

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Third Session — Seventeenth Legislature
34th Day

Tuesday, March 13, 1973

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Hon. Mr. Snyder (Moose Jaw South): — Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to introduce to you and to the Members of the House, approximately 50 students from the Adult Upgrading Course from St. Louis College in Moose Jaw. These students are accompanied by their instructors Sister Louise, Mrs. Shillington, Mr. Wiebe and Mr. Matachuck. They are situated, I understand, in the east gallery and in the Speaker's Gallery. I should like all Members to issue a warm greeting to them and a welcome that indicates that our wish is for them to enjoy a pleasant moment with us and that they go away with a better and deeper understanding of the parliamentary system of government. We would also like to wish them a safe journey home.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan (Regina North West): — Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce to you and to all Members of the Assembly, 60 Grade Eight students from R.J. Davidson School in Regina North West. They are with their teachers, Brian Peever and Aurele Duperreault located in the west gallery.

This school bears the name of a well-known and long-time provincial civil servant who dedicated his life to education. On behalf of all Members a warm welcome to these young citizens and their teachers. May your visit here be pleasant and informative.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

Policy In Making Announcements By The Government

Mr. Weatherald (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to direct a question to the Premier.

Recently, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture announced outside of the House in the March 6, 1973 edition of the Leader-Post that grazing fees are to be boosted. Again in Friday's Saskatchewan Gazette an announcement was made of changes in the PEP program. The question that I should like to direct to the Premier is: Is this a new policy of the Government to announce all bad announcements outside the Legislature and all announcements which he thinks are good ones, inside the Legislature? Or, Mr. Speaker, will he direct the Cabinet Ministers to show some respect to the Legislative Assembly by making all announcements in this House?

Hon. Mr. Blakeney (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, as a veteran observer of so many news

conferences held outside the House in the days of the former government when, not only was there some modest announcement in the Press, but full television and radio coverage of something that had not yet been announced in the House, I find this a little strange coming from the Member from Cannington, that he has suddenly become sensitive to this sort of thing.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — However, I will take the point which he raises under advisement. I think many of these things are quite routine and there is not much point in taking the time of the House in announcing them.

Members opposite should know that in their regime, nothing was more routine than tax increases.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — We will certainly take into consideration the point raised. I think that it is not at all possible to announce in this House all of the things which are covered by Orders-in-Council. There are many dozens and hundreds. Someone must make a selection as to that which is important enough to take up the time of the House.

Summer Employment For Students

Mr. Weatherald: — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Now that it has become public knowledge that the Government does not intend to assist students for the coming year, who wish to work for businessmen and for farmers, what alternative program will the Government be putting forward so that businessmen and farmers may know what this will be in the coming months, as far as employment is concerned. What alternatives does the Government have as far as employment now that you have cancelled that program?

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, the Government's program in this regard, I think, has been indicated in part by the Minister of Culture and Youth (Mr. Tchorzewski).

Quite frankly we think that the farming industry does not require any subsidy this year particularly. We think that farming prosperity, generally, has never been greater; that the business has recovered from the dark days of 1969 and 1970. Retail sales are up in February, up by 12 per cent over February of 1972 and in 1972 they were up sharply over 1971. We doubt whether subsidies are needed in order to encourage employment, but we are very interested in providing additional jobs, as I think the Minister of Culture and Youth has already indicated. We had the feeling with respect to last year's program that many of the students who received the assistance from the Government would have been employed in any case.

We are, therefore, wishing to direct our attention to providing truly additional jobs. We have not foreclosed any and all avenues, but as of now we see it unnecessary for us to subsidize particular employment in the farming industry or in

private business. There may well be information which would indicate that that judgment is in error. There will be lots of time to change our minds on this, but as of now that is the position of the Government.

Hon. Mr. Snyder (Minister of Labour): — Mr. Speaker, my colleague behind me suggested that we might employ a large number of students and possibly cope with the entire unemployment problem, if we hired students for the purpose of tracing down Liberal rumors. And that might be a matter that might be taken under advisement.

James Smith Reserve

Mr. McIsaac (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, wasn't that a wise comment from the Minister of Labour?

I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Education (Mr. MacMurchy). Toward the weekend there was news in the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix, I believe, initially of a disruption, if you like, in the educational service of the students or pupils from the James Smith Reserve in the Kinistino School Unit.

I would wonder what has taken place since that time, Mr. Speaker. What is the Minister doing to alleviate the cause of that situation and what steps has he taken to restore educational services to the Indian students up there?

Mr. MacMurchy (Minister of Education): — Mr. Speaker, as the Member for Wilkie well knows the department is not involved in any agreements between boards and the Department of Indian Affairs in Ottawa with respect to the integration program of Indian students.

We are well aware that there is a problem. We are aware that the Indian students have been withdrawn from the school in Kinistino and we understand, from the information made available to us from the Board, that there is the intention to establish a schooling program on the reservation.

We have been made aware of the situation by contact with the Board and the superintendent there. Mr. Bergstrom the Deputy Minister of Education is still in Ottawa dealing with negotiations with the CBC in the field of Educational broadcasting.

I have asked him to seek an audience with the Deputy Minister of Indian Affairs, Mr. Basil Robertson, hopefully today and to get a discussion with respect to the situation at Kinistino. The Board is vitally concerned, as well they should be because the students have been withdrawn. They have seven staff members that are in the school because of the agreement to teach these students and they are wondering what they should do next. They have contacted us and we are now in an attempt to contact the federal people with respect to this problem.

Dismissals in the Department of Continuing Education

Mr. MacDonald (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would

like to direct another question to the Minister of Education.

I received a report this morning that there were some wholesale dismissals in the senior administration in the Department of Continuing Education. I also understand that many of them are rather old and dedicated civil servants. I should like to ask the Minister if he would give me the names of those people whom he has removed from the administration of the Department of Continuing Education. Could he tell the Members of the House the reason for these dismissals and could he give me any indication if there is a guarantee that these people will find alternate employment within the Civil Service?

Mr. MacMurchy: — Mr. Speaker, I do not have the information available for the Member. I suggest he put the question on the Order Paper and I can perhaps reply adequately to it. I am not aware of the situation within the department that he refers to at this point and I can't at this time respond to the question.

Mr. MacDonald: — Mr. Speaker, just a supplementary question. I just don't believe the Minister.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! A Member must accept a Minister's word for it whether you want to debate it at a later time, but I can't allow any debate at this time.

Mr. MacDonald: — A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Certainly the Minister knows of all the departments in government, Education is the one where with curriculum programming and training of the young people of Saskatchewan requires diversity of interests and political affiliation. Is it the intention of the Minister to hire nothing but dedicated socialists in the Department of Continuing Education?

Mr. MacMurchy: — Mr. Speaker, it is the intention of the Minister and of the Government to hire people that are dedicated in the field of education.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Condolences

Hon. Mr. Blakeney (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I wonder if I may, with leave of the Assembly move a motion with respect to the sad news which we received yesterday of the passing of the former Member of this House, Mr. H.C. Dunfield — Cliff Dunfield — as he was known to many of us.

Mr. Speaker, I move seconded by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart):

That the Assembly records with sorrow and regret the passing of a former Member of this Assembly, and expresses its grateful appreciation of the contributions he made to his community, his constituency and to this province:

Hugh Clifford Dunfield, who died on March 11, 1973, was a Member of this Legislature for the constituency of Meadow Lake from 1952 to 1956. He was born at Headingly, Manitoba in 1891 and attended public school, high school and Wesley Methodist College in Winnipeg. He came to Meadow Lake in 1915 where he was a rancher and homesteader. He served as a supervisor of the Meadow Lake Indian Reserve and in 1933 he established a business as a warm air heating contractor. At various times in his life he was president of the local hospital and school boards and of the Board of Trade. He was a member of the Masonic and Elks Lodges. He was a Justice of the Peace and from 1958 to 1960 he was Mayor of Meadow Lake. He was an author of some note, having written several articles and also a book about beavers entitled "Rusty and Susie."

In recording its own deep sense of loss and bereavement, this Assembly expresses its most sincere sympathies with members of the bereaved family.

Mr. Steuart (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, the Premier and the Hon. Member from Meadow Lake (Mr. Coupland) paid tribute to Mr. Dunfield yesterday on receiving the sad news of his passing.

I wish also to say a word today about Cliff Dunfield. He was a dedicated man in so many ways. He was involved in his community, as the Premier pointed out and at the provincial level as an MLA. He was involved in municipal life. He was involved in hospital work.

I think the best word that I can think of to describe Cliff was that he was a very involved man. There was hardly anything in the community, almost of the province, that he wasn't interested in and concerned about and eventually at some time in his life was involved in.

I should like to join with the Members who paid tribute to his memory and just say that this province has lost one of its outstanding sons and to pass on to his family our deepest sympathy and condolences at this time.

Mr. Dyck (Saskatoon City Park): — Mr. Speaker, I should like also to pay tribute to the memory of Cliff Dunfield and express my sympathies on his passing to his family.

I knew Clifford Dunfield, briefly, in 1963 and 1964 and I found him a very engaging gentleman and very interesting to talk to. In 1963 and 1964 my wife had the opportunity of working very closely with him in the preparation of his book "Rusty and Susie," and I should like to express my sympathy to his family on his passing.

Mr. Coupland (Meadow Lake): — Mr. Speaker, I also should like to add some words of condolence to the Dunfield family. I have known the Dunfields very well for the last 30 years.

Cliff was just one terrific man. As was already mentioned, he moved to the Meadow Lake district in 1915. I recall Cliff

telling me how he came to arrive in Meadow Lake. He was in Winnipeg at the time and he was wanting to go farming. Being a very meticulous man and wanting to make sure that he made the best move, he got a big map of Western Canada, showing the quality of land all over Canada. Apparently at that time there was an area in the Meadow Lake district which had land that was supposed to be the highest productive land in Western Canada.

This is why, in 1915, Cliff and Ariel his wife arrived in the Meadow Lake district. His father and mother came up at the same time. There he ranched and farmed and his wife taught school.

Cliff and his wife were the real pioneers. Their doors were open to anyone who stopped by and they were only too willing to offer a helping hand to anyone in need.

When I first met Cliff he was running a tinsmith shop in Meadow Lake, in a small place behind the Beaver Lumber. From there he expanded into the hot air furnace business. He put a furnace in my house back in 1950. Being the progressive type of man he was, when the forced air started to take over, Cliff learnt about the forced air heating and switched to plumbing and heating. He was very successful. At the time he was in the plumbing and heating industry he also served in this House for four years from 1952 to 1956.

When he retired from the plumbing and heating business he couldn't stay idle and he was continually writing, writing articles, and he wrote that book "Rusty and Susan," which is a story of a pair of young beavers, a very interesting book. He presented me and my wife with an autographed copy of it of which I am very proud. He also wrote a serial that was published in the Western Producer last year.

The Dunfields were very, very active in those early years in public life. Cliff was instrumental in getting the first Red Cross Hospital in Meadow Lake. They were instrumental in getting schools going in the district to educate the young children. They were very interested in church work and were instrumental in getting the first church built in that area, Methodist, I believe, now a United Church.

Cliff had one son, Colonel Dunfield, who is a medical officer with the armed services, stationed in Oromocto in New Brunswick. As it has already been mentioned, Cliff was very interested in politics all his life. Cliff moved my nomination in 1963. I will always feel that it was the moving speech that he made on my behalf that enabled me to win the nomination and go on to win the Meadow Lake seat in 1964.

Cliff lived a very full and useful life and contributed his utmost to society. I certainly offer my sincere condolences to Mrs. Dunfield and the family.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, with leave I move seconded by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart):

That the Resolution just passed together with the transcripts of oral tributes to the memory of the deceased Member be communicated to the bereaved family on behalf of this Assembly by Mr. Speaker.

Motion agreed to.

MOTIONS FOR RETURNS

Return No. 241

Mr. D. Boldt (Rosthern) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 241 showing:

(a) The percentage of vehicle accidents on all highways in the Province of Saskatchewan that could be attributed to alcohol in the year 1972; (b) Where death was involved in vehicle accidents on all highways in Saskatchewan, the percentage that could be attributed to alcohol in the year 1972.

