

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Second Session — Seventeenth Legislature
31st Day

Friday, April 7, 1972.

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

INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS

Hon. A.E. Blakeney (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, it gives me a good deal of pleasure to introduce to you and through you to this House some special guests who are seated behind the rail. I should like to introduce Senator L.D. Christianson, the minority leader in the State Senate of the State of North Dakota. With him are Mrs. Christianson and their three children, Jill, David and Kirk. I know that all Members of the House would like to extend a particularly warm welcome to Senator Christianson and his family both because we extend our greetings to them personally and because we wish to extend our greetings to them as representatives of the neighborly and friendly State of North Dakota.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. P.P. Mostoway (Hanley): — Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to introduce to this House, a group of boys on your left, of Grade Eleven and Twelve students from Allan School, accompanied by their two teachers, Mr. Flahr and Mr. Darichuk. Now, Mr. Speaker, you may or may not know, but if not, I am going to tell you that Allan is the potash, swish and kuhah capital of the world. The last one you eat. Now it is my hope that they enjoy their visit to Regina this afternoon and gain first-hand experience on how the Government of Saskatchewan operates. I know that we all wish them a safe and happy journey home.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. F. Meakes (Touchwood): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to introduce to you and through you a group of Grade Ten high school pupils from the town of Kelliher under the care of their teacher, Mr. Ledingham and their bus driver, Don Volman. I hope that their stay here today is educational and we wish them all a safe journey home.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. A. Thibault (Melfort-Kinistino): — Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to introduce once again a group of high school students from Birch Hills High School. They are led there today by their teacher, Mr. Grant Gets and Mr. Dick True. The bus driver is Mr. Lyn Cox. They visited the University this morning and I know that their trip here will be very educational and I certainly wish them a safe journey home.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. E.F. Flasch (Maple Creek): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to introduce to you and to this Assembly a group of some 50 students from the Prelate School representing the Grade Seven, Eight and Nine classes in that school, who have come some 240 miles to witness this Legislature in Session. They are accompanied by two of their teachers, Mr. Engel and Mr. Kot, who are also with them in the east gallery behind me. They are also accompanied by a group of drivers and some of their wives seated in the Speaker's Gallery. I should like to welcome on behalf of the Legislature the whole group. We would hope that they will have an enjoyable and an informative day.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. J.E. Brockelbank (Saskatoon-Mayfair): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to perform a double introduction today while I am on my feet. There are two groups of students from schools who came together to Regina today. One group is from Mayfair constituency and I believe the other group is from University – Cardinal Leger School. The group from Mayfair constituency are from McNab Park School. They are accompanied by three teachers, Mr. Froese, Mr. Birtsch and Mr. Cook. I am sure that all Members of the Assembly will join with me in wishing these two groups of students a good day in the Legislature, an entertaining day and an informative day, and a safe journey back to Saskatoon.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

POLITICAL COMMENT OF A CIVIL SERVANT

Mr. C.P. MacDonald (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Kramer). Two days ago I asked a question in this House regarding the political comment of a civil servant in a Department of Natural Resources pamphlet put out. The Premier left the impression that it was an irresponsible action on the part of that civil servant and that he would check into it. It has left the impression with the public of Saskatchewan that it was the responsibility of a civil servant. I should like to ask the Minister of Natural Resources, did he write this particular pamphlet or did he give instructions that it be printed in this bulletin?

Hon. A.E. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I will answer in part because I find that the bulletin that I got the photostatic copy of is not as I understood the Member to represent it. He suggested that the words complained of were written by a public servant. In fact what has happened is that a departmental report has been sent out quoting the departmental Minister. This has been traditional in this House and in this Government for many, many years. For good or ill there have been many departmental reports quoting the Minister. This one quotes the Minister of Natural Resources and I think that this is no departure from principle and accordingly I think the comments made by the Member for Milestone against this particular public servant were unwarranted.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — In reply, Mr. Speaker, this particular report is prepared by the Conservation and Information Service, Nolan Matthies, Supervisor. It mentions nothing about the Minister of Natural Resources on this information. It's a Resource report. "Saskatchewan Department of Natural Resources for immediate release, Volume 6, No. 48". It is not prepared, it is not printed, it is not sent out from the Minister's office. It is sent out by the Department of Natural Resources and it is a verbal attack commenting on a debate that proceeded in this House. Mr. Speaker, I also find a remarkable similarity put out by the Minister of Natural Resources in all the newspapers in southern Saskatchewan, letters to the editor, signed by Eiling Kramer, Minister of Natural Resources. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this was under the instructions of the Minister of Natural Resources, a direct summation of a letter to the editor printed by him in every newspaper in southern Saskatchewan to make a verbal attack at the Member from Moosomin (Mr. Gardner).

Hon. E. Kramer (Minister of Natural Resources): — Mr. Speaker, I need no lectures from the Member from Milestone as to how to run the Department of Natural Resources and what's more, regardless of how the information gets about I make no apologies for the letters I've sent out. When a Member of this House deliberately misinforms the public and the Press continues to carry that story in headlines which is factually incorrect information and information which should have been prefaced by information that the Member well knew was a fact that those policies were laid down by the former Government that he complained about, I think regardless of what channels are used the public ought to be informed as to what the facts of the case are, and I make no apologies.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — Mr. Speaker, is the Minister of Natural Resources telling this House and the people of Saskatchewan that from time forward he will use the Government Information Services to reply to political debate in this House. Is that what you are saying?

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I think that the question was raised the other day by the Member and it has been raised again today. Answers given may or may not be satisfactory but we can't permit a debate at this time. If further debate is necessary it can be raised in Estimates or by substantive motion.

ROMANIAN TRACTOR COMPANY

Mr. A.R. Guy (Athabasca): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Industry (Mr. Thorson). In view of the severe criticism from the city of Saskatoon and representatives of the Romanian Tractor Company for the Government's failure to announce the site of this firm, would the Minister inform us if the Government is still favoring Moose Jaw and if so when we can expect an announcement in this regard so that the cities of Saskatchewan will quiet their vendetta against each other brought upon by the Premier's

statement that he wants the firm to go to Moose Jaw even though it has started in Saskatoon.

Mr. K. Thorson (Minister of Industry): — Mr. Speaker, I hope that the Member for Athabasca is not going to begin an attack on the Romanian Tractor proposal as the Members did last night, belittling foreign made tractors, belittling our participation in this venture. I want to say in reply to the question he poses that these premature and unwarranted comments made by certain individuals and groups are likely to lose the Romanian Tractor project, not the actions of the Government of Saskatchewan. I want to point out to the Members opposite that it is in the interests of the province if the partners in this project are allowed to proceed without any unnecessary and uninformed publicity. The Government of Saskatchewan is attempting to pursue the question of location and other matters with its partners, Unizal Tractor and Autotractor in a rational and objective manner despite the unfavorable publicity which comes from, as I say, uninformed sources.

Now the Members surely are aware that in December of last year the partners signed an agreement undertaking to commission a feasibility study, undertaking to make a joint application to the Department of Regional Economic Expansion. That is under way.

We are going to assess the question of location on hard economic facts. Now we can't make a unilateral decision on location. I make no apologies for the fact that the Government has expressed concern about the need for industrial development in Moose Jaw. I don't think any public-minded citizen in Saskatchewan would deny that Moose Jaw has suffered more loss in economic terms in recent years than any of the two larger centres in Saskatchewan.

Now at this time the Romanian officials have indicated that they prefer Saskatoon, the Government has indicated that it prefers Moose Jaw if that is feasible. The Government and the Romanians both feel that these preferences have been expressed on the basis of preliminary and general impressions and both agree that the final decision should be based on economic facts. In order to achieve that objective we have invited the Romanians to send a team of technical experts here and we understand they will accept our invitation. And on our part we have commissioned a special study by consultants to assemble economic data for the consideration of the technical experts when they arrive.

I just want to say, Mr. Speaker, that the Government of Saskatchewan does not intend to close the door on industrial development for any community in the province.

Mr. Guy: — Mr. Speaker, I should just like to point out for the future that the Minister in giving his reply went three minutes and forty-five seconds and I would hope that we would have the same leeway when we ask questions in the future.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — I think that statement is not called for. I try to allow latitude and an answer sometimes takes longer than the

question. I hope all Hon. Members will bear with me, I'm trying to give fair play.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

SIMPSON FLYERS HOCKEY TEAM WIN

Mr. D.L. Faris (Arm River): — Before the Orders of the Day, Mr. Speaker, I should like to draw attention to the House of the outstanding accomplishment of the Simpson Flyers Hockey Team in winning for the fourth year in a row the Provincial 'D' championship. In addition they also won the Last Mountain hockey league. Ken Freeman is their coach and his team has the distinction of having eight members from one family on it, the VanThyne family from Simpson.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ADJOURNED DEBATES

RESOLUTIONS

RESOLUTION NO. 14 – HISTORIC OBLIGATION OF RAILWAY COMPANIES

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution by Mr. M. Feschuk (Prince Albert East):

That this Assembly urges the Government of Canada to remember the historic obligation of the Railway Companies to transport agricultural products to markets, and recognize the importance of exports, particularly agricultural exports, in providing national income and employment and earning foreign exchange, now give direction, assistance and instruction in all aspects of grain-handling and transportation with initial and particular attention to the utilization and re-organization of railroad facilities and grain-handling and loading facilities.

Mr. D.L. Faris (Arm River): — Mr. Speaker, the present problem at the West Coast is that grain is not being delivered to the terminals by the railways in sufficient quantities to meet the export requirements. Otto Lang and his officials have been forced to admit that we have lost grain sales due to this inability to meet the demand requirements. But what have they done about it? They promised an improved port facility at Prince Rupert. We welcome this action as it fulfils the Liberal promise going back to 1919 – better late than never! But we do not welcome the attitude of the Liberal Members in this Saskatchewan Legislature. We point out that measures must be taken now to move grain this year. Sales lost this year will be difficult to pick up in the future. Farmers not only lose millions this year from lost grain sales, they also have to pay the demurrage charges on the ships lined up in Vancouver Harbor. If you look at the number of ships that have been lined up from February 25th to March 23rd of this year, you will find that they range from 16 to 28. The average is 22 ships per day. If you take the average demurrage charge as \$4,000 per day then it has cost our farmers \$88,000 a day demurrage. This last month of Otto Lang's bungling has cost farmers over \$2.5 million. What do the Liberals say about this? The Member from Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) stated the other

day in this debate and I quote:

The storage capacities and handling situation and the cleaning facilities are the number one priority.

He wishes us to believe that the situation is that there are boxcars lined up at the doors at the Vancouver terminals. He wishes us to believe that there is more grain being delivered to the West Coast than can be handled or stored or cleaned by those facilities. This is certainly not the case. If you examine the facts you will find that the problem is not that boxcars are lined up outside the Vancouver terminals. The situation is that there are workers waiting for boxcars to arrive at the Vancouver terminals. Otto Lang has told us that we must unload 800 carloads a day at the Port of Vancouver to meet present commitments – 800 carloads a day. In the month from February 25 to March 23 how many days were there 800 carloads dumped – 20 days out of that month, 10, five? No, the answer is two days. These carload reports are public knowledge. The Member for Milestone should be able to find it in the Western Producer on page 2, where they are published in every edition. And if he found these reports he would also find the reason why there were not more boxcars unloaded. The reasons are the slides which occurred on the present rail routes. The explanation given in the Western Producer for the first week of March is, and I quote:

The railways were only able to deliver about half enough cars to ensure continuous unloading operations. The manager of the Pool Terminal Elevator at Vancouver reports that car dumpers sat idle for many hours because cars were not available for unloading.

But in the second week of March the explanation was:

Grain shipments from Vancouver still remain erratic because of a lack of grain arriving at the Port to sustain maximum operations. Daily car unloads are still far below the target of 800 cars.

The report for the third week of March was equally grim and I quote:

The terminals continue to operate at only partial capacity and were without cars on several occasions last week.

I repeat, again, the problem is that the railways have not moved the grain. Extra unloading, cleaning and storage capacities sit idle waiting for grain to arrive. Mr. Speaker, I give you the example of the Pool Elevator at Vancouver. This elevators with two dumpers, working 16 hours a day, can unload 200 boxcars a day. This elevator has a 24-hour cleaning capacity of 200 loads a day. From March 1st to March 29th on only one day did the Pool receive 200 cars. Instead of averaging 200 boxcars a day they only averaged 117 boxcars a day. Some days the two dumpers instead of working 16 hours had enough cars for only two hours.

