and I emphasize that, then the Government has treated Mr. Gardiner in a shabby way. The press reports indicate, and this may be wrong, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Gardiner was fired by a telephone conversation on the basis of a press report. I don't know whether that is true, but if so, then to fire a senior public servant on the basis of a press report as to what he said without a personal interview, is a cavalier way to treat a senior public servant whoever he may be. But we feel that this is a matter between the Government and Mr. Gardiner. If in fact the Premier has treated Mr. Gardiner shabbily, as some assert; if in fact the Minister failed to stand up and support Mr. Gardiner, as some assert, then this is a matter between them and Mr. Gardiner. I don't think the committee should become embroiled in that particular dispute. A Legislative committee should not become a court of appeal in a dispute between the Premier and a senior public servant and we don't propose that the committee that I am calling for get into that, unless Members opposite felt that that should be the purpose of the committee. That would be left entirely with the Government majority.

My concern and the concern of my colleagues is for Homecoming '71 projects and for the thousands of local government officials and citizens who have worked on them.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — I should not want that concern to be diverted into examination of any dispute or feud whether this be an old feud or a new feud. In short, I propose that we set up a committee that gets the facts on what representations and promises were made to local people by the Minister and by any of his officials, that gets the facts on what local people have planned or are planning on the basis of those representations, and that on the basis of these facts the committee recommend to the Government a grants policy. I think the recommendation will be a return to the Estey policy — that's what I think the committee would come up with. I think the recommendation would be that the policy, whatever it be, be set out clearly in regulations. But there may be factors of which I am not aware. There must be reasons for the Premier's announcement of March 5th, although frankly I don't know what the reasons are.

I think the matter of Homecoming '71 projects is an important one to many Members in this House. I don't think it is or need be a subject of division on party lines. I think a committee of the whole House, including all Members, which would be controlled by the Members opposite, could look at this problem and come up with a solid recommendation. I think that

this sort of a committee could come up with a recommendation which would allow all the Homecoming '71 projects which have been planned to go forward.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — I think this could do much to rescue Homecoming '71 projects from the confusion and uncertainty which now surrounds them. And for any one who doesn't think that confusion or uncertainty surrounds them, I suggest he ask the Mayor of Regina or the Mayor of Moose Jaw what they think the policy is.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — This, Mr. Speaker, is something this House can do, it is something that I suggest this House should do. It is not something that need divide us along party lines, it is something which we as a House could do to forward projects which by and large are supported on both sides of this House.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, with that in mind, I move this Resolution.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. W. R. THATCHER:** (Premier) — Mr. Speaker, my remarks this afternoon will be brief. I shall contend that the motion before us is unnecessary and I shall invite the House to defeat it. I should point out, Mr. Speaker, that all the information requested by the Leader of the Opposition can be obtained on page 26 of the Estimates, items 5 and 7, and in the Supplementary Estimates on page 3, item 8. There are three places, therefore, that all of the ramifications of Homecoming can be discussed in detail by this House.

Today, the Leader of the Opposition is suddenly showing great interest in Homecoming. I suggest that Hon. Members opposite are certainly displaying an about-face. Not too long ago, the Hon. Member for Canora (Mr. Matsalla) was speaking to a political meeting. He made this speech about Homecoming.

There is absolutely no need for the Government program, Homecoming '71, which is only being used for political purposes. A. S. Matsalla, MLA Canora.

He said further:

Homecoming '71 coincides with an election year, and until an election there will be a lot of political propaganda coming from the offices of Homecoming '71.

**MR. STEUART:** — Adolf you're red in the face now!

**HON. W. R. THATCHER:** (Premier) — What does the Leader of the Opposition have to say? He has been around on the hustings quite a bit since he assumed the leadership. I'll quote one speech, November 11th, speaking in Regina, the Hon. Leader made this statement:

Apparently 1971 was chosen to give the Liberal Government an opportunity to make political capital at the taxpayers' expense, prior to the next provincial election.

When he made these speeches, he said that Homecoming was simply a political gimmick which the Liberals had introduced to get votes. But now since these difficulties have occurred, how his attitude has changed;

Last Sunday he was speaking in Moose Jaw as he did this afternoon. Did he say then that Homecoming was only a political gimmick? No! Instead he stated: "My only concern is that this dispute does not boil over and scuttle dozens of Homecoming projects."

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. W. R. THATCHER:** (Premier) — Well we welcome his change of attitude. We are pleased that he realizes the importance of Homecoming '71.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. W. R. THATCHER:** (Premier) — Actually all Members of the House, indeed all citizens in Saskatchewan know that Homecoming '71 was introduced at the request of the Saskatchewan Tourist Association.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. W. R. THATCHER:** (Premier) — Actually all Members of the House, indeed all citizens in Saskatchewan know that Homecoming '71 was introduced at the request of the Saskatchewan Tourist Association.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. W. R. THATCHER:** (Premier) — As I say it was designed to bring additional tourists to this province, and we are glad now that the Leader of the Opposition realizes its importance. I should like to point out this afternoon again, that when the capital grants program was inaugurated I was still the Cabinet Minister-in-Charge. I made the original announcement to the press on September 28th, and I have that announcement in my hand. I may be accused of many things, but I don't think anybody can accuse me of indecisiveness.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. W. R. THATCHER:** (Premier) — I hope Hon. Members will obtain this press release of September 28th. Here is what I said at the time, I'm only going to quote two paragraphs, but the rest of it is available:

Under the program the Government will contribute the lesser of \$2.00 per capita or 50 per cent of the total cost of an approved project by a municipality or city to a maximum of \$125,000. Mr. Thatcher said.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. W. R. THATCHER:** (Premier) — And on page 2 of the same announcement:

A municipality must clearly indicate its plans for permanently maintaining in good condition the completed project before approval will be given to an application.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. W. R. THATCHER:** (Premier) — Mr. Speaker, as the Minister-in-Charge at the time, I state categorically again that from the beginning it was the Government's intention to have one project per community or per area.

About that time, Mr. Gardiner was appointed Director of Homecoming. Over the ensuing months, through misunderstanding or otherwise, he enunciated a completely different policy. He encouraged multiple projects. Now I suppose we would call it, the "Gardiner plan." I am not saying which plan was right or which plan was wrong. All I am saying is that the Government policy was for a single project. In the mean time, a new Minister was appointed, Mr. Estey. He was put in charge of the Department. The Director's approach to multiple projects did not come to my attention until late February. Now perhaps it should have, but it didn't: Maybe I was lax in this regard, but I have more to do than follow junior civil servants around this province.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear. Hear!

**HON. W. R. THATCHER:** (Premier) — When I learned of the attitude, I clarified the Government's position and I spoke to the Minister. Then not one but several Ministers discussed this policy with the former Director. They warned him on several occasions that there would be consequences if there was non-co-operation. The former Director refused to accept the Government's instructions and interpretation. For example, on March 10th, according to the Regina Leader-Post . . .



**MR. E. KRAMER:** (The Battlefords) — On a point of order. The Premier was reading from a news release earlier, which was supposed to indicate the policy, I wonder if he is going to table it.

**HON. W. R. THATCHER:** (Premier) — I'll be very pleased to table it when I have finished! Now I quote from the Regina Leader-Post:

Wilf Gardiner, Director of Homecoming '71, said Tuesday, he would not carry out instructions received from the Provincial Government to limit Homecoming grants to only one project per city. I told everyone in the province they could have as many projects as they wish, he said. Mr. Gardiner said he would not resign his position as Homecoming '71 Director over the issue, but will not carry out the Premier's policy.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I think every Member in this House can see the difficulty that such a statement would put any government in. We called a special Cabinet meeting, and we called a special Caucus of the Liberal Party to discuss the Director's attitude. The Cabinet and the Caucus agreed that if Mr. Gardiner would not carry out government policy, and at the same time refused to resign he would have to be dismissed. Accordingly the Minister-in-Charge announced such a dismissal last week. I only emphasize again that this was not my personal decision, this was a Government and a Caucus decision.

Now the former Director has suggested that I had some personal vendetta against him. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Blakeney) suggested today that we had treated the Director in a shabby manner. With respect I think I must discuss that subject. I should remind the people of Saskatchewan that this Government and I personally have given this gentleman four jobs in the last few years. First of all, I personally made him a Cabinet Minister. Secondly, when he was defeated at the polls and had no job, I was responsible for his appointment as Deputy Minister. When I hear the tears of my hon. friends opposite, I can't help but think of what they said the day we made him deputy minister.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — What did they say? Tell us;

**HON. W. R. THATCHER:** (Premier) — Here's what the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) at that time said:

Whether the appointment of Wilf Gardiner as deputy minister produces more fears than it does belly laughs will depend on one's mood, Mr. Lloyd said. The co-operative movement has a difficult and important job to do. If the Saskatchewan Liberal Government won't help, at the very least it shouldn't handicap.

That's what my hon. friend said when we made that second appointment.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Shame!

**HON. W. R. THATCHER:** (Premier) — Today they have great sympathy — they say we've been shabby in our treatment. In the third place, Mr. Gardiner resigned his position as Deputy Minister of Co-ops. He sought political office again and was defeated. Because he could not find employment, I again took the responsibility for rehiring him as a deputy, and this despite the fact that there were some grumbles from both sides of the House and elsewhere. Finally, I initiated his appointment as Homecoming Director, some five or six months ago at a salary increase of \$2,000.

Mr. Speaker, if I had had some personal grievance, why would I have found him these four positions?

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. W. R. THATCHER:** (Premier) — With respect, I say that the dismissal took place for only one reason — because the former Director placed the Government in an impossible position. He left us with no choice of action. His departure, I feel will not affect the success of Homecoming. Homecoming is far more important than one man. As the House knows, the new Director — and I think a very capable director — has been appointed who has been with the committee since its inception. He along with the Minister, will be meeting with the 11 area chairmen in the immediate future. The Minister (Mr. Estey) will give the details when he speaks in a few minutes during the debate.

I reiterate what I have said on several occasions that Government policy continues to be to encourage one project in each area or community. However, where there are projects that have been authorized by the Director, or where financial commitments have already been made by the local government, such commitments will be honored. We are not trying to get out of anything. We think the Director made a mistake, but since he has made agreements, since he apparently was talking for us, we will honor these projects. Hopefully decisions on most projects can be completed within the next several weeks.

Admittedly recent experiences with the former Director have been unpleasant and unhappy, I think for all concerned. But I say that the time has come for everyone to forget those difficulties, and get on with the job of making Homecoming succeed.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. W. R. THATCHER:** (Premier) — So I suggest that we join together, and make this Homecoming project benefit people all over the province. I

urge the House to vote against the motion which is now before us.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. G. T. SNYDER:** (Moose Jaw North) — Mr. Speaker, it isn't my purpose to speak at any great length or to make any judgments or to involve myself in any way in the internal epileptic spasms that have accompanied the Premier's announcement several days ago. I think quite clearly this is a problem of the Premier's and his Government but my particular concern today and since the Premier's announcement has to do with the many Saskatchewan people who have undertaken a number of planned projects that have already been approved or given at least a tacit approval by the community. These proposed projects have involved many thousands of people across the province who, I know Members will agree, have contributed unselfishly in terms of time and in terms of money and effort to see that Homecoming could develop in a meaningful way.