Hon. Mr. Romanow (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, with respect to Return No. 241, I have had my officials take a look at this from the Highway Traffic Board and from the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office. Unfortunately they have advised me that they feel there is no way the way the wording of the question is at present that an answer can be provided with any degree of accuracy.

I should like to draw to the attention of the House the question asks the percentage of accidents that could be attributed to alcohol in the year 1972. This I am advised is a very difficult statistic the way it is worded. I have tried to think of some amendment which would try and get at the fact because I am interested in this as well. I regret to advise the Hon. Member and the House that I haven't been able to think of one. The people tell me that being worded in indefinite terms as it is, the number that could be attributed to alcohol in the year 1972, is very difficult. Very often alcohol plays a part in accidents but there is no way to know about it. Sometimes there is no blood test after the fatality or after the accident occurs. Or the accident occurs and the person involved in the accident wanders off home. When the police come and a report is made there is no trace of alcohol. These are the types of problems that are involved. So what I want sincerely to communicate to the Opposition is that I don't want to defeat this because we are afraid of anything here, if the alcohol figure keeps on going up we want to know that as much as you people do. We just don't think we can answer it on this present basis. And perhaps, the Member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) could talk about it to figure out some new wording. I would be quite agreeable for him to come in with a new wording on this Return. But on this basis I am advised that we just can't answer it. So, therefore, I would rather ask him to withdraw it or the only other alternative is for us to defeat it.

Mr. Boldt: — Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw the question.

Question withdrawn.

Return No. 242

Mr. Boldt moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 242 showing:

(a) The number of 16 to 21 year olds that were involved in vehicle accidents in Saskatchewan in the year 1972; (b) The percentage of drivers that this age group represents; (c) The percentage of accidents that this age group represents.

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, here I will be asking the House to accept an amendment, that all the words after “showing” be deleted. This is only to make it a little more readily understood in the terms of the amendment.

What we are doing here is we are correlating the number of 16 to 21 year olds involved in vehicle accidents in the licence years 1968-69, 1969-70, 1970-71, 1971-72. What we have done is we have added the 1971-72 to the question and we have backed it up for three other licence years. I don't know what the answers will be to those, I can tell you that honestly. But I would be interested in knowing if the 16 to 21 category is showing an increase. I am advised with that amendment the licence year amendment, we should be able to provide the answer for the Hon. Member and for the House.

I move the following amendment seconded by my colleague the Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek).

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

(a) The number of 16 to 21 year olds that were involved in vehicle accidents in Saskatchewan in the licence years 1968-69, 1969-70, 1970-71, and 1971-72. (b) The percentage of drivers that this age group represents in each year. (c) The percentage of accidents that this age group represents in each year.

Motion as amended agreed to.

Return No. 244

Mr. Boldt moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 244 showing:

Whether any citizens of Saskatchewan have been given special driving privileges whose vehicle operators' licences were suspended or revoked since January 1, 1972 to March 1, 1973.

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, again here the officials advise me that it would be better for us to tie that to the licence year, therefore the amendment is to 1971-72, and again I am most interested in seeing what the comparison is. We may be in for a surprise but I would like to back it up three years. And therefore, Mr. Speaker, I will move seconded by the Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek).

That all the words after the word “showing” in Return No. 244 be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

Whether any citizens of Saskatchewan have been given special driving privileges whose vehicle operators'

licences were suspended or revoked in the licence years 1968-69, 1969-70, 1970-71 and 1971-72.

Motion as amended agreed to.

RESOLUTIONS

Resolution No. 14 – Urges Government of Canada to Reduce Unemployment

Mr. E.C. Whelan (Regina North West) moved, seconded by Mr. Robbins (Saskatoon Nutana Centre):

That this Assembly urges the Government of Canada to develop adequate employment schemes to reduce unemployment in Canada to more acceptable proportions; to disclose details of work plans for the winter season at an early enough date to permit maximum participation at the provincial level, and to fulfil its responsibility, through its control of Canada's fiscal, monetary and general economic policies, to take action designed to provide long-term solutions to the problem of chronic unemployment in Canada.

Mr. Whelan: — Mr. Speaker, all Members will be pleased, I am sure, to learn that according to the latest statistics from the Federal Government for the week ending February 17, 1973, unemployment in Saskatchewan has dropped from 7 per cent of the labor force to 5.9 per cent.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan: — This is a remarkable achievement when one considers this took place during the winter weather.

Although the Federal unemployment picture has improved slightly, from 6.2 per cent in January to 5.9 per cent in February, one cannot escape the obvious fact that under the Federal Liberal Government in this country, even after they have been "seasonally adjusted," 655,000 working people were without jobs in Canada at February 17, 1973, and 1.5 per cent of these were in the Province of Saskatchewan.

In Saskatchewan 7,000 more people were working at that date this year than one year ago. This is a good ground-gain for this province — one our opponents cannot deny. Our efforts are aimed at an even better performance. The position we take at Ottawa, and in this House, should be aimed in that direction.

This Resolution, Mr. Speaker, has been discussed in many ways, or referred to in other debates. Directly, or indirectly by innuendo, in the House or on television, Members opposite have tried to establish their position. It must be embarrassing to them, it must annoy the unemployed. This Resolution will provide an opportunity to set the record straight.

There is nothing less defensible or more hypocritical, more detrimental or more degrading to the position of all politicians, than to see supposedly responsible political people misleading the public. No better example exists in this respect when one considers the fact, than the Liberal Party, whether

provincial or federal, speaking or pretending to speak and suggesting that they might be able to present policies that would alleviate the plight of the unemployed in this country.

Why do I say this, Mr. Speaker? Well, because of the record. How did we get to the unemployment situation that we have?

Mr. Speaker, it wasn't accidental, it didn't fall from a cloud, it wasn't put together by a union leader, it wasn't found on a gooseberry bush. It wasn't thought up by a socialist theorist, Mr. Speaker. The unemployment we have was planned by the Federal Liberals to combat inflation. Let me quote the record, in the words of the Prime Minister himself. In the winter of 1969, in order to combat inflation, what was the position the Prime Minister of this country took? When asked to set out his approach to the problem of inflation, he said on December 22, 1969, at a news conference. I am quoting Canadian News Facts:

Prime Minister Trudeau said December 22nd that the most pressing problem Canada is facing in 1970 is inflation and that the Government would fight it fiercely even if it meant unemployment would rise to six per cent of the labor force.

Mr. Speaker, he put people out of work. These people opposite, these people in their sympathy for the unemployed, through their Federal leader, put people out of work. In December 1969 in the dead of winter they put people out of work to fight inflation. And what did we get, Mr. Speaker?

More inflation and the unemployment that he planned, because the Liberals, Mr. Speaker, federally and provincially, can plan unemployment. They are proving it every day. They can't plan marketing, and they can't plan economic programs. The only thing they can plan is unemployment. And in this they have done a magnificent job. In a land laden with the world's goods, minerals and food; with a world begging for manufactured goods – foodstuffs and machinery – these initiators of inactivity and stagnation have no cure for unemployment federally – and the people of this province shellacked them for their dismal failure to even partially solve the unemployment problem provincially. Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that the situation facing us today, with about 600,000 or 700,000 or 800,000 Canadians out of work, with productivity lost, with payment of many millions of dollars in unemployment insurance, Mr. Speaker, I put the question: has their fierce fight been a tremendous success?

With the Liberals the authors of the unemployment situation – in order to combat inflation – the record shows that we have more unemployment than the 6 per cent they planned, and more inflation than they imagined, clear-cut evidence that they have failed to stop inflation; but as a policy for unemployed, as planned, it has been extremely successful.

And now, Mr. Speaker, to have a ratchet-voiced group of people, like my friends opposite getting on their feet day after day, after they have instigated unemployment, and attempting to point the finger at others, is enough to make the people of this province lose faith in the sincerity of the Liberal party for ever and a day.

March 13, 1973

Mr. Speaker, before we become involved in the details of this resolution, two aspects of the unemployment problem, in my estimation, should be discussed as entirely relevant to this resolution. One aspect is: Is the Federal Government mainly or completely responsible for policies that either cause or cure unemployment? Secondly, how much can a province do to curtail unemployment without the assistance of the Federal Government?

Let us look at the second aspect first. Without the assistance of the Federal Government, how much can the Provincial Government accomplish? The Provincial Government can build buildings, it can organize student programs for employment, it can undertake winter works programs, it can pass legislation to increase wages and reduce working hours and it can, within its economic limitations, undertake activities such as the building of parks, housing, roads, bridges, schools and other facilities during the slack periods to help keep people employed.

When Members opposite, in a most sanctimonious performance pretend to this House that they are interested in unemployment and that, as a Provincial Government, they or a government made up of people like them, would alleviate the unemployment situation, they think that the people of this province have short memories, or that they can't read, or Mr. Speaker, they think that the people of this province are inept.

What are the facts, Mr. Speaker? When these people were in government, year after year after year, they voted money for a base hospital. When the 1967 election campaign was fought, they purchased the land and we took a picture of a bed sitting in the middle of the field. It was the only evidence that there might be eventually a hospital built. Time and time again, capital expenditures were listed and time and time again, Mr. Speaker, when a question was put on the Order Paper, we found the money had not been spent.

Mr. Speaker, those hovering angels, who exhibited their sympathy for the unemployed and enunciated their desire to help them when they were the Government, failed to expend money that was set aside for housing, year after year, as the Estimates of the day will testify.

What was happening? The last year we were in office, 1964, 7,000 people left the province. In one full year when they were in office, in 1969, allowing for births immigration and deaths, 32,000 people rushed head-long out of this province looking for work. Mr. Speaker, the irony of it all, the unbelievable hypocrisy, the most misleading and inaccurate promise ever made at any time, to any people in Canada by any political party was, when these people opposite made the promise to provide for the workers of this province, 80,000 jobs.

What did the people get, Mr. Speaker? They got the Liberals; money voted for public buildings that were not built on time; housing that was not constructed; jobs that did not materialize, and a record exodus of people seeking work in the years 1969 and 1970, which climaxed seven years of people leaving in haste, out of work. Altogether in the last two full years in which they were in office 50,000 people left. In the seven full years they were in office 120,000 people left the province, Mr. Speaker. This happened while these people administered the affairs of this province in a way that provided no employment for those that were leaving. Not only did we lose citizens, we lost the

money that we had invested in their education, we lost their technical know-how and Mr. Speaker, the workers of this province lost forever any faith they might have had in the Party opposite. Now look at them. They want to talk about unemployment, but they don't want to talk about their sorry record.

You know, we could say as they did on April 9th, 1968, in this House, that we don't need a housing corporation to build houses and vote it down as they voted down our resolution of that day.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we could do like they did, refuse to spend money under the winter works programs, refuse to rebuild or repair homes of senior citizens; we could ignore the development of secondary industries. We could merely take the position taken by one they would describe as a reliable person, who in the Leader-Post said on May 17, 1971, and I quote:

Any sensible person knows that unemployment is caused by a great many factors, largely beyond the control of a provincial government.

That is, any 'sensible' person – I don't know whether that would apply to the Members opposite but this statement was made by a very authoritative and very reliable person, highly recommended and certainly with the approval of Members opposite, representing their position.

Honourable Members opposite certainly don't qualify as 'sensible' persons in some respects. But the person who made this statement would certainly be acceptable to them. That person was their leader, the Hon. Ross Thatcher, and he made the statement at Allan, Saskatchewan, according to the Leader-Post. If the former Premier of this province was correct, and I assume that he was, then I suggest, Mr. Speaker, responsibility for unemployment as well as the solution for that problem lies mainly within the jurisdiction of the Federal Government.

The man quoted earlier, the same reliable and authoritative person – and I am sure when I gave you the source – on another occasion, speaking of the Province of Saskatchewan, that authoritative person stated:

Our people must look to Ottawa for leadership.

What was the program for Ottawa that was suggested by this very reliable person, very reliable leader? Let me quote further:

A massive crash public works program by all 11 governments, particularly Ottawa.

Immediate withdrawal of the sales tax on building materials at both Federal and Provincial levels.

Extension of the designated area legislation.

Temporary extension of unemployment insurance benefits.

This was at a conference in Regina, February 10, 1971, according to the Leader-Post, just before an election. Let me quote further:

However, action a provincial government can take is limited, because Ottawa controls international trade, fiscal policies and interest rates.

Let me finish by giving the final quote from this story:

Our people sometimes wonder if Ottawa realizes that Saskatchewan is still a part of Confederation.