On March 2nd, instead of 200 boxcars, 36. On March 3rd instead of 200 boxcars, 11; on March 9th instead of 200 boxcars,

April 7, 1972

14; on March 22nd instead of 200 boxcars, 14. Even on days when they received an average number of cars their dumpers were out of operation for many hours. The daily report for March 16th reads:

118 cars, both dumpers out of cars for six hours.

The daily report for March 21st reads:

110 cars, both dumpers out of cars for eight hours.

Now the Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) wants the farmers of Saskatchewan to believe that Otto Lang is doing a great job moving grain.

I want to tell the Member for Milestone and the Members opposite that the farmers are better informed than they are. They know that the grain is not even getting out to the Coast. They are interested in seeing grain sent down the Pacific Great Eastern From Prince George. They are interested in seeing a 35-mile rail link joining the CN and the PGE near Kamloops, thereby avoiding the major slide areas.

The Members opposite ask: who is going to build it? They find it hard to conceive that railways could build another 35 miles of track when they have already built 46,000 miles of heavy duty track in Canada. And surely now they are attempting to take thousands of branch lines out of Saskatchewan, surely they can build 35 miles of track to get the grain to Vancouver.

Mr. Speaker, in this morning's Leader-Post the following article came to my attention. The heading is "Unit Train Future said Dim." And it quotes W.S. Beaton, the Grain Movement Co-ordinator for the Canadian Transport Commission. In North Battleford he said Thursday:

There is no foreseeable future for the use of unit trains to move Prairie grain. Mr. Beaton said in an interview that the only way a successful unit train operation into bulk loading facilities into Vancouver could be achieved would be if ships would be waiting at the pier each time a unit train is unloaded.

And he is quoted as saying:

As far as future trains are concerned I don't think there is any definite scheduling in the near future.

This was primarily because, quote:

We are not fully utilizing the conventional facilities at Vancouver yet.

Mr. Speaker, what he said is true. The conventional facilities are not being fully utilized at present and we think they should be. But I would go further to say that it is no excuse at all to put aside this proposal of unit trains, to say that ships must be waiting at the pier in order for this unit train system to work.

Over the last month there was an average of 22 ships waiting at the harbor. Surely if there are 22 ships waiting in the harbor they can arrange to have one of those at the pier to have

a unit train unloaded into it.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Faris: — Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Federal Government is to be condemned by both sides of this House for their lack of co-ordination of transportation facilities – transportation facilities that are needed to ensure that we retain our markets and furthermore that we increase them. I am pleased to support this motion, Mr. Speaker, and I hope the Members opposite will do likewise.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. R. Romanow (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, just before the vote is taken on this matter, I feel that I should say a few words with respect to this very important issue.

I think this is one of the very important resolutions that is before this Assembly for consideration. This Resolution calls on the Members of this House to bring to the attention of the railway companies their obligation with respect to agricultural products and to make sure that the agricultural products are transported to market.

I don't think that language is overly aggressive or overly abrasive as far as the railway companies are concerned. This year, I think, has been a very difficult year with respect to the movement of grain. It has been difficult, the railway companies say, because of circumstances beyond their control. In fact, it has been suggested by some Hon. Members in this House that statements by the Government, indeed this Resolution, is somehow unwarranted simply because the delays are due to snowslides and weather conditions.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that for years now the route – the normal and traditional train passage – to the West Coast has always had a slide problem. There have been a considerable number of lost days because of this type of weather condition. I remind the Members of the House that lost time is almost unrecoverable time. The number of boxcars, that cannot be delivered and the amount of grain that cannot be unloaded sometimes and very frequently never is caught up. The result is that the facilities, very frequently, in Vancouver are left underutilized.

When I was there recently in the middle of February at the height of the crisis there was some considerable storage capacity at our own Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, something in excess of two million bushels left idle. They hadn't moved nor unloaded very many boxcars. I am very concerned about the attitude of the railway companies and the Government of Saskatchewan.

The railway companies seem to argue that the reason for this failure to move grain is basically because they don't have diesel power. They say they don't have enough boxcars. They say there is not enough trackage. All of this amounts to an implied argument, and in some quarters even expressly stated, that there is an onus on governments of the day to provide the railway companies with the necessary finances to provide the increased diesel power, the increased boxcars, increased

trackage and so forth.

We all know that movement of grain in Canada is regulated by the Crow's Nest rates. These rates are favorable to the Western Canadian farm producer and rightly so. I am very concerned about this particular plea by the railway companies because I have said outside this House, and I repeat again, that I think we see here the beginning of a not so subtle argument on the part of some executives of railway companies, or perhaps subtle argument depending on your point of view, that there should be a change in the rates on Crow's Nest. The obvious argument or answer, every time that we say we need more diesel power and more boxcars, is for the railways to say that we need more finances in the hands of the railway companies. And how do we get more funds and revenue into the hands of the railway companies? We increase their freight rates. And how do we increase their freight rates? By taking off the statutory protection of the Crow's Nest rates. And that is how I think the basic argument is shaping up and beginning to shape up from the railways' point of view.

Now some people have suggested in this House that the sort of theory that I have advanced is impractical. With respect to the Members who would think that I say that all you have to do is take a look at the statements of the various railway officials, I say that this crisis is being used in some quarters by railway companies as the beginning of a building argument to justify in the appropriate corridors of power some move to change Crow's Nest rates, notwithstanding the denials from the railway companies to the contrary.

I say, therefore, this Resolution is, in fact, very timely because we remind the railway companies that it is their historic obligation, their legal obligation, and their social obligation to this country to make sure that grain being hauled to the West Coast can be hauled and is hauled.

Mr. Speaker, some Members opposite have tended to belittle statements made by the Government respecting the use of the PGE. This is the so-called third rail route into Vancouver. In fact some Hon. Members in this House didn't know that there was trackage going into Vancouver. They argued against this particular aspect. They said how could it be done because the Hon. Minister who was speaking – namely myself – didn't even know that we had to build 38 miles of trackage. That was the argument. I am very glad that they realize now that in fact the trackage exists; that in fact there has been a haul of the wheat to Vancouver through the PGE. But this involves the co-operation of the other major railway companies, the CPR and the CNR. It involves the co-operation of the PGE. Above all it involves some motivation on the part of the Federal Government to be able to divert the boxcars over that necessary third route, if required, and get the wheat to port in Vancouver.

This route, I am informed by my officials, is relatively slide free. During the time that the troubles were continuing on the traditional routes when something in excess of two weeks of train time was lost, over the PGE route the total time lost due to weather and slides amounted to something in excess of four hours.

I don't argue that this is an ultimate solution. I think an ultimate solution is much more fundamental and much more

basic and requires a great deal of thought and study by all governmental agencies. But I do say that a great deal of thought and responsibility can be placed on the shoulders of the railway companies and the appropriate Federal authorities for failing to have directed that this movement of grain should be diverted over the third rail route. We could have moved substantial boxcars and gotten substantial numbers of bushels of wheat to the Port of Vancouver.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Now Members obviously have read the question of the Prince Rupert terminal elevator and the recent announcement by Mr. Jamieson, that Prince Rupert was going to be expanded and increased and I welcome this on behalf of the Government.

I welcome it and I am sure the Member for Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) welcomes it as well. We all welcome it, belated as it may be. But what actually happened at Prince Rupert, Mr. Speaker? From August 1st to December 29, in the first five months of the crop year some 4.7 million bushels were shipped from Prince Rupert. On December 29 there was 1.2 million store and between December 1971 and March 15, 1972 3.5 million bushels were shipped from Prince Rupert and the in-storage position had dwindled to 422 bushels, Mr. Speaker. Thus in the eleven week crisis period, Prince Rupert received some 2.2 million bushels of grain from the Prairies, yet its total unloading capacity in that same period was not 2.2 million but somewhere in the order of 13 million bushels of grain.

The question to be asked about Prince Rupert is similar to the query with respect to Vancouver, the PGE and the activities of the railway company. Why was not grain diverted when the CP and the CN lines were blocked as a result of the crisis to make full use of the Prince Rupert facilities?

There was gross negligence here, I say to the Members of the House, gross negligence either at the doorstep of the railway companies or to be laid at the doorstep of the Federal Government and the Minister-in-Charge of the Canadian Wheat Board. I want to emphasize that to the Members of the House and to the people of this Province, that the railway companies are not meeting the needs of the Province of Saskatchewan and grain producers.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — They are not sensitive to our needs. We have to build a transportation system which has margins for errors built into it, margins for errors such as slides and weather conditions; margins for errors with respect to ship tie-ups; margins for errors with respect to rail tie-ups. There are going to be three of those. It is inevitable in human affairs.

The problem is that the Federal Government and the railway companies have failed to construct the type of grain delivery system that allows this type of error margin for manoeuvring this margin for the people and the producers of Saskatchewan. And to that extent I say, again, there has been gross negligence for which the prairie farmer will pay far in excess of any

strike or another stoppage that may result.

Mr. Speaker, I say to the Hon. Member opposite that I feel, and quite sincerely, that most of them also recognize the work and the need of this particular motion to draw the problem to the attention of the railway companies. I want to remind all Members of this House that sometimes we think that because we are legislators or because we are in Government we wield power and I suppose in some respects we do.

In my eight months of office I don't think I have had more frustration than in the area of trying to deal with railway companies, whether it happens to be on the question of grain movement or freight rates or whatever. This is a very difficult and complex job. Wherever our officials discuss it with them, wherever we speak of the issue politically, somehow the railway companies appear to be insensitive to the needs of Western Canada and to the needs of Saskatchewan.

People can talk about separatist feelings in other parts of Canada, I hope those feelings are not accepted by this House, and in fact those developments do not occur. But I can certainly say from my travelling and experience the activities of the Canadian Pacific Railway in particular and the CNR as well, and some of the actions taken by those officials, has been a great source of Western Canadian dissatisfaction.

I commend the Hon. Member who brought forward this Resolution. I commend him for asking the Members of this House to be reminded of the historic obligation of the railways and for bringing this issue before this House and allowing the Members to debate it, because it is only with a united voice, rallying behind this Resolution, that we can put another arrow in the bow and try to impress the railway companies with the force of the needs of the Western Canadian producers in Saskatchewan, Manitoba and Alberta.

I urge all Members to support this Resolution. I certainly will.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. J.G. Lane (Lumsden): — Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to enter into this debate until I heard the remarks of the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow).

We were not, the Members of the Opposition, were not questioning the possibilities in previous debates about alternate trackage. We disagree with the impression given by the Attorney General that this relatively slide-free trackage already exists, which it does not. We also question the misleading impression given by the Attorney General that the so-called PGE, as he refers to it, would take this grain transportation and the freight of grain without taking into consideration the Crow's Nest Pass agreement.

We are starting to wonder now, after statements in the previous debates and the statements today about the PGE, the Pacific Great Eastern Railway, I believe it is, that the Attorney General is the one who has been holding himself out as the expert on rail transportation of the Government. And Members opposite seem to agree.

Well, I'm going to tell the Members opposite that there is no such thing as the PGE and if the Attorney General was aware of the situation that the British Columbia Government changed its name sometime ago and it is now the British Columbia Railroad. But the Attorney General seems to have forgotten that little aspect. That's how much in touch he was when he went out to Vancouver to discuss this problem. He didn't even know with whom he was dealing. The Attorney General, Mr. Speaker, is quite right when he says that there has been negligence on the part of the railways in the question of grain transportation. The railways have a tradition especially in Saskatchewan since 1905 when we became a Province in having benefits accruing to the railroads which were completely unjustified and for which they did not compensate adequately the people of Saskatchewan. We are only questioning, Mr. Speaker, the misleading impression that the Attorney General has been giving that this whole problem is railroads, a lot of the problem is railroads, not all of it. We question the impression and the statements made by the Attorney General that the Government of Canada is grossly negligent. If the Attorney general would take the rational approach of Otto Lang who has accomplished more in the last three years to try and rationalize the grain transportation system in this country, then maybe we would get something done and that type of approach is the approach that this House should be taking.

