

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Second Session — Seventeenth Legislature**  
**28th Day**

**Tuesday, April 4, 1972.**

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

**WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**Mr. J.K. Comer (Nipawin):** — Mr. Speaker, I rise on behalf of the Minister of Agriculture, the Member for Tisdale-Kelsey who couldn't be with us today to introduce a group of 100 students from the Tisdale School, they are accompanied here today by their teachers John Wink, Bob Burgess, Earl McNair and their bus drivers Kelvin Hayward and Paul Salisbury. I am sure that all Members of the Assembly will join with me in hoping that they have an educational stay here this afternoon and that they have a safe journey home.

**Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. K. MacLeod (Regina Albert Park):** — Mr. Speaker, I should like to associate myself with those remarks. Tisdale is the old home town and I always love to see some fine people from Tisdale.

**Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. E.F. Gardner (Moosomin):** — Mr. Speaker, I should like to introduce a group of 20 Grade Seven and Eight students from the Marieval Day School. This school is located on the Cowesses Indian Reserve north of Broadview. They are accompanied here today by their principal, Mr. Land and Teacher Mrs. Garrett and the driver, Mr. Harold Larat. An interesting thing about this, Mr. Speaker, one of the young ladies in the group mentioned that in touring the building at noon that she had seen a picture of her great great grandfather in the gallery downstairs. It is not very often that this happens to a student who comes in here. We hope these students have an enjoyable day in the city and that they have a safe journey home.

**Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. H.H.P. Baker (Regina Wascana):** — Mr. Speaker, I should like to welcome a group of students from Marian High School. I noticed the name of Mr. MacDonald was under the name outside here on the bulletin board as the one to greet them. I believe he is here accompanying them, is that right, Mr. MacDonald. I think he should be upstairs, it's one way of getting him out of his seat. I want to welcome them because of them or a good number of them live in Regina Wascana. The school is just on the fringe of my area and I don't know who the teacher is, the teacher's name is not listed on the bulletin board, but we do welcome this class of 150 girls in the east gallery. A very fine group I assure you.

**Mr. McPherson:** — All Liberals . . .

**Mr. C.P. MacDonald (Milestone):** — Mr. Speaker, I want to join my favorite Member from Wascana in also extending a sincere greeting to the students from Marian High School. They are a very special group of students. They are the students that have to put up with me from 8:30 a.m. until 2:00 p.m. I do want to say that I hope the Government Members will be on their best behavior and give them a good example this afternoon.

**Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

## QUESTIONS

### SASKATCHEWAN YOUTH BAND

**Mr. D.F. MacDonald (Moose Jaw North):** — Mr. Speaker, before Orders of the Day, I noticed in the paper that the Saskatchewan Youth Band may have played its last concert because of the withdrawal of financial support by the Department of Education. I should like to ask the Premier if he would consider some other means of financial support in some manner or through some other Department.

**Hon. A.E. Blakeney (Premier):** — Mr. Speaker, I'll ask the Minister of Education to answer that. The answer is, briefly put, that the support is being provided through another agency.

**Hon. G. MacMurchy (Minister of Education):** — Mr. Speaker, in an attempt to reorganize the grants program it was lifted from the Department of Education and it will be provided under the Arts Board for this year.

**Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. MacDonald:** — An addendum to that, Mr. Speaker. There seems to be some confusion on behalf of the band itself, of the organization. I wonder if the Minister has made this plain to them so that they are not interrupting their program.

**Mr. MacMurchy:** — I think there was some confusion, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Jeffrey in our Department who usually handles this area for us was not aware of the circumstances of transfer to the Arts Board. We have brought this to his attention and he will be getting in touch with the Youth Band, it is an excellent program and certainly this Government is prepared to support it, as it has in the past.

**Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

### INTRODUCTION OF LAND BANK BILL

**Mr. T.M. Weatherald (Cannington):** — Mr. Speaker, today being the 28th sitting day of this Session of the Legislature and the normal length for a session is approximately 42 days, we are concerned that the Government has not yet presented its Land Bank legislation. It is obvious that once it is presented there will be requirement of a little bit of time for farm organizations to look at it and considering

that an average length of time would only be slightly less than three more weeks we should like to know when the Government does anticipate presenting this legislation.

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, the legislation has taken a good bit of time to draft. It has now been drafted in a form where it is now at the Legislative Counsel stage, it is certainly through the first draft stage. We anticipate that it will be available for tabling in the House before many days. I want just to comment on one other aspect of the question. I think that it should not necessarily be assumed that the length of the Session this year will be normal in any sense of the word. There is a heavy volume of legislation and it is entirely possible that the Session will be over, in fact I think it is almost certain that the Session will go over an ordinary length and it may go over substantially.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Weatherald:** — I might comment to the Premier, Mr. Speaker, that the record I think is 55 days, which is only slightly longer. My first original remark would still apply that it is necessary to give the public a chance to look at it.

**Mr. Blakeney:** — I concede the force of the comment made by the Member for Cannington, and we are certainly going to try to get the legislation before the Legislature just as soon as we can.

### INTRODUCTION OF SUCCESSION DUTY BILL

**Mr. C.P. MacDonald (Milestone):** — Mr. Speaker, just as a supplemental to the question from the Member for Cannington. There is another very important piece of legislation that has not been tabled in the House and that is, succession duties. Certainly if we intend to proceed with the business order of the House we should like to see the Premier and the Provincial Treasurer table this at an early date.

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, I believe I am able to give the Member assurance that that will in fact be the case. I think this Bill is further along than the Land Bank one by a good bit. I know that we shall have it very soon.

If I may observe in passing that a number of the Bills which have been here have been adjourned a good number of times by the Members opposite. I would urge us all, and I speak for both sides of the House, to get rid of as much business as we can which is on the Order Paper so that when some of this other legislation comes along which has been held up because of the elaborate nature of the drafting we will be able to give it relatively undivided attention.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

### MOTIONS FOR RETURN

#### RETURN NO. 72

**Mr. G.B. Grant (Regina Whitmore Park)** moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for

Return No. 72 showing:

Locations, dates and oxygen and mercury levels of any tests made during 1971 of water in the North Saskatchewan River between the Alberta border and the junction with the South Saskatchewan River.

**Hon. G.R. Bowerman (Minister of Indian and Metis):** — Mr. Speaker, we want to provide the information which the Member has requested but we want to provide additionally some comparative analysis in order that the information which is provided will be of more benefit than that which has been asked for. I want therefore to suggest to the House that an amendment be made to the motion in the following manner, seconded by Hon. Mr. Kramer:

That all the words after the word “dates” in the first line be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

oxygen and mercury levels of any tests made by the Government of Saskatchewan during 1970 and 1971 of water in the North Saskatchewan River between the Alberta border and the junction with the South Saskatchewan River.

We believe, Mr. Speaker, that this will provide the information which the Member is seeking and will also provide as I have already indicated, additional information which will be comparative in order to make a proper comparison therewith.

**Mr. Grant:** — Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to this amendment, although the information was supplied last year, it is a repeat of information that was supplied last year. I believe it will probably show up the effects of the sewage equipment that was installed in Saskatoon, I hope it does anyway.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

## RESOLUTIONS

### RESOLUTION NO. 6 – FULL EMPLOYMENT IN CANADA BY FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

**Mr. W.A. Robbins (Saskatoon Nutana Centre)** moved, seconded by Mr. Matsalla (Canora):

That this Assembly urges in the strongest possible terms that the Federal Government mobilize all its resources to create jobs and achieve full employment in Canada.

He said: Mr. Speaker, we have had considerable discussion in this House during the present sitting of the Legislature related to the unemployment problem. I propose at the end of my remarks to move a motion for the consideration of all Members of this Assembly and I hope that they will support this motion.

Personally I have no particular desire to be consciously political in the discussion and debate in this proposed resolution. Opposition Members are constantly reminding us of an unemployment problem in the Province of Saskatchewan, and there

is a serious unemployment problem right across Canada. Their claim is that a lower percentage of unemployment existed a year ago than is the case today. Their claim may well be true, I sincerely hope that they are using statistics from Statistics Canada which should be the most reliable source in terms of statistics for the whole of this country. However, I would remind them that 1971 was a Homecoming year, particularly in the latter half of that year. Many tradesmen who left his province, electricians, carpenters, steel workers and other construction workers, left during the major economic recession we suffered in 1969, 1970 and 1971. These people went in large numbers of British Columbia and Alberta, a large number of those persons appeared in the statistics of unemployed persons in British Columbia and Alberta in those years. Large numbers of them were unable to find employment in those areas and have returned to this province, therefore they are a factor in showing up in the unemployment statistics available today in this province. This is a fact of our general economic life.

In the 1970s, Mr. Speaker, governments at all levels are going to be confronted with severe problems related to the work force and unemployment. I think, Mr. Speaker, it is perfectly logical to contend that our economic structure has undergone and is undergoing significant and fundamental change. The war babies of the last war and the children born in the 1940s and 1950s are now entering our labor markets and they are entering the labor market in increasing numbers. This is a basic fact of reality in the Canada of today, Mr. Speaker.

To the present date in our society we have a continuation of a practice which has, in my opinion been too long with us. Too many of the things which we as consumers buy are wants contrived by advertising. Often something which prompts the consumer to buy and in the process spend money, which he hasn't got, for something he really doesn't want; and an emphasis on selling all too often needless and wasteful production in terms of maintaining employment. Mr. Speaker, productivity in the industrial process in this country is extremely high. Expansion of the public sector is practically a foregone conclusion in the foreseeable future and cyclically graduated compensation in the form of unemployment insurance is already in process. Mr. Speaker, everyone in this Assembly is concerned about the unemployment problem and I believe they are sincerely concerned about it. Economically it is many hundreds of times more wasteful than are illness, absenteeism, loss of work through injury and all other factors combined.

In 1969 and 1970 the Federal Government of this country gave tacit approval to a form of monetary restraint applied by the central bank of this country, the Bank of Canada. The Government's contention was that it was a requirement to contain inflationary pressures in the economy. We all agree, Mr. Speaker, that inflationary factors create real hardship and enact a particularly potent penalty on the person who is on fixed income, the pensioner, the unorganized worker and particularly on the unemployed. By dampening down money supply through the central banking agency by a fiscal approach which balanced the Budget in 1969-70, thus removing purchasing power from the economy at a period of time when the work force was being swelled by numerous new entrants – those children born in the last war and after the last war – the unemployment rolls rose rather drastically. The Federal Government and the Prime Minister of this country readily agreed that unemployment would grow, but

contended that the steps taken although having numerous unsatisfactory side effects would reduce the inflationary factor and in the end result would be beneficial to all of us. Mr. Speaker, I am the first to admit that inflationary factors are a serious matter to all Canadians whether this fact is realized or not. As a person who spent most of his working lifetime in the field of pension administration I readily admit that inflation generally has a disastrous impact on pension probabilities. However, after outlining the problem related to inflation which hurts fixed income recipients, pensioners and particularly the unemployed, one must also look at the impact of deflationary policies which almost inevitably result in heavier unemployment.

Perhaps nothing is more soul-destroying than to be unable to secure gainful employment. My criticism, and I trust it is constructive criticism of the Federal Government's most recent policies in this respect, is that all too often the timing is in error and the tendency to rely on monetary policy as the major means of achieving adjustment is most unwise. Both monetary restraint and the offsetting approach of an expansionist monetary stance inevitably has its impact. The time lag between institution of such a policy and the end result is usually some 18 months or more. By the time the major impact arrives economic conditions have altered and the monetary methods employed are often attempting to correct a condition which is no longer applicable.

I favor a means of controlling inflation and readily admit that monetary restraint must be a factor which must be utilized. However, it must be utilized with extreme care and the timing associated with its utilization must bear no relationship to political expediency or an attempt to gain political advantage. My major complaint against the Federal authority is this country can be summed up under specific headings. 1. In using the money supply and the application of restraint to control inflationary tendencies sudden abandonment when electoral probabilities loom large in the authorities perspective merely compounds the problem, though it may be temporarily successful in diverting public opinion from an inevitable side effect of restraint policies, namely increasing unemployment. 2. If the Federal authorities would use selective price control, for example, on a basic commodity at a time of industrial confrontation the overall inflationary impact followed by monetary and fiscal restraint would be appreciably reduced. In addition the side effects created by the inevitable deflationary impact, Mr. Speaker, of the restraint measures would also be appreciably reduced.

May I simply give you an example to illustrate this point. In 1969, I visited in Ontario in the Sudbury area when the Falconbridge Nickel Mines and International Nickel Mines were on strike. These plants had been struck by the United Steel Workers, a very powerful union. The strike lasted some four or five months. During that period United Steel Workers with their muscle, if you want to term it as such, were able to extract a very good contract for their members from these two companies. Immediately after that settlement the price of nickel was raised 25 cents a pound. I had occasion to check very carefully Falconbridge Nickel and International Nickel, along with many other companies in my work as an administrator of a pension fund. I discovered that in 1969 International Nickel had net earnings of some \$59 million but in 1970 the year after they raised that price of nickel by 25 cents a pound, their net earnings climbed to \$161 million. Now it is obvious

that during 1969 the companies' earnings were hurt to an appreciable degree by the strike. My contention is simply this; an extremely powerful union, United Steel Workers and two powerful companies, Falconbridge and International Nickel, which largely control the total nickel supply in this country and indeed throughout the world, after they came to a settlement simply, of course, moved the settlement on to the consumer of the goods. Now the real problem that arises here is the tremendous impact that it has on our general economy. Nickel is a basic commodity. It is used in the manufacture of automobiles, washing machines, televisions, sets, industrial commodities, etc. If the Government of the day had used some kind of price control on the basic commodity it would have appreciably slowed down the inflationary impact on this country. In any economic society there are those who, when placed in positions of power, whether it's union groups or companies, will abuse that power and secure unfair economic advantage. It is the function of the Federal authority to police that power. This could be accomplished at least to some degree through a prices review board.

Mr. Speaker, there is little doubt that price increases at times are justified. Economic catastrophe could occur in an industry which could not alter its price structure on products or services when its costs have risen to a level which consistently exceeds realized return on its operations. It is equally true that price increases are sometimes totally unjustified. The unscrupulous may well take advantage of the general trend. A review board would analyze price increases, if unjustified such increases would be revoked. In fact, Mr. Speaker, on two occasions in recent years the Federal authority has used that approach, rather timidly admittedly, but they applied it in relation to proposed price increases in the steel industry.

Mr. Speaker, I presume it fair to say that inflation and deflation are in all probability not very meaningful to the man on the street or the average Canadian. Yet inflationary and deflationary tendencies in our economy exert powerful influences and vital impact on every Canadian. Inflation destroys the purchasing power of our savings and deflation may well usher the individual into the ranks of the unemployed. Economic devastation can be inflicted on Canadian economic life through the deflationary factor and through the inflationary factor. Mr. Speaker, no factor is more deflationary than hundreds of thousands of unemployed persons who lack purchasing power which prevents them from reasoned participation in the mainstream of Canadian economic life.

Mr. Speaker, Opposition Members in this Assembly have expressed well-founded concern for unemployed persons in Saskatchewan. They cannot, therefore, do other than logically support the intent of my resolution. They are well aware, at least they should be, that the economic capabilities of the Federal authorities whether in the field of monetary or fiscal policies are the vital factors in determining whether or not unemployment is a major problem in Saskatchewan and indeed throughout Canada. Suffice it to say that my criticism of the Federal authority in this matter is basically that all too often political expediency appears to govern the economic decisions. If our timing were improved with reasoned economic planning the hills and valleys of economic activity could be smoothed out to some degree and the tragic impact of unemployment on people thereby reduced.

Our objective in urging the Federal authority policies which may well alleviate the unemployment problem without attendant inflationary side effects is in line with the general recommendations of the Economic Council of Canada and in accordance with definable economic goals. I, therefore, Mr. Speaker, urge all Members to support my general Resolution.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. T.M. Weatherald:** — Mr. Speaker, I have not had the opportunity to prepare in any great length a speech on this particular subject but in listening to the Hon. Member who put forward some very valid points I do think a resolution of this importance, because it comes to one of the most important things in the country at this particular time and I really found very little to quarrel with him when he was talking about monetary policy, employment policies and so forth in creating a full employment climate in our country. I do think though that he has not nearly gone far enough in his analysis of the difficulties now besetting the economic system and the problems of unemployment in the country. For example, he says that the Federal Government should mobilize its resources to create jobs and achieve full employment in Canada. Mr. Speaker, that, of course, has been the long and great cry from the NDP for a number of years and it continues to be, but I wish to assure the Hon. Member from Saskatoon that the Federal Government alone will never overcome the problems which he so eloquently speaks of. The Federal Government through monetary policy, fiscal policy or any other type of winter works program that are measures to solve the unemployment in the short run will never overcome the difficulties besetting the country as far as the unemployed are concerned, without the co-operation of the people of this country themselves which unfortunately I have to say has not been forthcoming in the measures which are required.

I come to the very core of what he said about International Nickel and Falconbridge Nickel because precisely this is what is happening across the country. The economic groups such as the powerful labor unions or powerful business, one as bad as the other, have been able to look after themselves very nicely. A powerful union has been able to achieve substantial wage gains far beyond the inflationary gains in the economy; the industry in many instances has simply passed this on to the consumer at the expense of the poorly organized public. Those people who are unorganized are basically the farmers, the old age pensioners, young people, people who work in the small shops for relatively low wages and have very little economic power. They are the people who are paying the price towards both big business and big labor in Canada today and until the co-operation is forthcoming of both big business and big labor those people will still be occupying a very low rung on the economic ladder in Canada. I suggest to the Member, therefore, that if we in this country are to overcome the problems of unemployment that there is going to have to be a great deal more co-operation between both big labor and big business because it is pretty obvious that up until now they have simply been looking after themselves. It's absolutely mind boggling to myself to take a look at some of the provincial budgets that are being presented today. You take a look at the Province of Alberta which supposedly is under a brand new, one of great image politician in Mr. Lougheed and they bring in a budget of \$199 million deficit. Now the Province of Ontario, and not even an election



year I might add, Mr. Speaker, brings in a deficit budget of something like over \$500 million. This is going to be in one of the most prosperous years that our country has ever seen for the year that has been presently budgeted for in these two particular provinces. The Province of Manitoba I didn't have at my fingertips the deficit in its budget. And yet the provinces all across the country are budgeting for tremendous deficits in order to try and prop up the economy and solve our unemployment problems. Meanwhile much of the co-operation and need of the general public in keeping our costs and our competitive edge is being lost. Many highly organized unions and highly organized businesses are simply pricing themselves out of the market at the drastic loss of jobs to the general economy. We can't help but look at the demands which are being placed throughout the economy by people in all walks of life. Some of these demands are legitimate but far too often they are based on what is good for me and how much can I get, Mr. Speaker, and the economy becomes secondary.

What I want to do is suggest to the Member opposite that there is simply no use in us passing a Resolution saying that the Federal Government should be able to overcome all of these problems. The Federal Government can't overcome all these problems without the co-operation of the rest of the people of this country and they are not likely to overcome it. Whether the Government is called Conservative, NDP, Liberal or any other political stripe, the problems of unemployment aren't going away until the people of this country start showing some co-operation in the creation of jobs by remaining competitive and by the desire of people themselves to hold economic gains within reasons. I would apply these comments not to any particular group, because it is obvious that any group with economic power is using it to full advantage today in Canada and the only groups that are really suffering are those who have little or no economic power. So I want to simply suggest to the Member that while I support his Resolution that I should have liked him to address much of his speech equally not only to the Federal Government but to the Provincial Governments of Canada and to the various economic groups of Canada, including both big business and big labor. It is only through the co-operation of all of these groups that we in this country can ever possibly even come close to overcoming many of the economic problems that are creating such high levels of unemployment and difficulty for so many people.

Mr. Speaker, I will support the Resolution but I do not accept the narrowness of the Resolution but simply point out that the Federal Government by itself will never at any time, nor with the Provincial Governments at any time, overcome these problems without substantially more co-operation than they have been receiving up until now from various strong economic groups.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. G.T. Snyder (Minister of Labour):** — Mr. Speaker, there are a few words that I should like to add to this very important Resolution and I should like to say first of all that it is somewhat encouraging to hear some of the remarks of the Member for Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) who just took his seat. I think this is the first glimmer of recognition that we have seen from Opposition benches which recognizes that some of the economic ills and some of the

problems of our country can be traced directly to the exorbitant and excessive profits that have been wrung out of the national blood stream of this country of ours. I think that this is the first glimmer of recognition that we have seen in the 10 or 12 long years that I have had the opportunity of sitting in this House facing Members opposite.

I want to congratulate the Hon. Member from Saskatoon Nutana Centre (Mr. Robbins) for presenting with I regard as a very important Resolution on a very impressive problem. I feel that the Resolution proposed by the Hon. Member for Saskatoon Nutana Centre is entirely relevant and extremely appropriate at this time.

The Resolution's emphasis with regard to the allocation of responsibility for the alleviation of current unemployment is also very much to the point. The Federal Government I believe must bear the major portion of the blame for the high jobless rate in this country and with its control over the nation's fiscal, monetary and general economic policy, Mr. Speaker, it must assume the dominant role in implementing lasting solutions. Before the Federal Government started to tinker with the economy the Ottawa administration obviously adopted the widely held view, Mr. Speaker, that unemployment and inflation could not exist at the same time. Presumably this was their motivation in deliberately creating conditions of unemployment in an attempt to curb excessive price increases. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think it is well that we hesitate for a moment and see just how successful that Ottawa experiment has been. On the one hand their experiments have undeniably put hundreds of thousands of Canadian people out of work — 627,000 last month according to the most recent Statistics Canada Report. The February unemployment rate was 7.3 per cent or doubt what is needed to sustain conditions which are regarded as relatively full employment. Although the seasonally adjusted rate stood at 5.8 per cent, although it is lower than a year ago, it is still very much too high.