If we cry to Ottawa, Mr. Speaker, these people opposite when they were the government, and were dealing with Ottawa, were known across Canada as the full-time crying people. When they failed to document their requests, they became petty and ineffective. They were an embarrassment to the people of this province. The facts are, the Provincial Government is limited because Ottawa does control international trade, fiscal policies and interest rates. Yet we have these people opposite screaming for emergency action.

Let us turn for a minute, Mr. Speaker, to what the situation is in this province as a result of the Federal Government's planned unemployment. We are supposed to have 6.2 or 5.9 per cent unemployed, or whatever it is. And even that, Mr. Speaker, as far as I am concerned, (I'm talking about the Canadian picture) could be a grossly inaccurate and entirely unsatisfactory picture.

Last year, a proposal was made to Statistics Canada to find out "who's who" among the unemployed. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that we should really know when we talk to the Federal Government who is who in the unemployed. It is the first problem that we should tackle. Statistics Canada asked for \$7 million per year to get better information in this respect and they were turned down. Even superficial examination clearly indicates that the present figures are unsatisfactory, incomplete and do not sort out the unemployed in a way that they can be categorized and sorted out in a manner that will assist us in solving their problems, whether it is for retraining, initial education or relocation.

We have been given to believe that many of those people on Canada's unemployment rolls are not heads of families, but young people who left school early; that they are retired people who wish to continue working; that an increasing number of them are women.

We have been left with the impression that the Federal Government has been somehow saddled with job figures that were padded. Job figures that include a lot of people who don't deserve to be listed among the unemployed. Could it be possible that we have over-employment, not just one, but two jobs for every person with one job? I suggest to you that the answer is a loud and categorical, 'No'. Surveys by unions and other organizations have shown that the present survey of the unemployed has become too narrow and too small to show the kind of detailed information that governments need when making policy.

For example, we do not know who is voluntarily unemployed. Even in the United States there is infinitely more information about the unemployed. For example, the Americans in 1966 decided to probe the relation between the job market and poverty in the cities. In 1967 their Bureau of Labour set up a task force to pursue the question in ten cities. In addition, a

questionnaire was included in the 1970 Decennial Census in 51 cities and nine rural counties resulting in 68 volumes of raw statistics. They found for instance, that in New York City the conventional unemployment rate was 8.1 per cent. But this figure rose to 11 per cent when the discouraged workers were added. When those earning less than a proper wage were included, the statistics took a huge leap to between 40 and 60 per cent of the labor force.

Some of the statistics we need to measure unemployment accurately are available and could be developed. It is known that in 1971, for example, 12.8 per cent of employed females worked fewer than 25 hours a week, part of the low income positions of our working people in Canada, and a factor contributing to an inaccurate picture of unemployment. To assess the magnitude of the unemployment problem, we need much more information; we need to know the number of discouraged workers who have given up looking for jobs; the number who can find only part time work and the number who hold jobs but at insufficient wages.

We know from various studies of poverty in Canada that the lowest 40 per cent of our population earn only 15 per cent of the country's total income. This is part of our unemployment picture. So long as our official statistics make it appear that only 5 or 6 per cent of our labor force is in trouble, and that by inference, the other 94 per cent are doing fine, the tendency will continue to equate the rise in welfare and unemployment insurance costs with laziness and immorality. We are told repeatedly that there are enough 'good jobs' to go around if people really want to work. Conditions of the poor in terms of sub-employment explode this myth.

The need is for statistics to examine the whole employment picture, not only those who are shown as unemployed, but those who are under-employed, part-time workers, those who get inadequate wages, and the people who have become involuntary part-time workers and who have never had a job and who have given up looking for work. Until we have statistics that give us this complete picture, we do not even know who needs what kind of work or where.

In addition, if we are going to work on unemployment in this country, the present statistics available are almost a farce when it comes to working on a program to relocate, retrain or reorganize them as a work force.

Mr. Speaker, the inability of the present government at Ottawa to work from a positive point of view, year in and year out to provide employment, has left us with an inadequate, piecemeal, part-time winter works program that is anything but practical in planning either construction or employment.

This year, with the winter works program beginning so late, organizations and municipalities were unable to plan construction because the program was not announced early enough. To encourage employment during winter months for tradesmen facing a slack period, the Federal Government should announce (no later than June 30) that beginning September 30 plans will be approved for winter works projects to be built and completed not later than May 31st of the following year. Without adequate notice and without pumping huge sums of money into such a program, the winter works program as now known is inadequate and ineffective.

March 13, 1973

This year many projects in Saskatchewan, because the program was announced late, were abandoned while the Government at Ottawa fiddled and fooled.

To suggest that they are serious about solving unemployment when their schedule is erratic, unexplained, changeable, is difficult to accept and, to the unemployed, a sample of insincerity.

Let me list in synopsis form some programs that would develop our country and at the same time provide employment:

1. The Federal Government should make available money at a low rate of interest, for people desiring to build their own homes, particularly if the homes are built during the winter months.

2. Huge sums of money at a low rate of interest should be made available to provincial housing corporations to develop housing for senior citizens, students, native people, farmers, co-operative housing.

3. A program of loans on a long-term basis with a low rate of interest should be provided by the Federal Government to build tourist facilities in areas approved by the Provincial Government that would guarantee proper facilities for the travelling public during winter and summer.

4. There should be a federal program to develop parks within city limits and on a regional basis throughout the province, along the highway, for travellers in the North, and adjacent to historic sites.

5. The Federal Government should undertake on an organized basic employment program to develop the tourist industry.

Mr. Lane: — Can't do it yourself?

Mr. Whelan: — We are doing 25 times as much as you did and you weren't here to see it, but I can tell you that everybody on this side of the House that was here knows about it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan: — Your performance was 'gosh awful'. It was unbelievable! Well that's why there are so few of you over there now.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan: — That's why there's just a handful of you. You got beaten on unemployment and the Federal Government almost got beaten on unemployment and you still haven't learned a lesson. You sit there yakking away and making a noise. When are you going to wise up?

6. Through a heavy input of federal money, the Federal Government should complete the Yellowhead Highway, and develop a third highway further north across Canada, in co-operation with the provinces and territories involved.

7. As a safety feature, the Federal Government should, in co-operation with the provinces, build overpasses on the main highways across the country at every location where a railway crosses the main highway, whether it is No. 1 Highway, the Yellowhead Highway, or any other main east-west highway.

They did it in New Zealand. Have a look, you will see that they have done it in that country.

8. North-south roads into tourist areas and potential mineral producing districts in the northern parts of the provinces and territories should be developed by the Federal Government in conjunction with the provincial and territorial governments.

Even John Diefenbaker talked about that, that's not new. You probably never even heard about it.

9. Full senior citizen retirement pensions should be provided to anyone who has worked 35 years.

10. Shorter work weeks should be introduced in federal industries and particularly starting in the federal civil service in an effort to provide more jobs.

11. Arrangements should be made to allow a contributor to borrow and later pay back his investment in his pension plan at a rate of interest to cover only handling costs, providing the contributor uses the money to build houses.

12. Exemptions for those of the lower income brackets should be increased to provide a complete income tax exemption for those with large families and low incomes.

13. Grants or subsidies should be provided at special interest rates for municipalities desiring to combat pollution by building proper sewage treatment facilities.

14. The Federal Government should attach a cost-of-living clause to the payment of unemployment insurance.

15. It should expand opportunities for employment by developing services for people such as training staff for day care centres, senior citizens homes, convalescent homes, recreation, pollution control and public health education.

16. It should encourage the Provincial Government to subsidize and assist in overall planning activities in the fields of housing, day care centres, urban renewal, development of new secondary industries, chemical research.

17. We have to analyze the unemployment picture in this country through Statistics Canada or some agency so that we know who is unemployed – their age, their training, what sort of work they can do, what sort of work is available in this country for them and where it is, if they need training where they can get, how they can get it, whether we should transfer them from one location to another and who should pay for this.

18. A study should be made of needed public works. For instance, in the city of Regina there is a need to put all RCMP administrative offices under one roof, and there is a need to provide permanent housing for non-commissioned officers and

certain personnel in the Force who are stationed in Regina. In addition facilities are not adequate for proper training programs. There is a need for an extension of facilities at the Regina Training Depot.

19. Educational facilities, such as community colleges, should be heavily subsidized to provide initial training and retraining for those seeking employment for the first time and those who are out of work.

20. Subsidies, grants and low interest rate loans should be provided for industries and particularly co-operatives to process food stuffs where they are produced to avoid payment of freight, first on the raw product and second on the manufactured article.

21. In co-operation with the provinces the Federal Government should provide the funds to establish across Canada electrical energy facilities for all the provinces so that we won't have needless duplication of facilities which eventually adds up to extra costs for the consumer.

Let me say, in conclusion, unemployment is just not statistics. It is not just a political game that the Hon. Member from Lumsden (Mr. Lane) plays.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan: — It is three-quarters of a million Canadian men and women unable to find work, unable to feel the sense of participation in our society. It is \$5 billion, \$6 billion or \$7 billion lost in production and perhaps \$2 billion in tax revenues. It is a staggering increase in welfare costs to those taxpayers fortunate enough to be working. It is the incubator of social unrest, of blighted lives in young people unable to find a role and meaning in our economic world. It is loss of hope for families struggling to acquire a home and trying to avoid the clutches of a loan company. No government with a conscience that has looked at the full cost of unemployment, no government could deliberately choose increased unemployment as the answer to inflation. The Federal Government should have as its primary goal full employment. If some price rises occur with full employment or because of shortage or external circumstances it is far better and cheaper to compensate the victims of inflation, those on fixed incomes, than to squeeze the life out of the economy and pay the staggering bill for unemployment.

Mr. Speaker, the program that I have suggested is better, more practical, more acceptable and, in the end, will cost less in money and in human suffering than the route we are following at the moment.

Let me go back and recapitulate what I have said. First, the province in its limited way can, should and will do its utmost to meet the unemployment problem. Second, but because of its financial resources and the control it has over monetary policies and imports and exports, the Federal Government has the resources and the power and the jurisdiction to solve our problems.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan: — I have suggested a number of programs that might be undertaken. There are many more. I have listed them for consideration by this Assembly. Mr. Speaker, we cannot sit idly by and ignore the plight of the unemployed. We cannot sit idly by and ignore the inactivity of the Federal Government. We cannot sit idly by and expect unemployment to go away. The program that I have suggested should begin now, could begin now to curtail the rising unemployment figures.

Those opposite say we are crying to Ottawa. Well, Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan is part of Canada, Ottawa is part of us. The advantage of belonging to this federation of provinces and being part of this country, is to work together to solve our problems. Making a case for the unemployed in Saskatchewan is making the same case for the unemployed whether they are here in British Columbia, Ontario, Alberta, in Newfoundland and Nova Scotia. We should attempt to solve the problem not as residents of this proud province but as citizens of Canada. As a province our resources, our efforts will be mustered by building housing and developing secondary industries, by organizing local job opportunities to provide employment. But that mobilization to provide employment can be ten times more effective, ten times more successful, ten times more practical if it is worked out in co-ordination with the Federal Government. That means, Mr. Speaker, in co-ordination with the other nine provinces and the two territories. Anything less discounts the value of being part of Canada and discredits our dedication to being a responsible province of this great country.

Everyone knows, and there is no argument about the fact, that the Federal Government controls finances, exchange rates, tariffs, trade and commerce and the factors that determine whether we manufacture, whether we produce and whether we employ. To make the criticism that we are crying to Ottawa is a time-worn, foolish, irresponsible, senseless cliché. The challenge to put people to work is the one we must meet and we won't meet it successfully as a province by ourselves, we won't meet it by sitting quietly and failing to enunciate to the Federal Government policies that we think will help solve the unemployment problem. Crying? No! Making representations in a reliable, responsible, forthright, forceful and urgent manner, yes! Mr. Speaker, and when do we make these representations? Now, and in this Resolution. I therefore move this Resolution.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lane (Lumsden): — Mr. Speaker, never has the cruel arrogance and the hypocrisy of the party opposite been more evident by the remarks of the Hon. Member when he proudly announces that there is a 5 per cent unemployment rate in Saskatchewan, when he proudly states that we have created 20,000 unemployed in the province and he is proud of the fact. That is the arrogance of this Government, Mr. Speaker. That's the motion that this Government wants us to support and to endorse. In the words of the Hon. Member 20,000 people in the Province of Saskatchewan don't have work, 20,000 people have a loss of hope, 20,000 people are now forming an incubator of social unrest, 20,000 people are unable to participate in democracy, all because of the arrogant Government opposite, Mr. Speaker. The Resolution presented by the Member opposite is unfortunate in its attempt to mask the ineffective efforts of this party to deal with the unemployment problem in Saskatchewan.