Mr. E. Kaeding (Saltcoats): — I believe the main thrust of this Resolution before us must be to impress on the Government of Canada the extreme urgency to act quickly towards reorganization and rationalization of our entire transportation and grain-handling system. We are now moving into a period where our grain sales in the prairie region are nearing 900 million bushels per year and may in fact reach one billion bushels per year in the very near future. Developing markets for increasing amounts of potash and livestock and livestock products will be competing with the grain industry for the use of rolling stock and diesel power. The need for immediate response to the problems facing transportation facilities can no longer be ignored. Only recently we have been told by Wheat Board officials that we are unable to commit ourselves to further sales contracts because of inability to deliver. A number of factors seem to be responsible for this impasse.

No. 1. The argument of the railway companies that many of their branch lines are uneconomic and that they are losing money under statutory Crow's Nest rates.

No. 2. The inefficient assembly through use of outmoded equipment at elevator points and the unnecessarily large number of assembly points.

No. 3. The problem of moving freight to West Coast terminals in winter due to adverse weather conditions.

No. 4. The inadequacy of dock facilities at terminals which add to loading time.

No. 5. The inefficient use of the Port of Churchill as a delivery point.

No. 6. The lack of direction regarding priorities.

The necessity of early and effective action by the Government of Canada is important not only to Western Canada but to the entire nation. Export of western grain, livestock and potash contribute to a very high percentage of our earnings of foreign exchange and in providing national income through providing steady employment in many service trades related to these sales. Any slow down in sales must immediately be reflected in lost income in those areas. The Hon. Member for Milestone the other day blamed the antiquated collection system for the lack of grain arriving at Vancouver. Mr. Speaker, I agree that our collection system may be somewhat obsolete, however it has for many years been able to load the required amount of cars to provide at least 700 cars per day to Vancouver, if it could be moved through the mountains. This is a far cry from the average of under 300 cars per day which has been arriving at the terminals on many days ever since the first of this year. I am advised that there have never been less than 6,400 cars loaded and enroute to Vancouver and this at times has reached a high of 7,800. These cars are ready to move through the mountains any time that they could be taken through. Surely this indicates that the main problem is not in the collection system. He also blamed the lack of storage and cleaning facilities at Vancouver for much of the present tie-up. I agree that there is a lack of storage space. However, I would point out to him that terminals in Vancouver have the capacity to lean grain as fast it is can be unloaded at the terminals, up to 750 cars per 24-hour shift. I should further like to remind him that a number of years ago when similar lack of storage and terminal facilities was evident, a great deal of pressure was brought to bear on the Federal Government to build additional storage. But they steadfastly refused to do so. It was not until 1968 when the farmers of Saskatchewan through the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool decided they could no longer wait for Government action and that they themselves built the terminal at their own expense costing somewhere in the neighborhood of \$22 million. If it were not for their prompt action at that time the situation at Vancouver would now be near total chaos.

We are looking at a similar situation today. Surely the Federal Government will not once again renege on their responsibility in this regard. I believe that we are going to have to accept the fact that there will have to be some rationalization of rail and elevator facilities in some of our rural areas. The cost of maintaining assembly points at sidings six or eight miles apart regardless of availability of alternate services is no longer economic. The arguments of railroads with regard to the cost of maintaining hundreds of miles of track just for grain assembly cannot be entirely ignored. In many areas almost the only freight now carried by railways is grain. We also have the problem of the elevator companies who are facing reconstruction and renovation of a large part of their grain assembly system. In order to meet tight delivery schedules and to move large volumes of grain in a short time it is absolutely essential that these companies be permitted to rationalize their industry so that expensive renovations be carried out in locations that have a long term future in our changing society. Because this type of rationalization involves not only the economic considerations of the railways and the elevator companies but also encompasses a whole host of social implications, it is essential that this rationalization proceed with maximum participation of all parties concerned. This would include the railways and elevator companies, Federal Government and Provincial Government but most of all the communities themselves.

I am convinced that a very substantial rationalization could take place with very little disruption of community service if the proper consultation takes place and I emphasize, that if the proper consultation takes place. The whole question of running rights of one railway company's rolling stock on another's tracks could become part of this problem. In some cases new lines may be required to link large service centres to other trackage when a line is abandoned. It is unlikely that railway companies which are, of course, interested only in what the balance sheet shows will on their own do any kind of reappraisal of this nature. I believe that the Government of Canada under whose jurisdiction this falls must move quickly to meet this urgent social and economic problem. Every year that goes by and every piecemeal effort on unorganized rationalization will only serve to make the whole problem more difficult to resolve. The time to act is now. The rationalization of the assembly system however is only the first part of a larger problem. The need to develop a reliable year round delivery system to export positions is equally urgent. With trackage being reduced and with greater volume on existing lines it is becoming more and more obvious that some arrangement has to be made wherein the Board of Transport Commissioners can direct that the running rights of one railway company be available to the other.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Kaeding: — The logical solution of course would be nationalization of the CPR, so that the whole railway jungle could be straightened out.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Kaeding: — The negligence of the Federal Government in not using the Port of Churchill to its maximum capacity is also to be deplored. Here we have a real logical port outlet for our farm produce through a channel which is almost a thousand miles closer to European markets than the Lakehead ports. With modern radar facilities the length of the shipping season has been increased substantially and grain exports could very easily be increased substantially and grain exports could very easily be doubled if the proper facilities were installed and used to capacity. It is regrettable indeed that the Federal Government has not seen fit to make the necessary improvements in harbor and storage facilities to make this added capacity possible. I urge this Assembly to do all in its power to convince the Federal authorities to act quickly to correct that situation. The announcement that port facilities at Prince Rupert were being improved and extended to provide an alternate outlet during the winter months is most welcome, however we have heard promises of this kind of development before and we will be watching with a great deal of interest to see if this is really going to develop or if it is just another pre-election announcement.

There can be little doubt, Mr. Speaker, that one of the main reasons why the Wheat Board is having problems getting enough rolling stock from the railway companies to move our agriculture products is because of their objection to moving grain at Crow's Nest rates. There is much evidence to indicate that there is a deliberate attempt on their part to slow down the rate of grain movement in Western Canada in order to bring pressure to bear on the Government of Canada to remove these

statutory rates. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the Government of Canada through the Board of Transport Commissioners should once again very firmly remind the railways of their long term obligations to provide proper transportation services to the people of Western Canada. I believe they should be reminded once again of the very valuable concessions granted to them under the Crow's Nest Pass agreement with respect to land and mineral rights in Western Canada. These concessions have over the years and still continue to provide substantial returns to the railways. Because the Port of Vancouver is and will probably continue to be the major export centre for grain for some years to come one of the obligations that the Federal Government must accept is the immediate need at the Port of Vancouver for the updating of proper facilities. There is need for much better loading facilities and for greater storage capacity to take care of surge situations so that grain can be stored at dock side before the difficult slide problem arises. The increased use of inland terminals to clean and store export grain could possibly be of some service here. The question of alternate routes linking the major railways to the PGE to bypass the slide area is one that must have top priority. The closing of this link may be costly and may take some time but one thing we can be sure of we will continue to have bad slide years year after year on the existing routes and we just cannot afford the loss of sales and our reputation as a reliable exporter. The price we are paying for the lack of this alternate route is very substantial indeed and can be expected to escalate. In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would say that the time is past for political manoeuvring and procrastination.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Kaeding: — Changes in the entire grain assembly and transportation structure must be made at the earliest possible date. However, where rationalization of the assembly system takes place we must assure that not only the needs of the railway companies and grain companies are satisfied but that the social implications have a major priority when this rationalization takes place. Mr. Speaker, I will support this Resolution.

Motion agreed to.

RESOLUTION NO. 1 – OPPOSING PROVIDING OF PRINTING CONTRACTS TO SERVICE PRINTING CO.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution by Mr. Guy (Athabasca):

That this Assembly go on record as opposing any policy of the Saskatchewan Government which would provide printing contracts to Service Printing Co., which is solely owned and operated by the CCF Publishing Co. Ltd., which is owned by the membership of the NDP Party (Saskatchewan division).

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

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

favoring a policy of providing, as near as practical, an equitable opportunity for Saskatchewan printing

companies to obtain printing contracts regardless of political affiliation, provided they are capable of doing such work on a competitive basis under fair wage and working conditions.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Are you placing the amendment or the motion?

Mr. Speaker: — I am placing the amendment.

Mr. Brockelbank: — I believe, Mr. Speaker, I'm not certain but I think you said moved by the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. Speaker: — The amendment was moved by the Minister of Public Works, moved by Mr. Brockelbank, seconded by Mr. Meakes.

Mr. Brockelbank: — All right, Mr. Speaker, I thought I misheard you and just didn't want to be tagged with that.

Mr. A.R. Guy (Athabasca): — Just a few words, Mr. Speaker, in closing the debate. I don't think for one minute that the people of Saskatchewan will accept this amendment. If the Members opposite wish to see this amended motion passed in that way this is all the more reason why they will stand condemned before the people of this Province. Because I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, and I can tell Members opposite that the people, regardless of what Members opposite say, the people of Saskatchewan will not tolerate and will not approve of a political party who through its own printing company are receiving the taxpayers' dollars. This is exactly what is going on. Members opposite can get up like the Minister of Public Works and say it is a great company and we think printing should be spread equally and that Service Printing is no different than any of the other printing companies but the people of Saskatchewan know full well that this is not true. The Service Printing Company is owned completely and entirely by the NDP of Saskatchewan. And therefore it is absolutely wrong ethically and in every other sense to take the taxpayers' dollar, and then turn it directly and I emphasize, directly to their own political party for their own political use and, Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan know this is happening. They condemn it and they do not condone it and never will. So therefore regardless of what happens to this motion the people of Saskatchewan will not stand for that type of political chicanery pork barrel . . .

Mr. Romanow: — How are you going to vote for it?

Mr. Guy: — We are going to vote against it. We are going to vote against your amendment because as I say there is no way that the Liberal Party will ever be associated with a practice that is unfair, that is so politically biased as to take the taxpayers' hard earned cash and funnel it directly into their own political party for their own political fortune.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, will the Member permit a question?

April 7, 1972

Does the Member say that in voting against this amendment and this motion that is now before the House that it is the Liberal Party's position in Saskatchewan that political affiliation will be considered when contracts for printing are considered if they should be the party in power?

Mr. Guy: — Mr. Speaker, we are talking and the Member had a chance to speak in this debate and I think it is significant that he refused to do so.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — I think it was significant that he refused to stand up as one of the Treasury Benchers who has the responsibility of taking the money from the people of Saskatchewan and putting it in his own political party. Now the question he asked was, do we worry about political affiliation? And we do not.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — No, no, because we are not talking about political affiliation. We are talking about political ownership and the Service Printing Co. is owned solely by the NDP. It is much more than an affiliation. We don't care about affiliation of individual share holders in any printing company but we condemn most strongly any political party that will use its own printing company to take the taxpayers' money for political purposes. I hope this answers the Hon. Member's question and I regret that he didn't have the intestinal fortitude to stand up and make a speech on behalf of using Service Printing.

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, it answers the question that the Liberals still consider political affiliation.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order!

Mr. McIsaac: — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order, the Attorney General had the opportunity to get into this debate, chose not to very obviously . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I don't think we can permit to continue questions from the Minister. The debate is now closed on the motion before the House on Resolution No. 1 as amended by the amendment which has been dealt with earlier this afternoon.

Motion as amended agreed to on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 38
Messieurs

Blakeney
Wood
Snyder
Michayluk
Kwasnica
Faris
Mostoway

Dyck
Romanow
MacMurchy
Thorson
Carlson
Cody
Comer

Meakes
Messer
Pepper
Whelan
Taylor
Gross
Rolfes

Bowerman
Larson
Engel
Robbins
Lange
Kaeding

Kramer
Baker
Tchorzewski
Matsalla
Hanson
Flasch

Thibault
Brockelbank
Owens
Cowley
Oliver

NAYS — 14
Messieurs

Steuart
Grant
McIsaac
MacLeod
MacDonald (Moose Jaw N.)

Loken
Boldt
Gardner
McPherson
Wiebe

Guy
MacDonald
Weatherald
Lane

ADJOURNED DEBATE

**INTERIM REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE REVIEW OF LIQUOR
REGULATIONS IN SASKATCHEWAN**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. Faris: **The Interim Report of the Special Committee on the Review of Liquor Regulations in Saskatchewan** be now concurred in.