What about inflation then, Mr. Speaker? Not even the most optimistic Federal Liberal would claim that the February 1971 to February 1972 consumer price rise of almost 5 per cent or two and one half times the acceptable standard is in any way a measure of progress in controlling costs. The Members of the Trudeau Cabinet seem to have invented their own version of the old chicken and egg riddle in reverse. They couldn't decide which came first, unemployment or inflation, and so they didn't know which they should be attempting to make disappear before the other. As a consequence of their uncertain manoeuvring to settle the question they have been eminently successful, Mr. Speaker, in disposing of neither. No one will deny that inflation is a force to be dealt with but surely, Mr. Speaker, no responsible person will say that this should be done at the expense of a man's livelihood. In Saskatchewan in February some 20,000 people were reported to be without jobs representing an unadjusted unemployment rate of 6.1 per cent. It's true that the Saskatchewan rate is one of the lowest in Canada after Alberta and Ontario. However, this fact is not likely to offer very much consolation to the individual who finds himself without a job.

As a number of labor observers have pointed out if you are unemployment, Mr. Speaker, you are not 6.1 per cent unemployed you are 100 per cent unemployed.

It's disturbing to note the available statistics reveal that a significant proportion of the jobless total is made up of persons who have not worked for seven months or more. Moreover an important factor reflected in the February figures is the impact of unemployment on our young people. The unemployment rate in Canada for persons under 25 years of age was more than double that for members of the labor force who are over 25 years of age and a similar pattern may be set to apply in Saskatchewan also. At the same time I believe it has to be recognized that the official unemployment estimates do not tell us about the extent of underemployment as indicated by the number of persons who are not working on a full time basis. Nor do these statistics include persons who have withdrawn themselves from the labor force because they have despaired and have stopped looking for a job.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, it would be irresponsible, I believe for governments at any level to underestimate the severity of our unemployment problem.

The effect of unemployment on the economy is a cause for great concern. One thinks, for example of losses in output produced by unemployment in terms of the additional production of goods and services that the unemployed would have created had their productive potential been developed and utilized. This extra production would have resulted in higher personal incomes and purchasing power and accordingly higher business sales volumes and higher government revenues. In addition, a portion of the financial resources of the country must be set aside to provide the funds necessary to meet the living needs of the unemployed.

In 1971 during which a great deal was said about strike losses in Saskatchewan, time losses attributable to unemployment totalled about 3.2 million man-days or 1,600 times greater than the time not worked as a result of work stoppages. That is to say that the time lost as a result of unemployment was 1,600 times greater than the time not worked as a result of work stoppages. The estimated wage loss occasioned by unemployment in Canada last year amounted to the staggering sum of \$3.7 billion. Apart from the economic inefficiencies produced by the underutilization of manpower resources, Mr. Speaker, the implication of the social problems resulting from unemployment are also very substantial.

The unemployed person is often forced to endure a standard of living which is below the minimal acceptable line. Unemployment is frequently accompanied by poverty. Poverty breeds ill health, it leads to a sense of futility. It can mean poor housing and it can mean inadequate food. Above all the lack of a job places an individual outside the mainstream of productive society. Our younger people particularly feel this loss keenly because they are anxious and willing to start making a useful contribution to the development of that society.

Granted, we have social assistance programs to meet the sustenance level, physical needs of unemployed workers and their families but this is neither a complete nor is it a satisfactory answer.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, with your permission I should like to quote from a brief to the Senate Committee on poverty in Canada, submitted by the Humans on Welfare Group in

Edmonton some time ago. The report says this and I quote briefly:

To become poor, to be forced to seek welfare assistance is to be damned to second-class citizenship. To be thought of and treated as something less than a human being. Raped of dignity you experience constant panic, frustration, deprivation and injustices. Worse still is the shattering hopelessness of knowing that you are trapped because the system is designed to keep you there to maintain you in the welfare trap unless you possess extraordinary determination and good health or are blessed with good luck you will remain trapped on welfare street.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't concur in total with all of the sentiments that are expressed herein but I think it does express some of the feeling of loss and some of the feeling of frustration of those people, many of those people who make up our unemployment statistics.

Mr. Speaker, I resent and I deplore this kind of a situation as a member of this Government, as a trade unionist and as a Canadian citizen. It is imperative that effective and permanent methods be devised to combat unemployment to reduce the human and social consequences.

Late last fall, Mr. Speaker, in belated acknowledgement that action was required to deal with the question the Government of Canada established the Local Initiatives Program, the Government Loans Program and the Training on the Job Program to create additional jobs. Although these plans were hastily conceived and leave very much to be desired from an operational point of view, the Government of Saskatchewan was quick to take advantage of them for the benefit of the people of the province. A Provincial Task Force on unemployment was established to consider suitable employment producing projects which would qualify under those programs.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, the Provincial Government, itself, committed a substantial financial contribution to these programs in order to maximize the effectiveness of these programs in our province. The Government agreed to offer a Provincial Special Development Loans on the same basis on which the Federal loans were made available to authorize a system of grants to match the loan forgiveness feature of the Federal plan and to initiate a Provincial counterpart of the Local Initiative Grants Program, applicable when the Federal funds were exhausted.

The next cost of these programs to the Government of Saskatchewan is not estimated to be close to \$6 million. This is by no means, Mr. Speaker, the only involvement of the Government in work generating activities. We were cognizant of the pressing need for positive measures in this direction when we first assumed office. This is why the Government launched a special \$5 million capital construction employment creating program last fall. This is why individual departments are carrying on special projects intended to maximize employment during the winter months.

The Department of Welfare for example, Mr. Speaker, is engaged in the government subsidized scheme under which new special-care homes are being constructed and improvements are being made to existing structures. This is a program that was accelerated early last fall. Seven special-care projects are

currently under way and an additional seven will be commencing shortly. The total estimated value of this project is almost \$2 million and the labor content is significantly high. This is why the Government, Mr. Speaker, will move additional construction schedules forward this year. This is why the Department of Labour will be administering a special provincial employment program to find jobs for students and additionally, unlike the program of last summer, will also be finding jobs for unemployed young people out of the school system since February and for employable social assistance clients.

These arrangements will help, Mr. Speaker, but long term solutions are required to create conditions of full employment on a stable basis. This will be a formidable task as we all know.

As the Economic Council of Canada has recently reported some 1.4 million new jobs will be needed in the period of 1970 to 1975 if employment is to grow fast enough just to absorb the anticipated large increase in the labor force and to reduce unemployment to a more acceptable level. The Council has observed that the rate of job creation in Canada has not kept pace with the growth of the labor force in the last four out of the last six years. Further, the Council has reported that the greatest employment needs will occur in the 25 to 34 age group and they will be particularly large for men in this group for whom the rate of employment growth must be more than double that of the last half of 1960. This is the age group, Mr. Speaker, largely responsible for the establishment of families with their demands for housing, for durable goods and for urban services. Accordingly, unless meaningful steps are taken immediately to accommodate these requirements, there will be very serious repercussions before the end of the current decade.

In the achieving of full employment the entire spectrum of economic and social remedies will have to be explored, including more expansionary, monetary and fiscal policies, a greater emphasis on the development of secondary and service industries so that our natural resources will be processed in Canada and not simply shipped to other countries for refining. We will have to introduce measures designed for increasing purchasing power and to distribute income in a more equitable fashion. We must turn our attention to the institution of more adequate occupational training programs, possibly even the restructuring of labor demand to match labor supply and perhaps to the judicious application of such legislative tools as the reduction in the hours of work to create employment as we have already done in Saskatchewan to a minor degree or to the encouragement perhaps of early retirement.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government, I suggest will have to take the lead in introducing innovative and imaginative employment practices across the country.

Mr. Speaker, we pride ourselves in living in a land of plenty, a land with the second highest standard of living in the world, a land in which, assisted by technology, we've been able to exert impressive control over the resources of nature. However, I believe this all has a very hollow ring when we see the faces of despair in the line-ups in front of the Canada Manpower Centres, the Unemployment Insurance Commission offices and the Welfare offices of our country. It is the duty of Canadian society and the Government of Canada to look beyond the

statistical numbers used to measure unemployment to the individuals who are seeking work. Concern for people is what Government is all about and what our particular kind of democratic system is all about.

In this setting, Mr. Speaker, I'm firmly convinced that the Federal Government has an obligation to do its utmost to ensure that every able-bodied individual is entitled to the opportunity to engage in employment and this way share in the benefit of our growing national prosperity.

I'll be very pleased to join with the Member for Saskatoon Nutana Centre (Mr. Robbins) in supporting the motion that is before us, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. G.B. Grant (Regina Whitmore Park):** — Mr. Speaker, I feel that I probably could have supported this motion if the Hon. Member from Saskatoon had included the Province of Saskatchewan in the Resolution.

It's said to be a favorite game among politicians from the municipal level to the federal level to try to blame somebody else for their problems. I sometimes wonder how confused the public must get with this shifting of responsibility between levels of government. The Resolution before us certainly is aimed in that direction to point the finger at Ottawa as the one who has failed to come up with the answers to the unemployment situation.

I don't doubt but what everyone in this room shares the view that we should have as high a rate of employment as possible. I sometimes wonder though when the Hon. Member from Moose Jaw speaks of the line-ups in front of the manpower offices and I've seen some of them myself. When one looks through today's Leader-Post, in the help wanted columns there are about three or four of them without touching the sales types, and there is quite a variety of positions advertised; mechanics, accountants, delivery drivers, business form correlator operators, bartender, hotel clerks, heavy-duty mechanic, plumbing apprentice, parts manager, watch repairman, forest industry workers, accounting clerk, barber. Here's one, they want a gentleman — I don't know just what that category would be. A scraper operator, machine serviceman, caretaker, radiator repairman, grinder man for a large crank shaft general grinding outfit, watch maker, painter, light welders, driver for a semi-trailer unit, journeyman lineman, and I could go on but there are about four columns of help wanted and you wonder why some of these people who find themselves unemployed can't possibly fit into some of these categories.

My first impression is that they may be in the fringe of the trained area and possibly cannot get out of the ranks of the unemployed with their present abilities and if such, possibly training programs should be stepped up and this involves both levels of government. Ottawa is always a good scapegoat and I think it's justified by the assumption by politicians in most provinces that they can't go wrong by hammering at the Federal Government. We did our share when we were the government, nor can they go wrong by hammering the banks and the railways and there seems to be another group that is getting its share today, namely the big business corporations. I won't pretend to defend

them because I'll be accused of being a shareholder in one of them. But the Government opposite must have realized by now, Mr. Speaker, that it also has a responsibility to find employment for young people.

Now, the Hon. Minister of Labour has cited some programs that have been launched, some that have been carried over from the previous administration, but to me this is a mere drop in the bucket to what is required. I'm sure also that in light of discussions in this Chamber earlier that it must be quite evident to them that their philosophy is detrimental to the encouragement of job-making opportunities by the private sector and the Hon. Member from Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) said, governments whether Provincial or Federal, cannot overcome this problem themselves. They must have co-operation and the participation by the private sector and I maintain, Mr. Speaker, that the Members opposite are not in tune with the private sector.

On every hand as indicated in previous debates they seem to have been discouraging this sector. It is evident in such things as the pulp mill, the iron mine, the oil industry, the suggested increase in corporate taxation, probably worst of all the suggested Succession Duty Bill, restrictive legislation of all types and descriptions and as we saw yesterday a Bill to regulate the sale of training courses and to me it was using a baseball bat to kill a flea. Far out of proportion to the requirements and so complicated that if any training course salesman endeavors to sell his courses in Saskatchewan he's a brace soul indeed. He is going to have to struggle through about six pages of the Bill first to find out what he has to do and it must be pretty discouraging for them to even endeavor to be licensed.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that the Government opposite should put its own house in order before appealing to Ottawa, they should recognize their own failures in creating job opportunities for youth in our province. As I indicated there is certainly no harm in pushing Ottawa and if they had included their own shortcomings in the Resolution I would have no difficulty supporting it.

Certainly when the province has exhausted its own resources for finding employment then there is justification in appealing to Ottawa. This, in my opinion, has not been done whereas Ottawa has been recognized by other leading nations as having shown more success than most countries in handling inflation and unemployment.

The London Times, I believe, was one worthwhile publication that recognized the position of Canada in relationship to other countries in its fight against inflation and its fight to maintain employment. I doubt whether the London Times is going to be patting Canada on the back unnecessarily or when not justified. I feel that while Canada may not have done as much as we think they should when we look at the country in isolation, yet when compared to other Western countries our record looks petty good.

I doubt, Mr. Speaker, whether you are ever going to have full employment. It is something like the family farm and I don't know how you define it. It certainly isn't 100 per cent. I believe it is recognized that something around 3 or 4 per cent unemployment is considered full employment.

I feel that they have mobilized a lot of their forces in creating the record that they have created in the eyes of the authority that I quoted, namely, London Times. I should like to move an amendment as follows:

That the words after the word “Assembly” be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

Congratulates the Federal Government for having created more new jobs in Canada in the last six years than the Governments of Italy, France, Germany, Belgium, Holland, Sweden, and Great Britain combined, and condemns the Government of Saskatchewan for its failure to mobilize its resources to create jobs in the Province of Saskatchewan and create an economic atmosphere which would encourage the Private Sector to provide employment opportunities for our young people.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

The debate continues on the motion and the amendment.

**Mr. T.L. Hanson (Qu’Appelle-Wolseley):** — Mr. Speaker, I find that I cannot support the amendment and the reasons that I cannot support the amendment is that it tends to congratulate the Federal Government for the energy that they put into . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Hanson:** — . . . the solving of the unemployment problem in Canada. And the reason that I cannot support the amendment is because the Federal Government chose to discriminate against Saskatchewan in allocating funds to the programs that they initiated to combat the unemployment.

I should like to bring to the attention of Members sitting opposite some relevant facts. If we take a close look at the Local Initiatives Program, we find that in Saskatchewan we have a population of some 925,000 – give or take a few. Canada’s population is approximately 22.5 million.

Now when we look at the allocation of funds to the Local Initiatives Program we find that the Federal Government allocated \$150 million for all of Canada. But then we look at how much they allocated to Saskatchewan and an interesting observation is that the Federal officials did not reveal how much the allocation per province would be. On checking the figures we find out that Saskatchewan appears to have only been given \$1,388,000. This works out to something less than 1 per cent of the total funds allocated to the program, when we have approximately 8 per cent of the population.

When we look at Saskatchewan’s effort at the same time in the same program we find that we had already allocated \$885,000 almost as much as the Federal Government had allocated to this program. But the most interesting part of the picture is when we turn the page over to the Employment Loans Program and we find that the Federal Government did allocate \$6.9 million out of \$160 million. This works out to approximately 4.5 per cent of total funds allocated. At least we are trying to get close to our 8 per cent on a population base.



What did the Saskatchewan Government do at the same time? They allocated \$6.9 million to the same program. We were willing to do as much to combat unemployment in our province as the Federal Government was. Yet, I think, all the Members sitting in the House will agree that the unemployment situation is caused generally by the Federal Government's monetary policies.

I should just like to say before I close that most of the money, or a great deal of the money, allocated to these programs may not be spent because of the deadlines involved. I have every reason to believe that our Government will see fit to extend the deadline so that we can indeed spend the money that we have budgeted to these programs. We don't know how long we can extend them, but I am sure hoping that this Government will see fit to extend them by two weeks or one month. And only if the Federal Government will do the same thing can we really have a direct commitment from them that they really mean business in fighting unemployment.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. W.E. Smishek (Minister of Public Health):** — Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member from Whitmore Park (Mr. Grant) is trying to distract the attention of this House from the major issue and a major responsibility that rests with the Government of Canada in the area of creating employment and taking those measures that will reduce the present rate of unemployment in this country.

The Hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Snyder) has told this House that Canada is one of the most wealthy nations in terms of resources, in terms of potential. We are a nation where we can rid ourselves of unemployment, providing the Government of Canada gives leadership in adopting the kind of fiscal and monetary policies which would develop our economic resources in the interest of the people of this nation.

We recognize that in this province there is some unemployment. Fortunately the ratio of unemployment in the Province of Saskatchewan is less than the Canadian average and smaller than in most of the provinces in the Dominion of Canada. However, we recognize that this is not good enough. Keeping in mind that we have taken office a matter of eight or nine months ago, following on the heels of a government that had no policy for economic development and economic growth for the Province of Saskatchewan for the last seven years. It is not easy to develop a program in a short period of time, whereby thousands of new jobs can be created for those who have been unemployed for many years in this province.

We recognize that new measures have to be taken. We have already taken some measures. We have provided a large amount of funds for municipalities for public works programs by far larger than has ever been done in the last number of years. We have also taken legislative action in reducing the hours of work and increased the minimum wage, provided better wages for our public servants and better wages for the hospital employees so that their purchasing power can be increased. We know that their purchasing power will find its way into the community to help create more jobs.

What did the Liberals do in the area of providing decent

wages for hospital workers and for the Government employees? For seven years these workers were starved by the former administration. Yet the former Minister of Health is saying that within a period of nine months we should have done all the things that are necessary to be done to create massive employment. I can assure him that our Government is concerned about employment. That is why we admit that we are a government that intends to plan our economy and our economic development for growth and for creation of new jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I want to deal more comprehensively with this topic of unemployment. I would beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

**RESOLUTION NO. 9 – INCLUSION OF LEVEL III NURSING CARE UNDER  
SASKATCHEWAN HOSPITAL INSURANCE ACT**

**Mr. G.B. Grant (Regina Whitmore Park)** moved, seconded by Mr. Boldt (Rosthern):

That this Assembly recommends to the consideration of the Government the immediate inclusion of Level III nursing care under the Saskatchewan Hospital Insurance Act.

He said:        Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this Resolution is to try to rationalize health priorities in the Province of Saskatchewan.

I know, Mr. Speaker, that the Members opposite will be quick to point out that their program and their promises were a four-year document and that while they promised attention to the question of Level III care, that it wasn't necessarily to be a first year priority.

The election promise, in my opinion, was very garbled and I have spoken on this on previous occasions, and referred to Level IV care being covered under Medicare. It is quite evident that somebody did not have his facts when they drafted the plank in the platform because Level IV care is already covered under the Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan and in any event would not be covered under the Medicare Plan.

I am assuming that they meant to say the inclusion of Level III care, under the Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan. If this Resolution before us serves no other purpose than to clarify this misworded election promise I will feel that it has been justified.

Over the years, Mr. Speaker, there has been difficulty experienced because of the problem of distinguishing a Level III patient from a Level V or acute-care case, or a Level IV type. This was largely overcome in 1969 with the publishing of a booklet titled "Definitions and Descriptions of Various Levels of Care," and I believe it is now looked upon in the health field in the province and elsewhere as a good guide for determining the levels of care.

Another basic step forward was initiated in 1970 with the establishment of a Board of Referees to adjudicate on cases in dispute. As you can appreciate, Mr. Speaker, there are many different opinions on various cases and really the only way to reconcile them was a Board of Referees and this was established a couple of years ago.

However, there continues the fiscal difficulty involved in the transfer of patients from acute level to a nursing level. The first, namely, acute level being covered in the hospital scheme and the second category, namely, nursing level not being covered in the scheme.

As I stated Level IV already being covered adds another problem, an effort on the part of many to be designated Level IV, in place of Level III, and thus avoid personal costs. The nursing homes have a serious problem in staffing. Their staff complement is based on Level III care. However, it is a daily occurrence that some patients will temporarily lapse into a Level IV category and this requires a higher degree of nursing care, and the nursing homes are faced with not providing it or on the other hand providing it with no chance of reimbursement or staff complement strengthening.

There seems to be an ever-increasing number of elderly people falling in the category between social aid cases and well-to-do. It is only a matter of time until they become social aid recipients, when their own resources are exhausted. I believe some 65 per cent of the people in nursing homes in Saskatchewan are presently receiving social aid. I am sure we all regret seeing these pioneers become wards of the Government. Would it not be better, Mr. Speaker, to contribute to their care while they pay a portion of the costs from their own resources?

Alberta has followed this plan for some time. I believe the individual pays \$3.50 per day and the Province of Ontario, I believe, moves into this area this month. I believe likewise in Ontario the patient or his family will be responsible for about \$3.50 per day.

I certainly strongly favor a participating program and would suggest the Government consider paying roughly two-thirds of the cost and the individual one-third.

The inclusion of Level III care under the Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan is strongly supported by many groups in the province, including the Saskatchewan Hospital Association. They do this for various reasons, most of which I have already cited.

Mr. Speaker, three years go by quickly. There are many hurdles to overcome in the implementation of this scheme. I feel that this problem may have higher priority socially than utilization fees and premiums for those over 65. About the same dollars are involved and this is what prompts me to suggest that the Government opposite give it their attention at this time.