The NDP is guilty of not caring about unemployment in Saskatchewan and the Government opposite is guilty in failing to take any effective measures to deal with the unemployment crisis in Saskatchewan. The Government opposite is guilty, Mr. Speaker, of intentionally intending to create and trying to create unemployment in this province in order to create for themselves a cheap political issue. The Government opposite is guilty of attempting to deceive the people of Saskatchewan that the cause or the fault of unemployment is not of their doing but is the fault of someone else. Mr. Speaker, the NDP and Saskatchewan's record of unemployment is a dismal, unfortunate record indeed. Extremely high unemployment levels exist in every province under the control of an NDP government. On the national level the party opposite is guilty of the crassest form of arrogance in having absolutely no policy and no programs to deal with an unemployment crisis but, Mr. Speaker, the NDP Government in Saskatchewan is the cause of unemployment in Saskatchewan by its deliberate moves and efforts to prevent jobs in Saskatchewan and to prevent industry from coming to the Province of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, the Government of Saskatchewan has no one to blame but itself for unemployment in Saskatchewan. That the Government opposite doesn't care about unemployment, Mr. Speaker, is evident by the actions of government in closing the Athabasca pulp mill and the Choiceland Iron Mines. Mr. Speaker, the Government has approved by its actions that it wants, it deliberately wants, unemployment in Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, the Government opposite had ample warning about the unemployment crisis in Saskatchewan and it chose deliberately, deliberately, Mr. Speaker, to ignore the warnings and refused to do anything.

Mr. Speaker, I refer to a headline in the Leader-Post of November 3rd, 1972. The headline for the Hon. Members who are ignoring the problem, "Construction Trade Facing Job Crisis," November 1972:

An anticipated lack of building throughout Saskatchewan this winter may produce the worst employment record in the construction industry in more than a decade. Union and industry officials agree that the employment opportunities for the 4,000 unionized construction workers in the province are likely to be scarce. In Saskatoon, union officials are expecting that the present 25 per cent unemployment rate will double.

They go on to quote, Mr. Speaker:

The business manager of the construction general workers said that 50 per cent . . .

And I repeat for the Hon. mover of the Motion (Mr. Whelan):

. . . 50 per cent unemployment rate is expected in the unions' membership.

The General Manager of the Saskatchewan Construction Association said there were very few projects at that time. He goes on to be quoted, Mr. Speaker:

You have to go back to the early 1960s . . .

And I ask the House what type of government was in existence in Saskatchewan in the early 1960s? There is no doubt it was the NDP predecessors, the CCF:

... to find a comparison with the unemployment that can be expected this year. The lack of new industries and businesses locating in the province has also slowed construction.

The headline again, Mr. Speaker, for a party that is trying to get a consensus on press councils. I am assuming they read the headlines, that was November 3, 1972, and again it is in big, bold print for the Hon. the Attorney General, "Construction Trade facing Job Crisis."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I realize that it may not be a paper read by very many Members of the Government opposite, it's the Globe and Mail, it's an Eastern paper. But I am sure that certainly there are some people in the civil service . . .

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — I read that one.

Mr. Lane: — The Hon. the Attorney General just admitted that he reads the Globe and Mail. Then the Hon. Attorney General, the front benchers and the Treasury benches were well aware of that in November 1972, in the Globe and Mail, "More Jobless Expected in Saskatchewan." Headlined in the Globe and Mail, Mr. Speaker, they knew in November!

Hon. Mr. Messer: — What page?

Mr. Lane: — Seven! They knew at the beginning of November, Mr. Speaker, that there was going to be a terrifically high unemployment rate in the Province of Saskatchewan. I apologize, Mr. Speaker, to the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, it is page 14 and not seven.

Mr. Speaker, what is the sum result of the warnings that the front benchers, the Treasury benchers, the NDP Government and the NDP had to the unemployment crisis that was forthcoming? What did they say about? Here is the comment from the Hon. the Premier, the man who is leading the party that doesn't care about unemployment. He has the classic answer to unemployment, Mr. Speaker, he said that these job forecasts are inaccurate. He goes on to state, "We are launching what we consider a massive winter works program." Something not considered by the mover of the motion.

Mr. Speaker, the arrogance of this Government has never been more obvious in the summary dismissal of the unemployment warnings that were given to the Government opposite. Mr. Speaker, the Government opposite is trying to hide its own failures by blaming the Federal Government. The Federal Government didn't close down the Athabasca pulp mill, you did. The Federal Government didn't close down the Choiceland Iron Mine, you did. You are the cause of unemployment in the Province of Saskatchewan. You put tens of thousands of people out of work in the province and you did it intentionally, Mr. Speaker, and they have the arrogance to stand up and say they are proud of that fact. They are proud of 20,000 people unemployed. Mr. Speaker, the Government at Ottawa didn't close down the Choiceland Iron Mine, you

did. The Government at Ottawa didn't close down the Athabasca pulp mill, you did and put thousands of people out of work. Mr. Speaker, they are proud of the fact.

Mr. Speaker, the only proposal we have heard to deal with unemployment other than the farcical New Deal for People just introduced in this House by the Hon. Member which is certainly much too late for winter unemployment, the only proposal we have had from the NDP provincially, the NDP federally, the NDP elected representatives, the only proposal that they have come up with was David Lewis' proposal to reduce the personal income tax rate. Now, how much, Mr. Speaker, how much credibility do they attach to their own Leader when they turn around and ask this Legislature to endorse a drastic increase in the personal tax rate in Saskatchewan? That shows that when they finally do get a good idea, one of the Members gets a good idea, this Government opposite in its deliberate attempt to create unemployment goes around and throws it out the window. Mr. Speaker, the NDP proposal, their single proposal to deal with unemployment has no credibility because they have again deliberately, and I say again, deliberately penalized the average citizen with their tax increases this year. The Federal NDP program is not credible and the Provincial NDP program is nonexistent, Mr. Speaker, when it comes to dealing with unemployment.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier has admitted in this House he doesn't even have the statistics and then the Hon. Member has to go around crying that we have got to have more statistics. The Premier stood up in this House yesterday and admitted that he doesn't have the estimates of unemployment.

Mr. Speaker, we note that he has conveniently left the House when the truth is being told. It is very weak justification for their lack of efforts as attempted in this House. It is unfortunate that the Hon. Member, the mover of the motion wasn't around to hear the truth and take the responsibility and be man enough to take the responsibility for unemployment in this province.

Mr. Speaker, we had in Saskatchewan in February an unemployment rate considerably above the national average. Mr. Speaker, it proved in February and it was clear to every citizen in Saskatchewan that the fault of unemployment and the problem of unemployment in Saskatchewan was not the fault of the Government in Ottawa but was the fault of the deliberate attempts of the Government opposite.

Mr. Speaker, under the previous Liberal Government the unemployment rate in Saskatchewan was always much below the national average. We didn't stand up in this House, Mr. Speaker, the Liberals didn't stand up and be proud of the fact that they had finally reduced their unemployment to the national average. They were ashamed of the fact that they even got close and brought in programs to compensate at that point. This resolution proposed by the Hon. Member is an attempt to play politics with the unemployed in Saskatchewan and that is cruel politics, Mr. Speaker. In the words of David Lewis, it is inhuman and it is cruel and those are the words that aptly fit the policies of the Government opposite.

Mr. Speaker, the Government's efforts in the Budget were virtually non-existent, 4,500 man months of work was all that

they could come up with — 10 people having jobs for the rest of their lives, is the sum total of the NDP proposal. That's all they could come up with. They criticize the Federal Liberals for coming up with 200,000 new jobs in 1971, 250,000 new jobs in 1972 and trying for 1973 — 300,000 new jobs. You come up with 10 and you have the arrogance and the gall to stand up in this House and be proud of your record and be proud of your stand.

Mr. Speaker, to prove that this Government is deliberately creating unemployment another nail was driven into the coffin of the unemployed in Saskatchewan by the announcement that the Government has cancelled the STEP program started by the previous Liberal Government.

Mr. Speaker, the Government has deliberately ruled out the private sector in trying to cope with the unemployment crisis in Saskatchewan. Now farmers and businessmen are ruled out from attempting to deal with the unemployment crisis, intentionally ruled out, Mr. Speaker. Another example of the Government opposite downgrading the private sector in individual initiative in Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lane: — The Government says, Mr. Speaker, that there are abuses, there are abuses in the STEP and PEP programs. The Government is now saying that the businessmen and the farmers were dishonest when it came to dealing with unemployment. They are saying we do not trust the farmers, we do not trust the businessmen in helping us with the unemployment crisis. That's what the Government is saying with its emasculation of the STEP program as introduced by the Liberal Government. You are saying that they can't be trusted, farmers and businessmen can't be trusted. They have deliberately cut out the private sector from assisting with the unemployment crisis, Mr. Speaker. Add this to the power to close down any business, the corporate tax drastic increases, the buying up of Saskatchewan businesses in attempts to control the Saskatchewan business community, the Government is ruling out any efforts to deal with unemployment. Mr. Speaker, they are saying we do not want the private sector to assist in helping fight unemployment in Saskatchewan. The Government is deliberately trying to make a phony issue of unemployment in Saskatchewan an issue which is solely the fault of the Government sitting opposite, Mr. Speaker, solely the fault of the NDP Government in Saskatchewan.

All they can come up with when the Liberal Government in Ottawa looks at hundreds of thousands of jobs they come up with 10. Mr. Speaker, they only budgeted \$5 million out of a \$722 million Budget and then the Hon. Member has the nerve to stand up in this House and accuse somebody else of not spending enough money to deal with the unemployment crisis.

Mr. Speaker, the people will not be fooled, they know you cancelled the jobs, you cancelled the industries. You are spending money not to create new jobs. The people in Saskatchewan know that the unemployment crisis is your fault and no one else's and you can't hide this fact. Mr. Speaker, this resolution is merely an attempt to pass the buck it is merely an attempt to hide the sins of omission by the Government opposite, Mr. Speaker. No other party could sit in this House on a debate

on unemployment and be proud of the fact that there are 20,000 people in Saskatchewan out of work and think it is humorous and laugh at it. They don't care about unemployment, Mr. Speaker, they are misleading and attempting to deceive. In order that the people of Saskatchewan, although they well know the fact of where the truth lies, in order to make it clear that the Government opposite is not attempting to deceive the public we are going to urge the Government opposite, Mr. Speaker, to endorse the following amendment, seconded by Mr. McPherson (Regina Lakeview):

That wherever the word "Canada" appears it be deleted and the word "Saskatchewan" be substituted therefor and that the word "municipal" be substituted for the word "provincial" in the fifth line thereof.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The debate continues on the motion and the amendment.

Mr. Robbins (Saskatoon Nutana Centre): — Mr. Speaker, I had hoped that the level of debate in this particular resolution would be on a high plane. After listening to the broken record of the Member from Lumsden (Mr. Lane) I think we could call it 'Lane's Lumsden Lament'. Quite frankly if I had a little more time I could probably have concocted a bit of verse under that particular heading.

We are speaking I presume to the amendment of the motion which simply says that the word "Saskatchewan" be placed wherever the word "Canada" appeared in the resolution. I would wonder why the Hon. Member for Lumsden would even suggest such amendment when it would then read, "That the Government of Saskatchewan at an early enough date . . . " when they, that is the Government of Saskatchewan did announce the winter works program in September and the Government of Canada didn't announce theirs until December 8.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Robbins: — Secondly, I wonder why the resolution would read with respect to "Saskatchewan's fiscal, monetary and general economic policies," obviously the monetary policies of the Government of Saskatchewan are always very limited because this happens to be part of a federal state.

Mr. Steuart: — Give it to us in rollicking verse!