Hon. J.E. Brockelbank: — I am pleased, Mr. Speaker, to take part in the debate on the Motion before us.

The Motion reads — ‘That the Interim Report of the Special Committee on the Review of Liquor Regulations in Saskatchewan be now concurred in’.

I had the good fortune to be selected the Chairman of that Special Committee on Liquor Regulations, Mr. Speaker. I found during the time that I was Chairman I received good co-operation from the other members of the Committee. I believe a fair amount of credit for the Interim Report must be given to the staff, especially the secretary who worked so diligently in recording the deliberations of the Committee and in preparing drafts for the approval of the Committee.

In its deliberations the Committee made an early basic decision about the manner in which it would proceed. It was decided that the Committee would deal in the Interim Report with the items which would receive unanimous approval of Committee members. As it happens the recommendations that were drawn by the Commission have received the unanimous approval of the Committee members. In the main they are recommendations dealing with the area of our day to day existence when we may be in contact with a consumption of alcoholic beverages. Consequently people over the age of majority are offered, by these recommendations, a more convenient service, if these recommendations are accepted. Conversely, those under the age of majority will have less opportunity to publicly consume alcoholic beverages. I believe it is safe to say that the Committee agreed to leave the moral decision making up to the persons that consume the beverage and/or society at large. The Committee believes and stated that they thought greater expenditure will have to be made, particularly in the field of alcohol education and

rehabilitation of persons of Indian ancestry.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to the final report of this Committee which I hope will be delivered some time later this year. I suspect that that Report, Mr. Speaker, without judging it in advance, may display at its conclusion recommendations which are more likely to be identified with the individuals on the Committee. I say that, Mr. Speaker, because I believe the Committee will deal, in its final report, with items that are not so concrete as those dealt with in the Interim Report. Consequently views of the Committee members will vary accordingly.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I should be remiss if I did not put on the record what I believe to be the unanimous thanks of the Committee to the people of Saskatchewan for responding to our request for briefs as well as they did. I was pleased to note that we had more than 150 briefs and about half of them were presented orally at public hearings at five different locations throughout the Province of Saskatchewan. I feel that the Government of Saskatchewan will no doubt bring in legislation to put a number of these recommendations into the law books of Saskatchewan. I want to recommend this Report to the acceptance of the House secure in the knowledge that it represents public opinion of the people of Saskatchewan.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. D.F. MacDonald (Moose Jaw North): — Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to say a very few words. I want first of all to congratulate the Special Committee on the Review of Liquor Recommendations. I agree, I concur with nearly all the recommendations in the Report. There is one minor objection I have and I should like to put it on the record and that is Recommendation No. 3 that the Government of Saskatchewan consider increasing the penalty to licensees for serving alcoholic beverages to minors and the penalty to minors for entering licensed premises.

I think that I would agree that the penalty to minors for entering licensed premises could in fact be increased. But I do not think that it is wise to increase the penalty to licensees. My reasons for this, that I think when a minor enters a licensed premises he knows that he is breaking the law. I think that it is often very difficult for the licensee to determine whether an individual is a minor or not. I don't think that the penalties to licensees should be taken off completely. I think they have some obligation. The licensee has some obligation to attempt to determine whether they are minors or not but I don't think increasing it would particularly help and as I say the minor knows he's breaking the law. The licensee has to decide whether someone is or not. The minor may produce some form of identification and it puts a very heavy onus on the licensee. I admit they have an obligation but I don't think the penalty should be increased to the licensee.

Mr. E.F. Gardner (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, I'm not at this time going to comment on the substance of the Report. I think the Committee was in general agreement with the initial part of the Report. I would,

however, like to go on record as saying we feel that the hearings were certainly held in a very fair manner. The original chairman and his replacement were certainly capable and very careful to ensure that everyone who appeared before the Committee was given the complete freedom to express their views. I should also like to comment that everyone who presented a brief and didn't appear, that the substance of their briefs were also very carefully considered by the Committee. I should also like to say that the members of the Committee carried on their work in a non-partisan manner and I'm sure that the subsequent hearings will be held in the same high plane.

Mr. H. Owens (Elrose): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few words on this Report. I cannot wholeheartedly accept all the recommendations as they have been presented by this Special Committee. I think that possibly now is as good a time as any to let these feelings be known.

Recommendation No. 4, serving beverages in dining rooms on Sundays. I don't think that this is acceptable to me personally although this, I agree, has been the consensus of opinion as picked up by the Committee through their hearings throughout the Province. Sundays, it seems to me, is the day that a good many people would like to take their families into a dining room, or have dinner out and the surroundings, I believe, are not as acceptable, or would not be as acceptable if liquor was being served, in those places.

Recommendation No. 8, where it proposes to have the Liquor Board stores remain open until 2:00 o'clock a.m. This to me is a bit out of line. I think that all the liquor that anyone requires can certainly be bought long, long before 2:00 o'clock in the morning.

Recommendation No. 10, where the premises may be open until 1:30 o'clock a.m. with the option to close not before midnight. Again, Mr. Speaker, I think that these hours are exceptionally long.

Going back to Recommendation No. 1 where the age of majority takes over, I said at the time of The Age of Majority Act that I had my reservations about this age. I still do, especially when it comes to the use of liquor. It seems to me that if these recommendations were all accepted that there would be no restraint in the procuring or the drinking of alcoholic beverages at any time. It has been said that what is not available you crave for. If it is readily available the craving fades. Only time will tell whether this is true regarding the use of alcoholic beverages.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. D.H. Lange (Assiniboia-Bengough): Mr. Speaker, I rise at this moment to express my opposition to the third Recommendation which advocates increasing penalties to licensees serving alcoholic beverages to minors and to young people entering licensed premises under age.

In any research I have undertaken, it has always been made clear to me that the practise of public drinking should be approached in a medical and social vein rather than as a criminal-legal problem.

As Legislators, we have a first class opportunity now to alter our approaches to the usage of alcohol. Instead, I find in this Recommendation a distressing step backwards. Once again, we are treating alcohol as 'forbidden fruit'. In the ethos of youth, a minor often looks on drinking as an act of rebellion. Studies have shown that problem drinkers on the average, start drinking at a later age and their first experience was prompted out of rebellion to parental authority or community standards. This Recommendation simply aggravates this harmful trend of keeping young people in a state of perpetual immaturity.

Will an increase in financial penalties arrest the current state of under-age drinking? Hardly. People drink because they want to and because they want to, nothing will stop them from doing it.

Will it teach young people to use alcohol responsibly? That is questionable to say the least. From a medical point of view our Committee has found that there is a direct correlation between problem drinking and psychological distress on the part of the affected individual.

I suggest that if we want to break an individual, who already has the proclivity to drink alcohol, if we want to lead him down the skid row trail then we should support this Recommendation. In fact, maybe we should increase fines even more.

A Commission on the study of alcoholism which was funded by the American Government, reported that one important way of improving the mental health of an alcoholic or a person susceptible to the disease, was to help bolster his family life.

The provision of preventative intervention for an individual and his family should be made available,

the Commission said. Instead, our Commission proposes to recommend a policy which directly contradicts these supportive measures. In fact, the imposition of financial penalties through due process of law would only serve to break down family stability and effectively depress that young person's sense of personal worth. After all, I have no illusions that the monetary burden will fall on the culpable 17- or 16-year-old teenager. The real burden will be shouldered by the whole family. From a medical point of view, I can only see increased problems from a young person's home life at a time in his or her development when stability at home is pretty important.

Socially, increased fines are discriminatory and regressive. They are discriminatory because they affect, in particular, those ethnic groups in which alcoholism is most prevalent. It is well documents that the rate of alcohol consumption and crime resulting there from varies among different ethnic peoples, according to their customs and relative class. For instance, Professor Schmeiser from the University of Saskatchewan Law School shows in the Saskatchewan Law Review, Spring 1968, that while undertaking a first hand look at the administration of justice throughout the Northwest Territories sponsored by the Institute of Northern Studies he noticed the evident existence of a severe liquor problem particularly among the Indian and Eskimo population. He points out that in a survey of liquor convictions at Inuvik from January 1965 to August 1966 the native conviction rate was much higher than the white conviction rate. The total number of convictions was 849 and the

non-white population accounted for 800 of these. Although the Indians and Eskimos composed only 38.7 per cent of the population they were responsible for 74.6 per cent of the convictions during this period. The Metis figure was quite low and the white population was lower yet. Although Inuvik is not located in Saskatchewan I can think that we could find communities within this Province which are similar to this. Professor Schmeiser points out how equal applications of laws can accentuate injustices when applied to persons who are unequal in condition and in opportunity. In such cases he says, law can become the oppressor rather than the protector and the government action becomes unbearably bureaucratic.

I would stress that increasing the financial penalty for underage drinking will be discriminatory. Indeed I think there are serious drawbacks in having drinking offences punishable by fines at all. It would be a regressive law simply due to the fact that it would fall hardest on those people who can least afford it or on those communities which are culturally depressed. In many communities there is nothing else to offer the local resident but a night in a hotel beverage room. It is a sad documentary on the social conditions which exist in parts of Saskatchewan, but I am afraid it is true. The challenge of justice in a free society should be met, I will agree, through a reordering of the social economic condition, but this should be accompanied hand in hand by a restructuring of our legal practices as well. I know the answer is not simple but surely we can seek out alternatives that would work. The present handling of the alcohol problem in our society especially with respect to the courts is to my mind most demoralizing for everyone concerned, a more alienating process could hardly be invented. It is incumbent upon us to start decriminalizing classes of behavior in which justice cannot be met nor the social problem solved. Rather than seeking ways to become even more punitive in our approach we must work to construct laws that would favor the weak and oppressed to bring them into the mainstream of Canadian life. Mr. Speaker, I will concur with the Liquor Report.

Mr. J.C. McIsaac (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, just a few brief words on the Interim Report. I would point again, Mr. Speaker, as did the Member for Arm River (Mr. Faris) in introducing this report that it was indeed an Interim Report and also with the similar comments made by the Member for Saskatoon-Mayfair (Mr. Brockelbank) in the course of his remarks. Certainly I think we all appreciate, those of us on the Committee particularly that some of the recommendations would not perhaps be acceptable to individual Members here and to individual citizens in the province, Mr. Speaker. I can say this that while we did agree to the Report unanimously it wasn't without a good deal of consideration on some of those recommendations. I think for example of the recommendation and the point raised by the Member for Assiniboia and also a similar point, I believe the same point really, that was brought into debate by the Member for Moose Jaw North (Mr. MacDonald) the question of increased penalties both for the licensee and the minors. I think there is justification here and we did give this a good deal of consideration, Mr. Speaker. The question here centred around the fact that we proposed to provide a means of more positive identification to anyone 18 and over. It was for this reason it was felt that some increase in the penalty would certainly be acceptable in this particular situation.

Most of the other recommendations received a very thorough going over, Mr. Speaker, and as I say some of us did have certain reservations about some of them. I think of point number 8, raised by the Member for Elrose (Mr. Owens) and I can see his thinking on the point here in leaving the regular government outlets open until I think we recommended 2:00 a.m., it could be any earlier time than that. The view here was to cut out the illicit trade and traffic as far as bootlegging was concerned. In this particular recommendation the Committee met, as I am sure Members are well aware with members of the city police in Regina, the RCMP in Saskatoon and so on.

A good deal of consideration was given to all of these recommendations, Mr. Speaker. Again as was pointed out in the introduction of the Report, a much more comprehensive report will be coming when the final report is brought in. At that time a great deal more attention will be paid to the entire question of rehabilitation and treatment as far as alcoholism and the abuse of alcohol is concerned. At that time I am sure we can have a more comprehensive debate on a broader scale on this particular Report.

Hon. A.E. Blakeney (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I just wish to add a very few words. First I should like to compliment the Committee for the work done. My reports of the work of the Committee indicated that the Committee operated exceptionally well and that is a credit to Members on both sides of the House who were able to tackle these problems in an orderly systematic way, in a way which laid aside any partisan consideration and which brought to bear the full capacity of all members of the Committee.