The city that I represent, Mr. Speaker, along with my colleague, Mr. Davies, has attempted to take full advantage of the Homecoming projects. We have had many hard-working public spirited citizens who have involved themselves with real energy and real enthusiasm and a real effort has been made to take full advantage of the \$2 per capita grants that have already been earmarked for a number of local programs.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. SNYDER:** — Assurance, Mr. Speaker, has been offered to participants that no problem existed with respect to any one of the four projects planned by the city of Moose Jaw. In fact, on January 15, 1971 — just a short while ago — two projects were approved initially. I understand this has the official stamp of approval by the Homecoming people. The first one involved the Serpentine Program in Crescent Park, a \$75,000 program which would be shared. I understand the breakdown was a 50-50 arrangement. The second program which was given approval on January 15<sup>th</sup> was a project in the Regional Wild Animal Park involving a children's swimming and wading pool to cost approximately \$30,000 and it was intended that \$15,000 would come from the Homecoming grant, \$7,500 would come from the city and another \$7,500 would be applied from private sources.

These are the two programs that were given the official approval of Homecoming '71. There was still some money available under the \$2 per capita grant, so a good number of community-spirited citizens proceeded with the assurance, I understand, that these programs would be honored without any difficulty whatsoever.

Two more programs were planned. One of them involves a summer stage in Crescent Park including the band shell, that has stirred the imagination of a great many people. There are, I

understand, about 32 women's organizations working on fund raising and they have done a very impressive job in raising money for the community's share of the project. This will be a \$30,000 project with an expected \$15,000 coming from Homecoming. There are a great many fine people who have contributed unselfishly to community programs over the year and I think that it is a rather shameful thing at this stage, Mr. Speaker, to place these programs in a state of uncertainty after the kind of dedicated effort that a great many people, especially organized women, in the city of Moose Jaw have applied to this project. A great many of these women are well-known to the Premier and I am sure that they have been in touch with him over the past number of days. If they haven't, I am sure that he will be hearing from them in the near future.

There was still, I understand, approximately \$10,000 left in the \$2 per capita Homecoming grant and the Chamber of Commerce took an active role in promoting a new tourist booth which would serve the needs of visiting tourists. The present tourist booth is one which is unsuitable. It is a booth that has been located on the corner of Athabasca and Main Street. The proposal is to build a new booth at the top of Main Street in Moose Jaw. This is to be financed by the Chamber of Commerce to which they will contribute \$18,000, Homecoming '71 was to provide the additional \$10,000 — it was available under the grants and additionally, Mr. Speaker, the surrounding rural municipalities decided to devote their Homecoming monies for this purpose and this would mean an additional \$7,000 from the surrounding municipalities, making a total for the fourth project of some \$35,000.

These are four projects which the city of Moose Jaw in light of our past difficulties was looking forward to as an economic stimulus, a shot in the arm, and programs which Moose Jaw people have looked to with a good deal of spirit.

I just want to add a few words then, Mr. Speaker, in closing, in support of the proposition that our Leader has presented that a committee of the whole House be established in a way that can do away perhaps with the confusion that has surrounded this whole matter since the Premier's announcement. I am hoping most assuredly that one project, the Serpentine program which has been virtually completed, will be honored. I trust the Wild Animal Park program which received official approval on January 15th, will also be honored by the Government.

Certainly the other two projects which have probably involved a greater number of people than the first two projects deserve to get the official stamp of this Government. I hope that the Minister of Industry and Commerce (Mr. Estey) who has direct responsibility for Homecoming will give an indication today — if not, as soon as possible to these people who have involved themselves so diligently — as to the state of these additional programs which have been brought about as a result of the diligent efforts of these Moose Jaw people.

I will be happy to support the motion and I hope that all

Members will see the value in airing the matter and developing terms of reference that will give the people across Saskatchewan a standard idea of exactly what state of affairs the Homecoming situation is at the moment. I think the people of Saskatchewan deserve the assurance that hasn't been forthcoming to this date.

I will be happy to support the motion.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. C. L. B. ESTEY:** (Minister of Industry & Commerce) — Mr. Speaker, I sincerely regret that the Opposition has seen fit to bring Homecoming '71 into the Legislature in the manner in which they have done.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. C. L. B. ESTEY:** (Minister of Industry & Commerce) — For a few minutes I wish to be very factual in line with the request from the Member from Moose Jaw North (Mr. Snyder) . I am advised that to date approximately 550 applications have been received for the Provincial Government Homecoming Grant. We estimate that this may represent about 90 per cent of the applications which we may expect to receive. These applications, as all Members of the House are aware, have been received from both urban and rural municipalities and will be processed by a committee without delay.

To date that committee has processed around 95 applications and I am informed that only 14 of those applications refer to' what has been called today "multiple projects." If we take these 95 applications as an example of those which have been received and will be received, you reach the conclusion that approximately around 15 per cent of the applications will represent multiple projects.

The Premier has on several occasions enunciated in detail the policy with regard to Homecoming '71 grants. This policy states in part, and I quote:

Projects which have been authorized or where commitments have been made by the local government such commitments will be honored.

This statement of policy, I submit, is clear and concise.

Where an application has not been received from a municipality and where the municipality has not made a commitment to allot a portion of its grant to a local group or organization, we shall urge the municipality to have one project. But if such commitment has been made the application will be approved should it cover more than one project.

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

**HON. C. L. B. ESTEY:** (Minister of Industry & Commerce) — Now I want to reiterate in some detail the policy insofar as rural municipalities are concerned and particularly where the rural municipality has not a project of its own. If a rural municipality be in such a position it may assign its grant or part thereof to a project located in an urban centre or to projects in urban centres within or without the municipality in such manner as the rural municipality sees fit.

The success of Homecoming '71 is already assured. Thousands of people will return to Saskatchewan in 1971 due to the efforts of our Homecoming organizations. Hundreds of celebrations will be held in our province sponsored by local Homecoming committees.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. C. L. B. ESTEY:** (Minister of Industry & Commerce) — As of this date we have approximately 450 local Homecoming committees in the province and I submit that when you have that many committees in this province there is not the confusion that was referred to by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Blakeney).

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. C. L. B. ESTEY:** (Minister of Industry & Commerce) — I want again publicly to pay tribute to the hundreds of persons in our province who have for the past months given freely of their time to assure the success of Homecoming '71.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. C. L. B. ESTEY:** (Minister of Industry & Commerce) — Probably one of the reasons, Mr. Speaker, for the success of Homecoming is that it has involved local committees. As you are all aware, the province for the purpose of the Homecoming organization has been divided into areas, each area having a chairman. The chairman in turn is a member of the Provincial Homecoming Advisory Board. As the Premier intimated the new Director of Homecoming has called a meeting of this Board to be held in Regina on Thursday, March 25th.

Mr. Speaker, the Resolution before us calls for the establishment of a special committee and I quote:

... to enquire into Homecoming '71 and in particular into financial assistance by the Provincial Government for Homecoming '71 projects sponsored by local groups.

Mr. Speaker, as you are aware, no financial assistance whatever has been given as of this date to any Homecoming project in our province and the reason for this is simply because there is no authority from this Legislature to make such grants, but such authority is found in the Estimates which are before you.

I suggest that if the Opposition was not trying to make

cheap political progress out of this matter of Homecoming, that the matter would have been left until we come to a discussion in Estimates.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. C. L. B. ESTEY:** (Minister of Industry & Commerce) — Moreover, Mr. Speaker, the policy in regard to these grants, as I stated, has already been stated by the Premier and I submit that there is absolutely nothing for this Legislature to investigate with regard to the grants as of this date.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as has been intimated there are a few Members opposite — and fortunately only a few — who have since the inception of Homecoming '71 sought to downgrade the whole program.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Oh, more than just a few!

**HON. C. L. B. ESTEY:** (Minister of Industry & Commerce) — And now that they know Homecoming '71 will be a success they have redoubled their efforts. The point which I am dealing with was amply established in an editorial in the Prince Albert Herald on November 17th, 1970 which reads in part, Mr. Speaker, and I quote:

One wonders what the NDP will attempt to ridicule next in order to gain publicity for the next Saskatchewan election. The latest object of the NDP Leader Allan Blakeney's attack is Homecoming '71 and we are beginning to believe that he would be willing to wreck this province if the end result put him in the Premier's office. God forbid.

Then the editorial goes on, Mr. Speaker, I am not through quoting:

Mr. Blakeney may use any political gimmick he wants in the next election campaign but he should remember that the citizens of Saskatchewan are trying to promote their entire province and not the ambitions of a political party which appears to be desperate in its quest for power.

That, Mr. Speaker, I submit sums up better than I can do, the real attitude of the NDP towards Homecoming '71.

Mr. Speaker, and I say this with some regret, in my opinion and I am sure in the opinion of others, in the Resolution before us the NDP is simply attempting to do indirectly what they know they cannot do directly. And this is to discuss in this House the dismissal of a senior civil servant. As the Premier has pointed out such dismissal was not the action of any one individual, but was the action of this Government in which every Member sitting on this side of the House played a part.

Now I want to come to the question of Moose Jaw and to the question of Broadview, which projects were approved. The program enunciated by the Premier will cover the two projects for which applications have been received insofar as Moose Jaw is concerned and we shall honor the projects in Broadview because they were within the policy.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. C. L. B. ESTEY:** (Minister of Industry & Commerce) — Now the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Blakeney) referred to telephone conversations. I want to assure this House that whether the conversation lasted five or ten minutes, that I did have an interview on the morning that I made that press release with the former Director of Homecoming, and in decency it was followed by a telephone conversation. I underline the word decency because I thought it was the thing to do.

Mr. Speaker. I again want to reiterate that it is the hope, I am sure, of all those associated with Homecoming that those who return in 1971 will make several visits to our province during the '70s and thereby increase one of our most vital industries namely, tourism.

Mr. Speaker, obviously I will vote against the motion.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. SNYDER:** — Mr. Speaker, I got the feeling that the Minister had given me some assurance that the first two projects had been approved. I realized that this was an official acceptance of the first two programs. How about the second two? Could the Minister give me the assurance that the third project and the fourth one, the theatre in the Park and the Chamber of Commerce tourist booth, will both be approved?

**HON. C. L. B. ESTEY:** (Minister of Industry & Commerce) — The Member will understand that we have over 500 applications in and I can't say here that the applications are in for those two programs. They were in for the first two and they may be in for the others but I can't say that the applications are. They may be in, I don't want you to think that they are not in, but I haven't seen them.

**MR. SNYDER:** — When can the Minister give me this kind of assurance. There are a lot of people that are hung up on this thing. Surely, Mr. Minister, sometime today, sometime before the middle of the week.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order! That is a matter than can be discussed under Estimates.



**MR. W. E. SMISHEK:** (Regina North East) — Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the Resolution introduced by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. I had hoped that during the period the Premier and the Minister-in-Charge, spoke they would have clarified the policy to everybody. But I regret to say that I am still waiting for a clear and concrete position in respect of grants for the community projects.

The Minister-in-Charge made reference that someone is trying to play politics with Homecoming '71. Mr. Speaker it became evident over the last year who is trying to play politics and who has played politics with the program, and that is this Government itself.

Mr. Speaker, when the Premier said that those programs that have already been approved, grants will be provided where commitments were made by local governments, I am afraid I am no further ahead in knowing what is going to happen to the Regina projects after he spoke than prior to either the Premier's or the Minister's speeches. My main interest in rising this afternoon is to inquire and find out where precisely do the two projects in the city of Regina stand. Last night I had occasion to talk to the Chief Magistrate of the city. I asked him whether he had any clear-cut understanding as to where the two projects for Regina stand and he told me that he doesn't know whether the grants will be approved for the two projects accepted by the city of Regina.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to refer this House to a newspaper article that appeared in the Regina Leader-Post on March 8th of this year. It says:

In February, the City Council had approved two projects for Homecoming '71, a \$225,000 indoor skating rink in the northeast section of the city and a \$65,000 historical museum. The way that the city's financial committee interprets regulations covering the Homecoming grant, the projects' total value would entitle the city to receive the maximum allowance of the Homecoming grant of \$125,000.

It then reports a statement made by the Chairman of the City's Finance Committee, Mr. Roy Wellman. It said:

As far as I can see it would be to the advantage of the communities to do more than one project.

