

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

Wednesday, April 5, 1972.

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. F. Meakes (Touchwood): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to introduce to you and through you to the other Members of the Legislature, the first group of students from Touchwood this year. There are 16 Grade Nine students from the village of Goodeve in the Speaker's Gallery, led by their principal, Mr. Bohay, and the bus driver, Mr. Denesuk.

I would like to wish them a very educational day here in the Legislature. I must say that the town of Goodeve is a new acquisition to the constituency of Touchwood. It is the home of the Hon. Member for Melville (Mr. Kowalchuk). He is sick in bed and I know that he would have wanted to welcome them on his behalf, but instead of that I will do it. We wish them a very educational day and hope they have a safe journey home.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. H.H.P. Baker (Regina Wascana): — Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to welcome the Douglas Park School. They are located in the west gallery, 53 students in Grades Six and Eight. They are accompanied by their teachers, Mr. Martin and Mrs. Robinson.

Douglas Park School as you know is located in the southeast part of the city, next to Wascana Centre. I also note that there is a group of students here from Wetmore School. Some of them are in my seat, the others are in the northeast. But they used to be in mine before the famous gerrymander. I want to welcome them here as well.

I am pleased, through you, to extend the best wishes to them this afternoon and I might say that the Wetmore School students are accompanied by Mr. Culham. There are 35 in number and are seated in the Speaker's Gallery.

A warm welcome to these students and the teachers, and I hope their stay will be pleasant and very fruitful.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. G.T. Snyder (Moose Jaw South): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to take this opportunity to introduce to you 80 students who are located in the east gallery, from the Queen Elizabeth School in Moose Jaw. They are Grade Eight students, Mr. Speaker.

Anyone who is familiar with the geography of the city of Moose Jaw would be interested to know that the Queen Elizabeth School is situated somewhat in the northwest portion of the city which, I suppose, strangely enough to some people it would make it appear that it should not be in Moose Jaw South but

rather in Moose Jaw North. I know that the Member for Moose Jaw North (Mr. MacDonald) will want to join with me in welcoming this young group of students here, principally due to the fact that geographically it does seem to fall into the area, at least a rational appraisal would seem to suggest that it should. I am sure that he will want to join with me in welcoming these young people and hope that they enjoy their trip here and that they have a very pleasant trip home.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. D.F. MacDonald (Moose Jaw North): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to add my welcome to the students from Queen Elizabeth School in Moose Jaw.

I would like to draw to your attention that they are accompanied by their teachers, Mr. Cant, Mrs. Christeson and Mr. Power. They are having a tour of the city as well as the Legislature. They will be visiting the Natural History Museum and the Centre of the Arts and I do want to add my welcome to this Legislature.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. W.E. Smishek (Regina North East): — Mr. Speaker, permit me also to extend a word of welcome to the students from the Douglas Park School. I join the Hon. Member from Wascana in welcoming these students, primarily because it is the school that my children attend. I should like to welcome the teachers and the students and draw attention that my daughter is in the group. I hope they have a good stay in the Legislature this afternoon.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

FUTURE OF REGINA GREY NUNS' HOSPITAL

Mr. G.B. Grant (Regina Whitmore Park): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to direct a question to the Hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek).

A leading Regina physician last night in City Council expressed concern about the future of the Regina Grey Nuns' Hospital as to whether it would be continued as an acute care hospital and I should like to ask the Hon. Minister if he would clarify that situation at this time.

Hon. W.E. Smishek (Minister of Health): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to outline the Government's position regarding the purchase of the Grey Nuns' Hospital.

On February 3, 1972 I announced that the Government had accepted an offer from the Grey Nuns' Hospital to purchase the assets of the Sisters of Charity more commonly known as the Grey Nuns' for the sum of \$1 million.

This matter was then turned over to the solicitors of both parties to finalize the transaction. At that time it came to my attention that the city had attached a caveat to the property in 1913, restricting the use of the property for hospital purposes. As is usual, in the property transaction, I took the position that the purchase was subject to a clear title. Since that time the Grey Nuns' have been asking the city of Regina to withdraw the caveat which is within their authority. It has been reported to me that this matter was discussed at the Regina City Council last evening.

I am informed that there was a proposal made that the caveat be removed by the city if the province would give an undertaking to continue a 400-bed acute general hospital for the next 10 years on the Grey Nuns' property. This proposal is unacceptable to the Government as it imposes similar restrictions to the caveat.

I also understand that it was reported that I was given the undertaking to spend millions of dollars on the Grey Nuns' Hospital in the near future. This is not necessarily so, Mr. Speaker. The point I make is that the Government is prepared to spend millions of dollars on hospital undertakings in the city of Regina. The distribution of these dollars between the hospitals will be decided after such matters as the purchase of the Grey Nuns' Hospital has been settled.

Mr. Grant: — Mr. Speaker, just a supplementary question. Then at this time there is no clear-cut policy as to the future of the Grey Nuns'?

Mr. Smishek: — That is correct, Mr. Speaker.

SCHOOL GRANTS

Mr. J.C. McIsaac (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Education (Mr. MacMurchy) in connection with school grants.

In view of the great dissatisfaction expressed by many school boards with, not only the total amount of grants which differs from what the Minister told us in the House, but the distribution of them. My question is: does the Minister intend to bring in legislation or amendments to the present Foundation Grant Act in order the Members of this House can debate what it now appears to be his new non-formula?

Hon. G. MacMurchy (Minister of Education): — Mr. Speaker, we do not intend to bring in legislation as it is not required.

The present Foundation Grant Formula is in keeping with the Foundation Act which was passed by the previous administration, which you are well aware of.

It is interesting the comment with respect to dissatisfaction of many boards. We have met, in the Department, with some boards and not one board that we have met with, nor have I received any communication which expressed this dissatisfaction with the principle of the formula. Everyone agrees that it is

a good principle. Everyone agrees that our application of it, our phasing in of it, is a good method and it is well accepted.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. McIsaac: — Mr. Speaker, I can supply the Minister with a good list of boards that have expressed dissatisfaction with the principle and the manner that he is doing it.

RESOURCE REPORT

Mr. C.P. MacDonald (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Premier.

Mr. Speaker, I have in my hand a publication put out by the Department of Natural Resources called Resource Report, prepared by a civil servant in Information Services called Nolan Matthies, Supervisor, prepared by Conservation Information Services for immediate release, put out by a civil servant. In it he attacks a Member of the House and a debate in the House. I would like to report to you, Sir:

These statistics clearly and factually refute the statements recently made by John Gardner, MLA for Moosomin. It had been suggested by Mr. Gardner that present DNR policy was allowing wholesale destruction of Saskatchewan wildlife.

And then he goes on to make a political refutation of a statement made by a Member of the Legislature of the Opposition in this House, Sir, in a debate.

Is this what the Premier intends Information Services and the Government of Saskatchewan to be doing for the next four years?

Hon. A.E. Blakeney (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I have not seen the publication. I have heard of Mr. Matthies and that is all. He certainly wasn't hired by our Government but by the Government that preceded us. He is not in any sense, as far as I am aware, a political appointee unless he was a political appointee of that Government.

If he has put out material such as the Member reports to this House, I agree with the Member that if it is as I understand the Member to have said it, it is irregular and I will certainly look into it, because I agree with him that it is inappropriate for a public servant, if in fact this is what happened, to be using Government publications to refute statements made in this House by any Member of the House on either side.

Mr. MacDonald: — Mr. Speaker, I will send this over to the Premier as soon as I get it Xeroxed. We certainly want to keep this on file. I should like also to add that it is not necessarily the man it is the orders and the instructions that he comes under that I am concerned with.

SECOND READINGS

Hon. R. Romanow (Attorney General) moved second reading of **Bill No. 81 – An Act to provide for the Division of the Province into Constituencies for the Election of Members of the Legislative Assembly.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure this afternoon to move second reading of Bill No. 81 which is the Bill which will establish the Constituencies Boundaries Commission for the Province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, I can say this with, I think, more than the usual sincerity because I feel that this Bill transcends most, if not all of the others introduced thus far in this House, in its importance as far as the democratic institutions – probably the leading democratic institutions – of this Province are concerned, namely, the Legislature.

I truly believe that future students of political science will look upon this Bill as one of the watersheds – that may be a bit flowery but I think it is true – watersheds of democracy as far as this Province is concerned.

I think it will be so regarded because for the first time in Saskatchewan history an Act of this Legislature will guarantee that constituency boundaries will not be drawn in a manner which is designed to further narrow political interests and will not be drawn exclusively by the interest and controls of one political power party, namely, the party that is in power.

This priority given to our democratic institution is a piece of legislative reform that I say has been a long time coming to this Province. This Bill makes history because it is drafted around the principle of a truly Independent Boundaries Commission.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — We have guaranteed that Commission will be chosen in a non-partisan fashion. We have spelled out that once the Commission is chosen it will be allowed to do its work in an atmosphere of independence.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to discuss with the Members of the House in some detail the principles of the Bill. As I have said the main principle of the Bill, upon which Members will be asked to either vote for or against, is the establishment of an Independent Boundaries Commission – the composition of which I will say a few words about later – that will determine the boundaries of the ridings of this Province and determine the population of each constituency on a census population basis.

Members will know that the first Independent Boundaries Commission was established in Canada by the Parliament of Canada, at the time they passed the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act in 1965. The Commission established under that Act set up new Federal boundaries on a population basis about

1966. The last Federal elections in this Province were conducted in accordance with those 13 constituencies drawn in Saskatchewan by the Commission which I think, by and large, was independent and had the confidence of society. This was then followed by other legislation in Manitoba and in Alberta in 1969.

In this Bill that is before the Members of the House the principle of determining the number of people that are being represented by the census is the basic principle that is adopted. That is the overall, generally stated principle of the Bill.

Now I turn to the question of census. We have determined that population census of Canada should be the guideline with respect to the individual boundaries in respect to this Bill. Members will know that the population census of Canada is taken every 10 years under the Statistics Act of Canada. The last population census was taken in June 1971, a few months ago, and the next 10-year census will be taken in 1981. But that Act also requires that a census is to be taken in Saskatchewan every five years, so that the next five-year census – although it isn't as comprehensive and exhaustive as the ten-year census – will be taken in 1976 and every 10th year after that.

I should like to turn to the establishment of the Commission. Section 3 of this Bill deals with the principle of establishing the Commission. That Section provides that the first adjustment of constituencies in Saskatchewan is to be made based on the 1971 population census – the one concluded – and thereafter each 10-year population census, namely, the next one being in 1981. It is mandatory by the law that this Commission will be established at every 10-year interval, the first one upon passage of this Bill in 1971 and then in 1981 and so on.

Under Section 3, sub-paragraph (2), provisions are stated there whereby a constituency boundaries commission can be established at the discretion of the Cabinet if Cabinet deems it to be in the public interest, once after a five-year census. That is the census that comes into play in 1976 and 10 years after that. As I have said the first quinquennial census would be in 1976. This is designed to build in flexibility. There may be a dramatic drop in population, although I hope that is unlikely. There may be an increase in population which I am sure Members opposite will agree with me is very likely especially with this Government in power. We want to make sure the constituencies reflect accurately that particular aspect of it.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — I notice, Mr. Speaker, that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) agrees with that last statement that I made and I am glad to see that he agrees with me on it.

Section 3, subsection (3) of the Bill provides if the Cabinet orders a five-year constituency readjustments the order must be tabled in the House forthwith after it is made, if the House is in session. If not within 10 days of the next session.

Section 4 of that Bill provides that the proclamation establishing the Commission on a regular basis won't have any control by the government, it must be made within 30 days after

the Clerk of the Executive Council obtains a copy of the official census return for Saskatchewan from the proper authorities in Ottawa. So no matter who the Clerk is, when they receive the census return within 30 days, a proclamation is issued and the Boundaries Commission is re-established at that time.

I would like to say a few words, Mr. Speaker, about the Commission itself and the membership of the Commission because this will be a very important aspect of the Bill. In this regard it is proposed that the Commission shall consist of three men, a chairman, the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly, named by office, and another person who is resident of Saskatchewan. The Bill provides that the chairman of the Commission shall be appointed by the Chief Justice of Saskatchewan, at present Mr. Justice Culliton, either from among the judges of the Court of Appeal or after consultation with the Chief of the Queen's Bench from among the judges of the Queen's Bench Court. So that the chairman will be either one member from the Court of Appeal or one member from among the judges of the Queen's Bench, the superior court of Saskatchewan. In the very unlikely event that there is a refusal to act as chairman in either the Court of Appeal level or Queen's Bench then we have provided in the Bill that the Cabinet can after consultation with the Chief Justice make the necessary appointment of chairman. Though I stress this latter provision it is, I think Members will agree, a very unlikely occurrence and is used there in order to make sure the mechanism exists for getting the Commission started. The second member of the Commission will be the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly. We feel that this is a good choice for second member of the Commission because this is the man and I am not only speaking of the present incumbent, but I think of future years as well, the man with experience as the Clerk of the House who serves all of us as Members of the Assembly as fairly and as impartially as he can. I think he should be able to render excellent service to the Commission. He very often knows the needs of politicians, knows the province very well and I think is a man who all Members as well should be able to place their faith and trust in. The third member of the Commission rounding it out will be appointed, Mr. Speaker, by yourself after consultation with the Premier, President of the Executive Council and the Leader of the Opposition. This provision is thought desirable because it will allow the inclusion or the appointment of a third person who will bear an influence from the non-political world, an ordinary citizen or someone who has a keen interest in political science but who has more or less the confidence of both the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition.