I propose to support the motion before the House. I wanted to indicate that we as a Government have not had an opportunity of fully considering all of the implications of the Report and accordingly the support that I give, and very likely some of the Ministers would give, should not be construed as meaning that the Government will necessarily forthwith enact into legislation all of the portions of the Report. It may be that on mature consideration some of them would be thought to be unacceptable at this time. It may be that some of them will be thought to be more appropriately delayed until the final report is considered, it may be that some of them will be thought to be ones which ought to be immediately introduced. We will certainly be looking at it. And we certainly have looked at it — I don't mean to suggest we have not given it some consideration up to now. We have, however, not yet reached conclusions, we have not yet completed all aspects of our consideration of it. I find it generally to be a good report, I suspect that a number and indeed perhaps most of the recommendations will find their way into law. I merely wish to add the caveat that I am not adding — that I will support the Report, but it may be that on mature consideration some, one or more than one of the recommendations will not find themselves introduced into law forthwith or at any time.

Mr. W.A. Robbins (Saskatoon Nutana Centre): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to make one or two brief comments with respect to the Interim Report. I realize it is an interim report, I am sincerely hopeful that the final report will place some emphasis on one of the things that I presented personally to the Committee. I hoped that advertising of liquor

would not be permitted in the province. My argument here is basically that the liquor salesman is suspect because it is obvious that his approach is to increase the sale of liquor and liquor is a severe problem in our society.

I should like too to compliment the Committee. I think they did a very credible job. I know in the presentation I made before that Committee I was well received and every courtesy was shown. One of the sections of the Interim Report indicates extended hours for the sale of liquor. I am opposed to those sections. I do not believe that prohibition was satisfactory in any respect and I also believe that making it more available over longer periods of time does not in any way solve the problem. I certainly have my reservations with regard to a number of other sections in the Interim Report, but I shall await the final report for further comments.

Mr. K.R. MacLeod (Regina Albert Park): — I have two comments with respect to this Committee Report. One relates to the education of people to the dangers of alcohol and the second one relates to the advertising of liquor and alcohol in Saskatchewan.

I am in sympathy completely with the mood and the ideas of the Hon. Member for Saskatoon Nutana Centre, but I do not think that his comments are realistic having regard to what actually occurs with respect to the advertising of liquor. We find that newspapers coming into Saskatchewan from other places have all kinds of advertisements for alcohol, for beer and for all sorts of liquor. All the magazines that come from the United States into Saskatchewan carry liquor advertising. \$10 million of Canadian money is spent in the United States every year to advertise Canadian liquor back into Canada. A large part of this money is spent in radio stations near the United States-Canadian border; and this is \$10 million flowing out of Canada into the United States without in any way reducing the hazard of liquor.

Quite frankly, as I say, I am in favor of the sentiments expressed by the Hon. Member for Saskatoon Nutana Centre but I don't think it makes sense to chase the money across the border. I should like to see that \$10 million spent in Canada — repatriate these dollars and keep this advertising income in Canada. It would help not only people in the radio business, the newspaper business, it would help our economy and our balance of trade generally. But that does not in any way detract from the remarks made originally.

My second comment is very simply this, that the education of people to the dangers of alcohol must continue. I am not convinced that our province actually makes a profit on its liquor revenues. The money earned from liquor revenues is a substantial amount, but the amount and the cost of the welfare dollars going out to people because of the damage done to homes, to families, and to jobs, because of alcohol, may well eat up our entire revenues and it may well be, Mr. Speaker, that we do not make a profit at all, and that the profit 'so called' may be totally illusory.

Motion agreed to.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

RESOLUTIONS

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

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution by Mr. E.F. Gardner (Moosomin):

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

Mr. A.W. Engel (Notukeu-Willow Bunch): — I rise on a Point of Order, Mr. Speaker. The question I have is, is this motion before us in order due to the fact that the subject matter is contained in a Report tabled on March 2nd by the chairman for the Special Committee on Crop Insurance and The Family Farm Protection Act? A debate on this question would result in arguing the points that are going to be dealt with when we talk about this issue later. I should like your ruling on this.

Mr. Speaker: — I wish to thank the Hon. Member for bringing this point to my attention. I have not studied the Report referred to in detail, but he has drawn certain sections of it to my attention. I should ask the House to be able to reserve my decision on the ruling on the Point of Order on this until a later time, and in the meantime leave the motion stand until I have had a chance to check it on the rules and regulations.

Mr. C. P. MacDonald (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, may I speak on the Point of Order? There is only one question about it, Sir. There is no question that there is a report before the House on The Family Farm Protection Act which is a general agricultural report. This refers to a specific problem relating to the people that are involved, the implement dealers, credit unions and so forth. I do point out, Mr. Speaker, that this relates to a specific problem and a specific area not necessarily in that report.

Mr. Engel: — If the Hon. Member for Milestone would take the report on page 35, he could copy it word for word. In this motion here and I can't deal with just one aspect of it without discussing the motion based on the resolution made by the Hon. Member for Moosomin. This motion is dealt with in this book and I can't deal with half of it without dealing with the question.

Mr. T.M. Weatherald (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, on the Point of Order, I presume we have an opportunity to speak to the Point of Order now because you will be making a ruling and we should have the opportunity to make our views before you make that ruling.

I would suggest that the report covers a wide variety of subject and this is only one particular subject that is in the

Report. Therefore, it would be very difficult for us to vote for some sections of the Report and vote against some sections of the Report. This is a specific resolution on a specific area and that is why we have put it on the Order Paper, as it deals with a specific aspect of that Report. Because when the Report is brought in to the Legislature and debated we will be either voting in the Assembly for the Report or against the Report, not on individual subject matters in the Report. This is one individual subject in the Report, that is why I submit that this is in order.

Mr. Speaker: — I don't wish to make a ruling at this time because I haven't had a chance to study it. I am asking the House if they will agree that I can defer my ruling until a later time until I have had time to check the problem, because I haven't had a chance to study all the implications of the point raised by the Hon. Member.

RESOLUTION NO. 12 – MANDATORY HEARINGS PROPOSED BEFORE LEGISLATIVE ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGE

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

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

And the proposed amendment thereto by Mr. Hanson:

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

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

Mr. E.L. Tchorzewski (Humboldt): — I rise to say a few words, Mr. Speaker, in support of this amendment, in this debate, because it touches on an area which I hold that needs priority attention by all governments, either Provincial, Federal or local, as well as by individuals and that is the protection of our environment and the ecology.

Mr. Speaker, in adjourning debate on this Resolution, the other day, I said I was doing so because I felt that we could not continue to ignore the effects on the environment and ecology by human activity that we usually refer to as progress, but may in some cases be better defined as self-destruction and very possibly self-annihilation.

We have, for too long, been misleading ourselves with the outmoded conventional wisdom that proclaims bigger to be better. Now the bigger populations, more products and by-products of technology, greater use of resources and proliferation of wastes are lowering the quality of our lives and perhaps even threatening our survival, it is surely time to make intelligent choices which at best may preserve a reasonable quality of life and at worst will avoid disaster to all mankind.

Now I have no objection, Mr. Speaker, to public hearings before any major environmental change is made. I believe that people have become very conscious of the problems being created; created by reckless irreparable changes to environment and to ecology in the name of progress and profit at any cost. More and more people are becoming aware that man is dependent on his environment and that nature is very finely balanced with each creature, each chemical, each microbe having a role to play in maintaining that balance. And when environmental change is made people with concern and knowledge should be permitted to be heard.

Public hearings may also be of value in educating people about the problems of pollution that are ever-increasing at a rate faster than they are being resolved. This awareness may lead to the realization on the part of many that each one of us, every individual, has the responsibility towards protecting our environment. Pollution, Mr. Speaker, which we well know is an ever-increasing hazard to our environment and the ecology and man himself, is a result of human society, and therefore we must not look only at pollutants. We must look at man himself as well.

People involved in the problems and people learning about them can get a better insight into themselves and how they may be contributing to pollution by their own carelessness, by their waste, by their sacrifice of conservation for the sake of a fast gain and even by their apathy. Such public hearings would provide a forum for the expressions of ideas, concerns and proposals on behalf of individuals, community organizations, conservation groups, native representatives and all levels of government.

Mr. Speaker, the record of the former Government in this regard is unfortunately a dismal one. It is worth considering the kind of obvious effects of the pulp mill at Prince Albert which the former government refused to consider. It is said that about 30 million gallons of dark brown foul-smelling waste with accompanying foam and fibre were discharged into the Saskatchewan River each day. Test fish placed in aquaria in which the wastes were deposited died soon after.

Coliform bacteria levels increased five miles down the river from less than 1,000 bacteria per 100 millilitres to 4.5 million bacteria per 100 millilitres. The Water Pollution Control Branch suggests that water containing over 20,000 bacteria per 100 millilitres is badly polluted.

Anyone, Mr. Speaker, looking at the Prince Albert pulp mill could easily visualize the effects of the Dore Lake mill on the environment. Along with the points which I have already mentioned, the Dore Lake Project would have threatened the breeding ground of perhaps 10 per cent of all the California and Ring-billed Gulls in Saskatchewan and the only place in the province where Caspian Terns are known to rest.

Many people demanded public hearings, Mr. Speaker, about the proposed Dore Lake mill. To my knowledge no such hearings were held. Someone seemed afraid of what the facts would reveal. This lack of action on the part of the former Government was, putting it mildly, deplorable.

Mr. Speaker, governments and society as a whole must stop worshipping the sacred cow of the gross national product. We must deal with the reality of a society which is obsessed with the mania of growth, where an increase in the gross national product is a measure of all things good. We must understand that the reality of our society, based on the kind of 'profit at any cost' philosophy pushed by the Members opposite, is that it very often opts for short-term resource development. This short-term exploitation has led to waste, to pollution, to dire effects on the environment and ecology.

The previous Government refused to consider these things, they knew not how to consider social and human values because they were too obsessed with the idea of profit at any cost and with big for the sake of bigness. They seemed unable, or unwilling to project into the future. They chose to ignore any potential environmental hazards that may cause suffering to generations of the future. Mr. Speaker, because of a neglect to consider the effects of a wide range of things from industry to wastes and the poisons of insecticides and pesticides, there have been serious consequences.

Jacques Cousteau, after spending three years exploring the depths of the oceans, said in 1970 that the oceans are dying. He said, and I quote:

People don't realize that all pollution goes to the seas.

He said that the earth is washed by the rain which carries everything into the oceans where life has diminished by 40 per cent in 20 years. Mr. Speaker, this should surely be a sobering thought to all of us in this House as well as to the individuals, the cities, and the industries who contribute to that pollution without giving it a second thought.

I once read an article called "The Death of a Seagull" which tells of the life of a gull which, born hungry for fish, as all seagulls are, ate voraciously of that meat poisoned by DDT which was once used to kill insects and during World War II was used even to kill the body lice of the soldiers. The life span of the gull was four years, Mr. Speaker. On the fourth year when food became scarce the gull began to burn up its body fat where the poison is accumulated and stored.

During times of stress and hunger, the poison was released in massive doses. It inhibited the central nervous system. The bird thrashed and struggled for several hours, when it collapsed there were many convulsions before death came.

April 7, 1972

Now why do I take the time to repeat this story, Mr. Speaker? Because I want to point out that it is a dead seagull today and it may be a dying child tomorrow. I use the example of DDT, Mr. Speaker, but one could list other pollutants such as mercury and effluent from pulp mills which are hazards to our environment and ecology as well as other things.

Some zoologists claim that at least 150 bird species in North America are threatened with local extinction due to pollution. The cormorants off California are now laying eggs with no shells at all, just plastic bags of yolk. Trout in southern Ontario's Lake Muskoka and Simcoe are no longer capable of reproduction. One would not have to research very long to make a list of great length.

Mr. Speaker, the permitting of resource developments which have had dire effects on the environment and ecology of areas affected without sufficient study is totally inexcusable and very deplorable. Considering that the previous Government was prepared to allow effluent to be poured out of their proposed Meadow Lake pulp mill which in volume would have equalled the Beaver River volume of flow, one can't help being amazed and shocked by their short-sightedness.

I can recall not so many years ago when I could get up in the morning and step out the back door on my father's farm, as a young boy, and hear many birds singing in the trees. Today, there are far fewer birds. I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, that if we continue with our mad exploitation of our resources at any cost, that someday a few surviving people may be saying how there used to be crowded cities before people began to be added to that list of 150 bird species threatened with extinction. I say this in all seriousness, Mr. Speaker, and I am saying that we had better look very carefully at all developments, be they agricultural, industrial or whatever, that may have dangerous effects on the environment and ecology. If some birds are laying eggs today with no shells, how long will it take for babies to be born deformed, unrecognizable or dead?