I will now move this Resolution.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. A. Taylor (Kerrobert-Kindersley):** — Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to take part in this debate, although I can't say that I am happy to accept the Member opposite's interpretation of our New Deal for People. His reading must be rather limited. He didn't read page 13, for example, which says, "By increasing government support of public and non-profit nursing homes." Now this is a problem that has concerned me for some time and we ought to commend the man who

was the previous Minister of Health for his concern in this matter. In many ways, Mr. Speaker, the motion presented by the Member from Regina Whitmore Park (Mr. Grant) is laudable and praiseworthy. Very few in our society can be so callous as to disregard the needs of either the aged or those who are physically incapacitated. Level III care, what we normally refer to as nursing home care, has to be considered an important part of any government program of health and social care. It is an important component of any of the care provided. I should like to emphasize that I am pleased that the Member from Whitmore Park has so much sympathy for this particular segment of our society. Mr. Speaker, I almost have to be pleased, because I have to be happy when I see a conversion taking place. There is certainly much cause here for rejoicing. The one important part of the conversion process is repentance, which means simply to turn around and go the other way. I think this is what the Member has done. I say this, Sir, because I am somewhat conscious of the record of the previous administration of which this Member was a part and at one time also a Minister. Mention was made earlier of political games, and this is such a game where one as Opposition immediately introduces recommendations about things which they had not intention or inclination to implement while in office.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Taylor:** — Maybe along the conversion we could say that they are now attempting to overcome the sins of omission. So concerned were they in the past with the welfare of those who were incapacitated by age or illness that they taxed them for every day they spent in hospital. So concerned were they for the welfare of our senior citizens that they charged them \$1.50 every time they had to visit the doctor's office. So concerned was the Liberal Government with the difficulties faced by the aged that they withdrew \$4 per bed allowance paid special-care homes. This was done, if I remember rightly in 1969, up until that time all these homes received \$5 per bed per month, to assist in keeping the cost to the patient down at least slightly. I sat in on one of the roving Cabinet meetings that was held in the town of Kindersley in 1970. The local nursing home asked at that time that the grant be reinstated. The reply was very interesting. The reply they received was that the grant had been cut to \$1 a bed, because this was more economical than \$5. Now we have to admit to the truth in this statement! I think it was the Member for Milestone the other day who made some reference to simple arithmetic, and I should like to suggest that they were very good at simple arithmetic when it came to subtraction, but I am not so sure of addition. The \$1 a day bed was maintained so that the home would qualify for the sales tax rebate, not out of concern for the senior citizens. When we see then the actions of the previous administration I think we can be happy in seeing a change of heart, a repentance, or a conversion.

Have a look at the rationale for Level III care which the Member opposite himself mentioned. The Department of Welfare explains it this way.

This level of care is usually associated with the clients having an advanced physical or mental illness that is reasonably stabilized and which is not expected to deteriorate in the near future, barring the occurrence of additional disease or accident. This care while carried

out under the supervision of a registered nurse or registered psychiatric nurse and directed by the client's personal physician is rendered by staff aids who mainly have been trained on the job.

The kind of care required often includes special diets, tray service for meals, and this kind of thing. The client may well need supervision for his own health care, although in most matters he will be fully or partly dependent on himself. Clients at Level III care we are told will need an average of two hours of personal and basic nursing care per patient per day. Now there is no question, Mr. Speaker, that I believe society as a whole must share a responsibility for our senior citizens. With the changing patterns in our way of life, and in the very structure of society itself, it is too great a responsibility to be left purely to families. This could, and sometimes does, place such a burden on a family that they may never recover financially. We do as a society have a debt to the past that we cannot ignore. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that in our present culture, which is in many ways youth oriented, it would be easy to do just that. We cannot permit this to happen.

Most of the residents of Level III care homes are senior citizens, not all, but most. Any society which turns its back on its senior citizens is attempting to ignore its past heritage and in doing so is destroying its future possibilities. The future is always built on the past and we do have a debt to previous generations that we cannot ignore. I submit that New Democrats recognize this truth. We recognize the contribution which our senior citizens have made to this province. I can personally have nothing but respect and admiration for the pioneers of this great province. Their task was not an easy one when they settled this land, they faced many difficulties and hardships. In many cases they had to fight a pretty hostile climate with little resources, but they gave themselves to this task with a single minded devotion that ought to serve as an example to each of us. They literally spent their lives building for the future and future generations. It was in fact these citizens through the taxes and work of the past who supplied for us the education, health, and the other services that we now enjoy. Now when they reach a stage when they are in need of assistance we cannot turn our backs on them. We recognize that it is particularly difficult for these citizens to sit back and see savings dwindle away, savings that they have built up over many years of hard work. For many years they struggled for survival and then struggled to provide themselves with financial security for old age. Unfortunately now some of them see their savings dwindle as they make the necessary payments for their own care. For some this becomes almost a traumatic experience.

I want to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that our responsibility is not only financial as the Member opposite seemed to suggest. We must also ensure that the kind of care these citizens receive is of the highest possible quality.

As I have had the opportunity to travel across this country, Mr. Speaker, I can only say that I visited some nursing homes that could do nothing but turn your stomach. Just a few years ago I had the opportunity of visiting one, a two-storey frame building with 12 patients. The patients were not cared for in any real sense, they were left lying in their beds, lying

very often in their own urine. The kind of care provided, if any, was minimum. In some of these homes there were no trained staff and little, if any, enforcement of even fire regulations. Clients were literally left in them to die. We cannot permit this kind of situation to exist in the Province of Saskatchewan.

When we consider the cost of these services we must also consider the services the clients received in return. We must ensure that Level III facilities include care for the whole man, including his recreation and his social needs. Level III care homes must, I submit, be licensed; and they must be supervised to ensure that minimum standards are maintained. Indeed, Sir, I would suggest that all such homes should be public or non-profit owned. There must be no profiteering off our senior citizens.

As we consider the actual financing, Mr. Speaker, I mentioned the failures or shortcomings of the previous administration in this regard. I ask you to look with me for a moment at what this Government has already done to assist people in Level III facilities. Certainly I submit the abolition of deterrent fees was of major assistance, since people using these facilities often tend to have a real need for medical services. The removal of deterrent fees then has resulted in a considerable saving to the clients of Level III homes. Since most of the clients using such facilities are in the senior citizen category, the abolition of medical care premiums has also resulted in a considerable saving and has cut their costs by \$36 a year. The Government even now is working towards the establishment of a drug formulary program that would provide drugs at much reduced costs. Again this would be of great help to people in nursing homes, their drug use is above average.

This Government is also studying methods of providing hearing aids at much reduced costs and again this will benefit a number of clients needing such aids. The Government is also to be commended for the establishment of an interdepartmental committee to study the criteria for the establishment of special-care homes. It must then be recognized that this present Government is showing a great deal of concern for the needs and welfare of this segment of our population, and has shown more concern in eight months than the previous administration did in seven years.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Taylor:** — This Government is committed, committed to providing assistance for patients and for the special-care facilities themselves. In the New Deal for People we promised to assume the nursing part of that care. It should be noted that there was never a pledge to assume the full costs. The promise was eventually to assume the nursing component part of the cost. This is our program and policy, and I suggest that those who have not read this at least learn to read. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that this is a reasonable attitude. If we were to assume the total cost, it seems we should also have to assume the costs of senior citizens' homes, for this is part of the total cost of Level III facilities. Members opposite have been reported in the Press as calling for financial responsibility by this Government; and yet in this case they seem to ignore this responsibility, calling on the Government immediately to spend somewhere between \$7 and \$8 million in this particular

program. We believe that assistance has to be provided, and that Level III care must be available on the basis of need and not on the basis of wealth. This can only be done, however, with care and planning. Consideration must be given to the social as well as the economic factors involved. I am not convinced, for example, that we should make Level III care so financially attractive that there would literally be an encouragement to children to place parents in such facilities. I think in the long run we must ensure that the use of such facilities do not cause severe economic hardship or difficulties to the families involved. On the other hand, it would surely be wrong to have a stay in Level III care facility cheaper than a stay at home. I still believe that the family unit is important, and it would be wrong therefore for this Government to provide an incentive for breaking up that unit. On the other hand, when such care is really necessary, it should be available without a severe economic penalty to the people who are seeking the care.

This New Democratic Government is committed to providing assistance. We are committed by policy to assuming a larger proportion of the cost of Level III care. It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that this Government will do so after thought, foresight and planning. It is not the sort of question on which an instantaneous decision can be made. We believe that assistance must be given! We believe that financial responsibility must be considered! We also believe that the Government must assume responsibility for the quality of the care, and make sure that a high standard is maintained across the province. Because of this, Mr. Speaker, I should like to present the following amendment. I move, seconded by the Member from Arm River (Mr. Faris) that Resolution No. 9 be amended as follows:

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

regrets the indifference and inactivity of the former Liberal Government in providing financial assistance to special-care home guests and recommends to the consideration of the Government the provision of increased financial support by the Government for the nursing care components of the care provided to Level III guests in licensed special-care homes.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

The debate continues on the motion and the amendment.

**Mr. C.P. MacDonald (Milestone):** — Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few words on this resolution. You know the Member for Kindersley started off by the word 'conversion', and he indicated that there was a sudden conversion by the Member from Regina Whitmore Park (Mr. Grant). I want to tell you that we were around here in 1964 and we saw the situation in nursing home care in the Province of Saskatchewan in 1964 and I should like to remind him about it.

In 1964 there were 2,500 special-care beds in the Province of Saskatchewan, approximately, as the Minister of Welfare will tell you. Today there are over 6,000. There were more special-care home beds and facilities built in the last four or five years than since the beginning of the Province of Saskatchewan.

In the town of Kindersley, just walk down your own main street and see the new nursing home. Look around the city of Regina, see the addition to Pioneer Homes, Santa Maria, the Salvation Army, the Lutheran Home. Go to Weyburn, Estevan, Assiniboia, Moose Jaw, Melville, Yorkton, any town you want in the Province of Saskatchewan and there is a brand new special-care home built by the Liberal Government of this province in the last seven years.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. MacDonald:** — We spent more money in four years on special-care facilities and building nursing homes for the old people in this province than you did in the 20 years that you were the Government of the Province of Saskatchewan. You call that a conscience and a conversion.

Let me tell you that the contribution and the attitude of the NDP over 20 years to the senior citizens of this province was an absolute disgrace, an absolute disgrace! They had the most vicious means test on a supplemental allowance of any province in the Dominion of Canada and yet every time somebody spoke in this House they got up and criticized the Federal Government on a means test. Yours was the most vicious in the Dominion of Canada. There were people receiving \$2.50 a month. In addition to that you talk about the \$4 we took away from the \$5 construction grant. The reason that was taken away was simply for the fact that we could transfer that payment to the Federal Government because the Federal Government was contributing 50 per cent of the cost to almost 70 or 75 per cent of the patients, and it cost that many absolutely nothing. And the attitude of this Government since they have taken office? Ask the Minister of Welfare about the Community Services Program, a program that was originated and started here two years ago for senior citizens in the province where the meals on wheels are now in many of the cities including Saskatoon, Regina, Moose Jaw and Yorkton. There are recreation programs now for the first time in the senior citizens homes. There is day-care being provided and a multitude of community services which are being provided and instituted by the Liberal Government a year ago which were unheard of before.

The Member for Kindersley talks about nursing home conditions in the Province of Saskatchewan and they were bad in the Province of Saskatchewan where there was no trained personnel where there were people lying in their own urine, to quote the previous speaker, and that was absolutely the condition in 1964. We had to close up hundreds of homes in Saskatchewan which were supposedly looking after special-care facilities or senior citizens in the Province of Saskatchewan. The attitude of the NDP Government toward the senior citizens in this province was, as I say, a disgrace. Now to turn around and hear him talk, why they turned around and reduced the medicare premium, they took away utilization fees. That doesn't have anything to do with special costs. Certainly it does when somebody goes to the hospital, but 70 per cent of those patients were on welfare, and there were no utilization fees and they didn't have any medical care costs or medical care premium.

On top of that, I want to tell you another thing when you consider the fact that 70 per cent of those people are being paid by welfare now, we're not asking the Provincial Government to put in another \$7, \$8 or \$10 million and I am not sure of



the amount but I am sure the Minister of Welfare can tell you. We are saying that it is time that this is transferred from a handout from welfare where people will take their life savings and because in most cases Level III care is permanent care they may stay there for five, six, eight or ten years and despite the life savings that they may have it gets eaten away gradually and then they have to go to the Department of Welfare on handout. We are saying it is time it was transferred to the hospital plan, where the person has it by right where it is a form of sickness and you know the separation between Level III and Level IV care is in most cases very difficult. The Member turns around and says that is going to break up the home, that the home should assume the responsibility. I don't know whether he realizes or not but nobody can be accepted in Level III care unless it is by a doctor's written authority. It isn't a question of the patients. There is a special committee in each nursing home, an admission committee with doctors on it which determine the level of care that is required for each patient in the special-care homes.

Now, the reason for this particular resolution, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that this Government when they were running around the Province of Saskatchewan crying and looking for votes they promised the people in nursing homes that they would provide this under Medical Care or Hospitalization. Now it is time you carried out that responsibility. You know, it was rather interesting on June 23rd after the Government took over we instituted a new policy because for a while there was real hesitation in the Special Session of the Legislature. He almost reneged on that promise. We hear the Member for Maple Creek (Mr. Flasch) stand up and take credit for a new nursing home in Maple Creek. Ask the Minister of Welfare when the approval was given and when the financial resources were allocated from Treasury Board. The Member for Watrous (Mr. Cody) stands up now and tries to renege on a government promise with relation to a special-care facility in the town of Bruno. We will be very interested in the community of Bruno and what happens when we go to Estimates, Mr. Speaker.

All I can say, Mr. Speaker, that the resolution of the Member for Whitmore Park is a good resolution, it is an expansion of the priority that the Liberal Government gave to senior citizens in Saskatchewan where we had to concentrate on the resources of the Government to build special-care facilities, provide the places and locations for every town and every village, small urban centre in Saskatchewan so nursing home care could be provided. Now that the level of care is reached so that we almost have as many nursing home beds per capita as any province in Canada and perhaps more than most provinces in Canada, now it is time we look for an extension of service and that is what the resolution from the Member for Whitmore Park does. I certainly hope that all the Members will recognize their political promises on the campaign hustings and get up and support that resolution.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. G.T. Snyder (Minister of Welfare):** — It is always a pleasure to be entertained by the Member for Milestone on a short-term basis. I think there is a limit to how long people can really enjoy the kind of

melodrama that pours forth when the former Minister takes his message to the people of Saskatchewan. I was slightly amused by the Member's suggestion that these were facilities that the Liberals built. I just want to draw to his attention once and for all that any of the commercial nursing homes that were built had not one penny of Liberal money or Government money invested in them. I want to point out to him too that in the case of the non-profit nursing homes that the contribution by the Department of Welfare was then as it is today 20 per cent of the capital cost. So when the former Minister stands in his place and attempts to suggest that somehow this was a result of a construction project of Liberals I think he is stretching his imagination and the credibility of his Party once again just a little bit further than it can stand to be stretched.

I think it should be remarked upon and it should be remembered that at the time the Liberals came to office another specific event took place. It took place in the year 1965 when approximately 1,000 mental patients were released from the mental home in Weyburn in a matter of only a very few months putting the kind of pressure on the community that we have never seen in this province. It wasn't because of Liberal benevolence but because of Liberal neglect that it was necessary for a large number of nursing homes, many of them commercial homes to come into operation in order to take care of the backlog and the neglect that was brought about because of the events that were imposed on the community when the Government of Saskatchewan with the present Leader of the Opposition as Minister of Health imposed this dreadful hardship on the people of Saskatchewan. This was the thing that spurred the building of a large number of nursing home beds when these 1,000 people were thrust upon the community without any community support services, without any follow-up therapy, without any community resource people who would be in a position to take care of the needs that were thrust on the community within a matter of a very few months of the Liberal Government assuming office in 1964.

I say today that we in this Government, we of my political party are prepared to stand on our record and we invite you to stand on yours and the people of Saskatchewan will judge us as they have judged you and they found you wanting and that's why you are sitting over there in reduced numbers. That's why you are 15 in number and that's why you'll remain as you are as long as you assume the attitudes that you have in the past.

Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Whitmore Park has put forward a resolution to this Assembly and it proposes that this Government include Level III as an insured service under the Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan. As the Member for Kerrobert-Kindersley has indicated so eloquently we on this side of the House are very pleased at the recent conversion of Members opposite. We however wonder what happened during those years that were described by the Premier as those seven long gaunt lean years.

Before I comment specifically on the resolution, let me first of all take a few moments to review the actions of the previous Liberal Government with regard to the special-care programs that seems to have stimulated the imagination of the Member for Milestone. I should like to comment on it for a moment. I should like to draw to his attention that in the face of escalating costs early in 1971 various homes throughout

the province had requested, as the former Minister will recall, an increase in maintenance rates for their guests. In response to this request the Liberal Government made a blatant politically oriented move when they decided to hold back maintenance rate increase until after the June elections and the former Minister of Welfare will remember this well. The subterfuge used was that the increases in minimum wage was in the offing and that rate structures should be reviewed after the announcement of the new minimum wage. I suggest to you that this was political expediency and not the minimum wage which led to that particular decision. The Liberal Government didn't permit an increase in rates for one reason and one reason only and that was the impending June 23rd election. But in place of an increase in rates, Mr. Speaker, the previous administration promised government subsidies in order to cover increased operating costs until after the election. In a letter to the special-care homes, the Member for Milestone assured the homes that the Government would underwrite the increased costs for all guests, not just the welfare guests, but for all guests. The subsidy of approximately \$380,000 was authorized to assist homes to care for their guests who were receiving assistance under the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan. This Government, Mr. Speaker, has no quarrel with providing increased funds when it relates to those guests who require financial assistance. But in addition to the \$380,000 subsidy, Mr. Speaker, the previous administration authorized a warrant for a further expenditure of \$470,000 and the Minister will know that this is one of the first things I faced when I put my feet under his old desk, a warrant for \$470,000 authorized on the 29th day of June, shortly after this Liberal Government had been defeated. This was one of the last official acts which the previous administration performed before they vacated office. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this warrant, this \$470,000 warrant, was a deliberate attempt by the Liberal Government to embarrass the incoming government by attempting to force us into a totally unacceptable policy, a policy which we had no part in making, a policy which would have caused many special-care homes to operate at a deficit thereby jeopardizing the care of their guests.

In order to devise an acceptable solution to the situation the Government launched an immediate study of the Special-Care Homes Program, Mr. Speaker. This special-care homes study committee has completed a detailed report on all aspects of the special-care program. The findings of this committee are being given careful consideration by the Government and a policy statement can be expected regarding the financing and the development of special-care homes in the very near future.

We are concerned that the maintenance rates charged by the special-care homes to their guests have increased sharply in recent years and are placing an unrealistic financial burden on many guests and their families. We further believe that special-care homes should not be forced to operate at a loss, but rather homes should operate on a non-profit break-even basis. Therefore, in addition to instituting a study into special-care homes the Government also established an appeal committee to review the status of homes which were in financial difficulty as a result of the freezing of rates. Under the circumstances, Mr. Speaker, it was our decision that the rates for guests should remain frozen pending the outcome of the special-care study. At the same time however, it is imperative that wherever necessary special-care homes be given immediate assistance to ensure that they would not be forced to operate on a deficit basis. The appeal committee immediately began to

study the financial needs of special-care homes which appeared to be in difficulty. Block grants were made available to homes on the basis of the recommendation of that committee.

When the increase in minimum wage was announced, the Government invited special-care homes to reassess their financial position and block grants were again made in order to compensate for escalating costs. These then, Mr. Speaker, are some of the steps taken by the present administration to assist both senior citizens and special-care homes since we assumed office in June of last year.

Let me then, Mr. Speaker, turn for a moment to the matter of Resolution No. 9 proposed by the Member opposite. The resolution proposes, "The immediate inclusion of Level III nursing care under The Saskatchewan Hospital Insurance Act." It is our contention, Mr. Speaker, by definition that Level III care cannot be insured as a benefit under The Saskatchewan Hospital Insurance Act. The primary function of a special-care home is to provide personal care, the nursing care element constitutes a minor portion of the total service which is provided to guests. The first two levels of care, namely Supervisory Care and Limited Personal Care contain no element of nursing care whatsoever. The third level of care, Intensive Personal and Nursing Care is perhaps badly named in that it gives the impression that the word "intensive" applies equally to the nursing element. This is not the case, the word "intensive" refers to intensive personal care and stresses the depth of personal care required at Level III. Nursing care is intended to mean "basic nursing care". However, it appears that the description of Level III care as "intensive personal and nursing care" continues to cause confusion as to the amount of nursing care provided. I am confident, however, Mr. Speaker, that no confusion exists in the mind of the Member for Milestone, since it was he who as Minister of Welfare set out a very lengthy and a very definitive statement on Level III care to the Saskatchewan Hospital Association some time ago. That statement included a detailed argument against insuring Level III care as he will well remember.

I wish to stress once again that the focus of the special-care home is a social rather than a medical one. The aim of the special-care home is to provide the elderly citizens of this province with a setting that meets their social, emotional and physical needs. It is at Levels IV and V that the emphasis is based on nursing care services for the elderly. In recognition of the fact that Level III care does contain an element of nursing care it is the intention of this Government to give assistance to our older citizens towards the cost of basic nursing care which might be calculated as a portion of the difference between Level II and Level III care. Considering these facts, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support the amendment which was moved by the Member for Kerrobert-Kindersley which says in effect that this Assembly regrets the indifference and the inactivity of the former Liberal Government in providing financial assistance to special-care home guests and recommends to the consideration of the Government the provision of increased financial support by the Government for the nursing care component of the care provided to Level III guests by the Members of my political party prior to June 23rd, it is the position that we assume today and announcement will be made in due course in this connection. Mr. Speaker, I am particularly pleased to support this amendment.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Grant:** — Mr. Speaker, speaking to the amendment I feel I can't support it not only for the first part of it but the amendment fails to make any reference to the promise of the Government opposite when they were electioneering and suggests some financial assistance which is most inadequate.