And I agree with Mr. Wellman.

If there are more projects than one, surely this Government shouldn't hold back or prevent more than one project from going forward. The Government has adequate control in its grant system of \$2 or in the case of the city of Regina, \$125,000 maximum. The city of Regina is interested and anxious to develop the projects that they have considered.

Mr. Wellman makes further reference and he says:

Municipalities acted in good faith and it is not clear that they were not to get more than one project.

The city manager makes this statement in the March 8th article. It says:

Also surprised was Mr. Bruce Smith at the remarks made by the Premier on March 5th. Mr. Smith said in an interview that it was hard to figure out from the application forms for the grants that only one project was to be permitted. At no time did anybody from Homecoming '71 say we were wrong in our interpretation of the regulations.

Mr. Speaker, at all times — and I have confidence in the people of the city of Regina who have been dealing with this matter — in their interpretations, from their discussions with the Government, they understood that it was possible to have more than one project. Mr. Speaker, I should be interested to hear from the Minister of Public Health (Mr. Grant) and from the Hon. Member for Regina South West (Mr. McPherson) as to their views on this particular matter, because I know that our City Council is very much concerned at this stage of whether we shall have one project or two. I know the city manager and the committees working on these projects, are very much concerned. I know that the citizens of the area I represent, Regina North East, are deeply concerned about it. In our part of the city we are hopeful that the proposed skating rink will be built. But at this stage because of the confusion and doubt that has been created by the Government, we are not certain.

I should hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister-in-Charge; in fact I direct a question to the Minister of Industry and Information: will the two Regina projects be allowed to proceed? The application was made back on February 11th. The Government has said that they are prepared to provide a grant of \$125,000 to Regina which is indeed less than the per capita grant provided for municipalities. Can the city of Regina be assured that the \$125,000 grant will be provided and that the two projects that have been applied for, the enclosed skating rink in Regina North East and the Plains Historical Museum, will be allowed to proceed and the grants will be provided?

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. D. W. MICHAYLUK:** (Redberry) — Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to participate in this debate but after listening to the Minister-in-Charge of Homecoming '71 I thought that I should rise and make a few remarks in respect to some of the statements that the Minister made this afternoon.

The Minister stated, Mr. Speaker, that we are not at all

interested in the success of Homecoming '71, we are only interested in the dismissal of Mr. Gardiner, who was Director-in-Charge of Homecoming '71. Mr. Speaker, had we wanted to talk about dismissed civil servants we could have session after session, week after week, month after month, discussing the firing of civil servants from 1964 till this year by this Government opposite. Good ones! Civil servants in charge of corporations like David Cass-Beggs and many others. Therefore the dismissal of the Director, Mr. Gardiner is not our motive.

My reason and concern is for local governments in the Redberry constituency. Contradictory statements have been made in this Legislature and outside by the now dismissed Director of Homecoming '71. Homecoming '71 committees in my constituency are in a state of confusion. Mr. Speaker, it is understandable that the 12 area chairmen of the province had informational meetings with the Director. I don't think that these meetings should have been with the Director only but the Minister-in-Charge of the Homecoming '71 program should have been in attendance also.

The 12 area chairmen for the province in turn held meetings with the district chairmen and must have outlined the program. I want to mention but two rural municipalities in the Redberry constituency. One is under the Zone Director Mr. Jack Jordon for the area of Prince Albert, and the district chairman for the R. M. of Blaine Lake, Mr. Jack Glencross. I had a phone call on the day the Premier made the statement in this House to the effect that only one project is to be approved and not several projects.

Mr. Glencross informed me that they had been organizing four projects in the R. M. of Blaine Lake No. 434. Mr. Jack Glencross, zone chairman, received information from the district chairman, and I think that area chairman, Mr. Jordon, received the information from the Director of Homecoming '71 and the Minister-in-Charge.

Here is the program as outlined to me in the R. M. of Blaine Lake No. 434. They were to receive a grant under Homecoming '71 of \$2,900 for the four projects. What were the projects? \$300 to the village of Marcelin to assist the community in building a covered skating rink; \$1,500 for the seats in a \$105,000 arena which is already completed; \$850 for a curling rink and \$250 for the Kinsmen Association to build a children's park in the town of Blaine Lake.

One municipality with four projects planned anticipated that they would come to fruition. The Premier, only a few days ago negates this. They have received no assistance as yet, but they have planned for four projects.

I contacted by phone the R. M. of Meota No. 468. They are entitled to \$2,542. The municipality with the rural communities the village of Prince, and Meota, agreed to contribute to

the \$2,542 on the basis of equal contribution and participation. How many projects? Five, Mr. Speaker, not one but five. What are the five? Meota regional park \$680 with equal contributions from the village of Meota, making a total of \$1,360 for development of the regional park at Meota on Jackfish Lake. In the village of Prince, improvement to the community hall; \$200 contributed by the Government and \$200 by the village of Prince. The Glenrose recreational association to purchase entertainment equipment in the amount of \$75 from the grant and \$75 from the local community. The Cochin skating rink, another project to improve the lighting in the skating rink, \$100 from the grant and \$100 from the local hamlet. \$125 with a similar matching grant for the French Canadian home to be moved to the Western Development Museum at North Battleford. Here is a municipality, Mr. Speaker, that has planned five '71 Homecoming projects. The Premier in this House several days ago says No, only one is allowed.

When the Director defends these communities and their projects, and I am certain that the Minister must have been aware if the Premier wasn't, that multiple projects were being organized in various municipalities for Homecoming year '71.

My concern is not the firing of the Director. My concern, Mr. Speaker, is for the people who have been planning their projects and have not received grants from the Government because they have not been approved. The Premier stated that only those that were approved will receive the grants. I just wonder how many city governments have received money from the allocations of funds have not been approved but will be approved in the Estimates yet to come.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister has approved two projects in Moose Jaw and more than one project in Broadview, but as far as the rest of the province is concerned and in particular my constituency, only one is permitted according to the premier. I am disappointed and I am sure that many people in my constituency will be because of the reversal of the assumed previous stand that this Government has taken with respect to multiple projects from Homecoming '71.

I will support this motion.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. F. MEAKES:** (Touchwood) — Mr. Speaker, I rise for just a couple of minutes. The main reason that I rise is because of the remarks of the Minister who accused this side of the House of opposing Homecoming '71. I want to tell the Minister that in my home community there was a Homecoming committee formed. As soon as I heard that it was formed I went to them and said I would do anything that I could to help. In no way have I run down Homecoming '71 projects and in no way have I tried to involve politics in it and I think if there is any politics involved it is by some of the actions in the last few days by Government

Members from across the way. After listening to the Premier and to the Minister, really all it did was add confusion on confusion and I hope that I am wrong but the way I understood him, I think of one municipality which I will cite. One of my municipalities, the Municipality of Talumet which has no village or no town within the borders; it is between two railway lines and Talumet had agreed to divide their grant, partly to Ituna, partly to Goodeve, partly to Balcarres and partly to Lipton. Now I know the Minister can't stand up and answer but if he'll nod his head, will they still be able to divide the grant that way? Yes or No.

**HON. C. L. B. ESTEY:** (Minister of Industry & Commerce) — Generally speaking they can.

**MR. MEAKES:** — I certainly hope that the Minister is right, the reason these four towns were chosen was because the people from the municipality go to these four towns in the different areas. This is really the wish of the council that it be divided up in the different communities.

Before sitting down I just want to say again that there certainly was no opposition on my part to Homecoming '71. I volunteered my services to my community and anything I could do and I object to the Minister saying that there was politics anywhere on this side of the House. If there is any politics being played in my opinion, it is in the last few days from that side of the House.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. E. KRAMER:** (The Battlefords) — Mr. Deputy Speaker, one, thing about this entire debate, I think is that it is unfortunate that information is not going to be given to this House. It should be given to this House as required by the motion. But it seems that the Premier will never learn. You know he went into the cattle business. For about two years his herdsman tried to convince him about his failures, his calf-crop failures, they said he had to stop shooting the bull. Now in his political garden that he expects to bloom this year he wants to garner votes and harvest votes from his political garden. You know you can't get very far in having a good garden when you fire the gardener. That too is something the Premier hasn't learned. I think that that is another mistake in productivity, especially when the productivity was a vote harvest. As has been suggested in some quarters — the Premier denies this - the political garden was supposed to bloom because of Homecoming '71 and there were objections, there was criticism because of the staging and timing of the program. But that does not put Members on this side of the House as opposed to the good and useful programs and the good and useful people who are serving on committees. I am in favor of these programs and suggest these programs should be proceeded with in these communities. As far as the program committees in my area are concerned they are also in a state of confusion. I certainly hope the Minister will go ahead with them.

The Premier says that we are bringing politics into this. I wonder if the Premier — and I wish he was in his seat — would deny political considerations. It is true that it was suggested by the Tourist Development Association that they wanted the project for 1970, but the Premier said 1971 is the year we shall participate. And when asked why the Premier said, "Political expediency, that's why." He was quite frank and honest in that statement to the Tourist Development Association when they met and discussed these grants with him and I don't think he would dare to deny that if he was sitting in his seat.

Mr. Speaker, there are many criticisms of Members on this side. It was suggested we criticized Mr. Gardiner. That Mr. Lloyd, the former Leader of the Opposition, criticized Mr. Gardiner's appointment as Deputy Minister of Co-operatives. We did not criticize Mr. Gardiner's ability and I'm sure if Mr. Lloyd was present here today he would say it was simply that his background as a co-operator possibly left something to be desired. There were many positions he could have filled to better advantage for this province. But certainly the position that he filled in directing Homecoming, as a native son of Saskatchewan, left little to be desired. And I have admiration for him even though we have political disagreements. I have admiration for him in standing by his guns and not being pushed around or not being a shilly-shally as obviously the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Estey) is in not backing up decisions that were made, Mr. Speaker, decisions that he knew about long before Christmas, decisions that the Premier knew about long before Christmas. Why did he change horses in the middle of the stream if it wasn't to embarrass certain people or to protect some favorite of the Premier, this still hasn't been brought to light in this House.

I am in favor of the motion, Mr. Speaker.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. A. E. BLAKENEY:** (Leader of the Opposition) — Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to delay the House long with respect to this matter. I do not, for example, intend to reply to the irrelevancies brought into this debate by various persons on the other side of the House dealing with whether or not I in October said this, or in November said that. I shall be very, very happy to debate those when Estimates come along, but right now I am trying to find out from this Government what its policy is with respect to Homecoming grants.

**MR. STEUART:** — Kramer, he doesn't know either . . .

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — I'm not surprised that either the Hon. Member for The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) or the Hon. Member for Prince Albert (Mr. Berezowsky) doesn't know what the policy is because no one

in Saskatchewan knows what the policy is.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — But whatever someone may have said about Homecoming '71 — and we can deal with that on another occasion — that is no excuse for the Government not making perfectly clear what its policy is with respect to Homecoming grants.

Now we have had today a restatement of what I could call the “Thatcher” policy. We have had, in effect, a repudiation of what is called the “Estey” policy. The Premier stood in his place and said, “I know what the policy is because on September 28 I was the responsible Minister.” I'm really troubled by that because I don't really know who the responsible Minister was on September 28, but I thought it was the Minister of Industry and Commerce.