I have, Mr. Speaker, said a few words on the kinds of effects that have and may result if action is not taken to prevent the environment from being polluted and destroyed. I could go on and document item after item to strengthen this point. We could consider the Alaska oil slick which killed 10,000 birds in 1970; or the fact that American water supplies are so contaminated that at least 700 companies with sales in 1970 of \$75 million are selling bottled water; or the estimated \$1 billion cost to clean up Lake Michigan and the examples could go on and on.

Mr. Speaker, the new Department of the Environment which is mentioned by the amendment of the resolution is an important move by this Government to look seriously at the developing of our natural resources in the interests of the people of this Province while protecting the environment and ecology. The role of this Department will be a major one in controlling pollution. I hope that legislation, with teeth in it, will be readily provided when it is needed to stop pollution of the environment and the destruction of the balance of nature.

Such legislation may not always be popular but when it is a matter of life or death I am sure most people will choose life. Without pollution control the chances for life on earth are in

jeopardy. Laws in this area must be tough laws that demand that pollution be topped. It is not enough to simply levy a small fine. It is often cheaper to pay the fine than to install the controls necessary. The same situation develops with the bootlegger who distils the whiskey and sells it for as long as he can before he gets caught. By that time his fine is no seat off his back because he has already made his fortune.

Mr. Speaker, the goal of the Department of the Environment should be clean air, clean clear-running rivers, the presence of birds and wildlife in our lives, pickerel and trout in our streams; a future in this Province for our children and their children.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that we have to learn total respect for the total environment in which we live. We have to learn to manage and use our technology and we must more than in the past, put man at the centre of the whole thing. We can't continue to let 'things' dominate our lives.

Mr. Speaker, I support the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. A.R. Guy (Athabasca): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few words on this Resolution and amendment.

I believe that the resolution is a good one worthy of the support of Members of both sides of the House. I can agree with some of the comments that were made by the Member who just took his seat. I think we are all concerned with the environment. We have noted in the last few years legislation that has received support of both sides of the House, that did considerable to improve the environment and provide the legislation required so that we can go even further in maintaining a clean and pure environment.

It is deplorable to me, Mr. Speaker, that resolution after resolution, regardless of the content, has to be turned into a partisan political debate. It is unfortunate that a question that concerns every person in this Province that was put on the Order Paper by a Member of the Opposition in good faith, has to receive amendments and debate that is purely partisan in manner.

I hope that when this amendment comes before the floor of the House that Members opposite will have some second thoughts, because I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Saskatchewan I think are becoming somewhat disillusioned with the Government of the day, and the fact that they have forgotten that they are no longer in Opposition and that today the full range of responsibility lies in their heads, and on their shoulders.

I think the continual deploring of the actions of the former Government is not of any interest to the people of Saskatchewan today. The people of Saskatchewan had their opportunity on June 23rd and they took it to deplore whatever actions they saw fit of the former Government. I think that passing resolutions, deploring the actions of the former Government shows completely the complete lack of responsibility of the present Government. I think we have seen letters to the editor in the last few weeks

April 7, 1972

which have shown that the people of Saskatchewan are just a little sick and tired of this continual reference to what has happened in the past. They are far more concerned about what is going to happen in the future.

This Resolution is merely for the purpose of showing whether the Government supports the principles of public hearings. Surely they campaigned on it. Why is it necessary to amend it out of existence today rather than vote in favor of it. Is it just because it is an Opposition motion that you are going to vote against our motion? Or is it because in reality you do not believe in holding public hearings before changes in water projects and other environmental projects are to be carried out?

The question of the Athabasca pulp mill was raised in the amendment and, again, I suggest that public hearings in regard to the Athabasca pulp mill are completely irrelevant at this time because there is no longer any Athabasca pulp mill.

Public hearings could have been held if the Members opposite had wanted them. There are, on the Statute Books of this Province, waiting to be proclaimed an Act known as The Clean Environment Authority Act which the young Member from Humboldt (Mr. Tchorzewski) although he wasn't in the session last year, knows received the full support of Members in the Opposition as well as in the Government. Yet it is strange if the Government is as concerned about the environment as the Member from Humboldt lets on, that since July 1st they have not proclaimed this Clean Environment Authority Act. They say they are going to bring in a Clean Environment Department and we have no objection to that. We will support it. If they are not prepared to pass The Clean Environment Authority Act I am sure that if the clean environment authority is in the best interest of the people of this Province, it will have unanimous support. But The Clean Environment Authority Act was there. You were the Government on the 1st of July and before you cancelled the pulp mill deal you could have had public hearings if that was your desire in regard to the environment. There were no final decisions made on the environmental aspect of the Athabasca pulp mill. Studies were still being held.

So, again, I say let's get away from the past and look forward to the future in the protection of our environment tomorrow not today or yesterday. You are overlooking your responsibility deliberately, or because you can't get out of the idea that you are still in the Opposition.

I would suggest to the Member who just took his seat that he address his remarks to the people in the front benches if he is that concerned.

As I said earlier the people today are not concerned about what the policy was one year ago or what it was six months ago, they are concerned what the present policy is and what the policy is going to be tomorrow in the remote possibility that you do get some resource development in Saskatchewan. Are you going to hold public hearings?

The attitude that you are taking against this motion would lead us to believe and the public of Saskatchewan to believe, that you are not prepared to hold public hearings or you wouldn't be so concerned about this motion. This motion is clear-cut and straightforward. It would not weaken your

political position by supporting a motion of this type. I suggest sincerely to the Members on that side, that you are weakening your position by the fact that you are not prepared to take a resolution at face value from this side of the House and you prefer to amend it out of existence by going back to deplore actions of governments in the past.

I think you can enhance your position considerably by coming out supporting the motion as it was presented by the Member for Cannington because there is nothing hidden. There is nothing untoward about it. Really what we are doing we're asking you to go on record as supporting a policy which you supported in this House last year and you supported on the hustings. Some of your front benchers, at least, have supported it since the election and why you are not prepared to support it at this time is beyond our comprehension.

I am sorry that in the amendment the words 'proposed establishment of the Department of Environment' were in brackets. Are we to take that the decision has not been made whether you are going to proceed with the Department of Environment? If you have not I hope that one of the Ministers, perhaps the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) could give us assurance that if there is no Department of Environment that you will proceed with the proclaiming of The Clean Environment Act. It was a good Act. It received the support of all Members of the House last year and I think that if you had proceeded with it that it would have satisfied the immediate needs and for some time in the future. However, we are not condemning you for not going along with that Act as long as you provide a Department of the Environment as you have promised both in the past and in the present Session.

I would remind the Member from Humboldt (Mr. Tchorzewski), when he refers to the various types of legislation, that over the past five or six years considerable legislation has been put on the books of this Province which will control every aspect of pollution. We have the best pollution control and environmental control regulations of any province in Canada if the Government is prepared to use it. As far as industry is concerned there were amendments brought into The Water Resources Commission Act last year. And again they were supported on both sides of the House which gave the Government of the day the absolute power of closing down an industry if it did not fulfil the regulations.

I say to the Member from Humboldt that if the Prince Albert pulp mill is as bad as he claims it is today that it is his responsibility now to close that pulp mill down. The Act is there, you don't need any legislation. It's right there on the book. All you've got to have is the willpower to use it and it is your responsibility now. It's no use saying we didn't do it, or we should have done something. We in our wisdom, wise or otherwise, did as the Prince Albert pulp mill to take additional precautions. They put in additional equipment. We said at the time that if this was not successful further negotiations and further improvement would be necessary. Now it is your responsibility to see that it's carried out. It's no use blaming us for what has occurred in the past. It is clearly on your shoulders today whether you are prepared to use the legislation that we made available to you to control industry and control the natural resources and to control mineral resources. All those regulations are on the books but you have got to have

the willpower to use them, but they are there for your use and they were all put there by the Liberal Government. Air Pollution Control regulations are on the books, The Air Pollution Control Act was passed by us. We provided grants to cities. You talk about the Prince Albert pulp mill, for 20 years you let Prince Albert and Saskatoon dump their raw sewage into the Saskatchewan River and you didn't do anything to stop them. So don't go condemning today something that occurred in the past, your record isn't all that clean. But that's not helping the environment today what happened yesterday, whether it's by your Government or whether it's by our Government. As I said earlier the responsibility is clearly on your shoulders today. The legislation is provided through The Clean Environment Authority Act, The Water Resource Commission Act, The Water Pollution Control Act, The Air Pollution Control Act, The Intensive Livestock Operation Act and The Litter Act.

That's another Act that I want to bring to the Hon. Member's attention. The Litter Act was passed last session and we haven't heard a word about it since. Are you going to proclaim it or aren't you? The Attorney General, I am sorry that he is not in his seat, said in October that it would be ready by the first of the year. Four months of the new year have gone and we haven't heard a word. Nothing mentioned this Session yet whether The Litter Control Act will be enforced or not. I hope that you will. I know that you are having some problems with it and again I may be a little impatient with the fact that you've taken this long. All I am saying is that the legislation has been provided for you, now it's up to you to use it. British Columbia and Alberta both brought in litter control regulations. Surely to goodness it is not impossible for us to bring in something similar. The Act is there, now it is your responsibility to act.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I want to say again that I am sorry that the Hon. Member opposite brought in his amendment. I hope he will reconsider because certainly from our side of the House the original resolution was not provided with any political bias, we merely wanted to have it on the records of the House expecting support from both sides as we had support last session on most of our environmental legislation. It is important that we should have unanimous consent and it would have been on the record for the benefit of every person in Saskatchewan knowing that both Government and Opposition were prepared in the future to hold public hearings for the control and protection of our environment. So I would ask you if you would reconsider your position in this regard so that we can get a clear statement that is not being muddled up by amendments which are not completely but for the most part purely political in content. The question today as I have said, Mr. Speaker, is what are they prepared to do? The legislation is there, we should like to have a clear indication of whether they will accept their responsibility in this regard. Therefore we will be able to support the motion but we certainly have some reservations about parts of the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. J.R. Messer (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, we were aware even before coming into office of the increasing conflict, and in some cases, controversy, over projects requested by landowners through their

conservation and development areas and those persons particularly concerned with wildlife, and environmental aspects in the province. It is noteworthy that in spite of the existence of the Conservation and Development Act for over 20 years, the programs that have been conducted under it during that time, no positive steps had been taken to have these properly resolved or to have objections to projects properly and publicly heard. Now we have this belated resolution taking about major environmental change, whatever that may mean. Last summer shortly after coming into office I met with my colleague, the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Kramer), to suggest what might be done to resolve the conflicts in resource use which were being brought to our attention. We do fully recognize the major problems that some farmers are having due to flooding of their farm lands and I want to talk mostly about that.

The continued effort of farmers to improve their land, the continued pressure on farm income, the heavy added costs involved in modern farm operations by irregular shaped fields, have forced many farmers to undertake land improvement that was not considered some years ago. They are filling in pot holes, establishing shallow water runs, clearing lands and waterways so that water from snow melt or from heavy summer rains will move off their lands. It is collecting more and more on the land of the farmer in the lower parts of the drainage basins in this Province. Small pot holes and lakes on these farms are in wet years reaching new high levels, taking more land out of production and taking longer to dry in the critical spring periods. Wildlife depredation continues to be a major source of crop losses for our farmers in certain areas of this Province contributing further to the reduction of farm incomes. Through their conservation and development areas farmers are taking the initiative to organize in order to correct some of these problems. They petition the Department of Agriculture for assistance. Assistance is provided through engineering services so that works are properly designed and integrated to ensure that water is carried off the land with minimum cost and minimum damage to an adequate outlet. Financial assistance is provided in recognition of the fact that those most severely affected are in fact victims of circumstances and suffer losses attributable to causes that are widespread and generally beyond their means of control. Wildlife interests and environmental interests are properly concerned that this process may be carried too far that in constructing these works natural pot holes and small lakes which are very valuable to our environment, especially to migratory water fowl, are drained to the point that they lose them and affect this wildlife. Thus as a result of the discussions with the Minister of Natural Resources, we established first a wet lands committee made up of the Deputy Ministers of Natural Resources and Agriculture and the executive director of Saskatchewan Water Resources Commission. This is an overall co-ordinating committee. They recommended and there has been established a Wetlands Project Committee. It is made up of nine people including Judge H.W. Pope, Chairman of The Saskatchewan Water Resources Commission, who is chairman of the Wetlands Project Committee and eight other members. Four of them are involved in wildlife or natural history organizations and four are related to farm organizations. It is anticipated that these committees will do more than identify areas of conflict. To be effective it will be necessary objectively to review all project proposals and study various development alternatives in an atmosphere of understanding and compromise to ensure that all interests are properly served. Such public hearings will

provide an opportunity for all interested people to express their views and participate in the planning and co-ordinating of our surface water resources.