We think that it is important that having now chosen a judge to be chairman and a Clerk, an officer of this Assembly to be one member, that this will allow the leeway for a valuable contribution to be made by a citizen of the Province of Saskatchewan. The Chief Justice and the Speaker will communicate the names of the judge and the other member to the Clerk of the Cabinet and Cabinet will thereupon appoint the three man Commission. Pursuant to Section 6, subsection (4) if the Chief Justice is absent or the post is vacant the acting Chief Justice will discharge his duties. Similarly if the Speakership is vacant the member discharging the duties of the Speaker at that time is empowered by law to make the appointment after consultation. A proclamation containing the names of the members of the Commission must be published and the Commission is then fully established very shortly after the 30-day issuance of the

proclamation from the Clerk upon receipt of the census return. There is provision for a deputy chairman.

A quorum consists of two members of the Commission with a second vote to the chairman in the event of an equal vote. Any vacancy in the Commission must be filled within 30 days after it arises and under Section (9) no MLA or Senator is qualified for appointment to the Commission. We argue that this is advantageous because we want to avoid the possibility of a narrow partisan political viewpoint injecting itself into the deliberations of the Commission lest there be an accusation from the public at large that the member so appointed carries a political stripe and may thereby color the deliberations of the Commission. That's the establishment and composition of the Commission.

I should now like to move into the fifth point and the question of division of the province. We propose that this Bill will divide the province basically into two areas or divisions. This is in effect I suppose the only area of policy that involves this Government. We hope the Members opposite will agree. The northern area is one area which will comprise all that portion of the province lying north of a line that has been specifically described in Section 14 of the Bill. Roughly speaking although I haven't checked it out personally I'm informed that this parallels the line in the northern administration district area with some changes. I think at present that area included part of Meadow Lake, Shellbrook, and Prince Albert East constituency and a small part of Nipawin in the northeastern corner which would go to the general northern area. It is proposed that this northern area will be represented by two members and the law therefore says that the Commission must draw two constituencies there. The Commission will determine the boundary between the two constituencies based on a quotient to be established by the Commission.

Now since the official census figures are not yet available to me for careful perusal what I say here may now be somewhat hypothetical. I stress to Members it is not to be interpreted as being any Government statement of fact. To give Members some idea we can assume perhaps the total population of the province to be about 900,000. The Commission will, from the information made available to it, estimate the population of the two northern ridings and then establish the quotient on that estimated population for each of the two northern ridings and then determine the location of the boundary line between them. The boundary line can run north and south or east and west however the Commission should determine. So then say, for example, the population of the northern area is estimated to be approximately 20,000. Then each of the constituencies, because the law says there must be two of them, would be quite naturally divided on the basis of 10,000 population each or as close as possible to that. Then the Commission would take into account where the settlements are and hopefully draw a line accordingly.

The population of all of the area south of that line would be the second area of the province. So in this area if we use my example again of approximately 950,000 people and we deduct from that 20,000 for the North we would have roughly about 930,000 for the so-called southern area. The Bill provides that the Electoral Boundaries Commission shall divide this south areas into not more than 63 ridings. Now you will note here that unlike the North where we say there shall be two for the

southern area we want to give the Commission as much freedom and latitude as possible. So we say that you can appoint up to 63 but you have the freedom to go below 63 if it is in the interest of true representation. This is the maximum number of constituencies that may be established for the south portion. And as I stress again the Commission may choose any number because we think that the Commission will be best qualified after hearings and taking into account population figures, will be best able to determine what in fact the proper representation needs are of the province. The Bill requires that each constituency shall have as nearly as possible the same population. If the Commission decides to establish the maximum number of constituencies say 63 for the south, then taking that figure 930,000 population, the Commission would divide 63 into 930,000. It would be roughly over 14,000 per constituency, not voters but population. At the present time Saskatoon is represented by six Members, Regina by seven Members, Moose Jaw by two Members. I'm not including seats which represent parts of cities but go into the country. Take for example Prince Albert East or, as I understand it, Prince Albert West, as well as an example. Or take Moose Jaw. Moose Jaw more or less is in the city, in fact, all of it I believe is in the city. At any rate that is the way it is at present, six for Saskatoon and seven for Regina. Now if we have a quotient figure of something over 14,000 then one could estimate roughly that on Regina's estimated population of about 155,000, I don't swear to the accuracy of those figures, the Premier objects to that as being high, but these are the figures that are being used by my . . .

Mr. Blakeney: — I don't object.

Mr. Romanow: — He doesn't object he draws a reservation.

Mr. Steuart: — It slipped a little . . .

Mr. Romanow: — It could very well be, Mr. Leader of the Opposition, because the province is making tremendous strides of recovery especially since June of 1971 but I agree the Premier is still tending to think prior to June 23 because of the terrific job to clean up the mess that has been left behind in the economic environment.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — At any rate I come back to say that using the figures to just illustrate the point, the Commission will determine what it is in fact. But if it is estimating at 155,000 for Regina, then using that quotient figure you would divide 14,000 into that figure and you would have Regina being entitled to approximately ten Members or an increase. Saskatoon, if it has got 135,000, that might be high as well, you could come up to about nine Members, I say could because I will explain a variable later on that the Commission might very well adopt, likely will adopt. Moose Jaw would be entitled clearly to two seats at any rate. If the Commission uses the maximum 63 and the quotient figures and again this all depends on the figures and, therefore, one ought not to stress this too much, there could be 21 Members for the cities leaving 44 Members in the other areas, total of 65 if the maximum is used. Two for the North would leave 42 for the South and 21 for the cities and two for the North, a total of 65 conceivably. But you can play your own combination

depending upon what the figures are and what the Commission ultimately decides, it may decide to stick with 60, two northern, 58 south. We don't know what they will do.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I come to the sixth principle or point of this Bill and that is variation between constituencies. Although the first principle of adjustment of constituency boundaries is to be made on population basis as nearly as possible equal among ridings, the Bill does empower the Independent Commission to vary the quotient for a constituency either upwards or downwards by no more than 15 per cent of that quotient, 15 per cent of 14,000 or whatever the figure is. The factors that may be taken into account by the Commission to vary the quotient upwards or downwards could be sparsity, density or relative growth of population in any area or areas, special geographic interests, community or diversity of interest of inhabitants in various regions, physical features and other relevant factors that the Commission considers desirable. These rules apply to the two northern constituencies as well, so that there is a degree of flexibility built in. The 15 per cent is a good variation and will give them considerable leverage power as is necessary.

Now finally, Mr. Speaker, a few details as to how this Bill is finally reported and how the hearings are actually held. The Bill says that each member of the Commission has the power of a commissioner appointed under The Public Enquiries Act. The Commission may employ technical staff and advisors including a secretary subject to approval of the Cabinet as to remuneration and expenses. The Commission may make its rules regulating its procedure and one commissioner may, if the Commission decides, hold a part of a hearing on behalf of the Commission and report to it, although I don't see this as happening. The Commission is required to hold public hearings at places in the province that it considers desirable and I would hope that these would be fairly numerous so that our population and our people can have a chance to express their views to the Commission. Notice must be published of the public hearings. Publication shall include maps or drawings of proposed constituencies and indicating the population of each of them and the name to be given to each of them. Within nine months after the receipt by the Commission of the census report the Commission is required to prepare and file with the Clerk of the Cabinet its interim report and publish notice of its filing of that interim report. Then after that further hearings will be held at Regina and at Saskatoon wherein public submissions can be made by the public as to the merits of the interim report. This is to allow situations that could arise where the Commission draws a line when it is not fully conversant with the particular trading pattern of an area and the local community says, look, we should belong to this particular constituency. This was done I understand in the Federal redistribution and I think it is a good extra safety valve to give people a kick at the cat in terms of changing the report if necessary before the final report is in. We limit it to Regina and Saskatoon because, keep in mind the first nine months will involve fairly extensive hearings and in the second report hearings it will be only to consider the interim report. There will be more or less a document upon which to work and the areas of concern will be isolated. A copy of the interim report is to be supplied to each MLA and each candidate in the last general election. I hope that MLAs will take the opportunity to express their points of view to the Independent Commission when the public hearings are held.

April 5, 1972

Some Members might raise the question as to whether or not there should be MLA representation on the Commission. I think that is a valid point to be considered by the House. The basic reasoning of the Government in not so putting it was basically the fear that with MLAs on this Commission we might on occasion give the opportunity for partisan political debate to arise. Furthermore, there is a question of whether or not a Chief Justice in that type of situation would take on the chairmanship. I think it is important that we avoid as much as possible any accusations of partisanship with respect to this particular matter. We say furthermore that MLAs will have an opportunity to get their points of view across by simply coming forward as other citizens do and presenting their views.

Now the final report of the Commission after the interim report and after the hearings must be completed within one year from the time that the chairman of the Commission receives from the Clerk the census report for Saskatchewan.

If we pass this Bill sometime say by the end of May at the completion date of this House, and if we can get everything mechanically set up by June or so, conceivably we could have a final report by June of 1973 or fall of 1973 depending on how soon we start it. The final report must be filed with the Speaker of the House who is required by law to table it, if the Legislature is then in session, immediately, and if not then within five days after the opening of the next ensuing session, so the report is in the House and all the Members of the House can look at it. The Legislature is not bound by the report of the Commission the way the Bill is worded but the report is brought back before the House for consideration on resolution to adopt it by the Member who for the time being administers the Legislative Assembly Act, traditionally the Premier. Now the House may amend the report as it sees fit and the report as presented or as amended by the Legislature must then be adopted. You can't change the Bill but once the report is adopted then the Bill comes forward to reflect the report. So there is a chance to change the report by the House but once the report is passed it goes strictly into law and into the Bill.

Some Members might say why do we give the House in effect a final kick at the cat. Is there any danger in this area? To that I say the danger is next to nil in terms of any partisan interference. I think that all Members would agree that it would be a brave government that would by any substantial or material way alter the reports of a commission having conducted these hearings, having been set up in this manner. But we have to have this provision in I think for two basic reasons. As I said I believe this House is paramount, not a commission, that there are dangers in delegating these types of powers. Traditionally and I think quite rightly so we have always thought ourselves as being the men who decide what constituencies we will serve and the boundaries within which we shall serve them. What we are doing by this Bill is deciding as Members of the House I hope in an unanimous way to delegate a form of that activity to an independent commission. The second reason for retaining this power to vary in there is quite obvious. It may very well be that there is a need to reflect a particular point of view that a Member has by way of peculiar knowledge by virtue of him being a citizen of that constituency or by certain complaints that may arise.

Well, after the resolution is adopted and the report is

adopted then the Bill must go and the way that the report is adopted and the Bill is passed it comes into force by proclamation in time for the next general provincial election.

There are other provisions with respect to usual costs out of appropriations and the like.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I submit to the Members of this House that those details and those principles as I have outlined are principles which allow me and all Members to say that that is truly an Independent Electoral Boundaries Commission which they have set up. And I'm sure that Members of the House will agree with me when I said at the beginning that this was a Bill which in effect will be, I think, ultimately a corner-stone as far as Saskatchewan democracy is concerned, based on representation by population.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — If the people of our province get the idea that there is in fact no equity or fair play in the way that we draw up the boundary lines for the constituencies to represent those people, then I think the entire institution of parliament comes seriously under attack and is eroded. We must not allow that to happen through this Bill and we've sought to cover it by introducing it in this way, in this fashion in second reading.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that this House cannot afford any Bill which would be less than this one because we have already seen the ill effects of what happens when a political party by itself, basically for itself, chooses to draw up boundaries of constituencies in preparation for an election as was done in 1970 by the former administration of the day.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — The result is a terrible attack on the Government and questioning by the people of this Province. In that regard this Bill is a dramatic Bill, Mr. Speaker. It's dramatic because of its contrast to the gerrymander of 1970 by the Liberal Government of Saskatchewan.

The Leader of the Opposition who was the Deputy Premier at the time, in 1970 introduced the amendments to the Legislative Assembly Act and he said this:

Mr. Speaker, in planning the redistribution that is detailed in this Act I had the help of a Committee composed of MLAs from all parts of Saskatchewan, including the Hon. Allan Guy, Athabasca, the Hon. Cy. MacDonald, Milestone, Mr. McPherson, Regina, Mr. Robert Heggie, Hanley. Hon. Members will find that we have taken into consideration population changes and at the same time recognize the rural nature of our province and the large areas covered by some constituencies.