**HON. D. G. MacLENNAN:** (Minister of Labour) — What year? 1969 or 1970?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — I have before me a news release dated September 28, 1970, at 3 o'clock p.m. central standard time, which is the one the Premier tabled. And on September 28 of that year the Homecoming money was being spent by the Ministry of Industry and Commerce. Now the Premier might not know it but Mr. Estey ought to have known that on that date he was Minister of Industry and Commerce.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear:

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — When the Premier stood up and perhaps unknowingly misled the House, I should have thought that the Minister when he followed would have corrected that. But no chance, no chance. We are told by the Premier that he was the Minister and the Minister of Industry and Commerce knew that was wrong. The Minister of Industry and Commerce knew that he was the Minister. The Minister of Industry and Commerce shortly thereafter was confirming all of these statements to the effect that multiple projects were permitted and yet we are now told that there never was a policy for multiple projects. On what basis did the Minister then approve two projects for Moose Jaw. On what basis did he approve two projects for Broadview? There was in fact a policy by the Minister of Industry and Commerce for multiple projects. I wish he would have, what I should call the decency — perhaps that is too strong a word — but at least the courtesy to admit that at least for one period of time that was the policy. Now we have had a change of policy and we have had the Premier announce it again today and we have had it stated in terms that where there are single projects they will be approved; where there are multiple projects already approved, they will be honored. And then we had a different wording today. I wonder how many of you listened to the Premier and listened to the Minister of Industry, each of them stating perfectly clearly the policy,

and each stating a different policy. —The Minister of Industry said, “Where commitments have been made they will be honored.” Now that adds something to it. I made a note when the Premier was speaking, there is no doubt what the Hansard will say. He added another word today, it is a slightly different policy, the commitments must be financial ones.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Every commitment is financial under Homecoming. How could you build it?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — We are now told that every commitment is financial. That is at least an acknowledgement that we are not dealing with anything else but finances. But I submit that we are still in trouble as to what the policy is. Everyone opposite is saying, “No, no.” Well is the Mayor of Regina so dense that he doesn’t understand the policy? Is the Mayor of Moose Jaw so dense that he doesn’t understand the policy? Who can know what the policy is? And no one else can know what the policy is. I am putting it to the Government. Why not, let’s go back to the Estey policy.

**HON. D. G. MacLENNAN:** (Minister of Labour) — What did the Mayor say at noon?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — The Member for Last Mountain is saying, “What did the Mayor say at noon?” I understood the Mayor to say at noon — and I’m getting it second hand — that both projects in Regina were now approved.

**MR. CAMERON:** — He was delighted!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — He was delighted. I’m glad because he must have been given some intelligence which has not been given this House.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Because certainly nothing that has been said here by the Minister could assure the Mayor of Regina that both projects were approved. I am baffled to know on what basis he could do so since I challenge the Minister of Public Health (Mr. Grant) to say that any financial commitment has been given to the museum. No one knows when or where.

**HON. D. V. HEALD:**(Attorney General) — He can’t answer you.

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — he can’t answer in this debate but he is perfectly well able to give a statement outside and the news people are more than happy to take his statement as to when and where I am saying that this is simply not known. I am glad that we



are now acknowledging that the two projects in Regina are fine. But I am asking — why don't we simply go back to the Estey policy, why don't we simply go back to the policy which Mr. Estey, the Minister of Industry and Commerce was applying when he approved the Moose Jaw projects and the Broadview projects?

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Or in the alternative, if the Government is not willing to do that, why not let's form a committee and have the Government lay out its policy. Why doesn't the Government table even now a draft set of the regulations or the Order-in-Council which it proposes to pass under The Appropriation Act. Even that would help. But I defy anybody to find in print in one place, the Government's policy. It does not exist and that is the reason why we have moved that this committee be formed. There is nothing in the proposal to have a committee which in any way challenges the Government. The Government will have full control of the committee. All we ask is that the Government set out in written form what its policy is, set it out all in one place (one, two, three, four, five, six, seven) so that someone can read the whole policy and know it. This has not been done, it has not been done notwithstanding the fact that a good number of people had asked that it be done and the circumstances of the last few days have cried for a statement of policy. I won't try to reply to the remarks of the Member for Nutana Centre to the effect that some people were trying to make cheap political progress — those were his words — out of this particular debate. Certainly this problem has been in the newspapers day after day and we didn't put it there. This problem has been on the television day after day and we didn't put it there. This problem has been on the radio day after day and we didn't put it there. And when a matter of public concern is under debate in the newspaper and on the radio and on television and when this House is sitting, a perfectly proper place to debate that policy is right here in this House.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — We are saying that we feel we should have a committee. We feel that the committee should arrive at a recommendation to make to the Government with respect to policy and arrange to have clearly set out in one document what the policy is. If the Government is unwilling to do that then I ask the Minister or the Premier or whoever is the responsible Minister — and it is not easy to tell sometimes — I ask them to set out in one document what the policy is. I already pointed out — before the Premier took his seat — that the Premier was not in fact the responsible Minister when he said he was. I should like the responsible Minister, whether it be the Premier or the Minister of Industry, to promulgate a statement of what the policy is, to promulgate a statement of what it is so that the municipal people may know. I think that a simple and easy way to do this

would be to appoint this committee. We then could know whether or not any municipalities were being hard-done-by by any change of policy. But if the Government is unwilling to do that, then I ask them to promulgate a policy so that everybody may know.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. W. R. THATCHER:** (Premier) — May I rise on a point of privilege?

**HON. W. R. THATCHER:** (Premier) — The Member can rise on a point of privilege but he can't re-enter the debate.

**HON. W. R. THATCHER:** (Premier) — I was out of the House when the Hon. Leader was speaking. I understand there is some argument about the date which I gave as to when I was the Minister. May I point out that when the capital grants program was inaugurated, I was still the Cabinet Minister-in-Charge. I want to say that this policy was most assuredly formulated while I was the Minister. When I made this press statement on September 28, I did not mean to imply, or if I did I apologize, that I was the Minister on September 28. However I was the Minister when this grants program was formulated.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

Motion negatived on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 20  
Messieurs

Blakeney  
Bowerman  
Kramer  
Messer  
Wood  
Davies  
Dewhurst

Meakes  
Berezowsky  
Smishek  
Thibault  
Whelan  
Snyder  
Michayluk

Brockelbank  
Baker  
Pepper  
Wooff  
Kowalchuk  
Byers

NAYS — 31  
Messieurs

Thatcher  
Howes  
McFarlane  
Boldt  
Cameron  
Steuart  
Heald  
McIsaac  
Barrie  
Loken  
MacDougall

Grant  
Coderre  
MacDonald  
Estey  
MacLennan  
Gallagher  
Hooker  
Heggie  
Breker  
Leith

Radloff  
Weatherald  
Mitchell  
Gardner  
Coupland  
McPherson  
Charlebois  
Forsyth  
McIvor  
Schmeiser

**RESOLUTION NO. 6 — APPOINTMENT OF ROYAL COMMISSION TO REVIEW THE  
PRAIRIE AND SASKATCHEWAN FREIGHT RATE STRUCTURE.**

MR. G. G. LEITH (Elrose) moved, seconded by Mr. J. J. Charlebois (Saskatoon City Park University):

That this Assembly urges the Government of Canada to immediately appoint a Royal Commission to review the Prairie and Saskatchewan freight rate structure and investigate discriminatory freight rates in Saskatchewan and in the Prairie Provinces with power to recommend necessary remedial action to the Federal Government.

He said: — Mr. Speaker, this is the first time I have risen in the House to speak in this Session and I want to add my congratulations to the Member for Last Mountain (Mr. MacLennan) who is a new Cabinet Minister. I have known him for a very long time and I know that he is going to do a good job and be a credit to the Government and the people of Saskatchewan.

I also wish to add my congratulations to the Hon. Member for Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) on his election as Leader of the Opposition party. I think that he would want me to be completely honest when I congratulate him and so I think I ought also to say that I offer him my condolences. It is going to take every ounce of his wit and his strength just to keep those people looking in the same direction, Mr. Speaker, let alone keep them moving in the same direction.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. LEITH:** — Our parliamentary system if it is to function properly needs a strong Opposition, so I do wish him luck. Perhaps it is his fate to try to organize some Opposition from that scattered assembly over there and even after the election to try to organize an Opposition from a very much smaller cadre that will be on your left then, Mr. Speaker.

I also want to congratulate the Member from Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) on his selection as deputy leader. We know that he is an able debater and we know that he is going to beef up that front bench over there a little bit. Somebody said, unfairly I think, that he was made deputy leader so that everybody over there would know that he would come to the Assembly once in awhile. You remember that when he was first elected he was not a regular attender. Others say, unfairly I think, that the only safe place for Roy is in the front bench where everybody can keep a watch on him. I wish he were here because I intended to make these remarks to him, and I shall tell him when he arrives if I have another chance. Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I do congratulate them. I know they have a tough job and, as I said earlier, it is necessary to have a strong Opposition so good luck to them.

Mr. Speaker, since the birth of our province in 1905 and increasingly so over the years, the economy of Saskatchewan has depended in very great measure on our transportation facilities. This nation was cemented together, indeed it was built, by the transcontinental railway. Certainly the great settlement in Western Canada was possible only because of that ribbon of steel. The pioneers who came to our district, Mr. Speaker, came from the main line at Swift Current or from the line that stretched from Regina to Saskatoon. Our great grain export business exists only because we have relatively cheap transportation of our product to the Great Lakes and to tide water at Montreal, Vancouver or Hudson Bay. The Crow's Nest Agreement on grain rates makes this export of grain possible. Mr. Speaker, there is no complaint about these arrangements. Indeed if the Crow's Nest Rates Agreement were to be rescinded now our grain producers would be in very serious straits indeed. It is no exaggeration to say with other costs rising and the export price of our grain products falling, that any increase in freight costs could ring the death knell of our agricultural economy in Western Canada. But having said this, Mr. Speaker, and having drawn the attention of the House to the relatively favorable grain transportation rates, we come to the other and darker side of the coin.

Canadians who live on the plains between the Great Lakes and the Rocky Mountains believe that we are being discriminated against in the cost of transporting our other goods. We believe that over the years the railroads have penalized us for those Crow's Nest rates by applying extra tariffs on our other goods. We believe that to be able to make our full economic and social contribution to this great nation we ought to be treated fairly in the matter of transportation costs. Because of our location in the centre of the continent we don't have any really competitive transportation system. Because the railroads have no real competition except between themselves we are being unfairly charged for the transportation of many of the commodities that we import and for the transportation of the products that we fabricate here. Mr. Speaker, the freight rate structures of the railroads are incomprehensible to me, even though I am sure there are some very competent people who do understand these rates. Their scale is influenced by a large number of factors. For instance, goods can be shipped from Eastern Canada to Vancouver at a cheaper rate than from the same shipping point to Saskatoon or Regina which is a distance shorter by roughly 1,100 miles. Therefore the distance alone from the shipping points to the unloading point is not the only determining factor. When I ask why, I am told that the Toronto-Vancouver rate is made lower than the Toronto-Regina rate by the influence or the threat of competition by sea from Toronto, down the seaway, down the coast of North America through the Panama Canal and up the west side of America to Vancouver, B.C. This is just an example: if we compare the rates on a car lot (minimum weight of 100,000 pounds) of iron, that is angle irons, beams, channels, tees and zees, not punched, drilled or further manufactured, hot rolled and cut to length, we see that from Contrecoeur, Quebec to Vancouver the rate on this car lot is \$1.50 per 100

pounds. The same car lot, same loading point, same minimum weight, shipped on the same rail line to Regina, will attract a rate of \$2.23 per 100 pounds. The revenue per ton mile to Vancouver to the railroad is \$1.02; the revenue per ton mile to Regina is \$2.23. Mr. Speaker, the foregoing is just one example of the difficulties that we face. Transportation is one of the important cost factors of production. This statement is true whether related to either primary resource development or to secondary industrial development. In Saskatchewan these costs are particularly important.

If our economy is to continue to prosper and grow, certain conditions must be met: 1. The Province must develop its primary natural resources. 2. A secondary industrial base must be established so that the people of Saskatchewan can benefit from the multiplier effect such development would have on the economy. 3. Saskatchewan must remove its dependence on a one-commodity economy by providing sufficient diversification in the whole economy. 4. We must be sure of unimpeded access into domestic and world markets without the shackles of excessive transportation costs.

Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan potash producers must meet market competition from other world producers. Some of these other producers are much closer to tidewater and their freight costs are much lower. For instance, Spanish producers can put potash on board ship for \$2.03 (U.S.) per ton. The cost from Carlsbad, New Mexico to Houston, Texas is \$6.69, again in American dollars, per ton. Saskatchewan potash producers pay \$9.57, again in American currency, per ton to put their product on board ship at Vancouver. Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan potash producers pay 370 per cent above the cost for Spain, and 43 per cent higher than the American producers which is the highest of all our competitors.

I haven't said anything about the port of Churchill so far. The Government of Saskatchewan is pleased that some forward thinking and planning is being done by the Federal Government to explore the potential of this great port. Savings in freight costs from the prairie to world markets means an increase in the price of wheat. Another matter of which we should be very aware is the danger of increases in seaway tolls. Any increase in tolls will reduce somewhat the competitive effect the seaway has on long and short haul rail movements, both eastward and westward.

Another area in which Saskatchewan is disadvantaged is in the movement of wood pulp from Prince Albert. As an example, the existing rate of wood pulp from Prince Albert to Chicago is \$1.05 per 100 pounds. This is 80,000 pounds minimum loading. This is only 2 cents per 100 pounds lower than the rate from Hinton, Alberta, but it is 15 cents per 100 higher than the rate from Dryden, Ontario. If you look at the map, the Prince Albert rate to Chicago should be midway between Hinton and Dryden. Serious investigation should be made into the economic feasibility of extending the Ontario level of rates westward.

into the Saskatchewan and Manitoba areas.

Mr. Speaker, the level of freight rates is a factor in achieving the goals that I spoke of earlier. Anything short of a fair level in these rates is short changing all the people of the West, and particularly the people of Saskatchewan. During 1965 the railroads accounted for over 90 per cent of the total intercity tons of revenue freight originating on the Prairies. During that period slightly less than 1.8 million tons of motor carrier revenue freight terminated on the Prairies, whereas rail tonnage unloaded at stations on the Prairies amounted to over 18 million tons. It is reasonable to assume, Mr. Speaker, that this ratio of rail versus road unloadings is about the same now as it was then. It is also reasonable to assume that rail transportation will continue to be an important factor in the economy of our province.

Mr. Speaker, both of our railways are national and are regulated by the concept of national interest. Railway policy does not reflect regional interests unless these interests are profitable for the railways to pursue. Saskatchewan, particularly, can point to numerous examples which will substantiate that statement. Freight rates concern the whole Prairie region although Alberta and Manitoba are not quite so hard hit as we are, because both provinces are closer to tidewater. Their advantage is slight, however, Mr. Speaker.

When these transportation problems are examined more closely it is seen that they concern themselves with large areas that are not confined by provincial boundaries. Now, there seems to be two major factors that influence freight rates in this province. The first is the relative size of the movement of grain. I have suggested earlier, and I think most people believe that the railways lose money on this tonnage and are anxious to make up their losses on other shipments. The second factor, of course, is the 1100 miles distance from Vancouver, and the 800 miles from the head of the Lakes. Saskatchewan is farther than any other province from direct access to the major shipping ports of the world. Because of our urgent need to build and strengthen our economy, we need a transportation policy that will help and not hinder growth. Following numerous representations made by Premier Thatcher at the Federal-Provincial conferences on the question of freight rates affecting the Province of Saskatchewan, the Prime Minister of Canada asked the Minister of Transport to investigate this problem.

Mr. Jamieson informed Mr. Thatcher by letter that he was willing to send a delegation to Regina to explore the matter of freight rates. A meeting was subsequently arranged with Attorney General Heald on January 27 of this year at which time Mr. Heald and Mr. Setter of the Department of Industry met with four senior officials from Mr. Jamieson's Department. At the termination of that meeting, which lasted all day, officials of the Department of Transport suggested that if specific instances of freight rate discrimination could be documented, the case for Saskatchewan would be substantially strengthened. Consequently,

the Government is currently in the process of obtaining from representative Saskatchewan based industry documented evidence of excessive transportation pricing.

Evidence to date indicates that industry is co-operating as fully as possible with the Government in this matter. It is hoped that the first meeting the Provincial Government held with the Federal Department of Transport will ultimately lead to a full investigation by Ottawa into Saskatchewan claims of harmful discriminatory freight rates.

We believe that we must have a new look at our national transportation policy. We believe that it is possible to have an equitable rail system that will allow the development of our resources and that will assist the growth of secondary industry in the West. We believe that it is incumbent on the National Government to once again use the railways as an instrument of national policy to develop and strengthen our country. We believe that as taxpayers of this country, and as customers of the railways, we ought to insist that our complaints about inequitable rates be fully investigated. We believe that the best medium for such an open and impartial investigation of this problem is a royal commission. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move this Resolution.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. R. H. WOUFF:** (Turtleford) — Mr. Speaker, I don't think that there is any need for me to re-read the Resolution to the House, for the reason that it is something that both sides of the House are fully agreed upon. I should say in my opening remarks that it is something that is long overdue, that 60 years in my memory is a long time for the people of Saskatchewan to wait for such a move. It is inevitable, I think, that in discussing this Resolution there is going to be duplication of remarks to some extent. As long as there has been a province there has been a freight rate problem for Saskatchewan. I happened to come into the province about three months after it was first formed. Once freight got beyond the head of the Great Lakes, Mr. Speaker, there was only the steel ribbon of railway track from there to the Pacific Coast, over which everything so far as the Prairies were concerned must move. In fact for 60 years the railway companies ran Canada. Every phase of our existence was in their hands. The going and coming of our people, badly needed goods moving into the area and our produce being moved out. Our lives were ordered by every whim of the steel monsters that smoked and whistled their way across the Prairies. The old Territorial Grain Growers' Movement was born out of a fight and law suit with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company which gave them their first rights to load grain at the platforms. But that's a story all its own.

One cannot help but recall the battle of the Prairies to obtain the historic Crow's Nest Pass rates that the Member on the Government side has just mentioned. This covered our

grain and it has been the life blood of the West, especially Saskatchewan. Not only was there a terrific battle. Mr. Speaker, to obtain these famous freight rates but they have had to be jealously guarded against those, who for very selfish reasons, would have done away with them. While our grain enjoyed this freight rate agreement, there have been some strange applications of freight rates to other commodities. Certain lines of freight have already been mentioned to the House — goods could be shipped from Eastern Canada to the West Coast and back again to Saskatchewan for less than they could be shipped directly to the Province. For instance, at one time and perhaps even yet, I'm not sure, canned milk from the plant at Red Deer, Alberta could be shipped to the West Coast and back to Saskatchewan for less than it could be shipped direct to either Saskatoon or Regina. Over the years there have been some of the most weird freight structures one could imagine, but always it seemed the people of Saskatchewan had to bear the brunt of these anomalous freight rates. It has been Saskatchewan and Saskatchewan people who have always found themselves paying the most for their railway services.

It is not just a matter of history, Mr. Speaker, not something that just occurred in the pioneer days, it seems that the freight rate on pulp — and one hesitates to interject that subject into another debate — are just as erratic as some other commodities. I was looking through some Leader-Posts covering January 28 of this year and some prior to that date. January 28, on page 5, we had a news item which was drawing the attention of the public to the fact that freight rates on pulp from the Prince Albert mill to Eastern markets are higher than from the Alberta mills at Hinton or Kraft mills in British Columbia, which in the latter case is 500 miles farther from the prime Eastern market. The Leader-Post of November 25, 1970 report's that the Saskatchewan Government negotiated a reduced freight rate for potash but the general Prairie freight rate remained pretty static. Just to quote exactly:

The Government was successful in negotiating an 11 per cent freight reduction for potash.

However, Mr. Speaker, rates as stated in the quote, I suggest, didn't remain that static. I have also a quote from the Leader-Post of February 25, 1970 when Mr. Turner President of the Wheat Pool was voicing strong opposition, not to the freight rates as they existed, Mr. Speaker, but to an increase in freight rates on livestock. I quote:

The Wheat Pool President said that as recently as February 18, the Prime Minister announced in the House of Commons the Government's intention to hold the line on a number of increases including freight rates by Canadian National Railways. He said that representatives of the National Livestock Transportation Committee met with the railways in Winnipeg on February 19, but were unsuccessful in attempting to persuade them from instituting the proposed increases from March 1.



Then Mr. Turner went on to say:

I am concerned that freight rates for livestock were increased by six per cent on April 1, 1969 and scheduled to rise by another six per cent on March 1. The total increase of 12 per cent in one year period will add a substantial burden to the agricultural industry of Western Canada which is trying desperately to adjust in response to current grain marketings.

It would seem, Mr. Speaker, that the railway companies are bound to take from the farmers what they were losing on the potash rates. This bears out what I hinted at earlier, of the arrogance of the railway companies and the seeming lack of control by the Federal Government which over the years have all added up to rank discrimination against Saskatchewan. Just as further proof, if that were necessary, I have a copy of Hansard from the House of Commons for February 18, 1969 when freight rates to Saskatchewan were being discussed. I wish to quote from Mr. John Burton's address at that time. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I should like to read it into the record:

Transport discrimination reductions in express association rates.

Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, February 12, I addressed the following questions to the Minister of Transport, Mr. Hellyer: Will the Minister undertake to investigate recent freight reductions by the Express Transport Association in Western Canada, which appear to discriminate against Regina and Saskatoon? Tonight I am disappointed that I do not see in the House, either the Minister of Transport, the Minister without portfolio' with special responsibilities in the field of transport, or the Minister without portfolio, the Hon. Member of Saskatoon-Humboldt, Mr. Lang, who has special interest in this subject. I presume that the parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council, Mr. Forest, will answer the question and probably slough off any responsibility for this particular matter. The Express Transport Association is an independent body acting on behalf of Algoma Centre Railway, Northern Alberta Railway, Ontario Northland Railway, Railway Express Agency Incorporated, Canadian National Railways and Canadian Pacific Railways. In December the Express Transport Association and its member companies introduced freight rate reductions on bulk and individuals shipments from Toronto and Montreal to Western Canadian cities including Winnipeg, Calgary, Edmonton and Vancouver, but not including Regina and Saskatoon. The rate reductions which were introduced amounted to from 13 per cent to 28 per cent, depending on the type of shipment. For example, to quote some of the effects of these new rates: a 200-pound shipment from Montreal to Swift Current can be shipped to Winnipeg and then re-shipped to its destination for \$13.45. However, if the same order were to be shipped to Regina and then

shipped to Swift Current, the cost would be \$16.82, a difference of 25 per cent, which is incomprehensible and can only be classified as discrimination against Regina and Saskatoon as distribution points in Western Canada. In addition, it might also be noted that the same 200-pound article can be shipped to Alberta cities, that is Calgary and Edmonton, for \$11, which is \$2.90 or 25 per cent less than it would cost to ship the same goods to Regina alone. I can only conclude that this is discrimination, not only in Regina and Saskatoon, but against the Province of Saskatchewan.

Then there was a statement by one of the officials of the Express Transportation Association, Mr. G. A. Shaw, General Manager of ETA, who said in a telegram to the Regina Chamber of Commerce and Saskatoon Board of Trade; 'carriers are not prepared to reduce rates to Regina and Saskatoon in shipping from Toronto and Montreal'.