It will further provide an opportunity for the various segments of our society to become more aware and knowledgeable of the concerns of other interested groups and thereby gain a better understanding of the overall implications of the various resource development alternatives. This committee has held its first meeting and it is now presently arranging for public hearings to discuss a number of projects requested by conservation and development areas that affect or may affect multiple resources. It should be acknowledged that hearings of this nature should not be restricted to farmer initiated proposals such as those sponsored by conservation and development areas. It would seem reasonable to expect that farmers will be equally concerned about projects promoted by wildlife or recreational or industrial development interests. Thus, Mr. Speaker, in about six months we have taken positive steps toward resolving the conflict in resource use that had been allowed to develop into major problems under the previous administration.

Our objectives in this area go beyond the resolving of conflicts and we have committed ourselves to work toward an orderly development program to ensure the optimum use of our available resources. Further steps will be taken with the establishment of The Department of Environment so that the natural resources and qualities of the environment of this Province may not be wasted or imperilled by any project whatever its nature may be.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy) kept referring in his address a few moments ago to our need to come out with a straightforward policy and a clear statement in regard to where we were going in regard to developments that may affect the environment and the ecology of this Province. He attempted to suggest that we were trying to hide some of these things. I want to bring to his attention that in six months time we have established a Wetlands Project Committee that will and has already started hearings in regard to such projects in the province. He inferred that we were not going to hold public hearings in the Province of Saskatchewan and we have drawn to his attention that we have held one hearing and series of meetings are already posted throughout the Province of Saskatchewan advising interested parties to present briefs or recommendations in regard to projects that may affect the water or the natural wildlife in the Province of Saskatchewan. He criticized the bracketed word 'proposed' in the amendment. I would bring to his attention that at the time that this amendment was made to the resolution of the Hon. Member from Cannington, that there was not legislation in regard to the Department of Environment. It has not been introduced at this point in time in the Legislature but it is anticipated that it will be coming in the near future. Consequently there is nothing wrong with saying that the department is still in the proposed stage and in fact will be coming in the near future.

The reasons that we are proposing and will be establishing a Department of the Environment is so that we can take some of the Acts that the Hon. Member made reference to and consolidate them so that we can have an overall and concise policy in a Department that is structured and established so that it will be primarily involved with our environment in this Province. We

think that is the way it should be. Because we have already shown good faith in establishing a Wetlands Project Committee, because we have committed ourselves to a formation of a Department of the Environment which will look after the problems that we see developing in regard to human activity relating to our natural resource developments, the amendment that has been proposed by the Member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley is one that I think is needed and one that I think should be supported by all Members of this Legislature. I sincerely ask that the Members to your left, Mr. Speaker, reconsider their position and accept the amendment that the Member from Qu'Appelle-Wolseley has proposed because it is one that lays down a policy and a path that will provide assurance to the people of Saskatchewan that we will not have the problems with regard to environmental and ecological upset that we were confronted with by the former seven years of government by the Members to your left.

Having said those few words, Mr. Speaker, I again make a plea to Members to your left to support the amendment as I am sure all Members on the Government side of the House will do.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. T.M. Weatherald (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, I find it regrettable that the Member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley and the Government opposite chose to amend this Resolution because it is really a non-political resolution. I might add that I think I am on fairly safe ground when I say that the first time this Resolution ever surfaced in Saskatchewan I moved at our local Wildlife Association meeting and subsequently there for the next two years it was passed at the Provincial Convention. I know of no other place it occurred from and in that respect I think that that was where it began. It certainly was not political from that group because people of all political parties belong to that group and actually there are no political agendas. The one thing about conservation groups is that they usually take a pretty strong stand against any government if they don't agree with them. I agree with them entirely in that respect regardless of what political stripe . . .

Mr. Speaker: — I wonder if I can interrupt the Hon. Member. I think that maybe I am making a slight mistake here, but the amendment should be taken off first before you close the debate, rather than close the debate while the amendment is still on the table. If the Hon. Member will agree to that I will still reserve him his right to close the debate afterwards.

Mr. Weatherald: — Mr. Speaker, I do have the right, I think, to say a few words to the amendment then.

Mr. Speaker: — Yes, you do have the right to speak to the amendment but having moved the original motion you would have to stay entirely to the amendment. And if you wish to close the debate you couldn't do it at this time.

If you wish to speak to the amendment you may do so now or close the debate afterwards.

Mr. Weatherald: — Mr. Speaker, I should like to speak very briefly to the amendment and then I will close the debate afterwards.

I just want to make very brief comments. I think it is very unfortunate that the amendment has been moved simply because it originally is a non-political resolution. The Government opposite would have done themselves a much greater service by voting for it because it would have indicated to most people interested in conservation matters that they are going to do this, rather than attempting to blame the previous Government for whatever they did or didn't do.

In respect to the previous Government and the amendment, it could be safely said, and it is recognized I think by everyone, with possible exception of the Members opposite, that Saskatchewan's rivers and in respect to pollution, the Saskatchewan River at Saskatoon and at Prince Albert, that these were left in much better condition now than they were when inherited in 1964. I think that statistics as far as . . .

Mr. Gross: — How much . . .

Mr. Weatherald: — Well if the Member for Gravelbourg (Mr. Gross) doesn't know how much pollution equipment was installed in Saskatoon I invite him to ask some of his colleagues because he should try and find out.

The Saskatchewan River as far as the city of Saskatoon is concerned and the city of Prince Albert were concerned before 1964 was in a pretty deplorable condition and had become that way under an NDP Government for about 20 years. But that is a long held argument and I encourage anyone opposite to ask the Members for Saskatoon about what the condition was of the Saskatchewan River before the Liberal Government assisted the city of Saskatoon with a lot of pollution equipment.

I suggest that this Resolution will be a disappointment to most people in Saskatchewan interested in this matter, because by voting for this Resolution the Government could have said, we are willing to have the public hearings. We are willing to take the action necessary. But instead they have taken the back road or the political way out simply by going back to a few old political hackneyed phrases of indicating exactly what they themselves would do. Subsequently, Mr. Speaker, we will not be supporting the amendment.

The amendment agreed to on the following recorded division.

YEAS — 29
Messieurs

Blakeney	Dyck	Wood
Romanow	Messer	Snyder
Thibault	Larson	Baker
Brockelbank	MacMurchy	Pepper
Thorson	Whelan	Carlson
Tchorzewski	Owens	Robbins
Matsalla	Cowley	Faris
Cody	Gross	Mostoway
Rolfes	Lange	Hanson
Oliver	Kaeding	

NAYS — 14
Messieurs

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

The debate continued on the motion as amended.

Mr. Weatherald: — Mr. Speaker, I indicated that what, I think, most people interested in conservation matters would really like is an indication from the Government that they support this position.

While the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) outlined some recommendations or changes that he has made in this Department — and these are welcome — most of these were provided in Acts previously passed in the last year or two and he is now putting them into operation. In this regard he is following through what the previous Government had intended and was starting to actually bring about. I think what is required, however, is that more than . . . well he says that some public hearings are being held. I think that most people would really like assurances that public meetings are going to be held. He may speak of a Wetlands Committee and I think certainly we support that idea, the problem still exists that this Committee may or may not pass judgement for or against the project and still doesn't require that the public have a say in whether the project be proceeded with or not, simply by ensuring that this guarantee is given. Many of the problems that we have had up until now could be overcome.

I think that the Wetlands Committee is a desirable move. It is a move in the right direction, but I suggest to the Minister why not let's go all the way and ensure that the hearings be held because the Wetlands Committee, while I know it will take an interest in these matters and give considerable assistance, there still is the real danger existing that projects will be given the okay or turned down without the people concerned really having the final opportunity of participation.

So I would conclude, Mr. Speaker, by saying that it is unfortunate we feel that the Government chose this occasion to make it a political resolution when it was not a political resolution. We think it is unfortunate they did not see fit to give wholehearted support to the idea. We think if they had given wholehearted support to the idea, joined with the Opposition in supporting this, that it would have been a step forward in the Province of Saskatchewan. I mentioned in my original remarks that most of these matters are relatively new in this country and while it is easy to say that we should have done something ten or five years ago or so forth, that if we actually proceed in this course we still will be the first province in Canada to do so and I don't think this would be a bad record in any sense of the word.

So, Mr. Speaker, I just conclude my remarks and will not be supporting the motion as amended.

April 7, 1972

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Motion as amended agreed to.

RESOLUTION NO. 4 – PUBLIC WORK PROGRAMS

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

That this Assembly commends the Government of Saskatchewan for action taken in bringing forward public work programs in the early fall of 1971 and in extending and supplementing Federal Government programs for the relief of winter unemployment; Expresses regret at the tardiness of the Government of Canada in announcing its 1971-72 winter employment programs and at the dilatory manner in which municipal applications under the Local Initiatives Program were processed by the Department of Manpower and Immigration;

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

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

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

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

Mr. E.L. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a few comments on some of the debate that I have heard on this particular resolution which is another important one.

I recall the Member opposite from Moose Jaw North (Mr. MacDonald) who spoke the other day speaking of an ostrich with its head in the sand. Let me say that his comments and contradictions and seemingly intentional neglect to state the facts as they really are made him appear as the complete personification of that ostrich that he spoke about with his head in the sand.

He and his colleagues, Mr. Speaker, are the agents of one of two things, or maybe both of them. They are refusing to speak of all the facts, thus intentionally attempting to misinform the public, or, their research is so lacking that they speak only to take up time and know not really what they say. Somehow they have become so swallowed up by the fact that they are the Opposition that their only sense of direction seems to be one of criticism in providing no alternatives and suggesting no realistic improvements. Surely the role of Opposition in

Government must be meant to be more than a negative one.

I would have thought that the new Liberal Members opposite would have brought some fresh, new, realistic, positive ideas to the Liberal Party on the opposite side of the House. Instead they have unfortunately been completely engulfed and dominated by their seniors and continue the same kind of unconstructive activity in debate in this House which led to the defeat of the former Liberal Government.

It is somewhat ironic that the Members opposite would have moved and supported an amendment such as the one sponsored by the Hon. Member from Moose Jaw North, because they neglect to consider or mention the \$5.3 million worth of projects which were in the former Government's last budget as window-dressing, projects which could not proceed at all in the last year. Yet they move an amendment such as this one.

The former Government had frozen on the drawing boards a \$2.3 million provincial office building in Regina and a phase of the \$2 million Saskatchewan Institute of Applied Arts and Science building in Regina, and yet the Member for Moose Jaw North moves an amendment expressing regret that this Government did not develop a public works program.

Under the former Liberal Government 16 projects in the Education Department had insufficient planning to start work during the year, a value set at \$499,000. In the Department of Highways the same kind of thing with \$974,000; \$3 million in the Department of Public Works that could not proceed, and the list continues. And now those same Members who wanted to mislead the people of this Province or misinform them by including in their budget items valued at millions of dollars, which could never have been proceeded with in the past year. Those same Members try now to misinform the public by moving this amendment which is totally inaccurate.

I suggest that Members opposite should stop and look at their political cupboard before they criticize the efforts of today. Mr. Speaker, the Liberal projects which couldn't proceed were valued at \$5.53 million. They pretended to have a program to stimulate winter employment but when the facts were revealed they had almost none.

I think that when the Member from Moose Jaw North talks about people putting their heads in the sand he had better pull his out and look at the record of his colleagues who sit with him.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a few words in this debate because I believe there could be some very serious inadequacies in the way public works programs are developed, the way a lot of money is distributed and the manner in which the programs are administered.