Mr. Speaker, that was the way it was done before. That's an eloquent statement but it's more eloquent in what it does not say. What it did not say, of course, was that the Committee may have represented some parts of Saskatchewan from a geographic standpoint but it certainly didn't represent in any impartial

April 5, 1972

or fair way the political interests of Saskatchewan, throughout Saskatchewan, because all the Members of the Committee came from the Government front benches or close to the Government front benches. And I think that this Bill is an improvement on the former method of drawing up the Boundary Bill.

I also want to say that I hope that we put to rest in this Bill that we're giving second reading to today, the type of rationale which we saw in 1970. The rationale which is explained by a member of the Committee, a member who is now defeated, the Member for Hanley, Mr. Robert Heggie. Some of us said that he would be defeated if he brought in a Bill like that, but he didn't accept our advice. He said this with respect to the rationale:

Gerrymandering is as old as Democratic Government. Sir John A. MacDonald used an expression – 'Hive the Grits'. Sir John believed that getting all the grits in one hive would assure the Conservatives of four or five surrounding seats. That process is not new.

That was the rationale and the justification by a Member of that Committee who drew the constituency boundaries.

Now I am pleased to say, Mr. Speaker, that this Bill puts an end to gerrymandering in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — This morning when I read that remark and I see a Liberal looking to a Conservative for guidance, I can think of no more apt illustration of the blind leading the blind, where else would the Liberal Party be looking to for guidance but to the Conservatives. And I also hope that in introducing this Bill we shall have seen an end to arguments which basically revolve around political fortunes of individual candidates. I know that once in a while I've done it, Members have done it to me, we do it either in jest or for real, but I couldn't help but be attracted to one comment made by the Member for Lakeview who was a member of that Committee as well. He said about this Bill:

Now we look to the North (he was talking about Regina seats) now we look to the North, which is Henry Baker's seat. Henry only won by 432 votes as you all know. It was very close. So the Committee thought that we should give Henry a little help and they have.

And he was right, they did, because the Member from Wascana is back in this House. Although he didn't, I'm sure mean it at the time, because I heard his words. He did not actually mean that he wanted to welcome him back. Then the Member said:

Then we move on to the portion of Mr. Whelan's seat. Now Mr. Whelan needed a little help there so we enlarged his seat. Then we came to the new Leader of the Opposition who is gaining strength every day, Allan Blakeney.

To that I also agree.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — The problem with the forecast was that the Hon. Member didn't know how fast the Leader of the Opposition was gaining strength. He said:

We enlarged Allan's by taking a little of Henry's and this will make Allan safe there.

And you see again the method by which the Committee computed the boundaries. A very scientific method that said we will take a little bit of Allan's, we'll take a little bit off Henry's, we'll add a little bit on to Ed Whelan's seat and everybody will somehow be happy and we'll have Regina seats.

Now I want this Bill to be debated on a high political plane and I would not accuse the Members of the Liberal Party opposite of seeking to draw boundaries for political advantage. No I wouldn't. But I would say that quotations that I've read to the Members, and the method in which it was used to draft the Bill by a committee composed of Government Members only, certainly could lead one to be suspicious. And we ought to avoid that type of suspicion.

Mr. Speaker, I conclude by saying this to the Members of the House. We want to see an end to that type of action by all governments. We want to see this House unite behind what I think is basically a good Bill. I think that all Members, even those opposite who at that time thought that they were acting in the best interests, will support this Bill in second reading.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to move second reading of this Bill.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. D.G. Steuart (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I listened to the Attorney General introducing this Bill, this very important Bill, with a great deal of interest. And for the first, I suppose, 20 minutes of his speech I admired the speech and I liked it. Now you can sneer if you want. He destroyed in the last ten minutes everything that he attempted to set up in the first 15 or 20 minutes.

Let's talk about bringing in a non-partisan and an Independent Electoral Boundaries Commission and by bringing in such a Bill we will really have something that both sides of the House will support.

Well, you were sitting thee, Mr. Member from Redberry (Mr. Michayluk) for at least one redistribution that your Government brought in. The Speaker was a Member of this House for many years. If we want to go back and drag up redistributions that came in the past and talk about gerrymandering, we can go back to the one brought in by Clarence Fines. As great a gerrymander as ever pulled off in the history of this Province by Liberals or Conservatives. When they divided . . .

Mr. Romanow: — When was this?

Mr. Steuart: — I'll remind you when it was. When they divided the city of Regina had they not divided the city of Regina and he

said it in his speech, they would have lost every one of the Members, five or six Members in Regina, so they lumped them all together, or no – they divided the constituencies. But when it came to Saskatoon they didn't divide Saskatoon. Everybody in Saskatoon got five votes because they said Saskatoon (and this was the very cynical reason that was given in this House), the city of Saskatoon didn't lend itself to a division as does the city of Regina.

I can go back and point out gerrymanders that were brought into this House by our Government, by the NDP-CCF Government, and by many Members who are still Members of this House, by the Conservatives when they were the government. Make no mistake. When the Attorney General said at the beginning – 'Okay, we're going to make history. We're going to bring in a Bill that we hope both sides of the House can support. We're going to bring in a Bill that is truly non-partisan, that is truly independent.'

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — All right, we can look at this Bill in that vein and that's the way I intend to look at it.

What did the Attorney General, and I presume many of the other NDP Members who follow in this debate say, he set the tone, look it up, I think he spent 10 or 15 or 30 minutes pointing out the redistributions that we introduced and that I introduced in this House and going on to point out the inequities and the unfairness and calling it a gerrymander. That's fine. It will make great fun and a great debate. We can join in the same way and we can go back and dig up the old speeches of Clarence Fines, Mr. Brockelbank Senior when he sat here and point out some of the deals, some of the gerrymanders they pulled off which were equal or worse than we did, if that was a gerrymander we pulled off. Just as raw, just as one sided, just as partisan.

Let's look at the Bill in that tone, the same tone that the Attorney General looked at the Bill at the end. Let's look at it. He gets up very sanctimoniously and says this will be an independent commission and that's the key to this Bill. That's the key to the redistribution, the Committee that carries out the redistribution. Well, what have we got in the Bill if we look at it from the point of view the Attorney General did in the last five minutes of his speech. He's the one who introduced it at the very beginning of this debate. I'd hoped this would be a non-partisan debate, that we would take a look at this . . .

An Hon. Member: — Why should you mind?

Mr. Steuart: — No, I don't mind. I don't mind at all this kind of a debate. All right, let's look at it that way. You'll get the Chief Justice to appoint the judge. Okay, he'll be independent. Then who will the other two members be, if we want to take a look at it from a suspicious point of view? They will be representatives of the Government. The Clerk – you can hire him and you can fire him. Now I say this Clerk is independent, fine. And the next Clerk might be independent, but make no mistake, if you want to look at it from the point of view that the Attorney General just talked about, the Clerk of this Assembly is hired and can be fired and removed any day by the Government.

Now, they say the Speaker will appoint somebody after

consultation with the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition. After consultation! Well, it can be consultation and I hope it will be. Or it can be a consultation where I would be invited to a meeting and say we're now consulting you, we're going to appoint, Mr. Brockelbank, Sr., or we're going to appoint George Bothwell, or we're going to appoint some very fiercely independent person like that. I don't think they'll do that. All I'm pointing out, Mr. Attorney General, is you couldn't resist at the end of your speech bringing in a little cheap politics. And then you ended up saying, 'And I hope all Members, the Members on both sides of the House support this Bill'.

Well, let me say this, that I'm sorry you took that tone. I'm sorry you made the last five minutes of your speech, because I think you would have been a larger man, a bigger man, if you had left that out. And I think the Members opposite on the Government side would agree with me.

Mr. Snyder: — You . . .

Mr. Steuart: — I didn't start it. You missed his speech evidently, Mr. Minister of Labour. He made an excellent speech for 20 minutes and then the last five minutes he couldn't resist saying, "But look at that gerrymander, they did this", and so on. Okay, that's all I want to say about that because we are going to look at this Bill fairly if you allow us to. Just make no mistake, if you want to get this down into the mud of partisan politics we'll join you there. If you want to keep it up here we'll join you there. Now I look at that Bill . . .

An Hon. Member: — You're an expert?

Mr. Steuart: — Sure I'm an expert and I don't make any bones about it. Of course I'm an expert.

Now if we want to look at this Bill from a non-partisan point of view, I shall give the speech I intended to give before I heard the last five minutes of the Attorney General's speech.

Let me say to the Members on that side of the House, I hope you take the same attitude if you intend this to be a non-partisan look at redistribution, then have the decency and have the political bigness to do exactly that. If you want to go back into past history, rehash every unfairness that was ever committed by any government including your own, okay, fine, we can have that kind of a political debate too.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we welcome the Bill. Welcome it maybe from another point of view. Manitoba did bring in an Independent Boundaries Commission so did the Government of Alberta and they were subsequently defeated at the polls, so we welcome it from that point of view.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — But seriously, we do welcome the idea that you will bring in a non-partisan and an Independent Boundaries Commission and they will, we're confident, bring in an independent report that will set up boundaries in a fair and reasonable manner.

April 5, 1972

The key to it, of course, is the Commission. If the Commission is fair and reasonable then the resulting report will be fair and reasonable and I presume in fact I'm sure that the legislation that follows it will be fair and reasonable. And it can be a new step, and it can be a watershed as the Attorney General said in the politics in this Province.

Population as a basis, I think is a sound basis, with some considerations and under certain conditions. I am confident, as I said earlier, that the Chief Justice will face the responsibility and will choose someone from his Court or from the Queen's Bench Court and that individual, whoever he may be, will not put his stamp on anything that is not fair and equitable. And again I come back and I say that the Clerk of this Legislative Assembly, the former Clerks of this Legislative Assembly were fair and reasonable men and we would have confidence in them. And if, in fact, the Speaker does consult with the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition about some individual who will be the third man or woman on the Commission, then again I think that we can come to a reasonable conclusion and will put someone on who will give a fair and just consideration and bring some practical common sense which is necessary to the developing and the setting of the boundaries.

I want to say one or two things about the Commission. We are not going to prejudge the Commission. As I said, if we wanted to look at this from a narrow and suspicious point of view there will be in fact, the way it's set up, two Government appointees. But again, if we are consulted then those appointees can be and there are lots of people in the Province of Saskatchewan who can bring a fair point of view although I don't think there are very many independent people in this Province. I think most people in the province who are worth their salt have some political viewpoint. I am sure we can find people who will rise above their particular viewpoint to make fair and reasonable decisions in regard to setting the boundaries.

I should like the Government to consider, to think about those three people they have talked about and to give consideration, and we're going to make a big point of this, to putting one Member from the Government side of the House and one MLA from the Opposition side. I say this for this reason. I quite sincerely don't think we should confuse partisan politics and politics. One of the things that we are wont to say, even as politicians, is that we must take this or that out of politics. My question very often is: why? If politicians are sometimes held in contempt, if politicians are sometimes held in suspicion then I think you and I as practising politicians have to take some of the blame because we often use this phrase as if anything that is dealt with in politics must be bad or must be partisan, and anything that is dealt with above politics or outside of politics is necessarily sensible, practical and much better. I don't believe this. I think we should give consideration to have an MLA from that side and an MLA from this side for this reason, that it is very possible to have a redistribution that looks very fair and equitable, in other words there would be an almost equal number of people in each seat and a great many other things would be taken into consideration. If you looked at it from one point of view you could say that is a very fair distribution. For example, I think the last Federal redistribution would have been maybe a little bit better or a bit more practical if it would have had a working politician

or two on it. For example, take the city of Regina, I just think it was not practical to divide the city of Regina and Saskatoon, you have four seats, not of which are rural, none of which are urban. But that is just an observation, we are not going to make a big point of this. I agree if we put an MLA from that side and an MLA from this side we will be open to the question that the Attorney General raised of whether in fact a judge may feel that there might be a great deal of controversy from the two MLAs on the Committee and he may not feel that he wants to act. It may be that the public would think, well this really isn't removing it from the sphere of partisan politics. We're not making a big point of it, I just ask the Government before they bring this Bill into Committee or as they bring it into Committee to think about this.

I should like to point out the method that was carried out in Manitoba. In Manitoba they had I think the Chief Justice choosing someone, the president of the University of Manitoba was a member, I think the Chief Justice was a member or he chose someone and the Clerk of the Assembly, who is also evidently their Chief Electoral Officer, was a member. This is a permanent committee, I am told, that sits regularly and I think they each had a 10-year term or they sit every 10 years or they bring in a redistribution every 10 years. This is another point that might be considered, I don't say that it is necessary that we follow that practice. This is the way they did it in Manitoba. Our informant happened to be a Conservative MLA and he said it was so independent and so non-political that they were swept out of office right after they brought it in, so no one could accuse them of being very partisan. Again we're not laboring this point, I just put it up for the Government's consideration.