Referring to the New Deal for People published by the New Democratic Party of Saskatchewan. "A New Democratic Government will . . .," and there are several items here, fifteen or so, but this is item number 5:

Give better care to our senior and chronically disabled citizens through including extended nursing care Level IV as an insured service and by increasing government support of public and non-profit nursing homes and geriatric centres.

Now that is the most garbled, misleading, poorly construed, poorly thought up election plank I think that has ever originated in Saskatchewan. Now the thing that bothers me, Mr. Speaker, is I understand that the Hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek) either chaired that policy committee or had a prominent role in it and I think he must have been absent the day that that one was thought up because it's so completely at variance with the facts and I am sure at variance to what the Hon. Members opposite thought they were promising. Because, first of all if you are going to include — well, first of all they had the levels wrong and they had the branch of the government wrong, but disregarding that — if you are going to include this level of care under an insurance scheme then why do you have to give additional support to public and non-profit nursing homes and geriatric centres? Geriatric centres are already covered. So I just want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that I don't wonder the Hon. Members moved an amendment which really says nothing because the whole thing is based on a garbled political promise made last June that was poorly thought out and it admits, Mr. Speaker, that they are not prepared to implement the promise even if you interpret it the way they intended it to be interpreted. I will not support the amendment.

**Mr. MacDonald:** — Do I have the right to speak on the main motion?

**Mr. Speaker:** — You spoke on the motion and the amendment at the same time. They were concurrent.

**Mr. Grant:** — Mr. Speaker, I merely wish to repeat that it was quite evident that the Members opposite didn't know what they were talking about last June when they made their garbled promise and I haven't had an opportunity to analyse the other 13 as closely as I have analysed this one but I certainly hope that they are more accurate and that the Government opposite will be able to implement them.

**An Hon. Member:** — That was . . .

**Mr. Grant:** — Well, that's just as bad as the Minister of Health doing it because I just can't for the life of me understand how an election plank could get so garbled. Now we all make promises

that we have difficulty living up to and I am sure the Members opposite will remember the occasions when a pamphlet distributed in Regina South was waved at me on numerous occasions asking me when I was going to do such and such. But I should like to know, Mr. Speaker, when the Members opposite plan on implementing this garbled promise. The Hon. Member from Moose Jaw (Mr. Snyder) suggested that it wasn't cost shareable with Ottawa and I've heard so many different opinions on this that I must admit I am not prepared to accept or reject his statement. I am reading from a document by the Saskatchewan Hospital Association, Medical and Nursing Services Committee, saying this:

It is important to note that the Saskatchewan Hospital Association has checked with appropriate authorities in the Provinces of British Columbia and Alberta and were able to confirm that nursing care comparable to Saskatchewan's Level III care does receive Federal cost-sharing in British Columbia and Alberta.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Hon. Minister of Social Aid check with the Hospital Association and the two neighboring provinces to fine out how they are receiving this Federal aid because I must admit I have a tendency to believe what he says, but here is an authoritative group who says they have checked and they found ways of getting around it. Now it has been suggested by the Premier that the previous Government missed many opportunities to cost share with Ottawa and I wouldn't want the present Government to fall into that pitfall. If there is any possibility of cost-sharing with Ottawa possibly they had better take another look at the promise made last June 23rd and see if they can't implement it immediately Mr. Speaker, I'll support the motion.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

### **RESOLUTION NO. 13 – INCREASED GRAIN SHIPMENTS THROUGH PORT OF CHURCHILL**

**Mr. A. Thibault (Melfort-Kinistino)** moved, seconded by Mr. J.K. Comer (Nipawin):

That this Assembly urges that the Government of Canada recognize the importance of increasing grain shipments to improve farm incomes, and show their concern to preserve its reputation in world grain markets as a reliable and steady supplier of grains under its contracts taking all steps necessary to utilize more fully the facilities of the Port of Churchill and give immediate attention to planning and effecting improvements so as to increase the through-out capacity of that Port.

He said:        Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak to this resolution, I am going to try to keep my remarks as short as possible. I know that there are several other speakers who will follow me and perhaps cover the areas that I shall not deal with.

It appears to me that in Western Canada when we have a good crop we wind up with trouble trying to deliver the crop to the hungry people of the world. The railroads, port facilities and I think all the areas of grain-handling should be looked at.

But nevertheless, we have here right close, some 800 miles away from us the Port of Churchill. And when you look at the figures what has that Port been doing? In the last 10 years they have handled about 21 to 22 million bushels on the average. I think when you look at the amount of grain that needs to be moved and you look at the port facilities and the elevator facilities that we have in Canada and you look at the deep sea port right here close to us that is not being used any more than for some 20 million bushels, I think there is something to complain about.

I just want to read to this House some of the statistics that I got from the Wheat Pool, the Licensed Terminal Elevators. Just to show you how it is distributed across Canada. At Churchill you have five million bushels capacity. You know, in Saskatchewan we have 11 million bushels capacity in Moose Jaw and Saskatoon. That's inland terminals. British Columbia has 28 million bushels capacity. Then you go to Ontario, every company has a little transfer terminal. Now for instance, the transfer terminals amount to 53 million bushels in Ontario. Quebec has 69 million bushels. New Brunswick, three million bushels; Nova Scotia, five million bushels and that's at Halifax. What I want to point out is this: you take British Columbia with a capacity of 28 million bushels, yet last year for the year 1969-70, the Pacific Coast handled 43 per cent of our grain. The Lakeheads, 50 per cent and Churchill around seven per cent. So it appears that the powers that be want the grain to trickle through the Great Lakes, the Seaway and so on, at a much higher cost of handling in order to get the business down there. So I think this resolution should go to Ottawa and say to pay special attention to Churchill, that's what it is calling for.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thibault:** — I want to read an article from the secretary of the Hudson Bay Route Association quoting a speech from Sir Wilfrid Laurier and it goes back to 1907. And here is what he says, Sir Wilfrid Laurier speaking in the House of Commons, February 22, 1907, and I quote:

It is not enough for us to confine our views to Canada that it is now settled. We must look ahead, we must push northward as far as colonization can go. I have great confidence that before many years are passed we will see towns and villages on the shore of Hudson Bay like those we see on the shore of Norway. Where people will be prosperous, engaged in lumbering business, pulpwood industry and mining industry and others. That is what I hope Canadians will see before long.

Again on September the 8, 1908, he said:

We have undertaken the construction of another railway, the Hudson Bay Railway, there will then be a present route and the Hudson Bay Route. The trade of Canada is too great even of those of two other outlets.

Now, that was way back in 1908. Do you think the Port of Churchill has had a fair deal? I think far from it.

I could go on and bring out a few more statistics. When we read the annual report of the Hudson Bay Route Association and I want to mention the distance that we can save between Liverpool and Regina. You can save 980 miles between Liverpool and Regina via Churchill. Another thing, from Saskatoon you can save 1,128 miles. You know that is not walking across the street, 1,128 miles. From Prince Albert you can save 1,215 miles. That is quite a saving and I hope this Government along with the Government of Manitoba and Alberta will put pressure on the Federal Government to really improve the Port of Churchill. One thing we are not going to have any snow slides that are going to stop the trains and we can get to the Port in less time and it comes right into the heart of the grain belt. The railroads are there and I don't see why we should have waited so long for improvements to that Port.

Here is a comment by a man that the older Members of this House perhaps would remember, an address given to the 28th annual convention of the Hudson Bay Route Association by Mr. W.H. Howes of the C.D. Howe Company of Thunder Bay, Ontario. By request each delegate wants a copy. He goes on and I want to quote from the report.

First of all, I would like to thank you again, Mr. President, and the officers of your Association for the invitation to our Company to attend this convention. In the direction to his report which was adopted at the convention yesterday morning reference was made to our research for the Port of Halifax. And I would like to enlarge on this a little bit. What we proposed was a shuttle service set up between the Port of Churchill and the Port of Halifax. The main purpose of this shuttle service was two-fold as follows: To insure a steady supply of grain to the Port of Halifax at a time when the railways are fully committed elsewhere to obtain the maximum output from the Port of Churchill by using the ships specially designed for the trade on the regular schedule.

Now, he goes on to say that we could save five cents a bushel by using his shuttle service between Churchill and Halifax and bypass the railroads if they are fully occupied in other work. Now I think this is something to consider and I think if we work at some of those little things a little better when we have markets for our grain that we can really get it there on time and not have to lose any of our sales.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thibault:** — I think there are other things that will benefit us if we use the Port of Churchill a little more. We see industry closing up in Western Canada and I am going to tell you one of the reasons why. You see the Quaker Oats go, if they want to get closer to markets and don't you think with the Port of Churchill being 800 miles instead of 1,200 miles from the seaboard that we wouldn't gain some mileage on sales for our products not only wheat grain, but manufactured products if we want to go into it. There again the Port of Churchill would be very important in that respect.

I want to bring another attitude to the attention of the House and that's talking about the Hudson Bay Route Association. They work with a budget with some \$21,000. Just imagine \$21,000



bucks to try and promote the Port of Churchill. And who is handing out this money? The rural municipalities are putting up \$10,450 of that money, almost half. I think the Government is coming up with some because there are grants of \$2,850. I think we should pay more attention to seeing that this organization gets more money to put on a much greater campaign in favor of that Port.

There is a lot more that could be said about the shipping season. At the present time Churchill has a shipping season of 82 days and it can be brought up to 214 days if they build a causeway across the Churchill River and take the water around the Port. Now, a shipping season of 214 days would be possible and it would make the shipping season over Churchill almost as long as the shipping season from Montreal and over the Seaway – I mean from Thunder Bay. Therefore, I will leave a little bit for the other Members of the Legislature to say, but I hope that this Resolution will get unanimous support.

**Mr. C.P. MacDonald (Milestone):** — Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a few words. First of all I want to congratulate the Member for Melfort-Kinistino (Mr. Thibault) for bringing this Resolution before the House. I think this is the kind of Resolution that the House and the Members of the legislature should all, not only co-operate in, but get behind and give it 100 per cent co-operation. Because, and I might say something non-political, perhaps one of the favorite causes of the Late Premier Ross Thatcher, was the Port of Churchill. Many of the Members are aware that he devoted a great deal of his time and his individual effort in promoting the use of the Port of Churchill. In fact while he was the Minister of Industry and while he was the Premier of the Province of Saskatchewan he delegated one man from the Department of Industry who would have almost complete responsibility in doing everything to promote the Port of Churchill. And realizing, first of all, that it was a great benefit to the producers of Saskatchewan. I have here, for example, an illustration of what kind of a benefit it would give to the producer in the Province of Saskatchewan.

The cost of wheat at Liverpool – it was put out by the annual convention of the Hudson Bay Route Association 1971 – was \$2.02½ via the Port of Churchill; via Thunder Bay it was \$2.14; via the lower St. Lawrence it was \$2.12 1/8; via the Atlantic Ports \$2.14½ which indicates that even in the Thunder Bay region it was a saving of 10 cents, the St. Lawrence and the Atlantic Ports a saving of close to 12 cents to give you an idea of what 10 cents a bushel can certainly mean to the Western Canadian producer. As you know the maximum that has ever been exported out of the Port of Churchill is approximately 26 million bushels of grain. This is something like 56 grain ships. And all of us are aware now that with the new ice cutters that it is possible to use the Port of Churchill to a much greater extent than it has in the past. I believe it should be an active promotion.

I agree with the Member for Melfort-Kinistino that the same problem exists at the Port of Churchill as it does at Vancouver. It is unfortunate that he wouldn't pass his speech on to the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) and to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer), because I think the same kind of priority is required at Vancouver. As has been indicated the storage capacity is 28 million as compared to over 100 million at Thunder Bay.

The top priority at Vancouver is not to build a 10-day railway extension, but to increase the storage capacity and the handling capacity at the Port of Vancouver, or the West Coast, where there would be any port along there.

And so we certainly agree and I just want to congratulate the Member saying that he will have the support of this side of the House certainly on this Resolution and I would hope that it is the kind of a resolution that the entire Legislature can get behind and do anything possible to promote it on behalf of the producers of Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. L. Larson (Pelly):** — Mr. Speaker, I too want to congratulate the Member for Melfort-Kinistino (Mr. Thibault) for bringing this Resolution in. I am also pleased to hear that the Opposition is going to support it.

I am a little unhappy and a little disturbed at the fact that this is becoming almost a perpetual resolution. You know if you really want to do justice to the Port of Churchill it is difficult not to go back and look at some history and look at some events. It is, of course, true that the Port and the Bay in particular, have been recognized for several hundred years. The existence of it was known by the Eskimos and the Indians long before the white man ever laid eyes on it.

It was mean like Coates, Frobisher, and, of course, Henry Hudson, who really as far as the white men are concerned recognized the great potential and the great phenomena of an inland sea right in the heart of the continent. The fur trade recognized the importance of it. And, of course, as the country was settled and grain began to move the importance was emphasized even more.

Figures have been quoted as to price savings, distance and so on. I don't intend to bore the House with these, although they are very interesting and very revealing. I think that the more depressing aspects of the Port are the facts that for years the West has been clamouring for its additional use, clamouring for additional facilities. It is interesting to note that the studies for the development and use of the Port go back into the 1880s.

The MacLean Report on the Hudson Straits expedition recommended the lengthening of the season and the added use of the Port. Then you get into later years and another barrage of reports by the National Research Council, Mechanical Engineer, Feasibility of extending Navigation at Churchill by Tom Dick for the division of mechanical engineering and the Murray Jones and Associates Report. And then you have the Report of the Royal Commission on Pilotage in 1968. And then you go to a later date and you run into, again, a great number of reports and a great number of recommendations.

I think the irony of this is the fact that we have the information on what is needed to be done, we know some of the facts that are necessary and we equally well know the benefits that are available through the use of the Port, yet nothing is done. The question you will have to ask yourself is, why is this so?

An interesting item, of very great interest to every Canadian, is the process of developing the huge untapped resources of our North – oil discoveries, gas discoveries, natural resource discoveries of every kind. When you look at some of the developments that are taking place in almost similar territory, in the Soviet Union, Siberia with a population of some 22 million people almost the same as Canada. In the Siberian North it is interesting to note that there are 632 mines and factories every hour of the day, 24 hours a day. They have not stood back in developing the North.

These ports in Siberia are further north, and more icebound and they are much more difficult to manoeuvre and manipulate into. If we in Canada are serious about the development of the North we have to recognize that to get these resources to the world markets we are going to have to use the shortest routes possible. And, of course, lying right under our nose is the great Hudson Bay and the Port of Churchill.

It would be very, very difficult to understand why a country like Canada, with its huge undeveloped resources in the North is not developing a place like Churchill.

Now I could go on and quote a great number of other comparative examples that are taking place, but I want to, before I sit down, review some of the things that have been requested, minor things that have been requested. My friend from Kinistino talked about the grain that is going through the Port. It is interesting to note that the projections that go as far as 1985 include, when you look at the optimistic side, only an increase of up to some 52.8 million bushels. When you look at the conservative projections which are usually what we get, it is down to 37.3 million bushels. This is projecting into 1985. Very obviously someone is not really too interested in developing the Port. Someone is really not working at it with their true spirit and true minds and the true ability that Canada has to develop this great inland seaway.

It is very interesting to note that when you look at the amount of grain that is to be made available and my friend quoted the figures and I won't repeat them – they are always forecast and always projected a good year in advance. This means that someone is sitting down and just simply saying that we are not going to worry too much about Churchill. We won't let it go too far because it may cause trouble so we will just leave it on the status quo basis.

With the tremendous problems that we have had with the grain tie up this year, with the loss of sales, with the loss through demurrage that has been paid on ships, surely this ought to be the year when a concerted effort should be made to try to get some additional facilities, some additional lengthening of the season and some additional grain that can go through this Port.

It is quite clearly recognized that the shipping season could be lengthened by some 15 to 20 days without any danger. If you look at the average ice-free days, the insurance rates always play it about 15 or 20 days on the safe side. If we were interested in shipping, insurance can be made available with a slightly higher rate and someone picking up the tab and yet no one offers to do this. So in a year of tremendous problems, with tremendous amounts of sales being lost, and money being lost to

the farmers, it seems to me that a very concerted effort ought to be made in making Churchill our main port.

Now with these few comments and remarks, Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate, again, the Member for Melfort-Kinistino and hope that this Legislature will not only pass the Resolution, but that we will do something more constructive, put more pressure where it is needed. It is my contention that the Federal Government, together with the grain-handling industry, are not really interested in the development of this Port. And let us for goodness sake put pressure where it is needed and see if we can't get this Port into its full potential.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. J.K. Comer (Nipawin):** — Mr. Speaker, it is always nice to rise in this House when we have the so-far indicated degree of unanimity. It is not very often that we get this.

I think that the Member from Pelly (Mr. Larson) touched on some of the salient factors in dealing with the Port of Churchill. The fact that certain interests in this country do not want further development of that Port, certain basically Eastern business interests.

I should like to go back and deal for a few moments with some of the historical developments in Canada, which have brought this situation about. I should like to go back a long way beyond the development of the Hudson Bay Railway.

Canada, as a nation, developed around what has been called by geographers and historians the St. Lawrence Great Lakes System, a shipping system. It was that system which saw the French control of much of North America, control of what is now Canada, much of Canada, and control of what is now the United States. It was because of this transportation route which facilitates entry into the continent of North America that this control was exercised. After 1763 the British took over that control. They maintained that control of the northern half of the North American Continent. Because of this a transportation route that facilitated entry into the centre of North America facilitated the exploitation of North America.

First of all this route was based solely on the water route. The CPR was built really as just an extension of that route to make it easier to get into the centre of North America, to make it easier to exploit the centre of North America, to make it easier to exploit what is not the Canadian Shield and the Prairies. Because of that transportation route, industry and business developed in Eastern Canada. The goods from the Shield, from Western Canada were funnelled through the Great Lakes into the industrial heartland. And because of this a great deal of development has gone ahead in Eastern Canada and it has not gone ahead in Western Canada. We have become almost a colony within our own country.

I think it is because of this relationship between the industry of the East and the raw materials of the West that there is a good deal of potential for the Hudson Bay Railway and for the Port of Churchill. Certainly there is potential in the shipping of grain and making Western Canada more competitive on world markets. There is also the potential to have goods brought in from Europe to Western Canada cheaper. There is the potential

to have raw materials, to have manufactured products from Western Canada shipped out to Europe by this route, by-passing the Eastern interests which basically have an exploitative interest in Western Canada.

This route, this Port of Churchill, has the potential of greatly developing Western Canada if it is used. Now I think it is obvious that Eastern Canada and the economic power and the political power of this country lies in Eastern Canada is not interested as the Member for Pelly mentioned, in developing this route.

It is not interested and it is going to be up to the provinces of Western Canada to develop this route, the Provinces of Manitoba, Alberta and Saskatchewan.

Recently, I think, we have seen a furthering of inter-provincial co-operation on the Prairies. Let's hope that this co-operation can continue to develop the Port of Churchill, to develop Western Canada. The fight will not be easy but I think it is necessary for the well-being of Western Canadians. Now I am not making out that the Port of Churchill is some sort of cure-all for all of Western Canadian problems, it is not. But it is a beginning for starting to deal with some of the problems we face in our relationships with Eastern Canada. I am not suggesting western separatism although it might be possible to construe that. I am proud to have seconded this motion and I am very pleased that the Hon. Member from Melfort-Kinistino introduced it and I certainly plan to support it.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. I.W. Carlson (Yorkton):** — Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure to enter this debate today on a matter as important as the utilization of the Port of Churchill. I think one of the most important factors in the transportation of our grain to foreign markets is the utilization of this port. There are many reasons why the Port of Churchill is significant to us in Western Canada and to the grain producers of Saskatchewan. To start off with it's a much shorter distance from the Prairies to Churchill than it is to the Eastern seaports of the Lakehead or at Montreal or further east on the St. Lawrence. It is also shorter from Churchill to a lot of our markets in Europe but this is of less significance in that the transportation costs at sea are less than rail. I think the real significant factor is the closeness of the Port of Churchill to the Prairie grain producing areas. As an example, from the city of Yorkton to the city of Montreal is some 1,600 miles, but from Yorkton to Churchill it is only 700 and some miles. Indeed this is a significant saving. The Port of Churchill and indeed the CNR line to Churchill is geared specifically to handle grain. I think this is important when you realize that the main line of the railroads are always in a state of competition between commodities. They tend to give priority to high revenue freight such as merchandise, lumber and potash. The line to Churchill is geared to handling grain and train after train goes north to Churchill and train after train comes back with empty boxcars. I think this is important when you realize some of the complications of the transportation system as we know it in Canada today.

There are many problems I'll admit associated with the Port of Churchill. The main problem in my view is the fact that they

are not handling a large enough volume. If they were handling a larger volume the savings to the producers of Western Canada would be indeed much greater. Why is the volume so low? I submit that one of the reasons is the cost of insurance and the fact that the insurance companies determine the length of the shipping season. Lloyds of London, one of the biggest insurance companies in the world set the season from July 23rd to October 15th. As the other speakers have mentioned this is based on averages and in each and every year there is room for variations.

The opening of the shipping season for unstrengthened vessels is determined by ice conditions in Hudson Bay and the Hudson Strait. Churchill Harbor is open at least 35 days before the waters of the Bay and the Strait are open for navigation. The end of the season, the close of the shipping season, is determined by river ice in the Churchill Harbor. If November 10th is considered as the latest safe date for unescorted, unstrengthened vessels to pass through the Strait, the close of the season could be extended from 13 to 28 days if a method were devised to control the formation of slush ice in the Harbor. The explanation of this, of course, is that the Port is located at the mouth of the Churchill River and therefore there is a constant supply of fresh water and, as you all know, the fresh water will freeze earlier in the fall and thus determines the closing of the season. Conversely the salt water in the Bay and in the Strait remains cold much longer in the spring and thus protects the ice floes and icebergs that come down from the North for longer periods of time.