Mr. Speaker, you will notice that when the freight rate enquiry or discussion was on in the House of Commons at this particular time that Mr. Hellyer, the Minister of Transport, or the Minister without portfolio with special responsibilities for transport, or the Minister without portfolio, the Hon. Member for Saskatoon-Humboldt, Mr. Lang, were not in their seats. I suggest that this is little short of callous indifference, if not planned absence, on such an occasion. Here we have three Ministers, one of them representing the very area concerned with the discriminatory freight rate structure and not one of them there to raise a protest on behalf of Saskatchewan people. The Hon. Member for Saskatoon-Humboldt, Mr. Lang, did nothing for his own city, for his own constituency or for his own province.' I should suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it is little wonder that injustice seems to reign unchallenged.

I should suggest further, Mr. Speaker, that the Government sitting to your right has only discovered and acted on freight enquiries after finding out their own plight with regard to the freight on pulp and potash. The farmers and consumers have played a very secondary role in the Government's freight rate battle. According to paper clippings on my desk the Government produced an 11 per cent reduction on potash freight rates as of November 25, 1970. The Premier has been heard on the air from time to time regarding pulp freight rate inequities which he criticized most severely and rightly so. However, when Mr. Turner, President of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool was fighting against an increase in freight rates to livestock producers in the West, he got very little immediate help. I looked through a stack of Leader-Posts a foot high, but could not find a statement anywhere by the Government at that particular period that gave Mr. Turner the kind of support needed in his fight for the livestock producers.

Now I suggest, Mr. Speaker, regardless of the fact that I am in sympathy with this Resolution, that it is a belated

effort. Right at the moment on the eve of an election, they place on the Order Paper a weak, anaemic, delaying Resolution that smacks more of an endeavor to foil an Opposition than accomplish immediate restructuring of freight rates. However, if we can have a Royal Commission to take a genuine and impartial look at the problem and then bring in a report with a solution that will not just be shelved as many of our Royal Commission reports have been, we on this side of the House will be very, very happy. In fact, Mr. Speaker, even if Members to your right may not believe me, I am always happy when and if we can find common ground on which to work with the Government.

I take great pleasure in supporting this Resolution.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. J. J. CHARLEBOIS:** (Saskatoon City Park-University) — Mr. Speaker, I wasn't too clear on the remarks of the Member for Turtleford (Mr. Wooff). He started out his remarks by saying that he was in agreement with the Resolution and he certainly finished that way. I gathered at one point that he mentioned that at the time when Mr. Turner needed support in opposing the increased rates put on livestock one year ago, that there seemed to be no support. I may have misunderstood him but I might say that I, for one, spoke in the House last year against these increases. So I should say here, just as a matter of clarification, the House was certainly aware of these increases in the livestock rates and a protest was raised.

I must say, too, Mr. Speaker, that it is difficult to add to anything that has been said by the two Members who have ' spoken, one on each side of the House. They are generally in agreement. I certainly am in agreement with the Resolution. It seems that we are all very much aware of the inequities that have existed in freight rates for many, many years. It seems almost impossible to make any headway. I should say, though, that we should look at the future with some kind of optimism. In this last year, even though it took a type of cudgel, we were able, I think, through the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) to get better freight rates for the movement of potash through this province and outside of this province. This was only because of the fact that we were able to threaten the railways with economic reprisal by way of increased taxation on the mineral rights of the vast acreages that they hold in properties in this province.

The funny part about this is the fact that these lands were gifts to the railways in the first place. It did serve some purpose to use threats. This seems to be a very undesirable way to go about it. I think we should look to other ways and means. One of them that I think we should take note of at this time, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that the Saskatchewan Research Council has been doing some very, very valuable work. One year ago, or slightly less than one year ago, they completed a contract with

the CPR for research work into the movement of potash through the pipe line transportation method. I think here we are getting to be more and more aware of the fact that pipeline transportation is going to be something that we shall see, perhaps in the near future, rather than have to wait another generation for it. After viewing this and discussing it with the Saskatchewan Research Council at the site of the experiment, I have learned that the contract which they have with the CPR has produced a completely successful experiment and there is no reason why these various bulk materials are not going to be moved by pipeline in the near future. I should say, too, that we should be very much aware of the announcement that was made just a short while ago in the press, where the Saskatchewan Research Council has been awarded a further \$400,000 contract for research into the movement of bulk goods by pipeline transportation method.

The other thing, of course, is the fact that we have now negotiations going on between this province and the Minister of Transport, Mr. Jamieson. As was mentioned, he sent out a team of experts and hopefully, I think, we can look to a time when the Department of Transport will look at the freight rates in a reasonable manner. The inequities are very real but we have so far been indicating these inequities by picking out isolated examples and using them to point to the fact that we have been treated unjustly because of our geographical location. But now I think that we must hope that because of the tremendous amount of detail that has been marshalled by this negotiating team working on this, that hopefully out of this we shall be able to persuade the Department of Transport to use a little more reason and give us, what we think, is juster treatment in our freight rates.

I shall be very, very pleased to support this motion.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. D. V. HEALD:**(Attorney General) — Mr. Speaker, I don't want to take a long time in this debate, but I do want to say a word or two because I have been very directly involved in the whole matter of freight rates in the last year or two on behalf of the Government.

I, first of all, should like to express my pleasure at the likely indication that all Hon. Members are going to support this motion. I think it is a very useful motion and I think it will be very helpful to the Government in our deliberations and submissions to the Department of Transport at Ottawa. As many Hon. Members will know this matter has received, and is receiving, a very high priority so far as the Government is concerned. The Premier and myself, when we attended the Dominion Provincial Conference last fall in Ottawa, asked that this matter be placed on the agenda. It was placed on the agenda and after our submission at that time the Prime Minister agreed that the matter would be studied by the Department of Transport and he agreed with the Minister of Transport, Mr. Jamieson, that there would

be some officials of the Department of Transport coming to spend some time with us and to receive from us our arguments and our documentation in support of our position.

I think that it is probably a good idea, Mr. Speaker, to lay on the table the preliminary statements and the preliminary submissions which were made on behalf of the Government and the people of Saskatchewan by myself and our freight-rate consultant Mr. Setter. These submissions were made to the Department of Transport about one month ago when they were here, three senior officials of that Department. They are now in the process of studying our submissions and in the process of obtaining further information from us.

It is my great pleasure to lay this on the table and to say that before too long we expect to hear from the Government at Ottawa with respect to our submissions. Certainly the passing of this Resolution will serve to indicate the very, very great concern that all of the Members of this Legislature and the people of Saskatchewan have for the discriminatory treatment that we have received and are receiving so far as freight rates are concerned.

So it is my very great pleasure to support this motion.

Motion agreed to.

## **ADJOURNED DEBATES**

### **RESOLUTIONS**

#### **RESOLUTION NO. 1 — EARLY AND EFFECTIVE ACTION TO FIGHT UNEMPLOYMENT**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion 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 indicate:

(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 labour 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. W. G. DAVIES:** (Moose Jaw South) Mr. Speaker, the very comprehensive remarks of my

friends from Regina North East (Mr. Smishek), and from Moose Jaw North (Mr. Snyder), on this Resolution have more than justified the intent and the contents. I shall try not to cover the same ground that they so well examined. However, I have a few comments to make.

Mr. Speaker, this Resolution need not have come before the Assembly if the Liberal Party in power at Ottawa and in Regina had properly attended to their obvious responsibilities. In the first instance the whole country well knows that the overwhelming increase in jobless numbers has come about, not merely through the sins of omission of the Liberals, many though they may be; rather it has developed because of the wilful and deliberate actions of Liberals. It was, after all, Prime Minister Trudeau, who sedulously sought to create unemployment, to 'dampen down' the economy in an ill-advised and stupid program of allegedly fighting inflation.

I say that far-reaching damage has been done to the Canadian economy because of this program. Worse than that, hundreds of thousands of Canadians have been forced to endure hardships, worry and want. What we have seen from Ottawa, Mr. Speaker, is a brand of perverted economic arson, like burning down a house to get rid of ants; a dangerous and fantastic exercise as it has now revealed itself.

Only in the latter part of 1970, when the inexorable facts began to make an impact on Ottawa Liberals, did they undertake the belated and inadequate programs that we have learned something about in a very fragmentary way from the news media. Both the Ottawa Liberals and the Saskatchewan Liberal Governments now realize the political dangers that reside in the plight of young people who number such a large part of the unemployed, numbers that are going to soar even higher when students try to get work in a month or so.

On February 5th, as reported in the Leader-Post, national young Liberal Federation President, John Varley, lashed out at both Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau and Manpower Minister Otto Lang, for indulging in what Varley called 'diversionary tactics' in their statements on the unemployed problem. He remarked that young people faced a crisis of unemployment at nearly twice the rate existent for older workers. Mr. Varley said, "Surely some extra attention might be generated by a government so self-proclaimed to be concerned about youth." Mr. Varley said that student Liberals had sent copies of their own work-making plans to Cabinet Ministers, but that there had been little response. He urged the Government to rely less on advertising campaigns to persuade private industry to hire students in the summer and more on publicly financed projects.

In other words he wanted the kind of performance that we are today urging in this Resolution. And you know, today on the wire services, came the Federal announcement that they have a program of \$55 to \$57 million, I believe, to assist student employment during the coming summer. And if you examine the

statement (I don't have a copy here today, Mr. Speaker), but I read it earlier this afternoon, it will be seen that less than five per cent of the total number of students who will be on the labor market can be hired by this program. And if Federal performance is halting and lame, at the best in these critical times, it is even less where Saskatchewan is concerned.

Saskatoon Star-Phoenix Ottawa editor, George Smellie, said on January 18th, in a dispatch on the new Federal Budget this — and I quote:

Capital spending plan of the Transport Public Works Department all ignore Saskatchewan. The Public Works Department lists just one major project for Saskatchewan, a \$300,000 public building for Humboldt.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that for days Saskatchewan citizens have been trying to identify whether even this meagre project is a real one.

One would have thought that the Trudeau Government would have been anxious to improve the fortunes of his confrere Premier Thatcher, since Saskatchewan Liberals are now girding themselves for the next provincial election. What appears to be the fact is that Ottawa Liberals, after having been so long the target of attack by Saskatchewan Liberal leaders, who try to disassociate themselves from Ottawa Liberal policies, are now punishing Saskatchewan citizens for it.

Doing business with Ottawa was done better by a CCF government because the CCF government did business on a straightforward and courteous basis. They did not consistently cry, 'blame Ottawa,' in situations where the province itself should take some responsibility. But whatever the case, Mr. Speaker, one thing is clear as noontime — that if Ottawa's actions to generate work projects are feeble and inadequate nationally, they supply hardly a flicker of economic energy for Saskatchewan.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. DAVIES:** — Mr. Speaker, it has also become apparent to Saskatchewan people that the final solution to unemployment as expressed by the Saskatchewan Liberal Government policy is the encouragement of worker migration from the province. It is undeniable that our jobless figures would be very high indeed if so many citizens had not been forced to leave the province because of the total labor policy of this Government.

In the fall of 1969, Mr. Speaker, the Saskatchewan Liberals had cut back on work-making projects to balance the budget. They were warned against this by New Democrats, by organized labor and by others. Reversing themselves in early January of 1970, the Government announced projects to fight unemployment and this program, like the one we have heard announced in the Budget Speech of 1971, was accompanied with bombastic fanfare. The

1970 program has had, as everyone knows, little or no effect. Unemployment which averaged 11,000 for each day of 1969, soared by 50 per cent to an average of 15,500 for each day of 1970.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, we are awaiting an answer to a mutilated motion asking for information of the Government on 1970 Public Works projects and this motion of course was debated in the House just a short time ago.

It is very significant indeed that the Government refused to provide the facts that were requested in that motion. That question was for simple, precise information which the Department of Public Works should have been able to provide very quickly. In fact, it's the kind of question that we used — in the CCF government — to provide the answer in one day.