When you look at the Bill and you consider what they are doing in the North, again I am sure Mr. Guy will have a point to say about this, Mr. Feschuk, Mr. Coupland and other Members who represent northern Saskatchewan. I think the idea that we will guarantee so many seats for the far North is sound. I had difficulty attempting to trace the proposed boundaries on the map I suppose because the map that I had wasn't all that accurate or it didn't have all the divisions that were outlined in the Bill. However, it seems to me that this new area will take in part of Prince Albert East Cumberland, take in all of Athabasca, some of Shellbrook and a good portion of what is now Meadow Lake, and it could take in a piece of Nipawin. So we shall have two representatives from an area that did have at least in part five or six representatives. Again I realize the suggestion is that you would drop the very heavily populated area in Meadow Lake and there may not be any more people, but again I just put this forward for consideration. Is that enough representation for that very large area? This will be discussed later on and I am not making a big issue of it now.

I should like to put forward one more point in considering the southern part or what is called the southern part of the province where there may be 63 seats, and that is the question of fairness to our rural areas. The Attorney General touched on it and he said that there could be 10 seats in Regina and there could be about 10 seats in Saskatoon, certainly two in Moose Jaw and I believe there would be two in Prince Albert. I think by the time you take it the population of Prince Albert will be around 29,000 – thus there could be 24 seats in the four largest cities. This brings me to the point I want to try and make here that if we go by population our farmers could suffer. I realize

that in the Bill they are allowed some pretty wide latitude about 30 per cent, but there is no mention that I can find in the Bill where the rural fact of life in Saskatchewan is taken into consideration. I just want to point out two things; one, if we go strictly by population, if we divide the province strictly by population having regard for the two seats in the North we will in fact be doing a serious disservice to rural Saskatchewan. While it can be said it is fair and reasonable, it is one man, one vote, still with the large area that the Members from rural Saskatchewan will have to cover and the fact that agriculture is still and will remain for a long, long time the economic backbone of this Province, I would ask the Government to give serious consideration that in the criteria they develop for this 15 per cent one way or the other could be as much as 30 per cent which I think is reasonable, that the instructions go to the Committee that they do consider the rural fact of life in Saskatchewan. They may be able to do it, I don't say they won't be able to do it under the criteria as laid down in the Bill but I should like to see it spelled out a little more clearly in the Bill so that they know this is part of their terms of reference.

There is another point that I think should be taken into consideration and that is that when you divide the province strictly by population, I think you will find that there is a heavier concentration of young people in the cities, than there is in rural Saskatchewan, so it may end up taking a great many more votes in rural Saskatchewan to equal the number of voters in the urban part of Saskatchewan, cities, towns, etc. This again would work against proper and necessary representation by rural Saskatchewan. This can be taken into consideration and this can be solved by the committee and they may have the criteria in the Bill as it is presented, again I would hope that there may be a little more direct spelling out of the rural fact of life in the Bill or in instructions that go to the Commission before it is set up. Let me say that I think hearings are a good thing. The hearings themselves may bring to the attention of the Committee before they finalize the Bill such things as I have mentioned, such things as trading patterns, growth areas, rural distribution, and so on, that the Committee could in fact take these things into consideration and weigh them properly.

I also agree with the Attorney General that the House should have the final say. In the final analysis if it is the Government's decision to make a truly independent and non-partisan redistribution then they will do it, because you have the power. I don't say this in a critical sense, I say it as a fact of life, you have 45 Members, we have 15 and it wouldn't matter if you had 32 and we had 31. You have the power to do it, just as we had the power to do it, just as former governments had the power to do it. So in the final analysis whether we get an independent, fair and equitable redistribution will depend on whether you mean what you say. I take it for granted and I say it again at this stage that I do believe you mean what you say. You have said it, you have promised it in your election campaign, you campaigned on it, you criticized our redistribution and I think you certainly got some votes, I think the public certainly responded to that. We all knew that some day in Saskatchewan just as it has happened in other provinces and in the Federal Government there would be an independent redistribution. You said you were going to bring it in and I think you have the vehicle here to bring it in. Again I hope

that we don't get this Bill and this committee on the wrong foot by getting partisan. You can have some fun with us if you want and I am sure you can if you wish, but I think the public and the Press will judge you a little more kindly if you don't take that attitude and believe me I am not pleading with you not to have some fun and games with us. I can join in the give and take and so can the Members on this side just as well as you can.

I do think that it is sound that the Legislative Assembly does have the final say, because it is in fact the redistribution of the Legislative Assembly, not of any committee. I can't see anything wrong, in fact I can see some merit in the manner that was outlined by the Attorney General and contained in the Bill that the report would come in and if the House wishes to amend the report, once they have amended it and then that report would become the basis for the redistribution Act itself.

Mr. Speaker, that is all I have to say, certainly we will support the Bill. I hope the Government will take into consideration in Committee some of the things I have pointed out. On the rural question I have strong feelings that we do take into consideration the rural fact of life. On the make-up of the Committee I don't have any strong feelings. I think that there should be some value in considering an MLA from each side, but the disadvantages may outweigh the practical advantages. Again I say this that we will support the Bill and we will look forward to making our representations to this Commission when it is set up. If the Government brings the Bill in, in the spirit of the first 20 minutes of the Attorney General's speech, and we are given through myself or through my office the opportunity to consult with the Speaker and with the Premier on the third member of the Commission, I can tell the Premier and the Speaker, that I will enter this in the spirit of co-operation and I will do my best to put forward names, not partisan names but names of some people that I think would do a fair and reasonable job. If the Premier and the Speaker put forward the same kind of people, I am sure we can agree on the individual. There are lots of people in Saskatchewan while they will not be politically independent, I don't think there are very many political eunuchs in the province, but still there are people in this Province who though they may have a political bias one way or another, would feel very proud and be prepared to set aside that political bias and face a challenge like this and face their responsibility and do a good and reasonable job. Again, I congratulate the Government, Mr. Speaker, in bringing in this Bill. I think it can be the basis for a very fair and equitable redistribution. We will support it and we welcome it.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might just be permitted one quick indulgence in light of the Leader of the Opposition's remarks. That is the reference in the last five minutes of my speech. I repeat again to the Members and perhaps as far as I am concerned that's the only comment that I make that I used the quoted defence of the Bill in 1970 to be a principle upon which I do not believe in as shown by the second reading of this Bill. I quote that and I say it and I put it in second reading on that basis.

Mr. D.W. Michayluk (Redberry): — Mr. Speaker, I am indeed pleased to have listened to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition expounding his views on the setting up of a proposed Independent Boundaries Commission to draw constituency boundaries in the Province of Saskatchewan. I was not aware until this morning that this Bill would come for second reading. My constituency was one of the rural constituencies that had several redistributions or changes in boundaries during the time when the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and the gentlemen opposite were the government. This Bill, Mr. Speaker, will for the first time give an opportunity for Members to have representation by population with a 15 per cent tolerance as was indicated by our House Leader. Removing the drawing of boundaries from the hands of politicians is a very good thing. I think it is timely, as other neighboring provinces have done it. Similar procedure was employed by the Federal Government. Federal constituencies in the Province of Saskatchewan were set up by an Independent Boundaries Commission. Of course, the Commission may be criticized no doubt.

Mr. Speaker, when our Independent Boundaries Commission is set up there may be areas where some of our constituency boundaries may be contentious. I am happy that there will be no politicians on this Commission, Mr. Speaker. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition suggested that a politician, say a retired MLA of this Legislature, should be on this Commission. I personally, Mr. Speaker, see no reason for a politician to be on this independent electoral commission except for political reasons. It is about time, Mr. Speaker, that we remove the task of setting up constituency boundaries from the hands of politicians. Saskatchewan only recently, Mr. Speaker, has undergone this experience. This is one of the main reasons why you gentlemen are sitting opposite because of the way you gerrymandered.

Mr. Guy: — Come on, here he goes.

Mr. Michayluk: — Yes, Mr. Speaker, these little pocket and rotten boroughs left some constituencies 24 miles wide and 100 miles long. If we look at Last Mountain constituency represented by the Hon. Minister of Education (Mr. MacMurchy) you can hardly see it due to its reduced size.

Mr. Guy: — Where . . .

Mr. Michayluk: — Well I know where you are going to be Hon. Member for Athabasca. I know where you will be after May 4th.

Mr. Speaker, I have stated that my constituency has had two political redistributions. After listening to what the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has said this afternoon I should like to add more on second reading. Therefore, I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Debate adjourned.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Bowerman that **Bill No. 70 – An Act to repeal The Saskatchewan Indian and Metis Department Act, 1969** be now read a second time.

Mr. A.R. Guy (Athabasca): — We have had until just a few minutes ago when the Member for Redberry started his tirade a fairly peaceful afternoon so I suppose now that the peace has been broken it might as well be continued.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, although this Bill is a very short one, only two or three lines, it is one that the Opposition takes great exception to and we have no intention of supporting the abolition of the Indian and Metis Department, because we don't believe that it is in the best interest of people of Indian ancestry. I think it shows clearly, Mr. Speaker, that the NDP Government is returning to the do-nothing policies for Indian people that they followed for 20 years prior to 1964. You know for 20 years they ignored the plight of the Indian and Metis people of this Province. Their record, and you can go back through their legislative records for the 20 years they were the Government, is a disgrace. It's a disgrace that we find in no other Legislature in the Dominion of Canada. They did two things for the Indian people while they were in the Government, they provided them with the vote and they provided them with liquor and many times they used the two of them together. There is no question that the vote was deserved but I am sure it would have been appreciated much more by our people of Indian ancestry if there had been some programs with it to make the people feel that they were a part of the Saskatchewan community and on equal terms with other Saskatchewan citizens when they went to cast their ballots.

Liquor created problems due to the lack of consultation with The Federal Indian Affairs Department at the time, although it was available to them they were unable to take it onto their own reserves.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that abolishing the Department of Indian and Metis Affairs is not the answer to the problem of the Indian and Metis people but it is merely a shirking of responsibility by our friends opposite. They are trying to blame the Indian people for the Government's irresponsible attitude by claiming that the Indian leaders wanted this Department abolished. What they should have done, because this is what the Indian people also said, was to restructure the Department if necessary and they had the opportunity to do this. They should have tried it. If the Department was so wrong and if they're not satisfied with the way we established and operated the Department, surely they had the responsibility to sit down with the Indian and Metis and bring about the changes that they thought were necessary rather than, without consultation, to go out and abolish the Department. There is no solution to problems by putting your head in the sand and saying all the Indian problems are going to go away now that we have abolished the Provincial Indian and Metis Department. That is what they are trying to do.

The truth is, Mr. Speaker, that Members opposite had made up their minds prior to 1969 what they were going to do with the Indian and Metis Department. They made up their minds when the Bill was in front of the House that they were going to oppose it. They opposed it in the Legislature and they opposed it on the hustings. They created political sabotage at every opportunity before the Department ever had a chance to develop. They were taking opposition to it purely on a political basis. The Minister, the present Minister of the Department (Mr. Bowerman), the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Kramer), the Member for Kinistino (Mr. Thibault), the Member from Melville (Mr. Kowalchuk), the Member from Cut Knife (Mr. Kwasnica), the Member from Touchwood (Mr. Meakes), they all talked against the Bill in 1969 but they all voted for it because at that time they didn't dare vote against it. We called a recorded vote on second reading of the Bill when it was established and the vote was 53 to 0 in favor of going ahead with this Department. Now it is going to be interesting how those same Members vote today.

But the ink wasn't dry on the Bill before they started trying to undermine the success of the Department at every opportunity. They distorted the objectives of the program and they downgraded the personnel who were trying to put the program into operation. They went from one end of the province to the other separating the Indians from the Metis, separating the people from the North and from the South and from the East and from the West. They did everything in their power to pick out little events that occurred in the setting up and will occur in the setting up of any department and used them to try and break down any support that the Department had.

They opposed the Bill from the point of view of lack of consultation. The Member from Cut Knife – and I am sorry that he is not in his seat today – made a great speech when he said and I quote from the Debates and Proceedings of that year in Hansard:

Mr. Barrie said there was consultation with leaders in SGI and other Indian organizations. Good, but the type of consultation that really bears fruit I feel is right down at the reservation level with each Chief and his Council . . . Did the Government Members go to reservations to meet personally with each one?

Well, I guess, Mr. Speaker, that as the Opposition today we can say the same thing to the Government Members. Did you go to each reservation and talk to the individual Indian before you made up your mind to abolish the Department? Of course, the answer is No. The Minister of the Indian and Metis Department has made it quite clear since last June that he has met only with the executive of the Federation of Saskatchewan Indians and the Metis Department, and they asked to have it abolished, therefore, they are getting their wish.