Mr. Robbins: — Opposition Members concern themselves with the problem of unemployment and rightly so, all of us should be doing this. They also concerned themselves with the problems of unemployment when they occupied the Treasury Benches because they had severe problems in relation to unemployment during considerable portions of their term. I ask them to believe that we in this Government are no less sincere in our desire to alleviate unemployment than they were when they were in office. Some say we should engage in massive construction projects and thus create immediate demand for labor and thereby reduce unemployment. The previous

government believed you could alleviate the unemployment problem with the enticement through incentives to large industrial organizations, such as the Athabasca Pulp Mill. The Member for Lumsden referred to it today. They proposed the Athabasca Pulp Mill in the last election. They were beaten to a pulp in that election on June 23rd, 1971.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Robbins: — The Member for Lumsden makes comments about the Choiceland Iron Mine. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, the Choiceland Iron Mine was simply a figment of their imagination concocted for that election, and that there was no truth whatsoever in terms of immediate development of that project. It was just an election gimmick. Mr. Speaker, it is a fact that they had a severe problem related to unemployment during a goodly period of their term as the Government of this province.

Massive construction projects must have economically viable reasons for them being undertaken by a government or anyone else. Let's look at what a provincial government may do to broaden economic activity and thereby reduce unemployment. This Government will and the mover of the motion has already mentioned this, through the proposed Housing Corporation, stimulate construction. There is need for housing, particularly among middle and lower income groups. Grants to senior citizens to repair homes will also assist in this regard. Hopefully the activities of the Housing Corporation will result in rehabilitation of housing which is badly needed particularly in the rural areas and in the smaller centres of the province.

Mr. Speaker, the \$5 million on winter works program, announced well before winter's arrival is a means whereby unemployment is to some extent, alleviated. Programs which increase the quality of life in our province increase the propensity of Saskatchewan people to stay in Saskatchewan, this in itself is a job creating factor, assisting and reducing out-migration and retention of people. I am always amazed when the people opposite talk about the dropping population in Saskatchewan, when the worst possible record ever attained in this province occurred when they occupied the Government benches. They talk about whether or not this Government is concerned about unemployment and we have evidence to prove that steps are being taken in this regard. The forestry program that is proposed in relation to the North should help to increase employment in this province.

Mr. MacDonald (Moose Jaw North): — It will not!

Mr. Robbins: — The Member for Moose Jaw North says it won't. Well he is an expert and you know what an expert is; he is a fellow that knows more and more about less and less until he knows practically everything about nothing!

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Robbins: — Crown corporations such as Sask Tel will be spending \$3.7 million in terms of a microwave program in the North. That will certainly assist in terms of alleviating the unemployment program. Operation Open Roads and Operation Main Street will

obviously give employment to many people in this province in the coming summer. Grants in terms of tourism to municipal and local organizations will be a factor in reducing the unemployment totals. The development thrust of expansion into livestock production (although the Members opposite ridicule this) and the investment in Intercontinental Packers can lead in the future to a wide expansion in terms of processing which could create 4,000 to 5,000 jobs in this province.

Mr. Steuart: — Got took like grand . . .

Mr. Robbins: — Mr. Speaker, well I heard Mr. Mendel on the television yesterday and he said he didn't care what the Liberals say about this program. He said it was a good one, and we didn't tell him what to say.

Mr. Speaker, despite what any provincial government may do with respect to the unemployment problem they know it and we know it, the major responsibility in relation to it must of necessity lie with the Federal authorities. It did when they were in the Government benches and it does now when we occupy the Government benches. Fiscal and monetary policies of the Federal Government are the basics upon which the economy expands or contracts. This was clearly portrayed in the period of 1969 to 1970 when the Federal authorities followed a policy of fiscal and monetary restraint as a means of containing inflationary trends. The Prime Minister of Canada, the Hon. Pierre Elliott Trudeau admitted it would result in an increase in unemployment and that policy certainly did that very thing. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, it did not contain the inflationary pressures with any marked degree of success.

The Federal Budget introduced on February 19th this year by the Hon. John Turner, Federal Minister of Finance is to some degree an expansionary budget. Reduction in sales and excise taxes, a minor adjustment in income tax rates — it is very minor when you really look at it because the 5 per cent decrease is really only off-setting the 3 per cent increase which was previously suspended temporarily. Increases in old age security and veterans' pensions will release more funds for consumer spending. An estimated \$975 million Federal Budgetary deficit for 1973-74 fiscal year will, on the operation of an increased money supply and the fact that we have a minority government — the Hon. Leader of the Opposition should take note of this — will likely have a somewhat less restrictive stance in relation to fiscal and monetary restraint than it had back in 1969 and 1970 when the Prime Minister had a clear majority in terms of controlling the House of Commons. Mr. Turner in his Budget Speech predicted that the rate of expansion should provide jobs fast enough to bring about a significant reduction in unemployment.

But what is significant? The Member for Lumsden says they are going to create 300,000 jobs, that is of course merely an estimate, as obviously it had to be. The Budget and the fiscal and monetary stance of the Federal Government will not likely achieve a significant reduction in the overall unemployment rate. The high rate of unemployment that this country has been experiencing ever since the Trudeau administration introduced restraint measure in 1969 will likely continue. The unemployment situation in this country is directly traceable back to that particular policy which was instituted in that particular

period of time. It is most unlikely that this minority government will revert to a restricted monetary and fiscal stance similar to the one established in 1969 to 1970 and 1970-71. Most of the impetus for growth in 1973, aside from the mild domestic stimulus inherent in the new budget will come basically from exports to the United States where their economy appears to be heading into somewhat higher ground. Extremely heavy budgetary deficits in the United States are a factor in this regard and the apparent continuation of fiscal policies which the economy has pursued for the last 40 years would indicate that despite President Nixon's contention that he would introduce a tough hard-line budget and despite all the din and despite all the publicity, the expenditures will rise sharply as they have done for the last 40 years.

Heavy spending slashes are most unlikely to occur. As in the United States our Federal authority will likely discover the very blunt fact that reasoned expenditure control will work, in the long term, only if the economy can be kept relatively close to full employment. Increasing the size of the Federal Budget gains acceptance mainly because they can be sold to the general public as a means of combating unemployment. Expenditure restraint, Mr. Speaker, which is necessary and desirable has its acceptability dependent upon whether or not the policy can combine progress toward relatively full employment and stable long-term growth. Economic policy should be like a three-legged stool. In addition to fiscal and monetary measures there should be a conscious planning effort to combat unemployment. Some voluntary wage and price restraint is part of this package and the Hon. John Turner gave some emphasis to this point in his budgetary address. However, the economically powerful groups in our society which supply the basic raw materials and the labor input to the industrial machine of the nation are the ones which all too often display lack of restraint to the detriment of the general public. While stimulating the economy the federal authority should not neglect the other side of the coin.

A Prices Review Board before which price increases in commodities and in wage rates are justified could materially restrain inflationary tendencies without the detrimental effect on the unemployment rate which was realized in terms of the policy instituted by the Trudeau Government in 1969 and 1970.

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, if interest rates are to be held down when demand for credit is stimulated by fiscal budgetary measures, money supply will likely increase. The only effective way of holding cost of credit below the market value is the astute utilization of monetary measures accurately attuned to fiscal measures. Obviously, Mr. Speaker, this can only be done at the federal level. Therefore, the amendment is a silly amendment in terms of fiscal and monetary control related to the measures that must be instituted at the federal level if we are going to make any major impact on the unemployment situation.

Mr. Speaker, because the Federal Government happens to be of any particular political stripe has really no bearing in the final analysis on that fact. We have other factors here which we should, briefly perhaps, consider. Even outside the control of the Federal Government if we are honest with ourselves, we will realize that international factors are major factors in this respect. Even the most recent monetary crisis clearly portrays this fact.

March 13, 1973

We have a situation where the American dollar once considered to be completely secure in the world has been devalued twice in the last 14 months. One of the real dangers here is that these currencies, which are in fact reserve currencies, or have been used as reserve currencies, rapidly become devaluation prone, and that tendency continues. It happened to the French franc after World War I, and it happened to the pound sterling particularly after World War II, and it is now happening to the United States dollar.

Many of these factors have to be kept in the back of our minds in relation to the unemployment situation in this province and in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, as other speakers no doubt will stress the need for well-planned federal measures in relation to departmental capital spending; and early enunciation of winter works programs and projects, I will not dwell on those matters to any great length.

I should like to touch briefly, again, on a subject which has been before the House on a number of occasions, I think it very important that we give stress to the necessity in our type of society of progressing towards earlier retirements. I think it is quite likely that we will get old age security payments in this country eventually at age 60 rather than age 65. Obviously we are moving in the direction of lowering the retirement age levels. We have done that in a number of enactments in this House in the last couple of years in relation to civil servants, teachers and others.

That trend should be continued. That trend makes eminent economic sense. We must face the fact that if we are going to provide employment for younger people, we should provide incentives for people to move out of the work force at the older age levels of 55, 60 and 65, particularly at 55 and 60. This can be done if we approach pensions in a reasoned way. Quite frankly, this country simply has not done that to this date.

You may be aware of the fact that there are 16,173 public and private pension plans in this country, covering some 2,882,000 people in the work force in Canada, and those people in the main, will not have adequate pensions when they reach retirement age.

There is no way we could possibly have adequate pensions for those persons unless we get vesting and lock in, and I have stressed that point, Mr. Speaker, before in this House, The individual must secure a pension for this period of service or employment with an employer irrespective of the fact that he does not remain with that employer until he reaches what is considered to be normal retirement or early retirement.

Therefore, I think that we cannot stress too strongly the necessity of placing considerable emphasis on earlier retirements. That does not mean, Mr. Speaker, that these people will not be involved in what happens in the community, in the province and in the country of Canada. There are many things which individuals would like to do provided they had a reasoned economic base under them. If they moved out of the work force at age 55 or 60 and beyond, we would obviously increase the opportunities for younger people entering the work force.

It is clear, Mr. Speaker, that the prime responsibility for the unemployment problem does lie in federal hands. As I said before, it did when the Liberals occupied the Treasury Benches, it does now when we occupy the Treasury Benches.

The resolution points out this fact. It should be easy for every Member of this Assembly, to readily support the spirit and the intent of the original resolution. I, therefore, Mr. Speaker, am opposed to the amendment which makes no sense whatsoever, and I am very much in favor of the original resolution as it stood on the Order Paper.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald (Moose Jaw North): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to start by saying that in moving the motion, the Member for Regina North West (Mr. Whelan) shows that he is a man with no conscience. This Resolution is just cheap political tactics and is nothing more than an attempt to divert attention from the failure of the Blakeney Government.

The Member for Regina North West implies that the Provincial Government doesn't have any responsibility at all pertaining to unemployment or economic policies. By their actions today, I am beginning to believe that our Premier doesn't actually realize that he has responsibilities to the unemployed people of this province.

Rather than alleviate unemployment in Saskatchewan, the facts speak for themselves, and show that the NDP are actually creating unemployment. The NDP have, for some time, been berating the Federal Government for creating unemployment in order to attempt to control inflation.

The Federal Government did, in fact, take that course of action. I think it is also debatable as to whether or not this course of action was effective in controlling inflation to any great degree. However, due to the course of those events, because of present economic conditions, the Federal Government is pursuing a different course.

I should like to know by what logic did Mr. Blakeney justify creating unemployment in Saskatchewan? How does he justify taking the Saskatchewan unemployment rate from the lowest in Canada to a figure that is above the national average? I should like to know if Mr. Blakeney does this by design or does he do it by ignorance?

If the NDP are not creating unemployment by design then this does show that they simply do not care. It is certainly appropriate that this Legislature is debating the unemployment crisis in Saskatchewan. This debate should have taken place a month ago.

If Mr. Blakeney was sincere in his obligation to the unemployment problem he would have allowed this debate to go on a month ago. It is a callous attitude when the Premier won't allow debate just because it might embarrass his Government.

The unemployment picture looked bad as long ago as last summer, but had reached the crisis proportion in January.

March 13, 1973

Surely in these circumstances a compassionate government would have allowed, in fact even encouraged, a debate that might have provided some answers, answers that have apparently evaded the present government.

Mr. Blakeney should have been willing to listen to every voice in this Legislature, when he realized that he wasn't able to cope with the urgency. The reason that he didn't listen was because he was embarrassed. I am sure that he has found since that avoiding debate does not lessen the embarrassment. The situation that he finds himself in, the same situation that he created, is embarrassment that he can't hide from.