**MR. SNYDER:** — Not as hard as finding a car even, Lionel;

**MR. DAVIES:** — The motion that was substituted by the Government and rammed through the House is a mishmash which avoids the main and the legitimate thrust for the information we tried to secure.

In my view the reasons are very simple. The Government Public Works program which was so loudly touted and trumpeted was a deceitful facade and the Government is fearful that the true facts should emerge at this present time.

Mr. Speaker, when the 1970 Public Works program at long last reveals itself I predict that it will be very similar to the situation that we've seen with respect to last year's 'crash' program. It will fail to do the job as it should do, as it will not fulfil the expectations that have been aroused by its advocates and spokesmen. It has also been pointed out by my fellow MLA from Moose Jaw North (Mr. Snyder) and by my friend, the Member for Regina North East (Mr. Smishek) that the Public Works program of the Manitoba New Democratic Party government has been far-reaching and has been immediate in its impact. As well as involving far more money, the contrast with the comparatively small expenditure of the Saskatchewan Government is very clear indeed.

Now let's consider for a moment, Mr. Speaker, a Public Works expenditure of \$15 million and that's a little less than what is provided in the current Estimates. This sounds like a large sum but it's doubtful that much more than 10 per cent, \$1.5 million, is bound up in the direct wage bill to construction workers. The remaining amount, I think, may generate employment indirectly but again this may not all accrue by any means to Saskatchewan's benefit because many materials, as everyone knows, don't originate in the province of Saskatchewan. Anyway, assuming that 10 per cent that is taken up in direct wages, using \$4 an hour as the average wage of a construction worker, you'll find that with a little simple arithmetic, only about 270 men could find remunerative employment for 35 weeks



or eight months of this year.

This is creditable, but it makes very little overall impact and it would be necessary to embark on a far larger outlay of money on a Public Works program to substantially alleviate the unemployment problem that we have in the province at the present time.

Also, the use of house-building programs would first of all employ more men directly because of the slightly higher labor content concerned and more men indirectly because of the innumerable articles and materials which go into a home today. So, Mr. Speaker, I say that it is fair enough to take credit for the minimal Public Works program as this Liberal Government is doing,, always providing that it becomes, of course, an actual program and doesn't remain on the drawing board. But the program cannot be represented as anything which will decisively attack unemployment in Saskatchewan. The program is just too small for that.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. DAVIES:** — Well, it's arrived very late, everyone knows that. The effect of this Government's Public Works program has hardly created a ripple of activity or work in the province. To have been useful even in its very limited scope, it should have been planned fully at least five months ago. The most bitter fruits of unemployment which we are now experiencing will scarcely be touched and have scarcely been affected at the moment.

I say that the fatal deficiency of government responsibility in stimulating work in the building construction field and indeed other areas of employment, is illustrated by a January 5th, 1971 lead story in the Leader-Post by Mr. Harvey Oberfeld, City Hall reporter in Regina. The story is entitled, "Regina Building Lowest in 10 Years for 1970." The story pointed out that there were 391 permits for single family dwellings in Regina during 1970, compared with 555 in 1969. It pointed out that apartment construction dropped sharply and semi-detached house construction from a \$2,035,677 figure to \$78,208.

The Assembly recessed at 5:30 until 7:00 o'clock p.m.

Mr. Speaker, at 5:30 — if I can briefly recapitulate — I was talking about a story in the Regina Leader-Post with respect to the very poor building results' for 1970, and I had just prior to that said something about the crash program of the Liberal Government of 1970 which was one of those peculiar programs that crashed before it ever got off the ground. I said something also, I believe, about the 1971 program.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that any fair person has to agree that in a situation such as we have in 1970 and have experienced in the first few months of this year that it just has to be said and has to be concurred in, that provincial Government

action for the relief of unemployment should have been launched much earlier and I am here giving the fullest possible credit that I can to a varied program, because as inadequate as it is in its total aspect, it would have had some stimulating effect on promoting employment if plans were made at a sufficiently early date.

The results are described in the Leader-Post item that I have already referred to. Also, a Star-Phoenix item on December 31st, 1970 added this, and I am quoting verbatim:

A Canada-wide survey by a private employment agency claims 41 per cent of Saskatoon firms contacted plan to reduce employment levels during the first quarter of 1971.

And note this:

On a city basis the Saskatoon percentage was the highest in Canada.

Now, Mr. Speaker, surely the background in both of our two larger cities discloses all too truly the utter inadequacy and the total shortcomings of the Saskatchewan Liberal effort to stimulate the economy, to encourage business activity, and to remove, most important of all, the worst aspects of poverty and unemployment in our midst.

Mr. Speaker, we hear almost continually from the Premier and his colleagues about the proposed pulp mill — the new pulp mill. I think there is no doubt that they pose this in terms of something that is an answer to the regalanizing of an economy which has been staggered by the results of a Liberal Government during the past seven years.

Well, granted, this construction will create some work. It will certainly have a few favorable effects. But, Mr. Speaker, permanent benefits will not be nearly as large as they have been claimed so far as employment is concerned. And, of course, the dangers that may well accompany the development have already been briefly discussed and will be, I suppose, discussed more thoroughly at the proper time when that legislation comes before this House.

Let's not forget that pulp mills have never been the fundamental answer to employment anywhere/in Canada.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. DAVIES:** — The Province of Quebec has got a few pulp mills. Anyone who has been there knows about that and the effects on that province have not been all good by any means. Anyone can see that, as I did, when I was down there a couple of years ago, along the Gaspé Peninsula. It used to be one of the garden

spots of Quebec. Now it is littered with the refuse of pulp and it is very difficult indeed to swim almost anywhere there in certain portions and be comfortable about it.

I want to point out that in spite of all this, Quebec has one of the highest jobless levels in Canada and, as has been said so often, that high jobless level has been, in my opinion, the main contributing feature to the kind of unrest that has led to the most regrettable and most tragic situations of the past three or four months.

So, Mr. Speaker, without going into that aspect — because I am sure we're aware of it — it is absolutely unrealistic and it is totally misleading to talk about a pulp mill to the exclusion of the more meaningful solutions of our jobless problem. The House has already heard from my friend, the Member for Regina North East (Mr. Smishek) respecting a literal host of ideas for employment-creating projects. I say that it is in that kind of program that there resides the real essence of activity for a progressive government in fighting to reduce jobless numbers. I am not going to repeat what he said about that the other day.

I intend in a few minutes to mention one or two aspects that I think may be more peculiar to our province and which might help us if we took them into account. I am going to talk about certain fields of publicly-created projects for recreation and tourism. But let me just for the moment talk about another aspect.

Everyone who has read the newspapers of the last two or three weeks has heard something of the kind of project that has been put forward by the Federal and Liberal Minister of Labour, Mr. Mackasey. Now, I don't give Mr. Mackasey credit in entirety for everything. I think, though, that he has sincerity. I think he has some imagination. I think that he epitomizes for what it is worth, the modern, free enterprising Liberal Member who wants to do something to directly alleviate a situation that bothers him. I think that this springs from the background from which he has arisen and because he has enough sensitivity to realize that even a Trudeau Government has to do one or two things that will be recognized in this direction.

I say that what that Government has done lay in the power of this Government to do over the past 18 months of very severe unemployment in this province. What has Mr. Mackasey done? First of all, he has boosted the Federal minimum wage to \$1.75 an hour. Secondly, he has added to the minimum wage a very favorable feature, and a very logical feature, an escalator clause that recognizes cost-of-living increases so that the minimum wage will ascend as the cost-of-living goes up. Thirdly, he has added to labor standards. Dominion wide, features that are favorable and some of those features most significantly have to do with that portion of the population who work for wages and salaries who are women.

If you examine what was done there and done easily, and done in a national context in 10 provinces, we can realize all of the pressures that are created within the framework that we well know exists in any of the 10 provincial governments or the Federal Government in Canada. What has been done here?

When I think of the absolute torpor that has existed here during this past year, the past 16 months: Minimum wages everywhere else in Canada have gone up — nothing whatsoever in this province in that direction that would justify the trend else — where; something that could have been done that would have helped people in the worst depths of depression and poverty in this province — that would have helped to create, most important of all, employment in a time of deep unemployment.

I cannot forgive. Mr. Speaker, the Government for its omissions in this regard. I remember sitting on the other side of the House as a Member of the government and as a private Member from 1956 to 1960 and I well remember at that time . . .

**HON. L. P. CODERRE:** (Minister of Public Works) — You did nothing.

**MR. DAVIES:** — . . . and I want to point out to the Minister of Public Works, the erstwhile Minister of Labour, again because he is persistently forgetting what I constantly pointed out to him, that in those years we had the highest single minimum wage in Canada in this province. To proceed, I on one or two occasions as a private Member, arose to ask my government of the day to do more. It was pointed out to me by my colleagues that lower minimum wages existed everywhere else in Canada, lower labor standards of all kinds were present and that it was most difficult for a government in an agricultural province to go further. And there were other pressures. I know my friend, the Minister of Public Health, as a businessman, well agrees that those pressures existed in those days. My colleagues used to say, 'if we could only get the Federal Government to do something. If they would only move to set a standard then we could move too, it would be easier.' And in spite of that, a government predominately of farmers, passed legislation for minimum wages, for hours of work, for vacation pay, for all of the good things for wage earners that were then foremost in Canada.

But a new situation now exists. The introduction of a Federal Labour Standards Code with a much higher minimum wage than had existed in the provinces inspired other provincial jurisdictions to do that which they had been laggard about before, namely proceeding in a field which has been much, much neglected in Canada - and the minimum wage began to increase. Now, in this kind of background there was absolutely no excuse whatsoever, Mr. Speaker, for the kind of failure to act that has been demonstrated by this Government. Because all through this period it has allowed the minimum wage to remain the lowest or almost the lowest in Canada when once we led all provinces. It would not accept the leadership of its Federal Labor colleague,

Mr. Mackasey, to whom I give full credit for having done what he has done at this time respecting the minimum wage.

I say that these omissions, added to the fact that the Speech from the Throne, when we began this Session 21 days ago, said that the Government will move to a higher minimum wage. I pointed out then that that action did not have to wait until this Session; that the statement in the Speech from the Throne was a piece of propaganda.

If it wasn't propaganda why didn't the Government act two days afterwards to say, 'we are making an increase in the minimum wage of the following.' It is now over four weeks later and there isn't a single indication in this direction. I say it is shameful. I ask the Government, all politics aside to remember the people who depend upon the minimum wage and labor standards. I must ask you, for heaven's sake, to get off your backsides, and proclaim whatever you are going to proclaim. You won't secure any political advantage from this anyway because I am positive whatever you do that it won't be as good as has been done by Mr. Mackasey, your Federal colleague. It is the least that you can do.

Now, I really and earnestly feel for people who need minimum wage protection. You will note that there are something like 24,000 employers in the province. Even if you assume only one employee for each one of these employers, you have about 24,000 people. I suggest that my estimate of at least 25,000 people in this province at the minimum wage level is probably an understatement. These people are suffering. Their wages are 20 to 25 per cent below what they should be.

It used to be said I can well remember, that we can't get above the Prairie minimum wage level. When the premier was the Leader of the Opposition how he made this Chamber resound about the glories of Alberta and the glories of Manitoba to the detriment of this province and what would, of course, be done when a Liberal Government succeeded to power. The sorry record speaks for itself, I don't need to recapitulate.

But one thing is for certain, that at this point in time, that a Social Credit Government on one side and a CCF Government on the other side of us, have minimum wages of 20 to 25 per cent in advance of ours. There is no excuse, economic or for any other reason, except that the Government has failed to act, for what reason I don't know, unless it is that it is afraid that their business colleagues would resent that kind of interference.