Mr. Romanow: — We campaigned . . .

Mr. Guy: — I know, you campaigned long before it was ever established.

Mr. Romanow: — But that's . . .

Mr. Guy: — Well, I don't care whether

they did or whether they didn't. All I am saying is, if it is right that the individual Indians on the individual reserves should be consulted when the Department was established isn't it right then that they should be consulted when it is being abolished. And the Minister has made it quite clear that the individual has not been consulted when it comes to the abolishment of this Department.

The Premier has resigned, he left his seat. You can't creep up to the front that way, you've got to get elected again before you get into the second row.

Mr. Rolfes: — Makes you jealous.

Mr. Guy: — Get into the back seat where you belong.

Mr. Speaker, you know the establishment of the Indian and Metis Department in Saskatchewan was the first concrete step not only in this Province but in any province of Canada to provide our people of Indian ancestry with the same opportunity and services available to other citizens of this Province. But by abolishing the Department the Government says we were wrong in setting it up. We admit, and I mentioned this in an earlier debate, that we didn't have all the answers. We made mistakes but we did provide the opportunity for them to participate as equal citizens in the mainstream of Saskatchewan life. But you know the present Government have not made any attempt to find a new approach, if that was required, they have made no attempt to provide alternative answers or correct mistakes. They believe everything can be solved by abolishing the Department and I suggest that this is a most negative attitude.

We believed in 1969 and we still believe today that involvement of the whole community is needed to solve the problems of our Indian people. The Task Force did a terrific job of bringing the awareness of the problems of the people to the non-Indian society. Today by this Bill the Government is saying that the Indian must solve his own problems and the non-Indian community should stay out of it. We do not agree with this approach. The present Government says we forced the Indian to accept programs without proper consultation but I have made it clear on many occasions that perhaps we did move too fast because we were tired of listening to people saying, something must be done, and then doing nothing. We were determined to do something and we moved in that direction. But there was no force involved. We said all along that the Indian and Metis Department was to provide a framework for policies, legislation, and the financial assistance to provide education and training programs, employment, job opportunities, housing, electricity, telephones, roads and other services that are available to other parts of our society. Above all we provided the opportunity to participate in and contribute to our province on an equal basis and anyone else if they desired to do so. Many of the programs were asked for by Indian people, many were obviously needed and many appeared desirable to carry out the aims of the Department. None affected the treaty rights or the relationships of the Indians with other jurisdictions. The basic principle was and I state it again that programs and services must be made available to every person of Indian ancestry in this Province and this we followed, or at least we tried to.

By abolishing the Department the Government is saying, we

shouldn't have provided several thousand jobs with our Indian and Metis people; we shouldn't have provided thousands of training programs and related training courses; we shouldn't have brought electricity to every reserve; we shouldn't have starting bringing telephones and housing assistance; we shouldn't have encouraged the Indian people by providing grants for establishing their own economic enterprises. They are saying that this was all wrong when they take the attitude that abolishing the Department that provided all these services is the answer to the problems today. But I hope that before too long they will stop and ask the individuals who were assisted, who did find jobs, who did take the training courses, who had houses provided, who had employment opportunities and grants for industry and for business, if they think the Indian and Metis Department was a waste of time.

Since the election in June the steady downgrading in the Department has taken place from day to day. It was obvious they wanted to destroy it. Instead of showing imagination and initiative to correct the weaknesses and the shortcomings that existed and to make it into a Department that would carry out the requests and need of the Indian people, the Minister and the Government put their heads in the sand and believed that by abolishing the Department all problems of the Indian people would disappear. They fired the Deputy Minister and the Director of Placement, they cut back on the budget that we had provided with the result that even in the few months they have been the Government more than 250 people less were employed. We had a tremendous record of providing jobs and training programs within the Civil Service, within the Crown corporations for people of Indian ancestry. The short time that they have been the Government there has been a reduction of 450 jobs in that area. Training courses and a number of students involved have been reduced, returns are coming in almost every day showing that the work of the Indian Department was downgraded last year. The activities finally have ground to a halt.

1972-73 doesn't look any better for our people of Indian ancestry. The Minister claims that the new Human Resources, another agency, will take up the slack and fill in and carry on the same program. This, of course, is nonsense because there is no guarantee that there will be one dollar in this coming year for Indian and Metis people. There is no guarantee that the money won't be spent for some other segment of our society. The Budget shows that it is costing the Indian and Metis people of this Province \$2.8 million to abolish the Department. The FSI and the Metis Society may think that it is worth \$2.8 million to abolish the Department but it will be they along with the Government who will have to explain to all the other Indian and Metis people why there are no job opportunities this year, why there are no education programs, why there are no grants for housing and other services provided. More than half a million has been cut from the Government Supernumery employment program. It is obvious that none of the 783 new people hired in the Budget will be people of Indian ancestry. A reduction of \$1.2 million in special training programs shows the attitude of Members opposite and makes us believe we are right when we say that there will be no incentives, and no initiative shown by Members opposite to provide employment in the private sector.

We have heard a great deal about consultation, in fact the Minister opposite has made that the main argument of his speeches for three departments, the setting up of the Northern Department,

the setting up of the Human Rights Agency and the abolishing of this one. I would say that all the consultation in the world is no good if you are not prepared to put the financial resources where your mouth is to provide programs and assistance after you carry out this consultation. The Liberal Government proved that they were prepared to back up their promises with hard cash to accomplish the objectives of the Indian people.

I am going to give you a couple of examples and I could give you many more of what the Government opposite mean by consultation. I would suggest that if this is their approach to consultation that what we have said regarding the assistance, support and help for Indian people will be practically nil. I want to refer to an event that took place last fall under the name of so-called consultation. September 25th, less than three months after taking office and after promising the FSI and the Metis Society, they carried out what they called consultation. And this was the headline: "Metis March on Premier."

Seventy Metis representatives demanded to see Premier Blakeney Friday afternoon after marching to his office to claim about the bad deal they were getting. When they received word that Premier Blakeney and his Ministers would not attend the meeting they decided to march to the Legislature Building. Mr. Bowerman arrived a half hour late at the meeting.

This is the type of consultation that Members opposite are talking about. These people who had taken the time to come to meet the Members of the Government and who believed the promise that was made last year before the election that there would be consultation, did they present the brief to the Minister? No. The Press clipping went on to say:

In a brief presented to Mr. Blakeney's secretary . . .

Mr. Blakeney's secretary accepted the brief on behalf of these people who had come for hundreds of miles to meet this so-called new Government with a New Deal for Indian People. Is this what they call consultation with our Indian and Metis friends? The Minister-in-Charge is late, the Premier and the other Members of his Cabinet won't meet them at all and then the Premier's secretary accepts the brief on behalf of the Government. After it was all over and after presenting the brief to Mr. Blakeney's secretary the group was taken on a tour of the building by an official guide. That was going to be the sop for not meeting the Cabinet, they were taken on a tour of the Legislative Building. And this, Mr. Speaker, is what our friends opposite tell us is consultation with our Indian and Metis friends. This is the type of promises made at election time and then within three months this is the way they act.

I want to refer to one other situation which I think shows very clearly what is meant by consultation as far as our friends opposite are concerned. And this is in relationship to the Cutbank project.

We all recognize that the Cutbank project had many difficulties to overcome due to location, due to being a new program, starting in at a time when the election was called and was on. Also because of Federal responsibility and the Federal desire to give the buildings over to the province as quickly as possible that some use had to be made of them at a rather early date.

April 5, 1972

However, a program was drawn up, was started, that could have been successful if Members opposite had just followed the practice of the former Government of consulting with the Indian people when it was possible to do after the program had become established. The Member for Shellbrook (Mr. Bowerman) is nodding his head. Well I will have him nodding his head a little more before I finish the sordid story and the sordid attitude that he took as a new Minister-in-Charge.

We heard on September 1st, this again was only a couple of months after they became the Government, that the Government plans to include proposals to give Indian and Metis participants in the program at Cutbank a voice in decision-making and to involve the people more at the management level. And if they had carried this out I am sure that today we wouldn't be talking the way we are about the attitude of our friends opposite.

Even the assistant to Mr. Bowerman, Art Lloyd, who was an unsuccessful candidate in the June 23rd election, talked with the participants and the staff at the site at Cutbank and told them they were going to take a first hand look at the problems. Jim Sinclair, Indian and Metis Department Deputy Minister, said 26 families and 15 single trainees went through the program the first year. So it was off to not a bad start, but again, we are not suggesting that changes were not necessary.

Mr. Cody: — Are you running out of . . .

Mr. Guy: — No, I just want to get my facts straight.

Ken Mackay, President of the Local Metis Society Branch at Cutbank said that there had been some major problems because of the number of Government agencies involved. This, of course, was true. It couldn't be avoided but there was no reason that consultation and co-operation between these various agencies and governments could not have been solved. But he did say that this site could really be something Indians and Metis could be proud of in the future if the Government would let the people get involved.

So you see we have the two situations now, Mr. Speaker. We have the Government promising that the Indian people would be involved, and the President of the Local Indian and Metis Society saying, "It could be a success if we are involved." So the two ingredients are there. You would expect that the two would be brought together and this whole situation would end in one great happy story.

But let's see if this is the case. But I want you to remember these two basic ingredients – the promise made by the Minister that there would be involvement. Nothing would be done without consultation with the local people. Then the Metis Society president saying that if this involvement takes place it could be a place that the Indian and Metis people could be proud of. They made several requests for additional courses and they said that the agricultural program had been reasonably successful so there was – and the point that I am trying to make here is that there was no suggestion at that time that they weren't prepared to carry on the program, to participate and see it grow.

So that was the situation on September 1st. Now let's

move on to November 25th, this is two months later. Let's see if this involvement is taking place and to the satisfaction of the Metis Society and is still as good as it was on the 1st of September when the promise was made.

We find out on November 25th that they are talking about closure, but the possibility of closure of the year old Indian and Metis Centre at Cutbank was apparently staved off Wednesday as the Metis Society of Saskatchewan and the Federation of Saskatchewan Indians were asked to submit a report on how they felt the project should be run. So in the two months the Government was talking about closing it down and the Indian and Metis had to call another meeting with the Government in order to stave off this closure. This was the result of the involvement and the co-operation that this Government had promised two months before. Closure was one alternative for the centre raised by Indian and Metis Minister, Mr. Bowerman.

You know it is significant, he has a one-track mind. The answer to solving the problems at Cutbank was closing it down. The answer to solving the problems of the Indian and Metis people was closing down the Indian and Metis Department. That is the only solution that he has to any of the problems that have arisen since he became the Minister. You know, Mr. Speaker, I hesitate really to know what I should call the Hon. Member for Shellbrook. He was Minister of Mineral Resources but they took that away from him. I can't call him that anymore. He can't be called the Minister of Northern Development because that Department hasn't gone through the Legislature and now we can't call him the Minister of the Indian and Metis Department because there isn't such a department any more. It is being abolished. So it is rather difficult to know what title we should give the Hon. Member. I think we can give him the title of the Minister of Closure which would probably be as apt as any.

A meeting was held on Wednesday afternoon at Cutbank involving Provincial and Federal Officials and the President of the Cutbank Local of the Metis Society, Ken Mackay – and I want you to get this – he said that this meeting was one of the best we have ever had. Mr. Mackay said that Mr. Bowerman indicated that the Government had no intention – now I want you to get that – had no intentions of closing the centre at present. Mr. Mackay said that Mr. Bowerman just about committed himself to administration of the centre by a Board of Directors composed of native people.

So here we have another meeting, another great promise of involvement, another promise, another commitment that it was going to be run by native people and the President of the Local Metis Society said, "This is the greatest thing that has ever happened. The nicest meeting that we have ever had with the gentleman from Shellbrook."

It certainly looks again that the idea of closure has gone completely out of the mind of the Minister. There is no longer any suggestion that it is going to be run just by white people. We got the commitment that it is going to be run by the Indian and Metis. We have the commitment that it is going to be kept open. This, Mr. Speaker, was on November 23rd.

Then Mr. Mackay went on and made it quite clear that his people were upset by possibilities of closure. Both the

April 5, 1972

Federation of Saskatchewan Indians and the Metis Society said the future of the project was in keeping it open. However, the Minister had still not made up his mind about keeping it open because an enrolment and teacher hiring freeze had been in effect at the Centre since November. Officials were called in to study the school.

So on one hand he is telling them Yes, we are going to keep it open. Don't worry. We have given you a commitment, but with the other hand, deviously beneath the surface, he is trying to find some excuse to close down the program.