I hope the Government opposite has learned one thing, that it is about time that you pay attention to the people of this province and, in particular, to the unemployed people of this province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — It is about time that you start listening to someone other than that group of academic wizards that the Premier has surrounded himself with. All of the socialist theories that this group has been grinding out have proven to be just that — theories. This group may be fine for a society that operates within a goldfish bowl, but Saskatchewan is in the middle of the hard, real world. We proved it in the 1940s and early 1950s, that these theories aren't worth the paper that they are written on.

The Premier might find that a real positive step to deal with unemployment problems, is to unemploy this army of advisors and to start listening to people, with their eyes open, to the realities of life.

As I have already said, the debate on unemployment is overdue in this Legislature, however, it is really too bad that this debate has to centre on the ridiculous motion of the Member for Regina North West, a motion that attempts to divert attention from the real and honest concerns of this House.

If the Member was honest, he would recognize that our main concern in this House is Saskatchewan and, further that if the Federal Government has failed . . .

Mr. Whelan: — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Privilege. The Hon. Member is suggesting that I am not honest. He said — if the Member was honest — and I ask him to withdraw that.

Mr. MacDonald: — Mr. Speaker, I will repeat my statement. I said if the Member was honest he would recognize that our main concern in this House . . . That is what I said, Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Speaker: — I believe that that type of language would be better not used. I think each Member is asked to recognize the sincerity of another Member. We get difference of opinion in the House, and a Member need not agree with the other Member's opinion but there are certain words that would be better not used.

Mr. McIsaac: — Mr. Speaker, surely there is no question about the Hon. Member for Moose Jaw questioning the honesty of the Member opposite and on that ground he could ask for withdrawal. But he certainly wasn't questioning and he was giving his own interpretation and surely he is entitled to that.

Mr. Speaker: — I believe that the Hon. Member for Moose Jaw said that he doubted the accuracy of the statement that he couldn't back the facts up, he couldn't agree with the facts. But to say and to imply that the Member is dishonest it is an unparliamentary term. I would ask all Members to — I know those words are used more often than they should be from both sides of the House, and I hope the Hon. Member will refrain from using it because it does heat the debates when it is not necessary.

Mr. MacDonald: — Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think that the definition of the word in the way I used it would be insincere and I think that is acceptable in this House. I will replace the word with insincere if it should make the Member happy.

However, no matter that the Member has employed cheap politics, this side of the House will deal with the real issue which is the failure of the Blakeney Government not of the Federal Government.

It would be well if Members on the Government side of the House would also address themselves to the issues of unemployment that Mr. Blakeney is creating. It is obvious that the Members are not being heard in caucus. Surely they don't agree with creating 7 per cent unemployment.

This motion by the Member for Regina North West has a very interesting aspect. At the beginning of this Session, Mr. Whelan rushed in and presented a resolution. That motion was full of the word 'regrets'. It regretted this and that and the other thing. Then that motion was withdrawn and another resubmitted which is the present motion that we find ourselves with.

In the present motion we find that all the words 'regret' have been removed and the word 'urges' has replaced it. This motion is nearly exactly the same except that it now urges the Federal Government instead of regretting the Federal Government. I think I discovered why the wording was changed. David Lewis told Mr. Whelan to change it. You know it got awfully embarrassing for Mr. Lewis, because after this Resolution was presented in this House, Mr. Turner brought in his Federal Budget. Now we find that everything that Mr. Whelan was regretting was at the same time being supported by Mr. Lewis in Ottawa.

This is the contemptible and hypocritical position of the NDP.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — In Saskatchewan the NDP are saying one thing for cheap political purposes and in Ottawa the NDP are doing the opposite to keep politically alive.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

March 13, 1973

Mr. MacDonald: — This is a party of no principles and no sense of common decency.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — I would simply ask the Members opposite, if the Government of Canada is failing the people of Canada, as you would have us believe, then why do you support that government? The NDP are supporting the Federal Government.

There are only two reasons that they could be supporting the Liberal Party in Ottawa: One, would be because it was good government and deserves the support of the NDP; two, would be that it is not good government but that the NDP have no guts and no principles.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — And there is one thing that gives me consolation, and that is whatever one of these two reasons that your party is employing, you are the losers. For either reason you lose politically as a party.

You know it has been suggested that there has been a marriage of the Federal Liberals and the NDP. To the best of my knowledge I have not found this to be the case. It seems obvious to me that the Federal Liberals are using that pitiful band of 31 NDPs.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — David Lewis has no control over his destiny. I don't think it wrong for the Liberal Party to take advantage of that situation. I don't see anything wrong with the Liberal Government forging ahead with its programs, knowing that the NDP will be forced to support them. No, I don't think there is any kind of a marriage. The fact that the NDP keep trying to crawl into bed with the Liberals doesn't mean that there is a marriage. I also think that the NDP are going to hit rock bottom when they get pushed out of that bed that they are trying to get into.

If, as suggested, there was a marriage of the NDP and the Federal Liberals then I suppose that I would, by some way become a child of that marriage. And, in fact, the Members opposite would become a child of that marriage. And that would somehow make Members opposite and myself stepbrothers.

Well, I can tell you that this will never happen.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — Because I consider myself to have become of age and that if this marriage should ever happen, even a common law marriage, then I am leaving home.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — I think I could find a more

suitable environment. There is no type of relationship with the NDP that I can accept or tolerate. I would be willing to leave my present home rather than accept even a remote relationship to the party opposite.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — Mr. Whelan is critical of the Federal Government. Let us examine the federal measures and compare them to those of the Blakeney Government.

Let me first of all, quote directly from Mr. Turner's Budget Address. I will quote the very first words on page 1.

The purpose of this Budget is, first and foremost, to bring about a substantial reduction in unemployment.

He goes on and I quote:

This Budget is aimed at the faster growth of our economy and the strengthening of its basic structure. In order to achieve the greatest possible increase in the number of permanent satisfying jobs for our rapidly growing labor force.

This is a Budget which has as its goal the production of 300,000 new jobs this year. Compare this attitude to that of the Blakeney Government.

In Mr. Cowley's Budget the unemployment problem is not even acknowledged. There are not only no meaningful measures to deal with the problem, but they seem to imagine that the problem doesn't exist.

With these two contrasting attitudes, I say there isn't one Member opposite who has the right with a clear conscience to criticize the Federal Government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — The Federal Government whether it succeeds or not has at least recognized its responsibility and is prepared to meet the challenge as best it can.

The Blakeney Government must be made to realize that the Provincial Government has, at least, as much, and likely more of a responsibility to encourage and promote employment opportunities in our province. This is not a federal responsibility, it is our responsibility.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — The Federal Government is trying to find solutions but there is no doubt these solutions will not find success in Saskatchewan because of the road blocks being set up by the Blakeney Government. The best example of these roadblocks is the income tax. The Federal Government reduced personal income tax by 5 per cent to allow for expansion in our economy. This was a measure called for by many people.

March 13, 1973

I would just like to quote a statement made by Ross Hale, President of Saskatchewan Federation of Labour as he was reported last August 18th.

He said that income tax assistance has to be given to the average person to stem unemployment.

He then called for instant action by all governments – I repeat all governments – and said that the answer lay in following the principles that expand the economy.

So what happens when the Federal Government complies with these principles by lowering income tax for the average and low-income families? The Saskatchewan NDP put the tax back on even higher. To me it just proves that the Blakeney Government is just not concerned with the fundamental fight against unemployment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — In Saskatchewan he is willing to dull the tool used to fight unemployment.

Another example of the NDP roadblock is, the Federal Government proposes to reduce the top rate of corporation tax on manufacturing to 40 per cent . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — . . . This reduction would apply only to income earned in Canada from manufacturing or processing goods for sale or lease. The NDP oppose this, they oppose it for political reasons. They backed themselves into a corner with the election campaign slogan about corporation welfare bums. This was a narrow-minded simplistic approach to a very complex economic structure. Now it doesn't matter what the effects will be to Canadians, they are forced to oppose anything that mentions corporations.

Well, it's time the NDP stopped this blind opposition. The people aren't buying it any more and even David Lewis admitted this the other day when he said that he won't use this theme again.

Tax reduction for both consumers and manufacturers will do much to stimulate the economy and money saved through these budgetary measures will be spent, rather than saved.

I should like to quote, for the benefit of Members opposite the words of W.M. Keenleyside, who is chairman of the British Columbia Division of Canadian Manufacturers' Association, and he is discussing the tax cuts for Canadian Manufacturing. He said:

That the tax reduction were a welcome move especially from the British Columbia standpoint where secondary industry certainly needs encouragement.

Then he said and I quote:

You don't just create secondary industry by waving a wand. Conditions for manufacturers must be attractive. At present much of our industry is struggling to stay competitive.

Those are the words spoken by a man that knows what he is talking about.

Surely there is no other province which needs secondary industry like we in Saskatchewan do. So I suggest that Mr. Blakeney heed these words and stop his blind opposition that was inspired by an election campaign slogan. Let's get down to the business of trying to discover the best methods to get secondary industry.

I would like to trace the course of events over the past few months that show the callous attitude of the Premier of this province.

Back on August 18, 1972, Mr. Ross Hale was interviewed by the Leader-Post. At that date, Mr. Hale recognized that unemployment would be severe this winter. He pointed out that unemployment had increased from 2.4 in June to 3.4 in July and that this was considerably higher than 1971. Back on August 18, Mr. Hale suggested that the Government should concentrate on the construction of needed public buildings. This was good advice from a person in the field and not from one in the Premier's back office. That advice should have been taken.

Then on November 3, both union and industry warned the Premier about the upcoming jobs crisis. On November 3, 1972, these groups warned that a lack of building in Saskatchewan this winter would produce the worst unemployment record in more than a decade. At that time Al Neuman, business manager of Construction and General Workers Local 890 said that 50 per cent of his union's membership would be unemployed and that other trades would be faced with the same fate. Mr. Jim Chase, general manager of the Saskatchewan Construction Association stated that you would have to go back to the early 1960s to find a comparison with the unemployment that can be expected this year. Mr. Chase went on to say that among the suggested causes of the current slump were lack of government incentives to provincial industry. He said that the lack of new industries and businesses locating in the province has also slowed construction. This was good sound advice from the unions and the industry.

What was the reaction of the Premier to this advice?

Well, as Mr. Lane said, at a Press conference six days later after this advice, Mr. Blakeney said that the impression given is inaccurate because the association referred to major institutional buildings. He said that the advice he was given was inaccurate. He went on to say and was quoted in the Leader-Post and I quote the Premier:

I realize that the figures are very tricky and unreliable and it does look like we are coping with unemployment as well as anyone in Canada and we are launching what we consider a massive winter works program.

Well, that was November 8th. Mr. Blakeney apparently was satisfied and he didn't feel he needed any advice from people who really know what is going on.

On November 14th, Mr. Chase again warned of the upcoming unemployment disaster and he said that the proposed winter works program of the province, while they are necessary and

encouraged by the association, cannot alone significantly provide employment for our contractors and tradesmen. He said that there is little activity now in the private sector and the Government has refrained from proceeding with a number of proposed projects.

Then the next day, on November 15, Mr. L.V. Johnson, Assistant Director of Buildings and Civic Properties in Regina echoed the warning about unemployment. He mentioned the adverse effects that last spring's construction strike would have on winter unemployment. He pointed out that because of the strike not many projects were completed to the point where plumbers and electricians will be able to work through the winter and that these tradesmen will see a real shortage of work.

Then on December 9, 1972, after all this pertinent advice had been given to the Premier, Mr. Blakeney finally emerged to make another statement. What was his statement? He said that the "Work force figures for Saskatchewan could be termed encouraging." He went on to say that this Government was hopeful that "this impressive performance" would continue – impressive performance. Well, what was this impressive performance?

During November of 1972 when he made this statement there were 2,000 more unemployed people than there were in the month a year ago or 14,000 people unemployed. The unemployment rate was .5 per cent higher than a year ago – there were 10,000 less people in the province than a year ago. It was the warmest November for many years so construction was able to continue and should have provided for a very low unemployment rate.