Mr. Speaker, let me go on to a matter that I said I would speak about when I got to my feet this evening. The most populated area of our province lies around the cities of Regina, Saskatoon and Moose Jaw — a kind of rough triangle and maybe 50 miles outside that area. I want to point out that none of this area of the greatest density of population has within its area any large lake, leaving aside the Qu'Appelle Valley and associated lakes, and say Pike Lake in the Saskatoon area.

I don't think that it could be argued that these have very massive volumes of water. But this is where most of our people in this province live. I say that public efforts, the efforts of government, the efforts of not only the Provincial Government but of all governments, to generate the most massive recreation and make maximum use of the lakes and recreation area that we do have is a sort of a natural and logical indication, if only because of the needs of so many Saskatchewan citizens, the majority, as I have said. So there is plenty of scope in this area for a very large work-scheme that would benefit, first of all, our population to encourage employment and at the same time encourage visitors, to our province and make more work because of work that can be generated through advanced tourism.

I want to talk about my own constituency. I'm not going to be running again so I can say what I shall say with perhaps some degree of political altruism that, in my constituency there is a tremendous potential for the transformation of the Wild Animal Park into a Saskatchewan Zoological Park with the placing of a genuine, not a phony, pioneer town site, utilizing the old buildings that are beginning to vanish and collapse into the usual area of old things. We could use all kinds of articles from our recent past built around a recreation area and a Campsite. I want to remind the Members here that Besant Campsite, one of the most popular, is also one area that is getting a bit crowded. We could associate this development with the transformation of the whole Moose Jaw River Valley from the Wild Animal Park to Buffalo Pound Lake Park. This, I say, would result in the creation of a complex that would bring about all the advantages of summer and winter entertainment, not just for our own people, whom I primarily think about, but for the tourists, that I suggest can create the basis for procuring a successful industry in the Province of Saskatchewan.

I'm not talking about the traditional and conventional ways of developing tourist-attracting facilities, I'm talking about a radical and a far-reaching thing that will appeal to people on the basis of the way that we proceed, all the way from the Gulf of Mexico. Please don't believe that I'm exaggerating. I've examined the guest books at Besant and Buffalo Pound Lake and I am amazed that a fairly sophisticated tourist group from Miami, from New York, from Chicago and Detroit, talking about these areas containing the best campsites in the whole of Canada. I hope my friends will not feel that they are responsible for these. They have inherited what a CCF Government built and gave to them in the first place.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. DAVIES:** — I notice my friend Austin chuckles at this but of course he is new to government, new to this area and knows not what went before.

Now let's take the city of Regina. Regina has already made

plans (the Regina City Council) for a facility that would run — maybe I've got it wrong but as I understand it they are talking about a new facility — and I've thought about this myself — from King's Park through the Boggy Creek region to the Condie Natural History site. Here again I want to remind my friends opposite that when we were the Government we bought the Condie land and that is why we have such a fine site there today. I'm sure, to add to this; because I am equally positive that the Members from Saskatoon can talk about this that Saskatoon has plans that involve Pike Lake and the Winter Games' site. So that we should have in this whole area something that was not competitive but which would be complementary. We have our three main cities, and they are all on roadways that are traversed by thousands of tourists every year. They are increasingly looking to our province as a relatively unpolluted area. All you have to do is again look at the campsites at Maple Creek, Besant, McLean and Moosomin to understand how amazingly popular they have proven with tourists.

Remember, this is an area that ordinarily wouldn't be regarded as a prime tourist area. But you have to see the unsolicited compliments written into the camp books at each one of these sites to know what the possibilities could be if we proceeded with a truly imaginative and far-reaching program. They need supplementing and there's no doubt in my mind that a plan which would take into account the kind of projects that I have briefly outlined would pay for themselves over and over again in tourist dollars as well as in the enjoyment of our own people. Look at our economy, take a look at our assets and you can see that this is the sort of development we need in order to attract a different kind of industry, a new kind of tourist industry.

No province in Canada, in my opinion, has sufficiently extended itself in providing facilities for tourists. We are behind the demand; behind the concept, if you like. I think that there is the expertise for the enlargement of the concept and I feel capital spending is a logical investment in this direction in a day and age when most jobs are made in connection with the service industries.

All the Government has to do is study the figures of employment in the manufacturing industry and the service industry from 1945 to 1950 to realize the relatively few jobs that have been created in manufacturing industry. Technology — automation as it is loosely known — has meant that most of the jobs have gone to service industry. Right now, most wage and salary earners are in the area of the service industry, whether they work in hospitals or service stations, hotels, or are school teachers, wherever, that's the environment that we are living in. That's where we are going to get our new jobs, especially in our type of province, in the service industry.

Now, we are talking about a pulp mill which would cost over \$100 million. I'm not saying all of that of course is Government money. Some of this is guarantee, most of it is money the Government is responsible for guaranteeing. I

suggest that if we could outline a long-term plan — I don't know how long frankly, maybe five or perhaps ten years — I say that if we used that kind of a sum and it is not an extraordinary sum, you know, it is not much more than we spend in one year building roads in this province, not much more than the highway budget.

If that sum could be invested in a planned, province-wide network of projects to attract tourists, there is evidence that we could create finally, five to ten times the number of jobs that a pulp mill could bring to this province. I'm talking about something that would not be just one recreational network in the North, because people have to get to the North by coming from the South. We have to have things that attract people at all the levels.

I want also, Mr. Speaker, to point out that the advantages insofar as the protection of our environment and of our heritage are concerned, are to me too obvious to dwell very much upon this evening. My concept is one of a connected series of facilities and playgrounds which would service the tourist all the way from the Border to our evergreen Northland. One of the deterrents to tourism now, apart from the lack of the development in the northland is that hundreds of miles have first of all to be travelled without compensating attractions and comforts along the way. The kind of plan I have in mind would provide for this.

Last year, Mr. Speaker, we urged a similar Resolution to the one that we are now dealing with. Little of what we then said has been given any attention whatsoever by this Liberal Government. Now, I would hope that some of the lessons that have been learned since that time will have begun to be understood by the gentlemen opposite. I should hope that they would, therefore, support the Resolution that is before the House at this time.

Mr. Speaker, it is all too plain that it has been because governments and public agencies have failed in their responsibilities that we have the present mass unemployment in Canada and Saskatchewan. It is evident that the efforts of both public and private parts of the economy have to be melded to achieve the real and lasting results that we have in mind.

Mr. Speaker, this is what the Resolution seeks and this is why I shall support it.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. L. P. CODERRE:** (Minister of Public Works) — Mr. Speaker, I had no intention to get involved in this debate but I, think that the records of the House should be straightened out because of some of the stories of my good friend. Bill. He started propagandizing about what the



Socialists had done. I checked the records and found that when the unemployment rate in this province in 1961 was at almost the highest in the history of the province, they instituted a fantastic Public Works program of \$1,200,000 and now he is minimizing the efforts of this Government in accelerating some of the programs we have made. Very shortly we will be presenting to this Legislature the largest capital estimate in Public Works that this province has ever seen, the largest and at least four times as large as any year that my Socialist friends had in the past.

I was rather interested to look at the records for the year of 1961, the gross expenditure of \$1 million; 1960 with a gross expenditure of \$3 million. These were minimal efforts on behalf of the unemployed. It is strange that my Socialist friends for some reason or other that whenever they get up in the House minimize the efforts of any government in what they are attempting to do.

I think that everyone in this House knows that the drop in the farm income has been the basic reason why the economy is not rolling as fast as it should be. This Government has taken steps to provide programs which will provide employment to the people of the province. The fact remains that you will be asked to approve capital projects during the course of our Estimates which will exceed \$87,345,000. To illustrate, grants to schools by the Department of Education will amount to \$9 million which will generate \$14 million; Industry and Commerce will provide grants to the amount of \$1,000,600, which in itself will generate at least \$6 million; municipal road programs which will generate over \$12 million; grants to hospitals and health centres which is small in itself but will generate well over \$14 million. This Government has done more to provide employment for the unemployed in this province than has been done in any other province in Canada. For example, efforts of this Government in getting a pulp mill which means a capital expenditure of \$117 million will provide much needed employment for the people of Saskatchewan.

**MR. KRAMER:** — Tell us why they all left Saskatchewan:

**HON. L. P. CODERRE:** (Minister of Public Works) — It is very, very strange that my hon. friend from North Battleford is very vociferous, and bellowing sometimes that's all he can do. But when he was on the Treasury benches why didn't he ask for some action? He is now very vociferous in the Opposition but inactive when they were the Government. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that they won't be here the next time either. They won't be on this side, Mr. Speaker. Then he mentions what the great Manitoba Government has done for Public Works programs. They've put up about \$100 million in a pulp mill which somebody is just having a real good hay-day out of it. The poor working man is not getting very much out of it. This is the effort of a Socialist government.

Our house building program, the housing starts have shown a remarkable increase. Everyone knows that Public Works programs cannot in themselves overcome the unemployment problem. Every one knows that at least this Government is doing something about it. This Government is putting programs in the mill, it is turning out some work, it will provide work for the unemployed.

The proposals of the Hon. Member when he brought in this Resolution and what the Hon. Mr. Davies mentioned included the instituting of special methods to aid industrial development and expand technical and vocational training. I think that the Members across, Mr. Speaker, are blind. They just don't want to see, they don't want to accept what is going on and that is the progressive action this Government has taken. There are three times more working people who are availing themselves of vocational training then ever in history or when the former administration was in power. Three times more people are attending technical and vocational training; Special methods to aid industrial development? We take no back seat for the effort that this Government through its central and industrial branch in Industry and Commerce insofar as getting industries. The fact is that right now in Prince Albert, there is a pulp mill that you had attempted to get for the last 20 years.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — . . . never got it!

**HON. L. P. CODERRE:** (Minister of Public Works) — That's right Bill! It is there today! There will be another one and it will provide jobs for people.

Then there is training in the industries. In-service training for our students is being developed, improving labor standards protection. The most progressive labor standards laws in this country are right here in Saskatchewan, and have been brought in here by this Government and much more will be brought in. Consumer protection, employee protection, this is what this Government is doing to protect the working man, not my Socialist friends. Literally thousands upon thousands of dollars were lost by the working man because of their lack of protective legislation, and they are asking for improvement.

Publicly financed and assisted public housing? This is precisely the area that this Government is developing, we are giving public assistance. I believe that you had started 300 units of public housing in 20 years of office. Right now in six years of Liberal administration that has been multiplied by at least seven times to well over 2,200 housing units.

There have been more assistance and provisions made in the Budgets of the past five years towards public parks, recreational programs and similar projects. My hon. friends are belittling this type of work.

The Hon. Member for Moose Jaw South (Mr. Davies) has indicated that this was his last speech in the House. I do hope at this time, Mr. Speaker, that the press won't misunderstand

what is being said. I should like to give my congratulations to the Hon. Member for Moose Jaw and I do wish that his future will be very successful, pleasant, and I do wish Bill that you have a peaceful retirement. I do hope that in the field that you will be pursuing — in the field of labor — that you devote the rest of your wonderful life in attempting to minimize the tremendous losses that we have had through strikes in this province. If you do that, Bill, you will have made for yourself a niche in the history and the annals of this province as a great man. You have the knowledge and the ability to guide the labor movement into less losses which would be caused by strikes in areas where you have the power to act. Not like our young friend from Regina North East (Mr. Smishek) who is always trying to encourage the labor movement to go on strike, boosting salaries and wages, which in the long run is detrimental to the labor movement. This Government in my opinion has done more to provide employment through its industrial development, the encouraging of industrial development, the accelerated Public Works programs, the involvement, directly or indirectly into other programs. I shall have more to say on this Resolution, Mr. Speaker, and I should like to adjourn the debate until I have an opportunity to study all the information, to study the Resolution itself. I certainly hope to add more to it.

Debate adjourned.

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