This is one of the reasons why the Minister said that it wasn't very successful even though there were as many as 43 enrolled at one time. The Minister said that the Centre, as it stood, provided an unreal sort of operation in that it was so isolated. He said that it was unreasonable to bring northern Indian and Metis residents and to place them in the middle of the prairie environment for training.

And you know, Mr. Speaker, I agree with the Member from Shellbrook in that regard. It is difficult to bring northern people into this. But I want to remind you that the people who had come to Cutbank had come of their own free will and volition. But what was the alternative to bringing them from the North to the South and putting them at Cutbank? Well, a member of the Press asked Mr. Bowerman, "Well, what would you do then? Where would you put them?" Asked about what alternatives would be open to Cutbank residents should the Centre close, he said it would be more logical – get this, Mr. Speaker – it wasn't logical to put them in Cutbank in the middle of the prairie, but it would be more logical to place them in technical institutions in Saskatoon and build another one for them in Regina.

It is not logical to bring in Indians from the North to the South and put them at Outlook and Cutbank, but it is entirely logical to put them in Saskatoon or bring them further south and put them in Regina. So I suggest that it is not surprising that the events took place later shows a confusion in the mind of the Minister when he makes statements like that.

Mr. Mackay said that he expected the study – and this is important in view of what happened later – by the FSI and Metis Society which will cover such aspects of curriculum and the needs of the native people would be started soon. This was November 23rd. So here we have another meeting with the Government, the commitment that it would be kept open and the commitment that it would be staffed and managed by Indian and Metis people. And a commitment that a student would be carried out and nothing done until that study was completed.

Now let's look at December 23rd, one month later, one month after the promises and the commitments and the consultation of our friends opposite had taken place. It was reported by the Minister that the tiny community of Cutbank, comprised of a school farm complex and 40 houses is to become a virtual ghost town December 31st as the Cabinet decision to close the native training program takes effect. After the promises, after the commitments, after the pledges, and after a study which was being paid for partially by the Government, had been started they couldn't wait to get their sticky fingers in there and close it down. Less than one month after this great consultation had taken place, Mr. Bowerman said:

It has become completely impractical and exceedingly expensive to continue training programs at Cutbank and courses will cease before Christmas.

A great Christmas present for our Indian and Metis friends! Would you believe it, money before people!

Then he goes on and this is sort of interesting. I mentioned earlier that the study was going to be carried out. That the Provincial Government was going to assist in financing the study. Do you know where they were going to get the finances to assist in the study? They are going to close down Cutbank in order to save the money to pay for the study as it whether they keep it open.

Now this is the way our friends opposite operate. This is what the Minister said. The manager at Cutbank received a letter from the Minister stating that closure will help offset the \$28,400 cost of the Metis Society education study being financed by the province. They close it down and use the money saved to finance a study for something which now has become entirely obsolete.

Originally it had been thought by Mr. Mackay and other Metis Society members that closure of the program would not come at least until their study was completed. And they had every reason to believe that. The Minister had made the promise, he had made the commitment that the study would be carried out and that the Cutbank project would be kept open and in operation.

Mr. Mackay went on to say that he had been optimistic after a meeting late in November, which Mr. Bowerman produced plans for the study and it said at that time:

The possibility of closure has been staved off. Mr. Bowerman said that the money would be forwarded shortly for the study and that delays were unavoidable.

You just don't turn out approval just like that. However, we recall that Saskatoon Aid grant that came within four days and yet they couldn't do it for our Indian and Metis friends.

So, Mr. Speaker, when we hear comments from our Government opposite regarding consultation these are only two examples of what the consultation process means to them. It means, in both cases, the breaking of their word, the breaking of their promises and the failure to keep the commitments that they make to the Indian and Metis people. It is no wonder that the Indian people today are becoming disenchanted and fed up with the Government opposite.

The Government has failed to come up with an approach that is more positive than shrugging off their responsibility by abolishing the Indian and Metis Department. Since this is no answer to solving the problems of our Indian and Metis people there is no way that we can support this in second reading.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Faris: — Mr. Speaker, would the Hon. Member permit a question. Has the Hon. Member ever visited the Cutbank project?

Mr. Guy: — Yes, I have been there long before you ever saw the place.

Mr. J.G. Richards (Saskatoon University): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to support this Bill in second reading I can at least agree with the speaker who has just taken his seat, that Bill No. 70 in and of itself, does not constitute adequate government policy with respect to native problems.

I think, however, that even the Hon. Member opposite was not really expecting that Bill No. 70 was the entirety of the approach of this Government to the problems of native affairs. And he might allow that Bill No. 69 which deals with a creation of a Human Resources Agency in Saskatchewan and Bill No. 67 dealing with the Department of Northern Affairs, had some marginal connection with the problems of native people. Maybe this satire is too much for the Members opposite, but I think that we are all willing to allow the abolition of one departmental agency does not suffice.

However, I think another point is well taken that he made, that in the 20 years of CCF government from 1944 to 1964 we didn't pay adequate attention to the problems of native people. We intend, during this period, to make redress for that imbalance. It would be very easy now to start quoting statistics about native poverty, about the incidence of disease, about the average life expectancy of native people relative to whites, etc., etc. It would be very easy to imply great liberal virtues of which we are all proud.

However, liberals virtues of compassion and tolerance and sympathy for the plight of native people are certainly not going to suffice. And the most important reason they do not suffice is a very simple one and a very hard one to face — there exists racism in our society. Racism is quite simply the formation of attitudes about individuals on the basis of alleged racial characteristics. The alleged racial characteristics of Indians are drunkenness, laziness and on the other hand the alleged racial characteristics of white which native people may hold of being hypocritical, or being greedy, etc. Racism does exist in our society, in the sense that I have defined it. And we have to live with the ugly reality among us and we are not going to get rid of it by pretending it doesn't exist. In some sense there is a similarity between where we are in Saskatchewan in 1972 with where the United States was, in certain southern states with respect to their racial problems in 1962, even in 1952. The organizations of native people in Saskatchewan bear remarkable parallels to some of the more moderate early organizations of black people in the United States such as the NAACP, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and the Urban League.

And the next logical question to ask, Mr. Speaker, is whether we are going to be able to avoid the ugly progress of racial intolerance in America. Are we going to be able to avoid the dynamics of violence which has struck every large American city which has struck into the heart of American society? The ten per cent of our population of Saskatchewan which is of Indian or Metis background is not dissimilar in proportion to the proportion of blacks in the United States but unlike the blacks in the United States in the last decade the native

population in our country has been relatively submerged, has been unseen, unheard. Let us not talk about violence as if it is something which is an alien word to raise. All that happens now is that violence is turned primarily inwards and it's a question of native person against native person. The question is whether it is going to be turned outwards and whether it is going to affect the entirety of our society. I speak with some personal experience having lived on the edge of a ghetto of a large American city and experienced a triple murder three blocks away. Friends move out of an apartment with a murder in that apartment. Friends move out with an arson in the building next door. It is not pleasurable to contemplate the extent to which racial tensions can escalate if they are not solved. They are not going to be solved as I said at the beginning merely by liberal virtues of tolerance, compassion and the quoting of statistics about poverty.

It is an unfortunate reality of political life that "politicians in general react, they don't act." There I am paraphrasing a statement made by a senator of the United States with respect to another issue, the issue of the Vietnam war. But it is going to be a challenge to us to see whether we can as new Democratic party Government, as a socialist Government act in some other way than by reacting to pressures generated by each successive crisis. But given the truth of the aphorism that politicians in general react they don't act there is going to be a lot of confrontation, there is going to be a lot of tension in the next decade as native people organize in attempt to redress the injustices and the imbalances. It is going to require a superhuman amount of tolerance on the part of us as white people in power, in governments, whether it be as Members of the Legislature or actually on the treasury benches as Cabinet Ministers, to be able to respond constructively to that confrontation and not destructively. Now we have before us the disastrous experiences of racial conflict in the United States which at all costs we must avoid.

In conclusion I wish the native people of Saskatchewan well in their struggles. It must be they who lead but we have a role to play in laying out the path before them and in making the situation to be as amenable as possible to peaceful change. We must put our hearts, our moneys, and our minds, to the task.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. J.C. McIsaac (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to say just a few words on this particular Bill. The purpose of the Bill is very simple. The Act is certainly one of the shortest ones we shall be dealing with in this Session, because it will repeal the present Indian and Metis Department. I want to support some of the arguments put forth by my colleague from Athabasca (Mr. Guy) and I am sure after listening to the Member from Saskatoon University (Mr. Richards) support some of the points he was making. The Minister who brought this Bill in, Mr. Speaker, did so because of a personal vendetta against this Indian and Metis Department. Obviously the Government opposite has no fear of new or additional departments because we are setting up, I believe, four or five new ones at this Session. But it is quite evident from the Minister's statements throughout the last few years both in the House and outside the House, in the course of the campaign, and the course of introducing the Bill that he has intended from day one to sabotage this department. And I can

certainly say too that it is quite evident that the Government, Saskatchewan, from Bill 69, the Department of Human Resources that they are establishing and from Bill 70 (the umbrella department if we might call it that for northern Saskatchewan) that they obviously do propose to attempt at least to carry out the same functions with a few name changes, perhaps a different approach and some legislative foot work in essence to try and do the same job that this department was set up for. I think, Mr. Speaker, that no discussion on this particular Bill, to repeal the Indian and Metis Department can be complete without some reference to the former Premier of this Province, the late Ross Thatcher.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. McIsaac: — The Indian and Metis Department was established by the former administration, the Liberal administration and in particular by the former Premier, the late Ross Thatcher, the Member for Morse. As a matter of fact the very points that were raised and the very concerns expressed by the Member for Saskatoon University (Mr. Richards) were often expressed by the Premier in the course of discussion on this Department in introducing the Bill. He made those very same remarks time and again. Because certainly he did recognize the need both now and the possible danger if nothing was done to try and remedy the problem of the native people, if you want to call it problem and it certainly is. The former Premier was determined to do all in his power to try and avoid that kind of situation developing as my Hon. friend opposite has referred to the situation in the United States, the racial picture down there.

Certainly there may have been some opposition from time to time to this Department, Mr. Speaker, from certain of the leaders of the various native groups. There certainly was opposition from the party opposite at almost every step of the way, but let me say this, Mr. Speaker, there was no opposition from the rank and file Indian and Metis of the province. Because they knew it to be a sincere effort to help them. It was the first piece of legislation of its kind in Canada, Mr. Speaker. It represented a new attempt to help the native Canadian people, it was a meaningful effort and one that produced results, Mr. Speaker, and a successful effort. It was backed with dollars, it was backed with effort and as I say it emphasized not only the plight of the native people but the indifference or the disinterest if you like, or the misinformation of Canadian white society with respect to that particular problem. It was open recognition of one of the major social problems in Canada today and the former Premier, Ross Thatcher, made it his business to get on practically every reserve in this Province. He saw their problems first hand to an extent that no Canadian political leader ever did before, or since.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. McIsaac: — He saw too that Federal policies were inadequate and that the real problems of Indian and Metis in Canada were not being solved by welfareism and by more bureaucracy. He recognized and the former Liberal Government recognized that our native people needed not only encouragement, but they needed financial help and they needed new and different approaches to upgrading their living standards and their education standards. We

went ahead also with the establishment of the Indian and Metis Task Force which went along with the Department, in our effort in this regard and that Task Force brought together people from industry, from the various Government agencies and from the various churches, unions and other groups in our society whom we felt at that time must share some of this responsibility in correcting the problem. As the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) pointed out, life on the reserves in Saskatchewan was helped by many measures. Grid roads and other roads were built, electricity was brought to hundreds of homes and the homes themselves were improved, new and otherwise, the living standard in general upgraded and upgraded considerably, during the lifetime of this Department we now propose to abolish.

The very bread and butter type of improvements if you like, Mr. Speaker, that the former CCF Government spoke of in such pious platitudes only to turn around, and as the Member for Athabasca pointed out, never really get off the ground in implementing or doing.

I want to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Indian and Metis Department that was established by the late Premier of this Province represents the most significant piece of human rights legislation that ever was introduced into this House, up to this point in time.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. McIsaac: — The most meaningful piece of legislation of its type we have seen.

Members opposite like to talk and the Member from Shellbrook (Mr. Bowerman) is no exception. They like to talk about human rights and so on but so often the hot air evaporates before any action ever materializes. And this Bill that we are repealing, I want to point out again, was a most sincere and a most successful effort to help our native people. And there were programs there and they were backed up with millions of provincial dollars. Once again, I am sure that the Hon. Minister from Shellbrook can recall the former Premier was no great spender when it came to spending money. He did put every dollars that we could into this one but there was always a point and he would always say this was one problem of Government that could not be solved by more and more dollars and called for a good deal more than money. While money would solve most problems that any Government faced, this certainly wasn't one of these problems. I think of the programs in educational upgrading, not all of them Federally supported, the Cutbank one was an example of one that was, and there were others of course that were largely Federally supported. But I think of the adult five to ten program that was brought in with respect to upgrading, that program is used almost all across Canada and in the other States in the United States today, it's used by Federal Manpower and this came about largely as a result of efforts under the Indian and Metis Department.