Well a week after the Premier made this statement about his impressive performance, the true story emerged. On December 18, 1972, the headline in the Star-Phoenix read, "Gloomy Forecast Seems Correct for Local Construction Work." The article of December 18, 1972 goes on to say that unfortunately for Saskatchewan construction tradesmen, the gloomy predictions made last month by union and industry officials of unemployment rates up to 50 per cent are becoming fact. This was one week after the Premier bragged about his "impressive performance."

Let me tell this House what Mr. Al Neuman, business manager of the Construction and General Workers Local 890 in Saskatoon, had to say about this impressive performance and I quote Mr. Neuman's statement:

Unemployment has been bad in the industry before but nothing near what we've got now.

He is, of course, referring to the 50 per cent unemployment rate in his trade. Mr. Neuman said that in the late 1960s (the Thatcher Government years) when unemployment rates averaged about 15 per cent, we thought that was bad. This is what the trade union movement thinks about Mr. Blakeney's impressive performance.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — In a negative sense his performance is impressive. In fact, his failure performance is monumental.

I should just like to examine a few of the facts that were relevant when Mr. Blakeney made the statement about being so proud of his impressive performance.

The labor force dropped from 355,000 in October to 347,000 in November. In other words the labor force dropped 8,000 people in the month before this statement about impressive performance. In this same month there were 2,000 more people unemployed; October — 12,000 unemployed and November 14,000 unemployed. If we add the 8,000 people who were dropped from the labor force to the unemployed 14,000 we find 22,000 unemployed. This shows us that on the day the Premier boasted about his impressive performance, there were 22,000 people unemployed.

In January we find the impressive performance of the Premier has produced a 7 per cent unemployment rate and 24,000 people on the unemployment roll. And it's a lot worse than what it appears from these figures from the Department of Manpower. We must remember that 355,000 people were working in Saskatchewan last October and there were 12,000 unemployed. In January we find only 318,000 people working and 24,000 unemployed. This shows that there are 37,000 less people working in Saskatchewan in January than there were in October. So if we take the number of unemployed people in October, which was 12,000 and add it to the 37,000, we now find that there are 49,000 fewer people working in January than there were in October. Any fair-minded person would agree that 49,000 unemployed is a pretty impressive performance.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — That figure doesn't take into account the underemployed or people on the farm or people who haven't offered themselves to the labor force because they know there are no jobs.

I think there is one other very pertinent fact to be taken into consideration. The population in Saskatchewan has declined from June 1, 1971 to June 1, 1972 by 10,000 people. This is a fact contrary to what the Premier would have us believe. But I would ask him to read the Vital Statistics put on our desks today. Further to prove it, I asked a question in this House and the answer to this question No. 157 proves that during the calendar year 1972 the population of Saskatchewan continued to decline. So today, or in January 1973, we find we have 10,000 less people than a year ago but still have 49,000 who are not working. So I think it is fair to assume, had these 10,000 people stayed in Saskatchewan, the figure for people without jobs would have been 59,000 not 49,000.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — This is the impressive performance of the Premier. He considers this performance so impressive that he feels no further measures are needed to deal with a problem that he doesn't realize exists.

After listening to the comments of the two Members opposite, I ask them to refer to yesterday's paper. I will just quote the Regina Leader-Post, March 12, 1973. I would just like to

March 13, 1973

quote John McLeod, business manager for Local 2038 of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers:

Describes the outlook for construction workers this summer as 'terrible'.

Mr. Ed. Sebastian said:

If we don't get anything more we are going to be in bad shape.

Mr. Sebastian is Business Manager of Local 180 of the Construction and General Workers Union:

We are far from full utilization of our contractors, added Jim Chase, Executive Vice-president of the Saskatchewan Construction Association.

This, John McLeod, business manager for Local 2038 said:

We have almost given up hoping for improvement in the unemployment situation this summer. We are looking for the next year.

This is what is going to happen. I ask the Members opposite to read yesterday's paper.

As I said earlier, the Premier of this Province can take the full responsibility for this impressive failure to the unemployed people. Mr. Blakeney has created the unemployment. There are no jobs in the construction trades because the private sector is not investing in Saskatchewan. There are no new jobs coming into our province. The private sector is not locating or expanding in Saskatchewan because of the Premier and the NDP Government of Saskatchewan. This is a fact and you would have to be either blind or stupid not to recognize it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — The actions and attitudes of the Blakeney Government give the private sector good cause to be concerned. I give you as examples, the manner in which the projects of a pulp mill and an iron ore mine were stopped. These examples would make any sensible businessman stay far clear of this province.

The recent decision to buy Intercontinental Packers has sent a shock across this nation.

You can go anywhere in Canada and find that we are the laughing stock of the nation. Because of the political stance and the attitude towards business of Premier Blakeney, the rest of Canada is treating us with derision and no smart person in Canada would invest a nickel in Saskatchewan . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — . . . without an iron clad guarantee. That's the only way they will come in here. This means that there is no risk capital available for development in this province.

If this province is to grow and develop, it will need people who have confidence in our province and who are willing to speculate and to risk. People must be willing to take a chance with our province and they will only do this if they believe in Saskatchewan and its future.

Premier Blakeney has destroyed the confidence that other parts of Canada have had in Saskatchewan. And just as surely the NDP are destroying the confidence of business people within Saskatchewan.

Day in and day out the NDP call the businessmen crooks or imply that they are dishonest. We now have a spy agency to watch the auto body shops. We have had a spy mission on the drugstores. We are told that hearing aid dealers are crooks, that optometrists are gouging the public unfairly. We are told that operators of special-care homes and cable TV are not being fair and honest to the people. The oil industry has been threatened and insurance agents have been threatened and cancelled. Farm machinery dealers have been threatened. The loudest threats and accusations to business of all kinds comes from the Minister of Labour (Mr. Snyder).

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — The confidence of the business community has been lessened due to legislation and attitudes of the NDP. The business community has a great fear of the NDP and in this circumstance our province will never develop to its potential.

These are the ways that our Premier is creating unemployment. I'm sure that other Members will enlarge on some of these things that I have briefly mentioned. I'm sure of one thing — the impressive performance of the Premier will have a stunting effect on the development of our province — an effect from which Saskatchewan will never fully recover.

Mr. Speaker, we will have more to add and I would ask leave to adjourn debate.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Snyder (Minister of Labour): — Will the Hon. Member permit a question before he takes his seat?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! Will the Hon. Members come to order!

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order. Have we reached the point where you are going to count how much applause we give a Member?

I stood up to speak the other day when the Premier sat down and it went on for a minute, two or three minutes and you never said a word.

Sure we will come to order when you come to order and you start being fair in this House.

March 13, 1973

Mr. Speaker: — Order! If the Hon. Leader of the Opposition figures I'm not fair in this House . . .

Mr. Steuart: — I didn't say you weren't fair!

Mr. Speaker: — . . . you can put a motion on the Order Paper and the Members will debate it.

Mr. Steuart: — If you want respect, you earn it!

Mr. Speaker: — I'll consider where that came from!

Mr. Steuart: — Thank you!

Hon. Mr. Snyder: — I wonder if the Member would permit a question before he takes his seat?

Mr. MacDonald: — Yes.

Hon. Mr. Snyder: — Well, I may have misunderstood the Hon. Member. I understood him to suggest that there were 49,000 people not working and I'm wondering if this is correct. If this is the figure that he quoted then, I refer him to the statement from last month and the ones that were issued today, it shows the figure of 20,000, which is a considerable difference from the 49,000 he quoted. I am just wondering, did I misunderstand him when he suggested there were 49,000 people not working?

Mr. MacDonald: — No, the Minister didn't misunderstand me. I will just go back to this. In fact, I said that if 10,000 people hadn't left this province in the past year, I think we would have 59,000 unemployed.

I said that if we go back to October, we find that we have 355,000 people working. And when you add up the people that are working in January, plus the unemployed, unless these 37,000 people disappeared into thin air, then they are not working, they are not employed. There are 59,000.

Debate adjourned.

MOTIONS FOR RETURNS

Return No. 157

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. G. Lane (Lumsden) for Return No. 157 showing:

In accepting bids for goods purchased through the Purchasing Agency, whether the Government allowed any preference to Saskatchewan manufacturers of goods so purchased; (a) If so, the preference; (b) If so, the total cost of the preference in 1972; (c) If so, the number of contracts awarded in 1972 by the Purchasing Agency in which provincial preference was the deciding

factor in the award. Also, to whom were such contracts awarded, the amount of such contract and the types of goods requested.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank (Minister of Government Services): — Mr. Speaker, I find this question a bit awkward for the Department to answer and consequently I have an amendment which I think will provide the same general information which is requested. The amendment is as follows to Return No. 157.

Delete all the words after “Agency” where it first appears and substitute the following:

(a) Whether the Government followed a general policy of allowing preference to Saskatchewan manufacturers of goods so purchased; (b) Whether there are any exceptions to this general policy; (c) If so, the general types of products that exceptions are made; (d) the reason the exceptions are made; (e) Whether these exceptions created any additional costs to the Government for the purchase of the products.

I so move seconded by my seatmate Hon. G. MacMurchy.

Mr. McIsaac (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, briefly on the amendment it would appear to me in listening to the Hon. Minister (Mr. Brockelbank) propose the amendment that his amendment will in no way indicate whether or not a policy of preference is costing the province any money, on what number of contracts and by how much. As I listened to his amendment he went on to indicate whether or not there is such a policy. But, no where is there in the amendment any indication of the degree of that, what the cost really is in order to follow such a policy? As such it would differ quite considerably from the basic question asked in the original motion.

Mr. MacDonald (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, may I beg leave to adjourn the debate until we have had an opportunity to assess the amendment.

Debate adjourned.

Return No. 222

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. Guy (Athabasca) for Return No. 222 showing:

The total dollar value of Kraft products purchased through the Government Purchasing Agency or any other Government Department, Agency or Crown corporation for the fiscal years 1970-71, 1971-72, 1972-73 to February 1, 1973.

Mr. Grant (Regina Whitmore Park): — Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Hon. Member he has asked to withdraw this item because apparently records are not kept of the type that would permit the furnishing of the information.

Mr. Speaker: — On behalf of the Hon. Member for Athabasca, the Member for Whitmore Park (Mr. Grant) has asked that No. 222 be withdrawn. But this Motion has already been moved and adjourned. It really is a difficult position to withdraw it but I believe by unanimous consent . . .

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker, if it is easier, we could just vote on it to defeat it because I think, Mr. Speaker, the Member who submitted the question, Mr. Guy, discussed this with one of the Ministers and was informed that they don't have these records. He is quite prepared to drop it or we will vote to have it defeated and just take it off the Order Paper.

Mr. Speaker: — That would facilitate it for the House, because the Member is asking to have it withdrawn but after it has been moved and debate is adjourned. It has also been asked to be withdrawn by a different Member which does complicate the thing. So if we could put the question and let the House decide what we should do, it would be better.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, I will just say a few words on closing.

Mr. Speaker: — Which one are you speaking to?

Mr. Brockelbank: — No. 222.

Mr. Speaker: — It was moved by the Member for Athabasca and adjourned by the Attorney General. So the Hon. Minister can't close the debate. He may speak to the debate if the House wishes to continue the debate.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, you are suggesting that I could speak to the debate on 222.

Mr. Speaker: — Yes, the Motion is open for debate. But the Hon. Member for Whitmore Park had asked leave to withdraw it on behalf of the Member for Athabasca so the Members have a right to speak before it is voted on because it is difficult to withdraw it. So the Motion is still open for debate.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Then, that is what I propose to do, Mr. Speaker. Just by way of explanation I spoke to the Member about the particular Return No. 222, and suggested to him by way of clarification that the records are not kept in such a fashion that this could be determined. The answer would be inaccurate at best. I might give an example which will illustrate the point of why the Motion can be defeated and why the information cannot be provided. The Motion suggests that Kraft products be identified from the records of the Purchasing Agency. When orders are given to wholesale houses, I might cite for example, MacDonald's Consolidated, the Purchasing Agency has no way of knowing whether the products that are supplied to fulfil the order are necessarily Kraft products. They may or may not be. That is one reason why the answer would be inaccurate. The second reason would be that

we have no way of knowing, for example, in 1972-73 to February 1, 1973, whether in fact, Kraft Company did own some other company which was in effect selling Kraft products. So from that point of view it would be difficult to determine an answer with any accuracy whatsoever, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. McIsaac (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, it is rather interesting to listen to the Minister of Public Works tell this House that the Government's campaign to boycott Kraft failed right at their front door. A phoney deal to begin with and we just listened to the Minister indicate how purely political this boycott Kraft program really was. Here they are boycotting Kraft and at the same time promoting agriculture. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) busily building cheese factories and their program bogged down right at their own front doorstep. Very interesting indeed.