But the hazards do not appear to be as great as the insurance companies and insurance rates would indicate. Since the Port was opened in 1931 only one vessel has been seriously damaged or lost. In 1932 the S.S. Brightfan sank after striking an iceberg. The investigation found that no proper look-out was being maintained and at the time of the collision the ship was in fact off course. The second reason that volumes of grain that move through Churchill are low is the fact that the Churchill Port and the channel is not deep enough. The loading berth right at the loading platform is some 32 feet but the shipping canal has a minimum depth of 24 feet. Therefore, the larger ships once they are loaded can only leave after or near high tide. The third factor limiting the use of the Port is the loading rate. This is a limiting factor during the shipping season as we now know it. Two or three ships can be loaded at one time but they cannot be loaded at the full rate that one ship could be loaded. So there is definitely need to expand our facilities there. The real bottleneck appears to be in the cleaning facilities. The Port can receive some 35,000 bushels an hour, the facilities will handle 36,000 bushels an hour to convey it and load it into the ships but they can only clean 17,000 bushels. It is true they clean the grain during the off season and have some prepared to go when the first ships come in but this is soon used up and then the bottleneck occurs in the cleaning facilities.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that some of the people who designed the Port of Churchill were probably involved in the design of the Big River Sawmill. The fourth factor and possibly the most serious is the prejudice of the Federal Government which has a power base in Eastern Canada as the Member from Nipawin (Mr. Comer) has indicated. They have strength there both in terms of finances and of course in terms of political power or votes. They refuse to promote our seaport on the

Prairies. If you go back into history prior to and following Confederation you will find that it was a conscious decision of the Eastern politicians to develop what was then known as the Great North West for the benefit of the East. The West was developed as the market for manufactured goods of the East and as a source of raw materials that were destined for Eastern Canada and for export through Eastern Canada. Mr. Speaker, the same holds true today and the governments of the East are not prepared to give up this high revenue transportation through their ports.

I think there are a few recommendations that we should look at. First of all, as has been indicated by the Member from Pelly (Mr. Larson) the shipping season must be extended. We must be able to utilize the Port for longer periods each and every year. I would suggest that we could use the Port for 105 to 110 days a year at least. We must work together with the other Prairie Governments as this Government has done in the past and I am sure will continue to. We must put pressure on the Federal Government for them to take action in the development of the Port of Churchill. I think we could conceivably, in co-operation with the other Prairie Provinces and the Federal Government collectively devise alternate methods of insurance. Government collectively devise alternate methods of insurance. It seems to me that a joint effort in this manner could be of considerable significance in extending the shipping season through the Port. We must convince the Federal Government that the Port needs improving, we must dredge the channels deeper so that we can have loaded ships leaving when they are ready to go and not force them to wait for high tide. We must also convince the Federal Government and the National Harbors Board that we need an extension of the loading facilities so that at least three ships could be loaded at full speed at any given time. We need more dock facilities so ships that are unloading merchandize are not competing for space at the berth with ships that are wanting to load grain. We must double our cleaning capacity so we can in fact handle some 35,000 bushels an hour and not be retarded by this process.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, we must make it clear to Ottawa that we in Western Canada have for long enough been the hewers of wood and drawers of water. The time has come when Western Canadians demand to be involved as equals and not as serfs slaving for the West. We have our own seaport some 800 miles from the city of Regina, we want to develop it for the benefit of every grain producer and indeed every citizen of the Prairies. I think the expansion of the Port of Churchill is desirable and realistic, Mr. Speaker. I don't suggest that it is an alternative to shipping via the Lakehead or Montreal. I suggest it should be co-ordinated to complement the Eastern ports. I think it is a very good motion, Mr. Speaker, and I am indeed in full support of it.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. E.F. Gardner (Moosomin):** — Mr. Speaker, we have been pleased to hear from several of the Members opposite. I am sure that over the years there have been two favorite topics for discussion in this Legislature that we quite often agree on. One is the wheat problems that we have and the other is the greater use of the Port of Churchill. We have certainly spent many hours debating this the few years that I have been here but I think with equally disappointing results.

I should like to commend the Members certainly for their up-to-date information. We used to have Members, the NDP Members, get up in the House and blow the dust off their Port Churchill speech year after year and give us the same old speech. I thought maybe that some of the newer Members had inherited these speeches and I am pleased to see that they have dug up some up-to-date information on their own and we certainly are in agreement with them. I would certainly agree with the Member from Kinistino and the others who have promoted or who suggested that Churchill be upgraded, the facilities upgraded, more storage and that we use all of our influence to try and bring this about.

I think we should remember, Mr. Speaker, that the Port of Churchill is in Manitoba, it's not in Ontario, it's not in Quebec and it's not in Nova Scotia, it's in Manitoba. For this reason the Government of Manitoba should certainly be taking more active steps to promote the greater use of the Port which is in that province. We would hope that the Members opposite would use their influence, if they have any, with their colleagues in Manitoba and perhaps when this Legislature meets next year we may expect some action which will finally result in the greater use of the Port of Churchill. To indicate that in the Resolution I should like to move the following amendment, seconded by Mr. K.R. MacLeod (Regina Albert Park) that Resolution No. 13 be amended as follows:

That the words "and the Government of Manitoba" be added after the word "Canada" in the first line.

You will note, Mr. Speaker, we are not changing the intent of the Resolution, we are simply saying that in addition to asking the Government of Canada we should be asking that the Government of Manitoba participate in whatever steps are necessary to encourage the use of the Port of Churchill.

The debate continues on the amendment.

**Mr. K.R. MacLeod (Regina Albert Park):** — Mr. Speaker, I only have a few words to add to this. I have listened on two occasions now with some considerable interest to the Member from Yorkton (Mr. Carlson) and I do have to say that it's a pleasure . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — You must keep your remarks at this time to the amendment and not on the main motion.

**Mr. MacLeod:** — I wanted to congratulate him for his fine speech.

**Mr. Speaker:** — The amendment is just in addition to the motion, so we must debate the amendment first and then you would be in order to speak on the motion.

**Mr. MacLeod:** — Right. Mr. Speaker, I am aware now that if I am to congratulate him on his speech I must do it at some other time and if I don't rise then he has to do without that congratulations.



Mr. Speaker, the difficulty, of course, arises because the Port is in Manitoba. It is a very limited port in the sense that it is far from most of the centres of commerce. It is a limited port not only for the numbers and quantities of grains and products that go through it but also the time during which there is an open shipping season.

I agree totally that the Province of Manitoba must lend its full force and support to this motion and to this pressure that we hope to exert upon Ottawa and other governments, or else it holds little chance of success.

The Government of British Columbia certainly isn't going to support this motion. They have very little interest at all in this kind of motion. The Government of Alberta has far less interest in it than we have. It may well be a matter of reasonable indifference as far as the Government of Alberta is concerned, but it is vital to Saskatchewan, and I think should be vital – although it hasn't been demonstrated in Manitoba that it is vital to them but it should be vital to Manitoba.

The difficulty arises, of course, again because Manitoba has large interest related to the Thunder Bay area and shipment in that direction and has not shown in the past the kind of interest in the Port of Churchill that one would have expected from a government that had a port within its own boundaries. Consequently, Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the amendment.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. R. Romanow (Attorney General):** — Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few words on the amendment that is before this House. The words that I have are very few in respect to this amendment. I address myself to the question of whether or not it is appropriate, whether or not it really adds anything to the motion to add the words “and the Government of Manitoba.” In my submission to the Members of this House I say that it adds nothing to the Resolution. My reasoning is like this, if Members will analyze the Resolution they will see that the intent of the Resolution is as follows: This Assembly urges the Government of Canada to recognize firstly the importance of increasing grain shipments to improve farm incomes. Now in whose jurisdiction, Mr. Speaker, does the matter of increased grain shipments fall? Does it fall within the province of Manitoba or does it fall within the Government of Canada's jurisdiction? I think quite clearly the Member from Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod) and every Member of this House will agree with me that that is an area which is jurisdictionally, solely and exclusively within the power of the Federal Government, the Government of Canada. Then the next part of the Resolution says: This Assembly commends the Government of Canada that it show its concern to preserve its reputation in world grain markets as a reliable and steady supplier of grains under its contracts. I submit that in that second part the main thrust of it is a showing of concern for world grain markets. Who is in charge of world grain markets? Is it the Province of Manitoba or the Government of Canada? The answer is it is obviously the Government of Canada and not the Province of Manitoba. The Port may be located in the Province of Manitoba but the question of world grain markets falls exclusively within the jurisdiction of the Government of Canada.

Then the third part of the resolution says to take all steps necessary to utilize more fully the facilities of the Port of Churchill. I ask the Members of the House, who has the say as to whether or not facilities should be used. It is the Canadian Wheat Board, Federal Agencies, the Government of Canada, not the Province of Manitoba. The Province of Manitoba has nothing to do with rail transportation. It has nothing to do with national harbors. The problem falls within the area of national harbors. And the final request is to give immediate attention to planning and effecting improvements so as to increase the through-out capacity of that port.

Again, with respect, Mr. Speaker, if you analyze it, it must clearly fall within the jurisdiction of the Government of Canada. And I say to the Hon. Member who proposed the amendment that I think his motivated well. He wants as many governments as possible to show their concern but I think it is wrong for this House to pass and include in the amendment the inclusion of the Government of Manitoba. By my reading of the amendment to the motion there is no way basically that the Government of Manitoba has any direct concern on any of the points raised herein.

The points raised in the basic thrust of the motion falls solely and exclusively on the Government of Canada. Whether or not there is going to be any increase in grain shipments depends upon the Minister-in-Charge of the Canadian Wheat Board, Mr. Lang. He is going to determine by the control of the Canadian Wheat Board whether or not there are going to be increased shipments. It falls on the Liberal Government in Ottawa. The question of whether or not there is going to be an increase in world grain supplies depends on the abilities of the Canadian Wheat Board to sell the wheat and get it shipped. The question of increasing the facilities will fall on the National Harbors Board. The question of planning and effecting improvements also falls on the National Harbors Board together with the question of grain and the transportation.

So that adding the words, "the Government of Manitoba" has no effect at all. In fact, it will dilute the motion. It will weaken the strength of the motion. We as Members of this House should speak in a united way to Otto Lang and the Federal Liberals, we should say to them in a very strong way that we are not happy with what has been done in Churchill. We say that you have not done enough. You've neglected it. You have put other parts of Canada ahead of a very accessible port in Canada. By allowing this amendment we will be diluting the strength of the representations that all of us say that we are for. Therefore, I invite the Hon. Members to consider carefully this amendment, to reject it because it has no applicability to the Government of Manitoba. Let's get on with the task of insuring that Otto Lang and the Federal Liberals get this job done for the farmers of Saskatchewan, long overdue.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Gardner:** — Mr. Speaker, may I speak again on the amendment?

**Mr. Speaker:** — The Hon. Member cannot speak again on the amendment.

**Mr. Gardner:** — I believe I just made the amendment, do I not have a chance to close the debate?

**Mr. Speaker:** — No, you spoke to the amendment in moving it and you cannot close the debate on an amendment.

**Mr. D.L. Faris (Arm River):** — I want to thank the Attorney General for clarifying the situation. I hope in view of his explanation that the Members opposite might withdraw their amendment so that we can as a united voice support the motion.

**Mr. J.G. Lane (Lumsden):** — Mr. Speaker, before we vote on this particular matter. Unfortunately the Attorney General has seemingly ruled out of order many of the speeches made by his own Members this afternoon who spoke on the facilities at the Port of Churchill and did not restrict themselves strictly to grain sales and the transportation of grain. And I think it was the intent of every Member opposite notwithstanding what the Attorney General says or not to the knowledge of the Attorney General to speak on the facilities at the Port of Churchill. And it is with the concern of the facilities at the Port of Churchill that the Opposition has proposed an amendment.

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — Are we speaking on the amendment now?

**Mr. Speaker:** — We are speaking on the amendment but he was commenting on the remarks of the Attorney General on the amendment how he was relating the amendment to the Port of Churchill and I think the Hon. Member for Lumsden has attempted to do the same to come to the amendment which has been proposed.

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — It seemed, Mr. Speaker, with due concern that he was talking about points of order and I think he should restrict himself to the amendment that is before us.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Yes, well I think he will do so. The Member for Lumsden.

**Mr. Lane:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It seems that there have now been two Members on the opposite side who have had the matter clarified. Mr. Speaker, the amendment was proposed to take cognizance of the fact that the port is . . . Cognizance? I'll spell it for the backbencher who wasn't aware of the word and is not aware of the fact that the facilities are under the control of the Province of Manitoba. It was also proposed to bring to the attention of the House an argument that seems to have been ignored with the discussions on the Port of Churchill and we have heard talks about eastern control, etc., etc. We must be aware of the fact with regard to the Port of Churchill that in Winnipeg and Manitoba many people are not interested in the development of the Port of Churchill. The Province of Alberta is not interested in the development of the Port of Churchill. And what we really should be doing is speaking with one voice and showing that we want efforts by Manitoba which has that port under its control and which has done nothing in the development of that port. And this House should speak as one voice, Mr. Speaker, in urging the Government of Manitoba to take a more active part in the development of the facilities at Churchill and this is why we proposed that amendment.

**Mr. Romanow:** — Would the Hon. Member permit a question? Would the Hon. Member not agree with me that the National Harbors Board falls strictly within the Federal jurisdiction, port development and facility control, therefore falls within Ottawa?

**Mr. Lane:** — If I am permitted to answer, Mr. Speaker. Certainly I agree with that aspect but the point is we are dealing obviously in this House with a political question and the fact is . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lane:** — The fact is that the Government of Manitoba has done nothing to develop this port or very little and it is one political force that should be used to develop the facilities at this port and the confreres of the Members opposite in Manitoba have done nothing.

Amendment negatived.

Motion agreed to.

### **RESOLUTION NO. 15 – LOSSES DUE TO FAMILY FARM PROTECTION ACT**

**Mr. E.F. Gardner (Moosomin)** moved, second by Mr. Lane (Lumsden):

That this Assembly recommends to the consideration of the Government of Saskatchewan that a Board be established to determine the amount of financial losses suffered by various groups of individuals due to The Family Farm Protection Act, and to determine what compensation should be paid to these people by the Government of Saskatchewan.

He said: I can't understand all the applause. Mr. Speaker, this particular resolution was introduced because of our concern that certain persons are going to suffer substantial financial loss due to The Family Farm Protection Act. I don't want to leave the impression of course that our concern is only for those suffering loss of major or substantial amounts of money because of the nature of the events affected by The Family Farm Protection Act and the precarious financial position of some of the parties involved even a small loss for these people could be disastrous. I am not going here to argue the merits of The Family Farm Protection Act. We have done this before and we have a chance in the future to do this in another debate. But my argument at this time is simply this that in a case where someone interferes in the normal business relationship between two people and if this interference results in a loss, financial or otherwise to either party then those responsible for the interference should also be prepared to accept some responsibility for the loss.

The Provincial Government last summer by passing The Family Farm Protection Act interfered in the normal business relations between farmers and implement dealers, between farmers and credit unions and among other people. There is no doubt that the Provincial Government by its actions has directly caused substantial financial losses to various people. We therefore, feel that it is reasonable for the Provincial Government to set up some type of a board or tribunal to determine the extent of these losses and to accept its responsibility by compensating

those who have suffered the loss. Many types of losses will occur because of The Family Farm Protection Act. Some of these losses I think are quite obvious to us and other types of losses are perhaps more obscure. One of the more obvious is that suffered by the implement dealers in the province. At the Saskatchewan-Manitoba Implement Dealers Association Convention the president said and I quote:

Saskatchewan-Manitoba Implement Dealers Association president Bob Larter of Estevan warned that dealers will not feel the full effect of The Family Farm Protection Act until it lapses July 31st.

Dealers claim that they are likely to be caught with farmers returning a large number of machines which have been used for a full year and upon which the farmer has made no payment.

Now I am not going into details of how the dealers will suffer due to excessive depreciation or loss of machinery payments. This again has been debated and I am sure it is well known and accepted by everyone. The committee hearings indicated to me that the vast majority of farmers are in sympathy with and support their local implement dealer. They know that many dealers have gone broke or discontinued their businesses in the last few years throughout the small towns of Saskatchewan. They also know that dealers are needed in our small towns and they don't want to suffer the inconvenience that would result if any more dealers find it necessary to leave the implement business. The majority of farmers know that they will be the ones to suffer if the Government does nothing about the harmful effects of The Family Farm Protection Act on the small dealer. Farmers have become and have been very astute businessmen. They recognize that The Family Farm Protection Act was a grandstand play hastily conceived by the NDP Government in the flush of victory after June 23rd, and without consulting the farmers. There is no doubt the farmers were not consulted in this case. They recognize also that this NDP Government was not putting up one dollar to back up the legislation. It was not costing the Provincial Government any money. The Government hoped to take credit for The Family Farm Protection Act and let the machine dealer, credit union and small farmer suffer the losses. If you read the reports of the proceedings of the agriculture committee you will find many, many examples of how rural people feel about this lack of compensation for those suffering losses. I am not going to quote them, you can look at the recordings, the committee hearings but I would refer you for example to pages 58 to 63 the hearings at Gull Lake or page 77 of the hearing at Weyburn.

Some types of losses due to The Family Farm Protection Act, I will admit will be difficult to determine. How do you calculate the loss to a marginal farmer who desperately needed a new baler or combine last fall but couldn't obtain it because of the tightening of credit due to The Family Farm Protection Act. This may well have been the blow that put marginal farmers, the odd marginal farmer out of business and I certainly wouldn't know you would determine this loss. How do you assess the loss of a farmer whose loan application was turned down at the local credit union because The Family Farm Protection Act had prevented this credit union from making collections and using that money to make new loans. Because some types of losses are difficult to assess there is no reason why some attempt should not be made to assess these losses. Perhaps this is all the more reason why we need some sort of a board or a tribunal to

attempt to assess the loss. The board set up to examine these losses should consist of representatives of machine dealers, credit organizations and farmers. It should have power to pinpoint cases of financial loss and recommend payment by the Government who is in the end responsible for the loss. The people of Saskatchewan are expecting the NDP Government to accept responsibility and I am sure that the Members of this Legislature expect the Government to accept the responsibility in this case. I therefore, Mr. Speaker, take pleasure in moving this resolution.

**Mr. A.W. Engel (Notukeu-Willow Bunch):** — Mr. Speaker, during the summer months and this fall we were involved in studying this question of continuing The Family Farm Protection Act, and what type of legislation would be in order, or be involved, or what kind of board should be set up. We have made recommendations, Mr. Speaker, in this Special Committee on Agriculture report along similar lines. I haven't had time to study the comparison or if the Member from Moosomin has changed his mind because he has had reservations on this type of a recommendation in the report, and therefore I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

### **RESOLUTION NO. 16 – CANADIAN ARMED FORCES EFFORTS APPRECIATED**

**Mr. Gardner** moved, seconded by Mr. McPherson (Regina Lakeview):

That this Assembly express to the Canadian Armed Forces our appreciation for the work they have done in the past to maintain peace in the world, the efforts they are now making to ensure peace in the trouble spots of the world, and the valuable contribution they are prepared to make when emergencies arise in Canada.

He said: It seems to be my night, Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't want to miss this one. Mr. Speaker, I introduce this particular resolution to the Legislature for several very specific reasons. In dealing with the very urgent day to day problems in our society we are tempted perhaps to neglect and overlook the contribution that is being made and has been made in the past by a very important group of our citizens and I am speaking of the Canadian Armed Forces.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Gardner:** — Though it seems, Mr. Speaker, that among some of the radical groups today it has become popular to condemn, to criticize and to take pot shots at many of our long established and worthwhile institutions included the Armed Forces. And there seem to be two groups that there people could be put into I believe. I think they make these criticisms for two reasons. The first group are the most extreme radicals who have a genuine desire to destroy our society and our way of life and to do this they must attack and belittle the bastions of our society. We see many instances of this, they criticize our police forces, our universities, education institutions, our free-enterprise system and our Canadian Armed Forces.

Fortunately this first group of rather extreme radicals are not too numerous but they are well organized, they are dedicated and they are dangerous. They are active at our universities and they are skilful in acquiring recruits from less radical groups of young people. Examples of their activities are obvious in the Press almost daily. They oppose such things for example, as recruitment for the RCMP, the Armed Services, Defence Research Board and we see many examples of this in the Press. I'd like to just take a look at one or two of these. One is headlined for example:

Talks oppose RCMP career – Regina Campus students were urged against seeking a career with the RCMP in a number of short speeches made Tuesday by members of the Canadian People's United Front Against United States Imperialists.

And it says on in the article for example,

Circulars distributed to the students which summarized the view expressed by the speakers said the RCMP is attempting to recruit university students to oppress the Canadian people.

That is just one example. I have another here and this again is at the Regina Campus.

Small group of demonstrators gathered outside the Canadian Manpower office of the Regina Campus Political Education building to protest recruitment of students for the Federal Defence Research Board. The demonstration was organized by the Regina Campus New Democrats and the Students for a Democratic University.

Just a couple of examples, Mr. Speaker.