The winter employment program of 1971-72 and the tardiness of the Government of Canada in announcing it in a dilatory manner in which municipal applications under the Local Initiatives Program were processed by the Department of Manpower and Immigration cannot but lead one to believe that the Federal Government never really intended to have the Saskatchewan municipalities to take advantage of the program. It seems another example of a move taken prior to an election only to

April 7, 1972

try and garner a few votes and no real effort was made to fight unemployment in a meaningful way.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that it was only the actions taken by the Government of Saskatchewan which supplemented and expanded the Federal Government programs, that made it possible for many municipal governments to take part. I know of many projects that local governments were not going to work on until this Government provided the help that it did in the form of matching grants.

Winter works programs are failing to provide an opportunity for rural municipalities, as the Member for Biggar (Mr. Cowley) outlined small towns and villages equal to larger cities. Any crash program such as the one of the past year announced in such a careless manner leaves out many of our towns, villages and rural municipalities. Our larger cities with their full time city planners, architects and engineers are able to develop a program quickly which can be worked on under winter works. They have a larger concentrated tax base, making it easier to raise funds from their budgets that are needed to make up the amounts needed to cover the costs, the costs not paid for by winter works grants or forgiveness loans. As a result, Mr. Speaker, the cities are able to take advantage of these programs with ease. They swallow up the major portion of the moneys provided and the rural municipalities and smaller communities benefit very little.

In the setting up of public winter works programs there is a need for consultation between all three levels of government; Federal provincial and local or municipal. Some consideration might be given to the ability by different municipal governments to take advantage of programs. Their ability to mobilize resources and raise funds needs to be considered, and those considerations must be incorporated into winter works programs.

Another idea that should be given special consideration is that of recreation. If a community could show that its program will increase the opportunity for recreation for its members or that it will substantially improve facilities and opportunities, special consideration should be given. The lack of recreational facilities and well planned programs can no longer go ignored. I've said many times before that leisure time is increasing rapidly and people are demanding expanded opportunities in the rural areas. The cities alone can no longer be the only providers of good recreation opportunities. And to these, Mr. Speaker, other priorities can be added.

I am saying that winter works programs should provide for special incentives and help in areas of special needs.

To further help rural municipalities and towns and villages to take advantage of winter works programs, these should be announced well before freeze-up. They must have time to prepare plans, they must have time to complete their project after it begins. Our climate is not like in southern Ontario, or in coastal British Columbia. If foundation or excavation is needed, this should be able to be done before there is three feet of frost in the ground. This should be able to be done before mid-February when temperatures can be 40o below zero.

Mr. Speaker, I want to recommend strongly that in light of the fact that many projects will not be completed by the May

31st deadline, in fact many of these projects have not yet even begun, the deadline of May 31 be extended at least to the end of June. We must all urge the Federal Government to make this extension and announce it in their program.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words on the way in which the money has been allocated under the Federal winter works programs. I believe that the facts in this area prove that the programs were poorly planned, haphazardly set up and ridiculously mismanaged. I submit that there is a distinct possibility that some political motives might have been involved in the distribution of funds.

Under the LIP some \$150 million was allotted for all of Canada. At no time did the Federal Government indicate just how much local initiatives program money had been allocated to Saskatchewan municipalities. With four to five per cent of the population of Canada living in Saskatchewan; with the economic situation in Saskatchewan being of a serious nature over the last few years, during which time the Federal Government refused to provide any cash injection, one should have been able to assume that Saskatchewan on the basis of population and unemployment rate, should have been eligible for at least \$2 million.

What did Saskatchewan receive, Mr. Speaker? Out of 127 local government applications amounting to \$3,390,744 forwarded to the Federal Department of Manpower and Immigration only 62 applications amounting to \$1,388,704 received Federal approval.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, the Province of Quebec received 40 per cent of the Federal Government's Local Initiatives Program funds, according to the Globe and Mail of March 3, 1972. Quebec groups received \$60 million – two and a half times as much as Ontario and far, far more than Saskatchewan.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, the three prairie provinces together received only \$21 million. And even if one chooses to consider the prairie provinces alone, it seems rather strange that out of \$21 million provided to them by LIP, Saskatchewan received only \$1.3 million. One must be led to ask what has happened to that self-acclaimed spokesman for Saskatchewan, the Hon. Otto Lang? It would appear that the three of Trudeau – Marchand – Pelletier, are getting more than their fair share at the expense of provinces like Saskatchewan. It might be of interest, Mr. Speaker, and of considerable value to have a public inquiry into the LIP program as has been suggested by some in Parliament.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — I would hope that the Opposition Members of Parliament will continue to press for such an inquiry.

It is also rather strange the manner in which applications appear to have been dealt with. A kind of fox-and-goose or hide-and-seek game has been carried on by the Department of Manpower and Immigration and the Federal Government. A good case in point is an application made by the Humboldt RCSSD for assistance under the LIP. Assistance in the construction of a gymnasium at St. Dominic School. The first word was, Mr. Speaker, that hospitals and schools were not eligible. Then, and only after pressure from this Government, schools and

April 7, 1972

hospitals were included.

Early in 1972, the school board received a letter from the Department of Manpower and Immigration stating that their application had been rejected. It has been rejected the letter said because it did not provide UIC, CPP and Workmen's Compensation. I personally wrote to Winnipeg, Mr. Speaker, suggesting that the rejection was unacceptable and that the least that could be done was that the school board should be given an opportunity to correct its error, if an error was indeed made. To this day I have not received a reply to my letter. The school board did. They received a letter in mid-February and that letter said the following:

Your recent project application submitted under the Local Initiatives Program has been given careful consideration. I greatly regret to inform you that it has not been possible to give you the financial assistance necessary to carry out your proposed project. The response to the Local Initiatives Program has generated many worthwhile proposals from which a selection must be made. Your proposal has been carefully considered in comparison with others submitted under the program and we regret that it is not possible to approve a contribution to the project you have proposed.

And this time, Mr. Speaker, the rejection seemed final and without question. And it seemed like a good, worthwhile project was rejected. And then on a weekend following March 2, 1972, after arriving home from Regina, Mr. Speaker, I picked up the local weekly newspaper the Humboldt Journal and reading through it I came across a headline and the headline said: "Grant Approved". And reading further here is what it said, Mr. Speaker:

The Federal Government has approved a \$19,000 grant to the Humboldt Roman Catholic Separate School District. The grant, through the Department of Manpower and Immigration is to be used to hire 26 men to construct an auditorium-gymnasium for St. Dominic School.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this was not only the first time that I came across the new change of heart on behalf of someone in Ottawa. This was the first time, as the chairman of the school board informs me, that the school board was aware of the fact that after officially being rejected twice, their application had been accepted.

The question that arises is who were the shadow people who made the decisions on the LIP applications? What criteria was used in determining eligibility? Why are there such discrepancies in the amounts of money okayed to different provinces? Why was Quebec alone given \$40 million of the total money while Saskatchewan received only one per cent even though it has four to five per cent of the population of Canada?

The amounts of money allocated were done unfairly and obviously with discrimination. The administration of the programs by the Federal Government was inefficient with unnecessary delays and strange workings that are open to suspicion.

Mr. Speaker, as I have said before, of 127 local government applications totalling over \$3 million submitted to the

Regional Office of the Department of Manpower and Immigration, only 62 applications amounting to \$1.3 million were approved, under the LIP program. On March 6, 1972, the Province of Saskatchewan alone had given approval to 48 projects with estimated grants of \$885,146, almost as much as the total Federal effort. Since March 6th there have been other provincial approvals.

Under the Employment Loans Program, the Federal Government had given approval to 13 provincial applications and 72 local government applications for a total loan of \$6.9 million. This may cost the Federal Government in loan forgiveness a total of \$3.8 million in Saskatchewan. The province may contribute \$4.3 million in loan forgiveness in matching grants, an amount greater than that costing the Federal Government.

I submit that the Government of Saskatchewan should be commended for its action taken in bringing forward public works programs in the early fall of 1971 and particularly . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — . . . in extending and supplementing Federal Government programs for the relief of winter unemployment. The Federal program and the way that it was announced and administered, leaves a great deal to be desired. Only because of efforts made by this Saskatchewan Government were many municipalities able to take part in winter works projects this year.

In closing I want to stress once again that the deadline of May 31st must be extended to at least the end of June. Future programs must be announced early enough so that municipalities can plan their projects and have time to start them before freeze-up. Stress must be put in making it possible for rural municipalities, small towns and villages to take advantage of winter works programs on an equal opportunity with our large urban centres. Former programs have not been very effective. A total study by all three levels of government is needed as the Resolution presented by the Member for Canora suggests.

Mr. Speaker, I support this Resolution, I will oppose the amendment.

Mr. MacLeod: — Just a question. I just didn't hear what the Hon. Member said was the population of Saskatchewan as compared to Canada, was it nine per cent you said?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Yes, I said it was approximately nine per cent.

Mr. MacLeod: — I rather make it something like four per cent but . . .

Mr. Romanow: — There has been . . .

Mr. MacLeod: — Yes, the only reason I am starting to question these figures is that the Hon. Member from Redberry made a 50 per cent error. I thought we should understand how big a margin of error they will normally allow.

Hon. E.I. Wood (Swift Current): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few words in this debate if I may, Sir.

An Hon. Member: — In the 'woods' again.

Mr. Wood: — That's the name of the game so far as I am concerned. Mr. Speaker, I am quick to agree that there is real need for employment in the province at the present time. I think there is a need, I think that unemployment is one of our problems and this problem has been with us for some time. It was not new when we came to office. We had a serious unemployment problem last winter and at that time the government of the day said that they were bringing in a huge employment program, some \$15,775,000 of capital program in the Department of Public Works. They made a good deal of sound about this a year ago, Mr. Speaker, in the session but when we came to office in the summer of 1971, we found that this \$15, close to \$16 million was not indeed that much. But we found that some \$8,695,000 of it had been completely frozen. It was not considered to be in the Budget at all so far as the Department of Public Works was concerned. They were told to not consider this. It was not to be considered in the work they were proposing. Those items that were included in that amount were to be forgotten until they heard further from them and there was nothing, nothing had been done in planning them, nothing had been done to be prepared to go forward with them.

When I became Minister of Public Works, Mr. Speaker, my instructions from the Cabinet were to get everything going that I could in that Department in regard to construction. To move forward everything that was possible to move forward. We approved for acceleration some \$5,657,000 worth of construction. We brought in some new projects of some \$2,378,000. There was additional other winter works projects in other departments of some \$314,000 which made a total of the projects which we were endeavoring to bring forward of some \$8,349,000.

But, Mr. Speaker, the problem was in getting this work underway. The Government was prepared to spend this money. The Government was anxious to spend this money. The Government was only too willing to make the money available and to get the work going for the people of this Province that they might have employment this winter and that they might be able to make the jobs for the people that needed them in the province. But the Department of Public Works was not geared up to do this. The Budget had been frozen. They had no shelf of work lined out that they could go on. There had been no previous planning done. There was no planning, there was no designing brought forward in regard to work that could be gone forward.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the amendment which we have before us I believe says this House expresses its regret that the Government of Saskatchewan did not develop a public works program in the fall of 1971 sufficient to alleviate the severe unemployment problem that existed. Well, if we did not, Mr. Speaker, there is one very plain door at which we lay the blame and that was in the Government of last year that laid the foundation and laid the planning for the projects that were to be brought forward in the latter part of the year. There was no planning, there was no money available, there was just nothing there. I said to the men in our department, "How can we get these things

rolling, how can we generate this program? How can we get the planning and the designing done that is necessary to get these programs underway?" I said, "Can we hire more men?" They said, "No, that's useless we have just so many people in this capacity in the Department at the present time, if we bring in more new people who are not acquainted with the work we have to take out time to train these people. We are hamstrung, if we try to increase our staff at this time instead of giving more impetus to the program it will be delayed and held back." Mr. Speaker, the Department of Public Works was not geared up to bring in a kind of program that this Province needed. And it was not the fault of this Government it was the fault of the previous Government that had left the Department in that position.

Now I want to give all credit to the Department of Public Works of which I was Minister at that time. I had the very best of co-operation from these people and I have nothing but commendation for them but I have no words of commendation for the previous Government that left the situation as it was and I have not much sympathy with the people who bring in such a Resolution. Not only did they not do anything when they were the Government, not only did it leave the Department of Public Works in such a position that they were not able to move forward but they bring in a resolution now saying that we express regret that the Government of Saskatchewan did not develop a public works program in the fall of 1971 sufficient to do these things.

Mr. Speaker, I do wish to speak further in this debate. Could I ask leave to adjourn the debate?

Debate adjourned.

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