Trade training programs such as the heavy duty equipment operators' course, Mr. Speaker, the placing of these people into jobs with hospitals, Crown corporations, Civil Service and the establishment of native people on farms, on decent sized farms, was accomplished under this new Department that we are setting out to abolish. I'm sure some of the Members opposite will

April 5, 1972

recall the 40-acre plot, the NDP plan for Green Lake, I'm sure the Member for Meadow Lake and there are other Members over there, are well aware of that plan, typically socialist, completely unrealistic and consequently a complete failure, but we did implement agricultural policy and platform with respect to establishing Indian and native people on farms on the reserve and off the reserve. It has been a success. It has been a slow process but certainly, Mr. Speaker, advances have been made in this regard.

Now the native people, just for the record, Mr. Speaker, themselves, were very definitely involved in the development and the implementation of these various policies. And I hope, Mr. Speaker, that they will be in the future, involved in the development of these policies. And I also hope that sociologists and other social experts aren't allowed to dominate the new agencies and the new efforts that the Minister is going to put forth. Because sometimes they get caught up in rhetoric of planning and forget the purposes for which they really are there for. I want to wish him well in his efforts to continue the work that was begun so well under this Department.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. F. Meakes (Touchwood): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak to this Bill before us, I really had no intention of speaking until the Hon. Member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy) got up to speak. I will only speak for a very few moments. I do want to remark on a couple of the remarks by Hon. friend from Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac) made. I want to say that if you check the records of the House I believe you will find that when this Bill was brought in that most Members in the Opposition supported it. I know that I did and I remember exactly what I said. I supported it with reservations. I thought it was a worthwhile effort to try it out. I would agree with the Hon. Member that I believe the Government was sincere at the time but I really have to disagree with him that it was successful. I again say that I voted for it with reservations.

The next three years I spent much of my time talking to the native people of my constituency and at no time at that time, the early part, did I say that it wasn't going to work. The reason I rose mainly was the fact that the Hon. Member for Athabasca, I am sorry he is not in his seat, said that the native people were not consulted. Well, I want to say this, that during the campaign itself, 1971 in June, I visited every home on the five reserves in my constituency and in every home I left this card which was the New Deal for the Indian and Metis program.

The first item on that program was a promise, if desired, to completely overhaul, or if desired by the Indian and Metis organization, abolish the Indian and Metis Department. And if the Department was retained it was to be staffed and operated largely by Indian and Metis.

I might say that when I look at the returns of the election in Touchwood, when I look at the returns of the different reserves, I feel that the action that I am taking in supporting doing away with this Department and the bringing in of a program in another department, which will I believe help the Indian and Metis people better, it was overwhelming the support I got. This may sound like boasting, on one reserve I got a 6 to 1

vote, another one I got 3 to 1, 2½ to 1, 4 to 1, and about 3 to 1½. So I just want to say that I do feel that the native people of my constituency and I believe all the constituencies, were consulted in the election. I know for a fact that the Minister since the election has continued to consult with the organizations.

One other remarks before I sit down because I said I was only going to speak for a minute or two. I want to react to a statement from the Member from Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac) when he said the Government prior to 1964 had done nothing. I will admit we never did as much as should have like to have done, but I can remember the Minister of Municipal Affairs and myself meeting with the Indian Affairs Department in Ottawa a number of times hoping to come up with some kind of an agreement such as was done later. I'm not trying to take all the credit for it but I believe that much of the work that was done by the Government prior to 1964 and continued by the Government of my Hon. friend when they were in power. It was the back work of coming to an agreement for the two governments being able to work together.

I have no hesitation in supporting the doing away with the Indian and Metis Department. As far as I am concerned I feel I have had the go ahead signals by the support that I have had from the native people both at the election time and after.

I think the other charges, Mr. Speaker, can be best answered by the Minister himself but I did have to make this statement clear that as far as I am concerned, I have consulted with my native people in the three years after the Department was formed and the election campaign, their verdict, their support of myself in those polls, as far as I am concerned gave me the authority and the right to come in here and support the actions of this Government.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. E. Kramer (Minister of Natural Resources): — Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to say very much on this particular Bill but there are a few things that a few people may not know about the whole picture of the treatment of native people in this Province. I have been around this Province for a while, a bit longer than the boxstall physician from Spud Island who just sat down and he hasn't learned much since he came here either judging by the tirade and the noise that was made and the amount of wisdom that he brought forth. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if these people would like to go back and look at the treatment of native people in this Province. Let us remember that the native people, the real native people, always have been and still are under the jurisdiction of a Liberal Government most of the time with a few little breaks for Tories, the Government at Ottawa, that's where the responsibility lies mainly for welfare of the native people. We have the responsibility for the Metis. And I say that over the years, until a very few years ago that that Government at Ottawa failed miserably in their handling of the native people. All that the Indian reservations in their opinion were a catch pit for defunct politicians to be Indian agents. That's the story. That's the story of the Liberal policies of the former Liberal Governments in this Province.

I will give credit for an honest attempt and I think possibly as the Member for Touchwood said, and that Members across the floor said, that some honest attempts were made but the whole thing was that it started off on the wrong foot. I said this at the time, that the name, the Indian and Metis Department, was a segregation in itself. That was the first thing. That is segregation and it would continue to be segregation as long as we left that apartheid name on it, because you do segregate and they did segregate, actually, when they set up that Department. That is the main reason that I am supporting this Bill. Let us not forget that history shows that in 1944 when the CCF Government came into power that the natives in the northern part of this Province were dying faster than they were being born after having been exploited by the Hudson Bay Company traders and the whiskey traders and all those people who would filch their livelihood. They were dying faster than they were being born, Mr. Speaker, from every disease that the white man could bring them, from every invasion that was made by the whiskey peddlers and the traders, leaving nothing behind but poverty. To take what little fur and what little fish the native produced. The only time the native was noticed by the people that exploited them was during the fishing season and they'd bring the nets put them out on the lakes and they would offer them a dime a pound for the first pull. By the time they got off the lake, once they got them fishing they were lucky to get a couple of cents a pound. And then as soon as the fish market was glutted, off they went again leaving the natives with nothing but a headache because when they got through buying their fish they peddled the liquor to them so that they could get the money back. That's the story.

Mr. MacDonald (Milestone): — What did you do?

Mr. Kramer: — What did we do? I'll tell you what we did, I'm just coming to that. Immediately . . .

Mr. McIsaac: — Did you . . . tell us . . .

Mr. Kramer: — Yes, I'm telling you. Sit there and listen. You just sit back on your bale of hay, Mr. Member from Wilkie, and I'll tell you.

Immediately we brought health care into the North. Hospitals into the North. We brought nursing care to the North. We brought food to the northern people. This is all again a matter of history. In that 20 years, and here's the proof and even you should be able to understand this, Mr. Member from Wilkie, that instead of the population of the North dying faster than it was being born, it became in those 20 years the fastest growing population with the exception of five areas in the world. I am going to tell you . . .

Mr. MacDonald (Milestone): — Did you pay for . . .

Mr. Kramer: — Did we pay for their hospitalization? We did a whole lot more than was ever done before.

Mr. MacDonald (Milestone): — The Federal Government . . .

Mr. Kramer: — The Federal Government, very well. Mr. Speaker, those treaties were disregarded in those days until there was some action by Saskatchewan on behalf of the Metis people and the Liberals were shamed into it by the former CCF Government.

Mr. Speaker, history shows and here are the facts, and anybody that has any sense in their heads at all and wants to listen, knows that you do not, Mr. Speaker, have a fast-growing population unless that population is reasonably well fed and healthy. The only mistake that was made was the fact that when they received some education, when they improved the health standards, the people of that day thought like a white man thinks, that all of a sudden they were going to move out into society and that they were going to take advantage of the outside world. Which they didn't and which they won't, time has proven this. We were well on the way and I am sure that when the Minister gets up to close this debate he will enlarge on this because he knows more about the North than I do.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to remind this House that that was where we were at in about 18 or 19 years after going from absolute desolation and poverty to a situation where we had a problem to know what we were going to do with the fast-growing native population. That wasn't the situation in 1944 and that's the point I want to make. If we had left the situation as it was under Liberal administrations at Ottawa and Saskatchewan we wouldn't have a problem in the North now, the native people would have all been dead.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. D.L. Faris (Arm River): — Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to speak in support of this Bill to abolish the Department because the matter of the Cutbank program has been raised and the Cutbank project is contained within the Arm River constituency. It has been said by the Member from Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac) that from time to time there was opposition to the Indian and Metis Department. Well if from time to time is another way of saying all the time then that is true. He says that the native people were involved in the development of policies. Well let's look at the Cutbank project. I've spoken to the leaders of the FSI concerning their consultation in regard to the Cutbank project and they said there was none. I spoke to the Metis Association leaders in regard to their consultation and they said there was none. I spoke to the native people who were at the Cutbank project about what they had to say about the establishment of the project, that answer is there was none. Previously I asked the Member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy) whether he had ever visited the Cutbank project and I asked him for the very reason that the native people at that project told me that they had never met the Minister-in-Charge of that project prior to meeting Mr. Bowerman. I think it is a very important fact that in this last election that when the people at that Cutbank project, in a separate poll, had the opportunity to express whether they were for the New Deal for People program for themselves, which involved a complete relooking at that project and at the Indian and Metis Department, they voted 2 to 1 for the New Democratic Party.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to support this Bill. I believe that removing this piece of legislation will remove a piece of legislation that in fact had ingrained in the law books

April 5, 1972

of Saskatchewan, racial distinctions that I don't like to see in this Province. I will support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. C.P. MacDonald (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, I can't help but get up after that pile of "guff" that we listened to from the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Kramer), talking about northern Saskatchewan and all they did for the Indians. You tell me of one five cent piece that the NDP Government spent in 20 years on the Indian population in the North. It was a Federal responsibility and you know it. You never built a house for the Indians, you never built a single street. You go up to the Indian homes in the North and the deprivation and the degradation and the poverty in 1964 was the same as it ever was. You never contributed a cent, you never did a thing for the native people, you never assumed any responsibility whatsoever.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say one word about this Bill, this is more of the window dressing that we have been talking about ever since the present Government came to power. If you will look at the Estimate book it is going to give you an indication of the change of directions that the socialists are going to turn this new Department of Human Resources. You know there is one thing about Ross Thatcher, he was willing to put his cash where his mouth was. Mr. Speaker, a few years ago the Indian people and Metis people in this Province were getting nothing. Last year in the Budget the then Premier brought the Indian and Metis Department up to \$2,418,000. This year do you know what is being spent on the Department of Human Resources which is supposed to have expanded responsibilities, \$2,401,000.

But the thing that I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, is that the Premier Ross Thatcher had one idea and one concept, he said the way to help those people is to give them equal job opportunities, give them a little dignity and a little self responsibility and a little self respect, and so he started a placement service where he would assist these Indian and Metis people in Saskatchewan to find jobs. Not only, Mr. Speaker, in the Government and the Civil Service but also in private industry. Do you know what they have done this year? The new Human Resources has been cut by over 100 per cent the number of placement officers. Is it any wonder that this Government is spending an additional \$16 million in welfare in this Province? They are not interested in finding jobs for the Indian people, they are interested in more handouts and a bunch of window dressing. This Bill, Mr. Speaker, means absolutely nothing to the native people of Saskatchewan in dollars and cents and in programs, except window dressing and nothing, as I say, nothing but window dressing. Not a single new program, not a single new dollar, not a single new effort. It's a new name and that's all. I think if the New Minister of Northern Affairs and the Minister of Human Resources (Mr. Bowerman) wants to demonstrate some interest for the native people he'll talk the Provincial Treasurer into giving them a little money, he'll talk the Provincial Treasurer into giving him a few people to find them some jobs. It's going to be very interesting.

I hope the Minister gets up when he closes debate and tells us how many people of native extraction are working for the Government of Saskatchewan eight months after they have been in office, because we are certainly going to be asking them when

we get into Estimates. We haven't heard anything about any effort anymore to find jobs for native people but I hope they are continuing. What efforts are you making to find jobs for native people in industry and private concerns, because if there is one thing we need for the native people it isn't more welfare, it isn't more handouts, it's jobs and effort and people. That's something that this new Bill doesn't offer. It doesn't offer a single thing to the native people. You can get up and have all your pious platitudes and all your high-sounding phrases and all the nonsense that the Minister of Natural Resources talks about but until you are willing to put your dollars where your mouth is, this Bill doesn't mean a thing.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. P.P. Mostoway (Hanley): — Mr. Speaker, I should just like to say a few words on this Bill. Now the reason for that is in my constituency I have a small reserve, called the Moosewoods Reserve and it is sitting around Dundurn. No doubt you have heard about it. In dry weather very often they put on a rain dance and there is no doubt that it has been effective at times. Now prior to the election, Mr. Speaker, I visited the Moosewoods Reserve out at Dundurn and I found conditions deplorable. I don't think I have to say that because I think everyone would agree that this is common throughout the province. But one thing that I wanted to tell you is that when I went out there and did a little bit of electioneering, it was minor, they were simply amazed because I didn't offer any promises at all. They couldn't believe this at all. Now I must admit that promises had been offered to them for years and years and years right through the reigns of various different governments.