The second group that are involved in criticizing our institutions perhaps have less sinister motives but the results may be equally as dangerous. They comprise perhaps a greater number of people, mostly young, who believe that it is the "in" thing to attack the establishment. They are cynical and in seeking publicity they make statements perhaps they don't completely believe themselves. It is a fact of life that if you make a statement supporting the police, the Armed Forces, Cadet movement, or anything of this nature, no one is really likely to listen to you or pay much attention. But if you make a statement critical, defamatory or downright insulting about any of these institutions you are likely to get your name in the paper or gain some prestige amongst fellow radicals.

Again, examples are easy to find and you don't have to go to the United States or distant provinces, many examples are available right here in Saskatchewan.

For example, I have here a picture of the demonstration which took place here in Regina and I'll table this later, and it shows a group of young people who are carrying banners which read, "NDY supports the NDF" or "Victory to the NLF," and it's headed by the NDY and this of course is simply saying that the New Democratic Youth are supporting the National Liberation Front or the communists in Vietnam.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Gardner:** — In addition I have a little quotation also from Winnipeg and this one says:

That a panel at the New Democratic Party Convention here supported resolutions seeking more assistance for American draft dodgers and deserters.

I also have here a report, Mr. Speaker, of an incident in Saskatoon where a disturbance was caused at a wreath-laying ceremony and an NDP Member of this Legislature later wrote to the Saskatoon City Council in an attempt to have the charges dropped. And I'm sure that you are all familiar with this. It happened only last fall.

**Mr. Guy:** — Was that Rolfes?

**Mr. Gardner:** — No, it wasn't him this time. This apparently was a young lady and the newspaper reports said that it is alleged that she used a megaphone to shout slogans during a wreath laying ceremony at the cenotaph during the annual RCAF Association Convention.

The article that I have with this is headed "Letter terms insulting" and it is also date-lined Saskatoon.

Members of the City Council, Monday, took exception to what one alderman described as an insulting letter from MLA John Richards. The letter, signed by Mr. Richards as MLA for Saskatoon University and Legislative Secretary to the Public Health Minister, suggested that charges brought against Alice Klein for her part in a demonstration on September 29th be dropped.

And it goes on to ask, for example, is the province giving direction or is it Mr. Richards in his personal capacity? Alderman Owen Mann described the letter as insulting as the previous request.

Mr. Speaker, everyone is certainly familiar with the NDP stand during the FLQ crisis in Quebec, when the NDP opposed the War Measure Act which was necessary at that time to maintain law and order.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Gardner:** — And I'm not trying to suggest, Mr. Speaker, certainly not, that all radicals are NDP or that all NDP are radicals. Very, very far from it. I am sure that some of the NDP Members in this Legislature and certainly members, many members of the rank and file of the NDP are as concerned as anyone about some of the events that are happening today. But it does seem that most of the radicals seem to end up in the NDP and become the radical fringe of the NDP movement.

You know unfortunately today, Mr. Speaker, the silent majority are often ignored and I believe that a great percentage of the people today, and this includes both younger people and older people, appreciate the job being done by the Canadian Armed Forces now both in Canada and overseas. The great majority are certainly thankful for the sacrifices made by our servicemen in World War I and World War II. The great majority



also favor the Cadet movement and realize that we must have well-trained and well-organized peace-time armed forces. This is one reason why this Resolution appears on the Order Paper. It is an opportunity for those who wish, and I certainly hope there are some, to speak on behalf of the silent majority and express our appreciation to the Armed Services.

The Cadet movement in Canada, in the last three or four years, has been singled out for considerable criticism from radical groups in Canada. These radicals on one hand seem to be in favor of extensive government grants and hand-outs to any far-out group for underground newspapers, questionable opportunities for youth programs, radical schools or colleges and various other destructive projects. But they object to the relatively small amount of money allocated by the Federal Government to support the Cadet movement.

The Legion, the Veterans' Association, have also been subjected to harassment by radical groups and by news reports. This is more apparent perhaps in the United States than it is in Canada. American Legion Conventions, for example, in recent years have been particularly bothered by demonstrations and criticisms from radical groups. The 18 million veterans in the United States are a stabilizing influence on the society of the United States and for this reason they are a source of annoyance to radicals. The same applies to a lesser extent in Canada. Canadian Legion Branches all across Canada are providing useful community services as well as serving as fraternal organizations for veterans. Right here in Saskatchewan there are over 300 Legion Branches with over 20,000 members actively serving their communities. The Saskatchewan Legion sponsors one of the largest physical fitness camps in Canada.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Gardner:** — It is for boys and girls, Grade 7 to Grade 12, it is held at Dundurn every summer, it is not restricted to the children of veterans. It has been very successful and it is only one example of the many community services that Legion Branches are engaged in. Many Legion members have actively defended our country and the institutions that are associated with it. For this reason they are not likely to stand idly by and see these rights and these freedoms eroded away and attacked by radical groups. Legion members certainly know better than anyone else the horrors and the futility of war and for this reason they favor peace-time armed forces which can act as a deterrent to war.

Mr. Speaker, the Legion members are active throughout Canada and it is difficult perhaps in this day and age always to identify readily the Legion members of the veterans in our society. You know I was trying, while I was making this speech, to get my colleague from Regina Lakeview (Mr. McPherson) to wear his old Tank Corps beret tonight. I thought that this might help to back up the speech while I was giving it, because really I don't suppose many people know that he led a tank crew after D-Day in great tank battles with the German Panzers in Normandy during the last war and was wounded at that time. As I say veterans are mixed in our society and not readily identified.

No one can deny that the Canadian Armed Forces have served a vital role in the preservation of peace in the Middle East and other places in the world. They have been responsible for the

prevention of hostilities during the past 15 or 20 years which would have resulted in the loss of many lives throughout the world. And I don't know how you could put a price on this type of thing. Certainly I doubt if anyone can say that Canada should not have spent defence dollars in this particular manner. Now I know it's easy for someone to get up and say that we shouldn't have spent money on Romeo missiles or aircraft carriers or certain other types of equipment. This is easy to say after. It's like a person saying that the money he spent on fire insurance over the past 20 years is wasted because the house never burned down.

I should hope that everyone will support this Resolution and that it will not be rendered meaningless as some others have by opposition amendments. It will be an indication to past, present and future members of the Canadian Armed Forces that we do appreciate the job they are doing and I, therefore, take pleasure in moving this Resolution.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. A. Taylor (Kerrobart-Kindersley):** — Mr. Speaker, I am just a little bit confused as to what the previous speaker was getting at. He made mention of a number of things which, you know, are important, but I wonder if when one is supporting the Armed Forces one has to put it in the same bag as the free-enterprise system. If we criticize the present free-enterprise system does it automatically mean that we are against the Armed Forces and that seems to be the suggestion.

The members of our Armed Services gave a good deal. Many of them gave their lives to provide us with the right to criticize when we thought something was wrong. And yet the Member who has just taken his seat suggested that our young people are wrong in being critical of the establishment. I suggest that the members who gave their lives gave them for this very reason.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Taylor:** — The Member who has just taken his seat also suggested that the New Democrats were supporting Communism or the communists in Vietnam, because we at some time have said that there are certain policies that should be followed, because we have been against some of the bombing raids that have taken place. Do they then suggest, and I don't think they do, because I don't think Liberals believe that, but are they then suggesting by the same logic that Liberals support Napalm bombing of children in Vietnam? If the one is logical, so also is the other.

I'm not going to speak very long about the FLQ crisis, but to us, at least to me, it was a question of individual freedoms and rights and really had nothing to do with the Armed Services as such.

I happen to be a member of the Canadian Legion. I also lived in the city of Glasgow during the bombing raids of the last World War, and I appreciate what many of the men who served in the Armed Forces have done. I remember hearing the bombers come over and the V-2 rockets landing on my city. I remember some of my friends and relatives being killed by these same rockets and bombs and I appreciate what the men did, and

the women, who fought for our freedom. But I appreciate it enough that I am going to fight to keep that freedom, that freedom to criticize.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Taylor:** — I don't remember New Democrats ever criticizing the men who have fought for this country, or the men who are at present engaged in the Armed Services. But we do reserve the right, and insist on it, to criticize any policy which forces the Armed Services to carry out the types of manoeuvres with which we do not agree.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Taylor:** — I think our men have done a tremendous job in the two World Wars, in Korea, in Suez and in Cyprus. During the Korean War, the start of it, I spent six months in a military hospital as a patient and saw some of the men who were involved. They believed, as did the men before them, that they had been fighting for something worthwhile. But remember, friends, that in the two world wars men believed that they were fighting a war to end all wars, and this is what our young people are disgusted with. It didn't work. And now they are turning and trying to find other alternatives.

Now I suggest that the use of troops for United Nations Policing purposes is certainly something with which we can all agree. We can probably all agree with the use of troops for defence; but some of us, at least, draw the line when it comes to using troops to interfere in the internal struggles of other nations.

Now the Legion has also been mentioned and it has done much for its members. After a lot of years of fighting they even convinced the Federal Liberals to raise the pension benefits for their members.

And so I take this opportunity to pay tribute to the men who have given so much; and of asking the Members opposite to at least give us the right, as individuals not as a Party, to differ when we are differing with policy and not differing with the intent of the men who have suffered and who have died.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. D.M. McPherson (Regina Lakeview):** — Mr. Speaker, as a veteran I served overseas for four years, I was in the same bombing that the Member for Kerrobert-Kindersley was talking about in the southern part of England. I am going to speak just a few words on behalf of the Legion, these are veterans who have come home and are settled in Saskatchewan, all over Canada and they are people who have contributed a lot. Every member in our regiment stationed in the southern part of England, in Brighton we had 16 and 17-year old men come up as recruits. Being in a tank regiment we had a tank crew of five and these men were well trained and the people that we wanted to put into field. We went into France on D-Day our casualties were very heavy in the Fort Garry Horse and on the first day in four hours we lost 200 men. I want to tell

this House that as a Veteran it makes you feel just a little weak when you hear somebody get up and criticize the Armed Forces and what they are doing.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. McPherson:** — To see 200 men killed in a matter of hours is something. These men were all 16, 17-year old boys who wanted to fight for their country. I feel pretty bad about it when I hear the criticism the Member from Bengough (Mr. Lange) criticizing and talking about welfare for our armed forces. I want to say also to this House, Mr. Speaker, that as a veteran and the veterans of Canada recognize people that have fought for their country, and have done a good job. When I see the Minister of Natural Resources and the Minister of Public Health laying a wreath on the cenotaph it makes me feel pretty bad with all the members of the civil service we could have picked out two legionnaires. I criticize the Premier very, very much for asking these two. I can't see what he is thinking of. I know there are a couple of veterans over there, there may be two or three and I am speaking on behalf of them too. But to pick the Minister of the Natural Resources and the Minister of Public Health to lay the wreath on the cenotaph for the veterans makes me feel just a little bad. Mr. Speaker, I'll have more to say because I know that the veterans on this side of the House and the veterans on the other side of the House feel very bad about the way the Member from Bengough talked about the Legion, talked about the members of the Armed Service and I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

**Hon. A.E. Blakeney (Premier):** — No, no, if the Hon. Member is going to reprimand another Member he should continue . . .

**Mr. McPherson:** — All right I'll stand up and keep talking too. The Member of Natural Resources, was he a veteran? I just said that the two Members, the Minister of Natural Resources and the Minister of Public Health were not veterans. I said you could have picked other people to lay the wreath. I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Motion for adjournment negatived.

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, may I just raise a small Point of Order. I am not speaking on this debate. I would ask, now that the Member has taken his seat, that you ask Members to speak from their seat and not from other seats. I didn't want to interrupt the Member, but I want to point that out.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I realized that the Member wasn't speaking from his own seat, but I didn't want to interfere at the time.

**Mr. C.P. MacDonald (Milestone):** — Mr. Speaker, I have a few words to say in this debate and I beg leave to adjourn it.

Motion for adjournment negatived.

**Mr. D.H. Lange (Assiniboia-Bengough):** — Mr. Speaker, it is with some apprehension that I rise to speak on this motion. It seems almost strange to me that a motion of this nature should appear almost 'out of the blue' so to speak. I cannot help wondering for what reason it could have been introduced, unless of course it is a titillating tactic on behalf of the Opposition to arouse a latent nationalist spirit amongst the populace. If this was indeed the strategy of the Opposition they should be highly commended. Upon mulling over the consequences of this motion however in my mind, one thought has become significant to me and as a result I should like to offer some advice to the Opposition.

I realize that it is rather presumptuous on my part being one of the youngest Members in the House and with little experience to be offering advice. But one possibility has occurred to me which if allowed to run its full course unchecked could have traumatic consequences for the Members opposite. We would not want that to happen would we? I would caution the Member from Moosomin to weigh very carefully his comments on this matter because this is a subject charged with emotion. It is possible, for instance, that some iconoclastic reprobate could get a copy of your comments and distort them beyond recognition. Suppose, for instance, that a reactionary editor of one of our newspapers were to do a misconstrued article on your comments. Again having had very little experience in this line I am willing to concede that I may very well be wrong. It is only because I am concerned about the welfare of the Opposition that I have offered any advice. Since I can't imagine anyone having the unmitigated gall to oppose this motion — of course that doesn't apply to the Member from Prince Albert West, since I understand he has had most of his removed anyway — and as one conscious of how my freedom has been attained, I unequivocally give this motion my wholehearted support.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. E. Kaeding (Saltcoats):** — Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with the other Members who have spoken in this debate in support of this resolution. I wondered when I saw the resolution on the paper just why the Member from Moosomin had brought in this resolution. It was quite obvious after we heard him start in his debate that it was brought in strictly for political purposes. I expected better from him and I was disappointed. I thought he would give a reasoned statement which would reflect some respect and appreciation for the Armed Services and for what they have done. Instead we were treated to the kind of a ridiculous accusations which I didn't think even he would believe.

As an ex-serviceman with some four years of service in the Armed Forces and as a member of the Royal Canadian Legion I want to express our appreciation for all those who served their country during the two world wars and to those unfortunate ones who served and did not return. To them and their surviving families we owe a debt of gratitude which we cannot easily repay. We are also appreciative of the many young men who have since that time served in many troubled areas of the world as part of the United Nations peacekeeping force. We commend the spirit in which they have performed what may be construed by some as being a very unenviable role in a conflict between warring nations. When we on this side of the House take issue with many

of the policies on military matters which have been pursued by various governments in Canada in the past years we are in no way being critical of the young men who are performing their required duties as a result of such policy.

It is very difficult to condone, for instance, the huge useless expenditures being made by the Department of National Defence, such as the refitting of the aircraft carrier Bonaventure for the sum of \$18 million and its subsequent scrapping within a year as obsolete. We question the expenditures of huge sums of money on the Bomarc and Minute Man programs on this mid-Canada and Dew Line sites when it was acknowledged that this mode of defence was obsolete even before it was completed. We questioned the spending of millions of dollars on fighter aircraft which were outdated before they rolled off the assembly lines. We will continue to criticize these and other expenditures which add nothing to the security of our nation but constitute a serious and unnecessary drain on the taxpayers of this nation.

These however, are political decisions and blame for such misdirection cannot in any way be laid at the feet of our servicemen and there is no desire or intent on our part to implicate them in any way. Members of the Royal Canadian Legion are extremely conscious of their responsibility with respect to the maintenance of freedom and democratic rights which they sought in two world wars to preserve. Wherever legionnaires meet there is concern for the best possible means to ensure those freedoms. Contrary to some general misconceptions the Canadian Legion is not a pro-military organization. Having been exposed to the tragedies and brutality of actual combat and having experienced first hand the wholesale destruction of property and mass annihilation of innocent civilians, they are most keenly aware of the need for a strong and effective world organization; an organization which can act to prevent further conflict and which will serve to improve the economic conditions of underdeveloped nations. They are aware that only through united and sincere efforts of all nations to relieve the disparities and miseries of underprivileged nations can there be any real hope for lasting peace. Because we live in an imperfect world we recognize the continuing need for all responsible nations to make their contribution to a world peacekeeping force. In spite of some of the disillusioning experiences we have had with peacekeeping operations of the United Nations in the past we recognize that for the present at least it is the only alternative to military balkanization.

The role of a serviceman in a peacekeeping operation is sometimes much more difficult and frustrating than that experienced by his predecessor in actual combat. Not only must he be ready for instant action where necessary but much of the time he must exercise the utmost restraint in the face of intense provocation. In such cases it would be much easier for him to strike out at the tormentor rather than to maintain a calm and unruffled posture. In many cases they find themselves embroiled in political manoeuvring which they extremely dislike but have no power to resist. I am very concerned that our Armed Forces should not be put into a position in Canada where they are used indiscriminately for crowd control particularly where public demonstrations take place by people who have grievances against governments or other jurisdictions. We recognize that there may be some requirement in emergency to guarantee the safety of the public. However, more often than not military forces are used to impose the will of autocratic governments in very

undemocratic situations. This we must resist to the utmost if we are to remain a truly democratic country. We are now almost two generations removed from the time of hostilities after the end of World War II. It is difficult for many of our younger people to comprehend the bond of fellowship and loyalty experienced by those who served during those critical years. On many occasions the resentment shown by our younger generation to anything military, strikes a discordant note among the older generation who were trained to accept the premise that military strength signified security. However, we now live in a new era where civilization has the power to completely annihilate itself through the use of modern weapons. Under these circumstances the role of the serviceman becomes less and less important and the political role becomes much more dominant. We must commend those who have worked tirelessly to provide the kind of world wide political structure which is the only hope for the survival of future generations. A true and actively supported United Nations appears to be the only logical force which can hope to assume this role.

In conclusion I should like to emphasize again that I believe our only hope for world survival is in a strong and internationally supported United Nations. I agree that as a responsible nation which is a partner of that international body we must be prepared to make our contribution with both financial and military peacekeeping forces. I know that in this role our servicemen will not fail to uphold the traditions of which our former servicemen were so justly proud. Mr. Speaker, I will support this motion.

**Hon. W.E. Smishek (Minister of Public Health):** — Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak in support of the motion I only want to make very few observations. I am brought to my feet because of what the Hon. Member from Lakeview had to say. It is regrettable that we find people who for whatever motive reduce the debate at times to its lowest unbecoming level. Mr. Speaker, as I recall my laying the wreath at the cenotaph, the Premier and I were invited, as most Members of Legislature are invited, to participate in memorial services on November 11. If my memory serves me correct it was the legion that made the request and we felt it an honor as well as a duty as Members of the Government to be part of the services that are held on November 11th. I know that Members of the Legislature throughout the province participate in laying wreaths on that particular day when we remember those who gave their lives for this country, whether they were in the Armed Services or were not in the Armed Services. As it happened, I was not in the Armed Services because I was too young, but I might tell the Hon. Member that in the First World War my father served in the Armed Services and was wounded twice in the cause of freedom. I don't know what the Hon. Member from Lakeview is trying to prove but I do believe that he owes this House an apology for bringing in that kind of an argument. I do hope that in the years that are ahead of us all Members, regardless of what side of the House they sit that they will respect and pay tribute to those who have fought for our country and on November 11th they will be part of those services. I intend to be because I do respect those who have fought for our freedom. I believe I am no less loyal, no less interested in the cause of freedom and peace than a person who had been in the Armed Forces. I believe as a Member of the Legislature I am trying to serve my province and I am trying to serve my country as well as those who have fought in the Armed

April 4, 1072

Forces in the interest of keeping freedom in this nation and throughout the world.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. E. Kramer (Minister of Natural Resources):** — Mr. Speaker, I now rise in this debate to answer statements that are made by the Member, I won't say Honourable because he has dropped in my estimation, Mr. Speaker. There are people who did not serve, of which I am one, and I am not going to stand up in this House and say why, I'll leave that to him to find out why.

**Mr. McPherson:** — I know why!

**Mr. Kramer:** — Oh, do you! Well bless your heart! You mention the Legion, I have in my hand here an honorary membership in the Legion, my own Legion in North Battleford. I don't think Legion people are so hypocritical that they would bestow an honorary membership on anyone if they felt that they were not really worthy of it. It just so happens, Mr. Speaker, that I have laid wreaths on Remembrance Day, on decoration days in North Battleford in two and three locations ever since I have been a Member of the Legislature and the people of The Battlefords have seen fit to send me back as MLA for 20 years and that is something few people can say in this House.

I will put my loyalty and my conscience up against anyone else in this House or outside of it, any Canadian, and that is all that I am going to say on that matter.

I stayed home in Regina and failed to lay those wreaths that I have laid for the last 19 years in order to take my place at the Legion cenotaph here on behalf of the Government. If I get an invitation again, I will certainly check with the Regina Legion and those people who are responsible for the ceremonies, as to whether or not I am acceptable or if they think the same way as the Member who just spoke.

I want to say while I am on my feet I support the motion. I think the motive of bringing it in was certainly not genuine, not sincere. I think the whole thing is a cheap political move, but the words I can support, the motive I can't.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. A.R. Guy (Athabasca):** — Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a few words. I wasn't going to take part in the debate.

**Mr. Kramer:** — You are another . . .

**Mr. Guy:** — The Member from The Battlefords had his chance to take part in this debate. He was on his feet and he sat down and now he still wants to continue the debate. I think there are some rules in the House that say once you have spoken you have to wait your turn.

I am glad, Mr. Speaker, to hear that so many Members opposite are supporting this motion. I have been in this House for some



12 years and I can recall motions very similar to this that were presented by Members opposite dealing with banning the bomb and certain questions like that. And as I recall I don't think we ever stood up and claimed that they were being introduced merely for political purposes. We didn't always agree with those and this was even before the time of the young Member from Saskatoon, the present Attorney General (Mr. Romanow).

**Mr. Romanow:** — I remember the . . .

**Mr. Guy:** — Well, you can get up when I finish speaking and make your speech. You will have the same opportunity that all other 59 Members in this Legislature, you always have. In fact you probably take more time than any other Member in the House talking about things which you feel you have something to say about, so nobody is going to hold you back.

All I am saying is that I don't think the Members opposite should read ulterior motives into this any more than we could have done and we could do in much of the legislation, many of the resolutions, that we spoke on today that Members opposite introduced.

I think perhaps the comments of the Member for Regina Lakeview (Mr. McPherson) were misinterpreted. I didn't take those as being particularly critical of the two Members who laid the wreaths. I think it was a criticism of the Premier for not ensuring that when veterans are available to lay wreaths on Remembrance Day, that he should make some attempt to get veterans.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the fact that the Premier was so quick to react shows that probably this thinking is not too far off the track. It is surprising how he snaps to the bit, jumps up whenever there is the least bit of criticism. I would suggest that if he is going to be Premier for very long he is going to have to get used to some of the criticism from this side of the House.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Guy:** — He is not living in an ivory tower, you know, and the sooner he comes down out of the tower and is prepared to accept criticism which I think was levelled in good faith, then it would be better for all concerned.

I could say considerably more about some of the resolutions that have gone back and forth on both sides of the House, on banning the bomb, and when some of the supporters of Members opposite burned an American flag not too far out of town here, but I don't think there is to be anything gained here tonight to bringing these in. These have been debated in the past. I as I said in my opening remarks, that we are going to have support from both sides of the House. I am sure that the veterans of Canada will appreciate it and consider it in the light it has been presented.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to.

## ADJOURNED DEBATES

### MOTIONS FOR RETURN

#### RETURN NO. 28

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. D.M. McPherson (Regina Lakeview) for Return No. 28 showing:

The number of new industries that have been opened in the Province of Saskatchewan since June 23, 1971, and the company names.

**Hon. K. Thorson (Minister of Industry):** — Mr. Speaker, the motion for an order in its present form seeks to inquire into the number of new industries that have been opened in the Province of Saskatchewan since June 23, 1971. I should like to move an amendment as follows:

That the words “new industries that have been opened” be deleted in the first line and the words “industries which have commenced new commercial production or completed an expansion” be substituted therefor.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

#### RETURN NO. 37

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. A.R. Guy (Athabasca) for Return No. 37 showing:

The number of sawmill operators that were licensed and operating in Saskatchewan in the fiscal year 1971-72 as of March 1, 1972.

**Hon. E. Kramer (Minister of Natural Resources):** — Mr. Speaker, question No. 37 there was some problem in getting an accurate answer to this in the way that it was worded. I am moving an amendment now to read as follows:

That all the words after the word “Saskatchewan” be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

In each of the fiscal years for 1964 up to March 1, 1972, based on a licence expiry date of September of each year.

**Mr. A.R. Guy (Athabasca):** — Mr. Speaker, I will raise a question which the Minister can answer when he closes debate. First of all I would say that I don't know why this question is causing difficulty. It is worded in exactly the same way, the identical words that the Minister himself asked a question when he was in Opposition last year and we had no difficulty providing the answer. I would think that the same staff is there to do the work and therefore I don't see the difficulty, Mr. Minister. But if this provides me with the information, and I believe it does, if the licence expiry date of September refers to September 1972. Is that correct, Mr. Minister? And the September that we are talking about is September 1972?

**Mr. Kramer:** — Yes.

**Mr. Guy:** — So that is fine with me.

**Mr. Kramer:** — Mr. Speaker, I might say in closing debate . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — I must warn the Hon. Member that he cannot close the debate on an amendment.

**Mr. Kramer:** — Can I not answer his question, Mr. Speaker?

**Mr. Speaker:** — No, I think you are out of order at this time because if he had risen to ask you a question before you took your seat it would have been fine. But he didn't do so and so you are out of order to answer at this time.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

### RETURN NO. 38

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Guy (Athabasca) for Return No. 38 showing:

- (a) Whether there has been any timber extraction operations in Nipawin Provincial Park from July 1, 1972, to March 1, 1972.
- (b) If so, the names of the operators.

**Mr. Kramer:** — Mr. Speaker, on question No. 38, once again, we feel that the information that the Member has requested is not going to be complete, therefore I move, seconded by Mr. Bowerman that it be amended to read:

That all the words after the letter (a) be deleted and the following be substituted therefor:

Whether there have been any timber extraction operations in Nipawin Provincial Park from July 1968 to June 30, 1971.

(b) Whether there have been any timber extraction operations in Nipawin Provincial Park from July 1, 1971, to March 1, 1972.

(c) If so, the names of the operators in each case.

**Mr. Guy:** — Mr. Speaker, I am glad to get the additional information to save me the work of going back into the Journals for the past two or three years and sorting it out.

But again it is the identical question that was asked by the Hon. Minister when he was in the Opposition last year. The answers are available in the Journals and I was going to save him the time of having to look it up himself but now he has offered to do it. It is appreciated.

**Mr. Kramer:** — Mr. Speaker, once again the answer is the same, but the answer given last year was incorrect . . .

April 4, 1072

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order! You cannot come back into the debate.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

### RETURN NO. 41

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Guy (Athabasca) for Return No. 41 showing:

- (a) Whether there has been any change in government policy since July 1, 1971, respecting reforestation of areas in which timber has been cut for use by MacMillan Bloedel at Hudson Bay.
- (b) If so, the substances of the changes.

**Mr. Kramer:** — Mr. Speaker, once again, on Return No. 41. The Hon. Attorney General raised the question and I think with some very good reasons regarding whether or not these are proper questions and motions to be put, or whether or not they should be asked under Estimates as policy questions, because they are policy questions.

But in order to oblige the Member and break protocol we are prepared with a minor amendment to go ahead and answer it. We hardly think the ‘gufuffel’ is worth it and if he wishes to submit the question that was turned down previously we will answer that one too.

No. 41 – and I hope you won’t have to amend this one, Mr. Speaker – is to be amended to read:

- (a) Whether there has been any change in government policy since July 1st, 1971, respecting forest practices and reforestation of the areas in which the timber has been cut for use by MacMillan Bloedel at Hudson Bay,
- (b) If so, the substance of the changes.

It is simply by an addition, Mr. Speaker, of forest practices in the former motion.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

**Mr. A.R. Guy (Athabasca):** — Mr. Speaker, a brief word that again I appreciate the offer of the Minister to provide as he calls this ‘gufuffel’. I might remind the Hon. Member that it is exactly the same ‘gufuffel’ as he requested last year when he was sitting almost in fact I think this is the identical desk that he was sitting in when he moved that ‘gufuffel’ that was provided. There is only one question that I can’t help but wonder about and I suppose probably it is due to the inefficiency of the Attorney General, I am not sure. But it seems very strange that they are now prepared this evening to pass this Resolution regarding MacMillan and Bloedel and hopefully Prince Albert Pulp and yet they voted down by a standing vote the one on Simpson Timber just a few days ago. Now I think we should resubmit the question because it appears that there might be something that you are trying to hide in that area.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

### RETURN NO. 42

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. A.R. Guy (Athabasca) for Return No. 42 showing:

- (a) Whether there has been any change in government policy since July 1, 1971, respecting reforestation of areas in which timber has been cut for use by Prince Albert Pulp Co., Prince Alberta, at Hudson Bay.
- (b) If so, the substance of change.

**Mr. Kramer:** — Once again, Mr. Speaker, this amendment to Return No. 42 is amended in exactly the same way. Once again I move seconded by Mr. Bowerman. That all the words after the word “respecting” in (a) be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

Forest practices and reforestation of areas in which timber has been cut for use by Prince Albert Pulp Co., Prince Albert.

- (b) If so, the substance of these changes.

We have also deleted “at Hudson Bay”. I don’t know what the Member for Athabasca meant, but anyway Prince Albert is not at Hudson Bay so we took that out.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

### RETURN NO. 66

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. A.R. Guy (Athabasca) for Return No. 66 showing:

- (a) The names of Cabinet Minister, Legislative Secretaries, and other government employees that have been issued credit cards at the request of the Government of Saskatchewan.
- (b) The credit cards that have been issued to each of the above.

**Hon. J.E. Brockelbank (Minister of Public Works):** — The Member for Athabasca has demonstrated a continuing need for more information and we are quite willing to oblige him. The question as it was placed on the Order Paper some time ago was rather imprecise and I approached the Member about it and he more or less agreed that I should offer some amendments to sharpen up the point of the question. I am therefore, Mr. Speaker, proposing an amendment, seconded by Mr. Cowley (Biggar):

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

The names of Cabinet Ministers, Executive Assistants to Cabinet Ministers and Legislative Secretaries that have been issued credit cards, or CVA 1 cards, at the request of the Government of Saskatchewan;

(1)(a) in the fiscal period 1970-71; (b) in the period April 1, 1971 to August 6, 1971; (c) in the period following August 6, 1971, to March 31, 1972.

(2) The reason for the change from the CVA 1 cards to credit cards.

By way of brief explanation, Mr. Speaker, I should like to say that the purpose of breaking the periods down in this manner was to give in (a) for the sake of comparison, the fiscal period 1970-71. In (b) the period April 1 to August 6, 1971, when it became the practice of the Central Vehicle Agency to issue credit cards in some instances rather than CVA 1 cards; delete the final part of the Return asking for the number of credit cards that have been issued in each of the above, which is irrelevant

because a person with a CVA 1 card could obtain services from any number of service stations with that same card, whereas with plastic credit cards as we all know them, you have to have a separate credit card for each station. Therefore in order for the Minister or the person using the card to have the same flexibility they would have to have a number of credit cards for use. If the same person was using a CVA 1 card and from a certain date onward he was using a plastic credit card he would not necessarily be buying more product but would need the extra number of cards to facilitate his use of a vehicle. I therefore, move that amendment, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Guy:** — I believe this is all right. I'll just ask the Minister a question and he can nod his head. This includes other credit cards than just CVA?

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

## **ADJOURNED DEBATES**

### **RESOLUTIONS**

#### **RESOLUTION NO. 2 – INCOME STABILIZATION PROGRAM FOR PRAIRIE FARMERS**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution by Mr. J.R. Kowalchuk (Melville).

That this Assembly urges the Federal Government to proceed immediately with legislation to establish an income stabilization program for prairie farmers, which program would include the following:

- (1) A guarantee that total grain receipts in the prairie region will not fall below 1.1 billion dollars during the 1971-72 crop year, and that this figure be adjusted in subsequent years to take into account costs of production;
- (2) The establishment of a Stabilization Fund for the purposes of this program, with contributions from producers, consumers through a two-price system for wheat; and the Federal Government, through an annual contribution from the Treasury;
- (3) A payout from the Stabilization Fund in any crop year that gross-receipts fall below the guaranteed minimum, with distribution on the basis of the numbers of bushels of grain delivered, such payment to be included in the final payment made by the Canadian Wheat Board.

**Mr. D.L. Faris (Arm River):** — Mr. Speaker, this debate concerning farm income stabilization is one of the most important of this Session. It is important because it reveals the difference between the NDP and the Liberal farm policy in an inescapable manner. Both parties want a stabilization plan. The Liberals remain loyal to the Otto Lang stabilization plan which went down in flames in the Assiniboia by-election. The NDP position is that any plan must take into account increasing costs of production. The Liberals support the Otto Lang plan to remove all Federal responsibility for grain storage costs. The NDP will support removal of the Temporary Wheat Reserves Act if it is replaced by a plan to have the Federal Government responsible for the storage costs of 400 million bushels of all grains stored. The NDP position is based on the view that any stabilization plan must be designed to stabilize the farm net income situation. Any plan that does not take into account increasing costs of production does nothing more than guarantee poverty. That's why every major farm organization in

Canada opposed the Lang Stabilization plan. The Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, the Manitoba Wheat Pool, the Alberta Wheat Pool, the United Grain Growers, the National Farmers Union, the Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture, Unifarm of Alberta, the Canadian Federation of Agriculture, all of them opposed the Lang Stabilization plan. The Liberal Party stood alone in opposition to the farmers of Saskatchewan.

What happened to farm income in Saskatchewan under Ottawa and Regina Liberals? The realized net farm income reached an all-time high of \$480 million in 1967. Within two years it had plummeted to a 27-year low of less than \$170 million in 1969. In 1970 the Saskatchewan realized net farm income had increased by a mere \$25 million. Yet the Liberal Party continued to stand alone in opposition to the farmers in Saskatchewan. I want the Opposition to know that the farmers of Saskatchewan still realize that net farm income is their greatest need. In a presentation to the Saskatchewan Government just last February the Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture said and I quote:

Too low a realized net farm income is the most important problem facing Saskatchewan farmers, the total agricultural industry and the provincial economy. The last five-year period has been plagued with rising farm production costs, relatively poor markets and lower prices for farm products. To be successful beyond the short run agricultural adjustment policies must be part of an overall, integrated, Provincial-Federal agriculture policy that has improved farm incomes as its objective.

Mr. Speaker, the Federation of Agriculture was referring to the Land Bank as an adjustment program. It was pointing out that unless there is Federal co-operation to improve net farm income the Land Bank could not be successful. This is perfectly true. Unless the Federal Government will co-operate with our provincial program there is no hope for farmers. There is no hope for Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, for the sake of Saskatchewan I hope the Opposition will unite with the Government of Saskatchewan and fight for a stabilization plan which will take into account increasing costs of production; fight for a plan to include basic grain storage costs; fight for a plan based on a realistic level of net farm income.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support this motion.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. D. Boldt (Rosthern):** — Mr. Speaker, the other day when the mover of this motion spoke I was quite impressed by the forcefulness, it almost looked as if he was really mad at somebody that there were promises made, I can't quite recall all the promises he reiterated that the Liberals had failed to fulfil. I thought I would just remind the Member, he's not in his seat today, that I should like to refer him back to his promise during the election campaign that within three weeks of an NDP Government the hospital at Neudorf would be opened. I don't think that hospital is open to this very day.

He referred to the Task Force on extermination of two-thirds of the farmers of Saskatchewan. The Task Force takes into consideration all the farmers in Canada, not only the Saskatchewan farmer. The Task Force really has nothing to do with the

Government, the Government has never said that they would go along with the Task Force whereby it had recommended that two-thirds of the farmers should be taken off the farm. It is rather a very weak argument when one looks at some of the committees that have been struck and the recommendations that have been made, governments very seldom implement the recommendations that the committees make. The only one that I know of currently that has been adopted is the Liquor Commission Report.

I think if I'm right, the Farmers Union at first did not oppose the stabilization program, nor did the Wheat Pool. As a matter of fact I think they went along with Otto Lang until there was some resistance from some farmers and then they stabbed him in the back. Later on Mr. Lang said that he would never again go back to the Wheat Pool or the National Farmers Union and ask for their advice, he would rather go to the grassroots farmers. In answer to strong support in the Assiniboia by-election where they had gained the seat, I believe they only got 39 per cent of the vote as compared to 61 against, so that doesn't speak very strongly about the support of the NDP policies.

The Member that just sat down had some comments to make regarding the Temporary Wheat Reserves Act and the cost of production. This is where the Wheat Pool and the farm organizations and I have violently disagreed. Always considering the cost of production, now a two-bushel quota to many farmers, let's say he has 1,000 acres under cultivation, a two-bushel wheat quota would mean \$2,000 for this farmer. The cost of production can only be assessed on the amount of sales he has. If there are no sales whatsoever then of course the cost of production is tremendously high. If the farmer could sell everything he produced and if he wouldn't have carried into the Operation LIFT program and raised another crop in 1969, and if all this grain was sold that is now in storage, the farmers wouldn't be asking for any subsidies. The NDP Government Members are just one year late in proposing an income stabilization program. The farmers of Saskatchewan needed this kind of support last spring when Otto Lang introduced just such a Bill. But at that time, Mr. Speaker, the NDP were not the Government of Saskatchewan and they did everything possible to prevent the passage of this Bill and eventually the Federal Government had to withdraw the Bill.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Boldt:** — Now that they are the Government they would like the Federal Government to pump as much money into the Saskatchewan farm economy even more than the Federal treasury can stand just to improve the provincial economy.

They forget, however, that the Provincial Government could also implement programs which would help the Saskatchewan farmer. In the seven years of Liberal Government many programs were initiated by the Provincial Government to help stabilize farm income, but not once did we ever get any support from the then Opposition which is now the Government. In fact the now Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) ridiculed the hog marketing program and other stock programs that were initiated to help the farmer diversify and have a better income.

They went out and claimed that because of our diversification our programs were instrumental in reducing farm product prices.



The Federal Stabilization Bill was not designed to take care of all the farmers' troubles, but it certainly was a step in the right direction. The actions of the NDP, the MLAs and the MPs in Ottawa just kept \$60 million out of the farmers' hands.

Today with increased grain sales, good cattle prices, and hog prices 50 per cent higher than a year ago, a Stabilization Bill is not as urgent as it was a year ago when you people defeated the Stabilization Bill. \$60 million last spring would have meant more to many a young farmer than now when sales and income to the farmer is much greater.

The Federal Stabilization Bill would have assisted many small farmers who had not delivered grain to the Wheat Board. Under the payments made through the Temporary Wheat Reserves Act a highly diversified farmer with no sales to the Wheat Board, he got absolutely nothing. Instead the landlord, not necessarily farming, reaped the benefits of the Temporary Wheat Reserves Act by virtue of grain delivered in his name by the renter.

A diversified farmer with no grain deliveries to the Wheat Board could have received about \$950 under the Federal Stabilization Bill. The NDP MPs and the Saskatchewan NDP supporters can be credited for doing them out of this amount.

The Resolution suggests that the cost of production should be taken into account. This has also been argued by the farm organizations, however, there is nothing that will benefit the farmer more, as I said a few moments ago, than to be able to sell all his grain. There would be no hardships in Saskatchewan – and I am sure the Government would be quite pleased – if the farmers could sell the 800 million bushels of wheat that is now in storage and will be in surplus after the crop year. We will have about 300 million bushels of barley in surplus and about 40 million bushels of rape. The surplus grain we now have on hand could very easily amount to \$1.5 billion to the prairie farmer.

The emphasis for the farmer still is sales. If all of our grain could be sold farmers would not need to request subsidies.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Boldt:** — The Provincial Government has responsibilities as well. The Member for Arm River (Mr. Faris) looks at the Feds and criticizes Otto Lang. You take that boulder out of your own eye and then look at the splinter in somebody else's eye.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Boldt:** — The two Members sitting there talk about conversion on this side. They really need some conversion on that side.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Boldt:** — The Provincial Government has responsibilities as well but so far they have made farming much more costlier. Sure all they have done is implement the 40-hour week, applying this to the farm implement dealer which has raised his cost,

which he is transferring to the farmer. And he has also cut his services to the farmer. That is the way you act but you want the Feds to do differently. You are, in my humble opinion, the most hypocritical group that have ever sat to the right of Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Boldt:** — They are just not honest. They have the — now the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) is walking out and I have a message for him.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Boldt:** — They talk about farming. Why didn't you, the Member for Arm River tell the Attorney General, why it was necessary to raise the farm licence plates by \$1. If you think the costs to the farmers are too high why didn't you leave him out? The truck plate rates are high enough, the premium income equal the claims so there was no need whatsoever to raise the licence plates on the hard-pressed farmer.

Most of the rural municipalities mill rates will go up. These are the farmers that we are talking about. Why, I hear, one municipality after another raising the mill rate because the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Wood) has cut grants here and cut grants everywhere. And yet you talk to Ottawa, what you steal from the farmer you want Ottawa to make up.

And now for the school units. I spoke to a school unit member today.

**An Hon. Member:** — From Rosthern?

**Mr. Boldt:** — No, from Aberdeen. He said that the mill rate in the Saskatoon East School Unit would have to go up by three mills. And these are farmers and you say they can't afford to pay any more. Why are you so hypocritical, why don't you give grants so that the school rates could be reduced?

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Boldt:** — But you have a completely different opinion when it comes to your pocket book and when it comes to the Ottawa pocket book.

These are only a few of the examples of this Government's treatment of the farmer and certainly they do not indicate that they have any intention to assist the farmer at the provincial level. Recently we have learned of the farm services leaving Saskatchewan in droves and these are the ones that you wanted to bring into Saskatchewan and just the opposite has taken place. I am thinking of Smith-Roles. A large hog enterprise was interested in locating in Saskatchewan. This would have created 1,500 jobs. Maybe it would have put all the unemployed school teachers to work.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Boldt:** — It would have utilized 11 million bushels of feed grain and about 500 to 700 farmers would have contracted with this firm to raise the hogs. But the Minister of Industry (Mr. Thorson) calls this a bogus industry or bogus company. This company will now establish in Alberta as have many others since June 23rd. If they are not moving to Alberta they are going to Ontario as did the Quaker Oats from Saskatoon.

The Liberal Party of Saskatchewan supports the principle of the Income Stabilization for Saskatchewan farmers. We deplore the political actions taken by the NDP in Saskatchewan and the Federal NDP Members of Parliament in defeating . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Boldt:** — . . . the Federal Stabilization Bill introduced by Otto Lang in the House of Commons in the spring of 1971. I, therefore, want to amend this Resolution by striking out all the words in the third line after the word “farmers” and the following substituted therefor:

That this Assembly condemns the action taken by the Provincial and Federal Members of the NDP for sabotaging the first Federal Government’s Stabilization Bill, causing loss of \$60 million to western farmers.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Speaker:** — This becomes an alternate conclusion of motion so the debate will continue on the two concurrently.

**Mr. E.L. Cowley (Biggar):** — Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition says “another farmer,” well I was born and raised on a farm and I suspect that I know as much about farming as he does.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Steuart:** — If that’s all you know you better sit down.