An Hon. Member: — . . . \$1 a vote.

Mr. Mostoway: — I don't know, apparently it didn't work there anyway. I think it came out about half and half. But I do want to say that there appears to be a little bit of inconsistency on the part of the last speaker, he says put your money where your mouth is. Well, first of all he condemns us for not expending vast sums of money for these native people and in the same breath he says, well, what we should really be doing is creating jobs for them. Well, I don't think I have to remind him that we can't really create jobs, we can try and induce people to hire other people, but this is sometimes a very difficult task. I think the Opposition Members are well aware of that. There is no politics involved there, but how do you get employers to hire them. That's a horse of a different color. I am quite sure that this Government and previous Governments have tried to do that.

One thing I would like to say is that the old Indian and Metis Department apparently wasn't working and I am willing to support any kind of a change. I quote the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) who insofar as industry is concerned said, well, at least we didn't stand idly by, we went out and tried something. So it is on those grounds that I would say that I would support the Bill. It's an attempt to try and make some changes. I would just say, just hold up a little while, and give us a few years, and see how it operates, and just reserve your criticism for a little while, and see how it operates. It is on that basis that I support the Bill, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. H.E. Coupland (Meadow Lake): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to rise and say a few words in this debate. I don't think too many Members in the House have more people who were directly involved in this Department than the Member for Meadow Lake. I see already they have taken off half my seat and they are mostly people who will be involved in this Department. I am very, very sorry, Mr. Speaker, to see this Department being abolished. Needless to say I will oppose this Bill. I can't understand, as some of them have already mentioned here, for the former Premier of the Government who first had the intestinal fortitude to actually go out and set up a Department and try to do something for native people in this Province and then to have the Members opposite when they were in Opposition going around the province and running down the Department at every opportunity they could. I don't see why when they were so concerned with these people that they couldn't have just done a little reforming in this Department if they wanted to change the way it was operating and put a sincere effort into doing what the Member from Saskatoon University (Mr. Richards) said, instead of trying to throw out this Department. The only reason for doing so that I can see is that it seemed an easy way of getting rid of a lot of civil servants that they didn't want.

The Minister mentions that he has consulted with the Metis Society and the Saskatchewan Federation of Indians. I wonder how much consultation he has had with the other 80 per cent of the natives in the province. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that those two groups don't speak for not even half the native people in the province.

You know, Mr. Speaker, we have heard some of them say that the Indian and Metis Branch wasn't working. Well I have here, Mr. Speaker, a copy of a petition that was sent to the Minister when they did get rid of a civil servant who was working for the Indian and Metis Department. This petition is signed by over 250 natives.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Coupland: — They are in essence saying that they want the Indian and Metis Branch and it was doing a good job for them in their area. This is what it says, read it, it says they want . . .

Mr. Bowerman: — It doesn't say that.

Mr. Coupland: — It does, it says they want him to stay there. All right I'll read it.

We the undersigned residents of the Buffalo Narrows area request that the transfer of Alex Shatilla be cancelled and this man continue working in the Buffalo Narrows area. We have found him to be very co-operative and very sincere in any dealings that we have had with him.

This is the man who was working and operating the programs of the Indian and Metis Department in that area. I want to say that this petition was not instigated by anybody but a group of natives who went out on their own and got names from Dillon, Patuanak, Turner Lake, LaLoche, Buffalo Narrows. This is the

best indication that the native people want to keep the Indian and Metis Branch. That's why, Mr. Speaker, I will be opposing this Bill.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. G.R. Bowerman (Minister of Indian and Metis): — Mr. Speaker, I want to express my appreciation to those of my colleagues who have spoken, as well as some Members from the other side who have given this matter their consideration. I most of all appreciate the comments that were made by my colleague from Saskatoon University (Mr. Richards). I think he applied what might be considered the broader point of view which all too frequently is lost in the nuts and bolts of debate and in the political interchange which goes on in this particular place.

I want, before I say anything of myself, to read into the record of this House what the representatives of the Indian people in Saskatchewan have said with respect to this Department which we are debating here today or this Bill which will repeal the Department. This was taken from the Leader-Post dated December 27th, I quote:

Native leaders are pleased the Indian and Metis Department portfolio may be eliminated early in 1972. David Ahenakew, chief of the Federation of Saskatchewan Indians said Thursday, dissolution of the Department should have happened a long time ago.

Jim Sinclair, president of the Metis Society of Saskatchewan is not quite as enthusiastic, but said he was generally in favor of closure.

Chief Ahenakew told the Leader-Post that elimination of the Department would be a positive approach. Programs benefitting native people should be handled by the various other departments.

Mr. Speaker, this is really the emphasis which we want to leave with the House this afternoon in the closing of this debate.

These officials speaking on behalf of the people who elect them, representative of the two respective Indian Associations in this Province have very clearly and decisively stated that the Saskatchewan Indian and Metis Department was not doing to job which it was intended to do, that being to provide for the assistance and the upgrading of people in the Indian and Metis communities. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I say that all of the discussion that would go on here is irrelevant to that point, that it does not indicate that which the Indian people have said themselves with respect to the repeal of this Department.

So I say that the opposition which has been voiced this afternoon is again an indication of the same kind of opposition which was voiced by us when we sat in Opposition and was suggested to the Government at that time that if they had consultation with the people of Indian ancestry and if in fact these people were requesting that this Department be established then indeed we would be in favor of it. We find that this was not the case. There was considerable amount of discussion about the consultation with Indian people. I want to refer the

Members in the Opposition to the year 1964 shortly after they became government in this Province. They held a rather large meeting of Indian people in Saskatoon. The minutes of that meeting I have on previous occasions read into the records of this Legislature. The records that are recorded there indicated to the Government of that day that the Indian people wished them to go very slowly and they would not proceed on any programs affecting the lives of Indian people in this Province until they were consulted, and consulted about the matters which would affect them. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the Members of the Opposition, and to all Members of this House, that subsequent to that first meeting in 1964 there was not another meeting held, there was not another meeting held with the Indian people in this Province. They did indicate to the Government that they wanted to go slow and they wanted the Government to consult with them and they did not want the Government to proceed unless they had indicated their wishes to proceed in such a way. I suggest to you that the statement which I have quoted to you coming from the chief of the Federation of Saskatchewan Indians and coming as well from the president of the Metis Society for Saskatchewan, is a voice which represents the Indian people of this Province. May I say to the Members again in the Opposition and to the Members of the House that it is the policy of this Government that we will recognize the representative associations of Indian people, that we will not segregate or we will not break down or we will not diffuse the efforts which they are putting in to establishing on a firm basis representative organization among their people. I say that the representative organization to this date in the province is the Metis Society of Saskatchewan and is the Federation of Saskatchewan Indians. We will support those representative voices and we will provide to those representative organizations grants and funds in order that they might speak on behalf of the people of this Province, so that they might be representative, that those associations might be representative of their people in the province.

One needs only to ask the Indian people of this Province whether they wish to be placed in jobs in the manner in which they were placed in jobs under the former administration. I say to you that one of the things which people, any one of us would want to be recognized for, is our ability to do the job, our ability, our skill, whatever qualities that we might have that would qualify us for the position. I say that the position that Indian and Metis people were in in the job placement program under the previous administration did not consider that to be a prime requisite among Indian people. The matter of placing Indian people in this Province in jobs was on the basis of the percentage that they represent in the population. In other words, the attitude and the impression was left that here is a person of Indian ancestry, he is able to do a job, we bring him to an industry and we say to industry you must hire him, you must move the people aside and here you must hire one Indian person for every seven whites that you have in this industry. It left the kind of injustice in the minds of these people which has been in their mind and which in fact has been the way that our society, our Canadian society has established itself with respect to Indian people since the foundation of the country itself. If a person is qualified, if a person has the desire to fit into a job he will then if the opportunity is provided him, fit into that position, feeling much more secure and feeling much more as if he has qualified for the job than under the arrangements which were provided

under the Indian and Metis Department previously.

I want to say again that the comments with respect to consultation with Indian people in the province, I believe to have been more than outstanding with respect to this Government's approach. I say that we have provided a grant of \$28,400 to the people at Cutbank for a proposal which they made, a proposal which they put together, a proposal which asked for that amount of money in order that they might consult with their people in the Province of Saskatchewan, in order that they might undertake a survey of their own people with respect to education and training requirements of Indian people in the Province of Saskatchewan. I say that that program is progressing very well. They themselves are doing this survey, they themselves are doing the study. There are very few strings attached so far as the Government is concerned in placing that money in their hands other than the accounting responsibility which we all have. Therefore, I say to you that I don't know how better we can consult with the native peoples of this Province, better than to provide them with the funds whereby they might undertake the study, whereby they may be employed in searching out some of the difficulties which they know and recognize are difficulties not only among their own society and among their own people, but are difficulties that must be resolved by them and by us in a co-operative approach in the road ahead.

In addition to that we have provided as I said in the House the other day, we have provided additional grants to the Metis Society, to the Federation of Saskatchewan Indians and to other persons who have been appointed, to undertake consultation programs with people of Indian ancestry. This has met with their approval and with their satisfaction to this point.

The Members referred to Cutbank and I only want to deal with it briefly because of some of the comments that were made by the Member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy). He was not in his seat when the MLA for the constituency representing that area indicated that the people of Cutbank told me as well as the Member representing them that they had not seen any Cabinet Minister of the former Government in Cutbank since they had been there, including the Member from Athabasca although he said he had been there. The Member from Athabasca read the quotation from the Press very, very carefully in order to be able to present his own position, and of course that we can understand. I want to say that some of the costs involved in the training of one student at Cutbank, was in the neighborhood of \$20,000 to \$25,000. When the people at Cutbank were given this advice and indicated that this was the cost that was involved they of their own choice decided that there may be a better way out, that they may be able to use the money to a much better advantage than to sit in Cutbank, a place established wherein they had no consultation, had no voice in the way of setting up of Cutbank, they were placed there and yes they took advantage of the opportunity to be there in order that they might raise their aspirations, their hopes and their skills in some kind of educational process. I want to say that it came to my attention that we had instructors driving from Moose Jaw to Cutbank who would spend the day at Cutbank to teach one student in a welding course, and had them driving back to Moose Jaw the same day. We felt, and do did the residents of Cutbank, that this was very unwise and certainly not justified. In addition when they were made aware of this, they chose to go the other way, they chose to study the matter and to advise the Government the way in which they

April 5, 1972

thought we should go.

The Member from Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac) referred to the programs of the former Department and I want to commend those programs that were useful in the other Departments. The repeal of this Department and the setting up of the Human Resources Development Agency will continue to utilize those programs, but those programs themselves will be transferred to the program departments. The placement and training which was carried on under this particular department will be carried on under the Department of Education and the Department of Social Welfare and other departments relative thereto. Therefore, the expenditures of funds which he refers as not appearing in the Estimates will appear as having been going to the other program departments and there they will find their place. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this approach is in conjunction with the Chief of the Federation of Saskatchewan Indians had to say in the quotation which I read to you earlier which he made to the Press. It is also in keeping with the recommendations of the Metis Society, although they have been less willing to suggest that there has been sufficient consultation between myself and themselves in the development of this program, and I lay that before you honestly. But, I say to you that when the president of the Metis Society was questioned he said there must be a change that in fact the Department as it presently existed could not and would not satisfy the needs of Indian people in this Province. Mr. Speaker, I therefore am pleased to move second reading of this Bill.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division:

YEAS – 41
Messieurs

Blakeney	Dyck	Meakes
Wood	Romanow	Messer
Snyder	Bowerman	Kramer
Thibault	Larson	Baker
Brockelbank	MacMurchy	Pepper
Michayluk	Byers	Thorson
Whelan	Kwasnica	Carlson
Engel	Tchorzewski	Richards
Owens	Robbins	Matsalla
Cowley	Taylor	Faris
Cody	Gross	Mostoway
Comer	Rolfes	Lange
Hanson	Oliver	Feschuk
Kaeding	Flasch	

NAYS – 15
Messieurs

Steuart	Coupland	Loken
Guy	Grant	Boldt
MacDonald (Milestone)	McIsaac	Gardner
Weatherald	MacLeod	McPherson
Lane	MacDonald (Moose Jaw N)	Wiebe

The Assembly adjourned at 5:30 o'clock p.m.