**Mr. Cowley:** — We will record that one for the next election.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Go right ahead!

**Mr. Cowley:** — Mr. Speaker, I was interested in listening to the amendment offered by the Member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) who accused the New Democratic Members of Parliament of sabotaging – and I believe that was his word – sabotaging the grain stabilization program offered by the Federal Government.

I was rather interested because I have been listening to the debate from the other side of the House over the past few weeks in which they have been accusing the Government here of steamrolling them. I should like to remind them that it is not the size of the majority, it is the fact that the Government has a majority which enables it to put legislation through.

Had the Federal Government wishes to go ahead with the legislation, and had they been capable of convincing the people of Saskatchewan that it was good legislation, I am sure that the Federal Government would have gone ahead with it. But once they proposed that legislation, and once the National Farmers Union which the Member opposite mentioned, and the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool which the Member opposite mentioned, had seen the legislation in detail, had had a chance to examine it, they came out in opposition to it, as did our Party.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Cowley:** — The Member opposite made a great point out of the fact that only 39 per cent of the people in Assiniboia voted for the New Democratic Party. And he said that 61 per cent voted against them. I should like to draw to the Member's attention that it was a considerably smaller percentage of the people in Assiniboia who voted for the Liberal Party and for the Grain Stabilization Bill.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Cowley:** — If the Member opposite is very interested he might consider and take a look at the size of his majority in comparison to the size of the majority of the Member of Parliament for Assiniboia.

Mr. Speaker, the Member also mentioned in his amendment there was a loss of \$60 million to the farmers of Saskatchewan. I mentioned in an earlier debate, and I think it bears reiterating for the information of the Members opposite, that you can hardly call this a loss of \$60 million. That payment would have been a one-shot payment to the farmers of Saskatchewan which would not have been repeated. The farmers of Saskatchewan would have been required to pay 2 per cent of their gross grain sales thereafter into the stabilization plan. I think the Member opposite has probably read some of the submissions to the Federal Government on the grain stabilization program.

In some of these submissions, such as the one made by the Government of Manitoba, it was pointed out that it was highly unlikely, because of the low level of gross receipts from the six grains included over the past few years, it was highly unlikely there would have been any payments out of the grain stabilization program in the foreseeable future.

Mr. Speaker, the farmers lost the \$60 million, but I should like to draw to the Member's attention to the fact that in the last crop year there was some \$62 million paid in to the Temporary Wheat Reserves Fund. Some \$62 million in 1970-71, the last crop year. And this would have been wiped out retroactively had the Bill passed. There was a \$73 million final payment which was just announced a few months ago and a large part of this payment was a result of that payment into that Temporary Wheat Reserves Fund.

Also there was a two-price system which was announced. Mr. Speaker, I don't believe — and the Members opposite may disagree with me if they wish — but I don't believe that a two-price system would have been announced had the \$100 million been paid out under the grain stabilization program if it had been brought into effect.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Cowley:** — Mr. Speaker, I hope that two-price system is not a one-shot effort. I hope that it will be carried on next year and the year after and in the years to come for the farmers of Saskatchewan and the rest of the Prairie Provinces. That two-price system, I submit would not have come into being if the Grain Stabilization Bill had been passed by the Federal Government.

So I don't think that you can point to the 'sabotaging' as the Member calls it as having cost the farmers of Saskatchewan \$60 million, because I don't believe it did.

The other point which the Member raised and sent some considerable time on was the question of whether or not a grain stabilization program or an income stabilization program should be tied to the cost of production. And he said that if farmers could sell their wheat there wouldn't be any problem and there wouldn't be any need of subsidies.

Well farmers might be able to sell all their wheat at 25 cents per bushel. I don't think that the Member then would say there wouldn't be any need of subsidies.

**Mr. Robbins:** — Yes, he would!

**Mr. Cowley:** — You think he would? It is not a question of the amount of grain one sells, it is a question of what one receives for what he sells and a question of what it costs him to produce that.

I think the Member opposite is well aware of the fact that land prices have increased considerably in the last 20 years, the fact that the prices for machinery have increased considerably, and then he says that there is no need to relate an income stabilization program to the cost of production. It is simply not true unless the Member is thinking of building large corporate farms of 100,000 acres, or so that they can be farmed with this expensive machinery but on a high volume, then you may make money with low prices.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Cowley:** — He mentioned one thing that I thought was interesting, because when I read the Task Force Report they talked about the elimination of two-thirds of the farmers. I guess the Member is going to go a little further in solving the problem. I think he mentioned the extermination of them. He also mentioned that the Member for Arm River must have had a boulder in his eye. Well it is probably better to have a boulder in your eye than behind your eye.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Cowley:** — Mr. Speaker, I should like to mention again before I take my seat the question of the Member making the point that if we could sell all the grain, even at the price it is at now, there wouldn't be any problems. Well, I should like to draw to his attention that we are not assured of always having the kind

of rather bountiful crops that we have had in the last ten years in Saskatchewan over the whole province.

If we have an income stabilization program one of the purposes of that program will be to take into account the fact that the farmers haven't been able to grow as much. There will be years when farms will produce what used to be considered an average crop of wheat in our country, of 15 bushels an acre or so, not the 35 or 40 that we have had in the last few years. And it may be if farmers could sell all their grain last year or the year before last that they could have kept up to the cost of production in those two years because we had grown a lot of grain. I don't think we can assume that we are always going to be able to grow bumper crops and so the price of the grain has to be related to the costs of production.

Mr. Speaker, one other thing I should like to comment very briefly on and that was the Member's comment about mill rates for school boards and the fact that this was increased cost which farmers had to bear because he suggested that mill rates were going up all over the place. I notice he conveniently used the example of the Saskatoon East School Unit, rather than the example of the Rosthern School Unit. I would simply like to point out to the Members opposite that the school grants paid through the Department of Education to the various school boards around the province are not intended to reduce the mill rate. The mill rate is to be reduced through the Property Improvement Grant. And I think if the Member looks at an average farmer in the Rosthern School Unit or in the Saskatoon East School Unit or in the Saskatoon West School Unit or in the Biggar School Unit and takes into account their mill rate this year as compared to their mill rate last year for education and takes into account the Property Improvement Grant, he will find that there has been a substantial reduction in the amount of the tax paid for school purposes.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Cowley:** — Mr. Speaker, I will be pleased to support the motion and vote against the amendment offered by the Member.

Amendment negatived.

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division.

**YEAS – 48**  
**Messieurs**

Blakeney	Dyck	Meakes
Wood	Smishek	Romanow
Snyder	Bowerman	Thibault
Larson	Baker	Brockelbank
MacMurchy	Pepper	Byers
Whelan	Carlson	Engel
Tchorzewski	Owens	Robbins
Matsalla	Cowley	Taylor
Faris	Cody	Gross
Mostoway	Comer	Rolfes
Hanson	Oliver	Feschuk
Kaeding	Flasch	Steuart
Loken	Guy	Grant
Boldt	McIsaac	Gardner
McPherson	Lane	MacDonald (Moose Jaw N.)

Thorson

Lange

Wiebe

**NAYS – Nil  
Messieurs**

**RESOLUTION NO. 12 – MANDATORY HEARINGS PROPOSED BEFORE LEGISLATIVE  
ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGES**

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

That this Assembly recommend to the Government of Saskatchewan that legislation be proposed to ensure that provision is made for mandatory public hearings before any major environmental change is made in which the Government participates or for which Crown lands or Crown permits are required.

**Mr. T.L. Hanson (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley):** — Mr. Speaker, I must say on rising that I do indeed support part of the contents of this resolution in principle but I feel that I must move an amendment at the conclusion of my remarks to clarify my position as a concerned Member of this Legislature. The principle of holding public hearings, Mr. Speaker, is indeed a good one, especially before decisions are made affecting our environment. This was a policy seldom practised by the Members sitting opposite when they held power. But I find the clause in this resolution stating “only when the Government participates or for which Crown lands or permits are required” leaves a lot to be desired. If we are serious about listening to the public we cannot specify segregated areas when public discussion should be instigated. It is my hope that in setting up the proposed department of environment that it will be automatic that the public be consulted before any action is taken affecting the resources of this province. This Government has already initiated programs to bring the public into discussion on a number of projects.

A good example of this, Mr. Speaker, was the public hearings with regard to the Land Bank. But better still is the new Wetlands Committee and Project Advisory Committee which will co-ordinate and discipline all matters relating to Wetlands. They will be establishing a Wetlands inventory which would meet the demands of our residents for not only hunting purposes but educational and scientific purposes. We will under this program, Mr. Speaker, and through public discussion replace the hit and miss programs that developed individual and isolated projects. We may embark, if the public so wish, on a land purchase program to retire land as Wetlands financed not only by hunters' licences but also from the general revenues of this province which would recognize the total values of these resources to the province as a whole. The structure of this Wetlands Committee is such that Saskatchewan people will constantly have voice whether they are dealing with the Saskatchewan Water Resources Commission, the Conservation and Development Branches or the Water Rights Board. This should ensure that all projects are approved by the people of Saskatchewan before construction or excavation begins. In making these few comments, Mr. Speaker, I will move the amendment seconded by the Member for Assiniboia-Bengough

(Mr. Lange),

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

deplores the action of the previous Government in permitting resource developments that had dire effects on the environment and ecology of the areas affected without providing an opportunity for interested parties to appear before public hearings held for the purpose of considering the effect of such developments, in particular, the construction of a pulp mill in Northwestern Saskatchewan being an example of a possible or potential environmental hazard; and further that this Assembly commends the Government of Saskatchewan for the establishment of the Wetlands Project Advisory Committee through which water control projects that affect multiple resource use can be fully considered by all the interests involved, and furthermore, for the (proposed) establishment of the Department of Environment in order that the optimum use of our natural resources in the interests of the people of the province may be assured.

**Mr. E.L. Tchorzewski (Humboldt):** — I just want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I agree with the basic principle of this resolution. I think we can speak of developing our resources and using up the resources that we have which don't replenish themselves quickly or maybe not at all. But unless we consider the effects that this development, sometimes we refer to it as progress, I sometimes wonder whether it really is. Unless we consider the effects of this on the environment we may end up by destroying ourselves as well as our natural resources. I think, Mr. Speaker, that some of the points raised by the amendment are worth considering. I wish to have more to say on this and I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

### **RESOLUTION NO. 3 – TWO-PRICE SYSTEM FOR WHEAT**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution by Mr. Wiebe (Morse):

That this Assembly commends Honourable Otto Lang and the Government of Canada for the implementation of a two-price system for wheat.

And the proposed amendment thereto by Mr. Larson:

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

acknowledges the Honourable Otto Lang and the Government of Canada for the implementation of a long over-due two-price system for wheat and that this Assembly, out of concern for the temporary nature of the proposed payment, urges the Federal Government to establish a permanent two-price system with a method of distribution which is fair to both wheat producers and producers of other grains, such distribution to be through a Grains Income Stabilization Plan as proposed by Saskatchewan's present Minister of Agriculture.



**Mr. T.L. Hanson (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley):** — It indeed makes me happy to rise in support of the amendment. I should just like the Members of the House to consider the real objectives and the ideas behind a true two-price system for wheat. I want you all in the House to look at this program and analyse what the farming groups really wanted when they requested the two-price system for wheat, and consider for yourselves whether we are getting that program. The present two-price system that was proposed by the Hon. Otto Lang is going to be based, Mr. Speaker, on an acreage basis with a maximum payable to each permit holder. It looks to me as though we shall be averaging something like 78 cents an acre with a maximum of about \$500 per farm. The average per farm in Saskatchewan will probably work out to around \$300. Now from the time I was ten years old I was active in 4-H Clubs, then into the Farmers' Union, the Wheat Pool Committees and all through this period one of the foremost things on my mind as well as other people in these groups was the discussion of a two-price system for wheat and the principles that were involved in it. I should just like to point out to the Members sitting opposite, the principles that these groups, the Farmers' Union, the Wheat Pools and other farm organizations you can speak of, wanted included in the two-price system. The first idea that was important to all of us was that wheat producers would receive at least a dollar a bushel extra for the first X number of bushels per permit holder delivering said grade of wheat as used for domestic consumption.

The second principle was that that said payment would come from the consumers of bread not the national treasury. The estimated cost to the consumer was in the neighborhood of 1.2 to 1.5 cents per loaf of bread. Do we see any similarities between the farmer's idea of a two-price system for wheat and that as proposed by the Hon. Otto Lang? Not much except the name, Mr. Speaker. I should like the Members opposite to examine the Diefenbaker deficiency payment of the late 1950s. It was paid on an acreage basis, maximum acres per permit book, paid out of the national treasury not from the flour used in Canada, and it was not statutory, it could be removed at any time, definitely wasn't permanent. Notice any resemblance here, Mr. Speaker, to the Hon. Otto Lang's program? I say that it is an exact duplicate in every detail except for the final figures involved. I say that we should call a spade a spade. This two-price system for wheat that the Federal Government has announced is nothing more than a deficiency payment, an election bribe. I say the farmers of Saskatchewan will gladly take the money but in no way will we ever give them our votes again.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I must warn the Member that he must speak just to the amendment because he moved the original motion. He will have to stay strictly to the amendment at this time.

**Mr. J. Wiebe (Morse):** — That's fine, Mr. Speaker, that was my intention. I can't really understand the reason for the amendment because basically in the amendment it mentions the Grain Income Stabilization Plan. Now a short while ago we passed a resolution somewhat similar to this and if this amendment is adopted and passed tonight then basically we have passed two similar resolutions in one evening. I don't think that it is necessary. I think that the amendment should be withdrawn and I should like

to see the Government Members opposite have the courage for a change, to vote for or against a resolution that has been presented without bothering with an amendment. For some reason, as they will remember in my remarks when I introduced the Resolution, I said that I hoped that this House would refrain from involving any politics in this Resolution. It appears again that they are unable to do it. I think if I continue my remarks with reference to what I have heard opposite I may get on to the main motion itself and I believe that I cannot do this at this time. I feel though that I shall have an opportunity to close debate on the Resolution once the amendment is carried or voted down. I sincerely hope that it is voted down.

I understand from the remarks made by the Member from Qu'Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. Hanson) that he will be voting against the amendment because I had the feeling from his remarks that he was not happy with the idea of how the payment will be made this year of between \$300 and \$500. I might remind the Member from Qu'Appelle-Wolseley that his Leader, the Premier of this Province made a remark in the January 23rd edition of the Leader-Post and I quote as follows:

Saskatchewan's initial reaction is that it should be distributed on the basis of so much per bushel on say the first 400 or so bushels delivered. This would mean a payment per farm rather than per bushel and would benefit small farmers more rather than the large producers who are the ones producing the surplus.

I think this is the main idea of this two-price system of wheat in the way it is implemented this year. It is a plan that will benefit the majority of farmers in this province. I sincerely urge the Members opposite to reconsider this amendment in light of the fact that we already have passed a resolution this evening urging a Grain Income Stabilization Bill. I don't feel that two are necessary. Again I ask the Members opposite to forget about politics. I think that this Resolution is a good one. I feel as well that what we are doing is commending a man for a job well done. Other than that, Mr. Speaker, I again urge the Members to vote against the amendment.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

Amendment agreed to.

**Mr. Wiebe:** — Mr. Speaker, I will keep my remarks very brief. I feel now that we are not dealing with the Resolution which I presented, we are dealing with an amendment and I, in turn, Mr. Speaker, do not intend to vote for the Resolution as amended.

Motion as amended agreed to.

#### **RESOLUTION NO. 4 – PUBLIC WORKS PROGRAMS**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution by Mr. A. Matsalla (Canora):

That this Assembly commends the Government of Saskatchewan for action taken in bringing forward public works programs in the early fall of 1971 and in extending the supplementing Federal Government programs for the relief of winter unemployment;

Expresses regret at the tardiness of the Government of Canada in announcing its 1971-72 winter employment programs and at the dilatory manner in which municipal applications under the Local Initiatives Program were processed by the Department of Manpower and Immigration;

And further that this Assembly endorses the proposal for a joint examination of the existing programs, by federal, provincial and local governments, to evaluate the effectiveness of existing programs and to prepare criteria, guidelines and contingency plans for the winter of 1972-73 under varying assumptions of unemployment levels.

And the proposed amendment thereto by Mr. D.F. MacDonald (Moose Jaw North):

That all the words after the word "Assembly" in the first line down to and including Department of Manpower and Immigration in the 8th line and substitute the following therefor:

expresses its regret that the Government of Saskatchewan did not develop a Public Works Program in the fall of 1971 sufficient to alleviate the severe unemployment problem that existed.

**Mr. E.L. Cowley (Biggar):** — Mr. Speaker, I was interested the last day when we were debating this Resolution in listening to some of the comments from the Member from Moose Jaw North. I was particularly interested when at one part in his speech he praised the Government of Manitoba for the excellent use that they had made of Federal programs to promote employment and development in that province. He said, "Why not Saskatchewan?" "You know," he said, "Saskatchewan in the last few months has been like an ostrich with its head stuck in the sand." Well our problem was that it has taken us eight months to uncover the rest of the ostrich. One of the things which we have stated several times is that the province has not, in our opinion, made the best use of Federal programs and it is something which this Government is working to correct by setting up a department or a group of people who can investigate what Federal funds are available and to make the kind of use of those Federal programs that are being made by the Province of Manitoba.

The Member for Moose Jaw North also compared the budget for Public Works in Saskatchewan with Alberta. I think when you take a look at the size of the total budget in Alberta and the size of the budget in Saskatchewan, and you compare the populations, it is not a particularly fair comparison. You may do it proportionately. I am sure the Member for Moose Jaw North would object violently if I compared the public works program in Saskatchewan with that of Prince Edward Island, and rightly so.

He also mentioned that Saskatchewan's public works budget this year was somewhat smaller this year than the figures for last year. But I should like to draw to the Member's attention that these are actual figures and is what this Government anticipates spending, not figures inflated for the purpose of an election.

Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to second the Resolution with was moved by the Member for Canora (Mr. Matsalla). This whole area is one which has been and which continues to be of real

interest and concern to myself. The Federal Initiatives Program which we have seen in operation this year was nothing short of chaotic. It was the result of the Liberal Government's economic philosophy and approach to planning which is a 19th Century approach. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, some wit said that it wasn't only a pre-Keynesian economics, it was a Pre-Cambrian approach.

Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government knew far in advance that there would be a serious unemployment problem this winter. That Government had over three years since the last Federal election almost four, to develop programs to deal with such a situation. That they were unprepared, that they waited until it was too late to take action, was a wanton disregard of their responsibility. Even when the program was announced and the applications completed and submitted, after waiting for six weeks for the forms to appear, there were long delays.

You know some even suggested that the delays were so long that they appeared to be deliberate. Mr. Speaker, I cannot believe that a government would do this, even though it might result in the programs taking effect closer to a possible June election. I cannot believe that any government would play with the individual's livelihood just to take programs nearer to an election. I can only assume that the delay was due to gross mismanagement on the part of the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot afford this kind of lack of planning and mismanagement. For this reason I urge that the Federal Government, over the next few months, work closely with the provincial governments to develop a winter works program that will be set up to go in ample time next winter if necessary. And I hope they work in consultation with local government as well as they are obviously very directly involved in these programs. Even if such a program is not required next year, and I am sure that all Members of the House with this, that governments at all levels should annually plan, in advance and in co-operation with one another, a program which could be implemented when the need arises.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased our Government took action as soon as it became apparent that the Federal Government's program was insufficient. Even though this Government has had little time to prepare, even though the previous Government left no plans nor programs, even though the Federal Government chose not to consult the provinces or local governments on their program ahead of time, this Government took action. The plan that was prepared was not perfect but it was superior in many ways to the Federal program.

I would like to compliment the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Wood) and his Department on their efficient handling of the provincial program.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Cowley:** — Mr. Speaker, in my constituency it was the Provincial Government's program, and the Provincial Government's program only, which had any effect. I am pleased to say that three communities in my constituency were able to take advantage of the provincial program.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this Government and the Federal

Government will take a serious look at who these various winter works programs are assisting. I have two concerns; one, that the programs are not saving local governments money, that they are simply resulting in inflated prices and secondly, that the communities which are most in need of financial assistance and more services, are seldom able to take advantage of these programs.

To look at the second problem in detail – in order for a community to take advantage of these programs it must have planned in advance, it must be able to afford its share of the cost, and it must have a sufficient staff to be able to get through all the red tape.

Mr. Speaker, in the vast majority of cases the disadvantaged communities cannot meet any of these three criteria. Usually they do not have any long-range plan for the development of their community. In many cases they have no extra funds and little or no borrowing power to expand their activities. They are often hampered by a lack of staff to investigate Federal and Provincial shared cost programs. Mr. Speaker, these are the communities which most need the additional facilities which could be provided by winter works. They are often the communities which most need winter works programs in terms of employment as well. I should like to see this Government and the Federal Government establish a program which will allow these communities to take advantage of winter works programs. Too often in the past I believe that this type of a program has benefitted only those communities which are already quite well off in terms of services and facilities. I am not opposed to them receiving assistance, I am simply asking that we improve our programs so that all communities can benefit.

We need three things: 1. A special program which will cover 100 per cent of the cost for disadvantaged communities or long-term low interest loans to cover the community's share of the cost. 2. Special assistance for these communities to plan the development of their community facilities. 3. Some special assistance to these communities in steering their proposals through all the red tape involved.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that our Government can develop a sound approach to winter works. I hope that we can receive the co-operation of all local governments and the Federal Government. Mr. Speaker, I will support this Resolution.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

Debate adjourned on the motion of Mr. J.G. Lane (Lumsden).

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