Hon. Mr. Messer: — What program?

Mr. McIsaac: — The boycott Kraft program!

Mr. MacDonald (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, I wish to make an added comment. In other words the Saskatchewan Government is not boycotting Kraft, because they don't know if they are buying any Kraft products or not. Here the Minister stands up and tells us that we have no way of checking whether we buy their products or we don't buy them, whether we are getting them or we aren't getting them.

Here they turn around and smear a company right across this nation in their boycotting theme. And in reality they don't even know if they are boycotting them or not. It is a phoney political issue where they have smeared a national company that sells their products in Saskatchewan and they don't even know it.

I was going to vote with the Government on this, Mr. Speaker, to defeat this Motion, but I certainly will not do so now.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. MacDonald: — He spoke in this debate . . .

Mr. Brockelbank: — I am aware, Mr. Speaker, I have been cautioned by the Member for Milestone that I have spoken . . .

Mr. Speaker: — The Member has spoken and he cannot speak again on this debate.

Mr. Brockelbank: — I understand that Mr. Speaker. I want to know if I can ask the Member a question before he resumes his seat.

Mr. MacDonald: — No!

An Hon. Member: — Oh!

Mr. Gardner (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, I think that it is rather unfortunate that the Government oppose by their actions in boycotting Kraft and now they are not sure whether they boycotted them or not or

to what extent. But you will recall that they also lost a plant that might have come into this province because of their actions in boycotting Kraft. Kraft were negotiating for a fairly substantial industry but because of the attitude of the Premier in this province, with a sign on the bumper of his car boycotting Kraft and statements made by the Members of the Government here, Kraft changed its mind. This is just another indication of the war on business that they are conducting and the loss of an industry through political action of the Members opposite.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Would the Hon. Member permit a question before he resumes his seat?

Mr. Gardner: — No!

Hon. Mr. Messer (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, just a few brief words in regard to the Member from Moosomin's (Mr. Gardner) statement that he just made.

He is further promoting the kind of rumors that the Opposition have been attempting to do in the 34 days sitting in the Legislature without relating to any factual evidence of any kind. He talks about an industry that was lost in Saskatchewan. He doesn't know of any industry because he knows of no industry, Mr. Speaker. There is not one factual piece of evidence that shows that we lost any kind of industry under any of the actions of the Government of Saskatchewan in relation to the supposed boycotting of Kraft and I underline the supposed. And he should retract that statement that he has made in this Assembly.

Mr. Boldt (Rosthern): — Mr. Speaker, I remember very plainly that the Premier of this province got up and supported the National Farmers Union on the boycott of Kraft products. He was right on television. You don't have to go and spread false rumors right in this House. We certainly read the newspapers, we watch television and we know what is going on in the province and we know what you people want to do. I remember it was just before a hockey game, I believe, that the Premier came on the air and said that he would support the boycott of Kraft. As we noticed on television all the good food coming on the screen, I said to my wife, one television will outdo 50 television appearances of the Premier trying to boycott Kraft products.

Mr. Grant (Regina Whitmore Park): — I am very pleased indeed that the Hon. Member from Saskatoon (Mr. Brockelbank) clarified this situation because now it will help us to decide just how we should vote on this motion. Since apparently it has to be voted on. But it appears that with the Government Members, the right hand doesn't know what the left hand is doing. The Premier was certainly boycotting Kraft, all you had to do was look at his car out in front of the buildings and he had a "Boycott Kraft" sign on the car for a couple of days. It is also quite evident that the Government is purchasing Kraft products because Mr. Roy Atkinson, recently was eating in the Dome cafeteria and was quite disturbed to find that he was being served Kraft products, in fact, he didn't eat them. He took them as evidence and we feel we should bring this

to your attention. As a support of Mr. Atkinson and his group, I am sure you wouldn't want to offend him. The explanation given by the Minister of Government Services is certainly going to help clarify the situation.

Hon. Mr. Thorson (Minister of Industry and Commerce): — Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to say a word since the Member for Moosomin spoke. So far as I am aware Kraft was never interested in setting up any kind of industry in Saskatchewan while the Liberals were in power. So far as I am aware they have not indicated any kind of interest in setting up any sort of industry in Saskatchewan since we came to power.

Mr. Weatherald (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, that is about par for the course this afternoon because the Government doesn't know Kraft are interested in Saskatchewan. If they read the newspapers themselves they would know that they are interested. They are interested in Manitoba and they are interested in Saskatchewan. The Minister of Agriculture told us that he didn't think it would make any difference if the Premier drove around with a "Boycott Kraft" sign in the back of his car, he didn't believe that that would make one single bit of difference to Kraft, the fact that the Premier drove around town and had his picture taken with "Boycott Kraft" in it. That just about shows how out of touch the Government is, Mr. Speaker, with trying to attract industry to the province.

Mr. Lane (Lumsden): — Mr. Speaker, the remarks of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture are utterly amazing in this House. It is just another example of the Government opposite not knowing that industries have been trying to contact the Premier. And the Premier has refused to meet with them, refused to have anything to do with them. Now the Minister of Agriculture gets up and says he didn't even know that there was a possibility of a new industry in Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, they turn around on one instance, they don't want new industry and when somebody does talk to them they ignore them. Mr. Speaker, this whole question of boycotting Kraft is utterly amazing because the Premier and the Members opposite have gotten up and said they fully support the NFU boycott of Kraft on the one hand because the way Kraft is allegedly treating producers down East. Then when the Premier got some backlash he goes on the Harasen Line and says, no, that is not the reason. We are boycotting Kraft because we are trying to help local industry, a new cheese factory that is coming in. Now he turns around and says we find out the Government isn't trying to help local industry because there is no boycott in the first place.

Mr. Speaker, the absolute confusion of the Government opposite is amazing to the people of this province. Mr. Speaker, they don't know whether they are coming or going. They don't know whether they are having a boycott or not. We are forced now when we get these indications from the Members opposite of where they stand on business, on industry, on the boycott, what they are doing in local industry, the way they are treating them, we are now forced into a position, Mr. Speaker, of voting against this motion.

March 13, 1973

Hon. Mr. Rolfes (Saskatoon Nutana South): — Mr. Speaker, is it true that before the last election in 1971 that one of the criteria to become a candidate for the Liberal Party was that you had to have an IQ less than 50.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Mostoway (Hanley): — Mr. Speaker, I presume we are talking about cheese and I wonder if I could relate a little story about school. At one time, when I had one of the grades, probably six or seven, we conducted a little experiment. We had these little animals and we kept feeding them cheese and they loved this cheese. And that is all that they were concerned about was this cheese. They grew and grew and grew into big rats.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — I think some of the debates are getting away from the motion.

Motion negatived on the following recorded division:

Yeas — 13
Messieurs

| | | |
|-----------------------|------------|--------------------------|
| Steuart | McIsaac | MacDonald (Moose Jaw N.) |
| Loken | Gardner | Wiebe |
| Grant | Weatherald | Richards |
| Boldt | McPherson | |
| MacDonald (Milestone) | Lane | |

Nays — 36
Messieurs

| | | |
|-----------|-------------|-------------|
| Blakeney | Brockelbank | Tchorzewski |
| Dyck | MacMurchy | Cowley |
| Meakes | Pepper | Taylor |
| Smishek | Michayluk | Faris |
| Romanow | Byers | Gross |
| Messer | Thorson | Feduniak |
| Snyder | Whelan | Mostoway |
| Bowerman | Kwasnica | Comer |
| Thibault | Carlson | Rolfes |
| Larson | Engel | Hanson |
| Kowalchuk | Owens | Oliver |
| Baker | Robbins | Flasch |

Return No. 225

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. Guy (Athabasca) for Return No. 225 showing:

The amount of the \$100,000 under Subvote 11, Department of Industry and Commerce 1972-73 Estimates that has been spent to February 1, 1973.

And the proposed amendment thereto by the Hon. Mr. Thorson (Minister of Industry and Commerce).

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

With respect to the Department of Industry and Commerce Development Act, 1972 and Subvote 11 of the Department of Industry and Commerce 1972-73 Estimates:

- (1) The date The Industry and Commerce Development Act, 1972 was proclaimed.
- (2) The activities to be administered under the Act.
- (3) The cost of the activities under (2) – (a) to date; (b) estimates for 1973-74.
- (4) Recipients of grants under the Act and amounts paid to each.

Mr. MacDonald (Milestone): — I should like to on a Point of Order, Sir, suggest that this particular amendment is out of order. You will notice subsection (3), "The cost of the activities under (2) – (a) to date; (b) estimates for 1973-74." If for every question that we ask the Government of Saskatchewan they are going to estimate their expenditures for the coming year we are going to have a very sore state of affairs in this House. I see no reason why the Government should be able to give us estimates and suggestions. We state and as you know, Sir, from any Government department they are only estimates, they are guesses. We are asking for specific and accurate information and I would urge you, Sir, to move this amendment out of order.

Hon. Mr. Byers (Minister of Environment): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to propose a subamendment. I wish to move, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Romanow (Attorney General).

That Motion for Return No. 225 and the proposed amendment thereto by Mr. Thorson be further amended by:

Striking out all letters and words after the word and number (2) in subparagraph (3) and substituting therefore the words 'both to date'.

Mr. MacDonald: — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order, I would request, Sir, that you rule on my particular Point of Order, Sir, that that amendment is out of order before you consider any subamendment.

Mr. Speaker: — The Member for Milestone has raised a valid point. If this refers to the estimates as printed in the Estimates, then it would be in order, but it refers to an estimate made. If it was in the estimates that was printed in our Estimates which is an estimated figure, then it could show that figure which is recorded before this Assembly. But if it is an estimate from within the department, then it could be out of order. That part would be out of order, to take an estimate of things which are not yet a policy laid down or a firm figure or fixed. I think the point would be well taken that way. Number (2) says, "The activities to be administered under the Act," of Industry and Commerce under that Act and then the cost of

activities under (2) to date and Estimates for 1973-74. Well it is possible to show the cost to date but the estimates for the future is not a firm figure which can be given. I would have to rule that that portion was out of order and if any part of a motion is out of order then the whole amendment is out of order unless the Speaker amends and I didn't presume to amend Orders for Returns. I would have to rule the amendment out of order.

Mr. McIsaac: — I take it then you refer to the amendment that is on our blue Order Paper here, that the whole thing is completely out of order.

Mr. Speaker: — Part of it is out of order. The Speaker, on a motion can amend a motion but in the case of an amendment to the motion I don't think the Speaker should exercise his prerogative to try to amend it. If any portion is out of order then the whole amendment becomes out of order. So, therefore, for that reason I would rule the proposed amendment out of order.

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — I am still not clear about this. Are you ruling out of order the subamendment proposed by the Minister of Environment?

Mr. Speaker: — If the amendment is out of order, the subamendment deals with the amendment and there is no amendment to deal with and, therefore, the motion now reverts to what it was originally and if it is going to be amended it has to be amended on the original motion.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, speaking on the Point of Order, are you ruling, if I may clarify, ruling out the amendment because it is asking for information which is not available.

Mr. Speaker: — I ruled it out of order because it is asking for the estimates of expenditure for 1973-74 within a certain phase, so I ruled it out of order.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, further to that point, would it not be in order then for the question to be answered, 'not applicable' or 'not available'? I am thinking right now, Mr. Speaker, of the previous question which we dealt with asking for information which is not available and was . . .

Mr. Speaker: — That was the past resolution or motion. The past motion is now past. We are debating as to whether I have ruled this out of order.

Mr. Brockelbank: — I am not talking about the past motion, Mr. Speaker, I am just saying that the precedent observed there was that that information was not available but, however, the House voted on it anyway.

Hon. Mr. Smishek: — May we adjourn the debate?

Debate adjourned.

Mr. McIsaac: — Just to clarify a point. In simple terms the subamendment never really was before the House, is this correct?

Mr. Speaker: — Yes. The amendment was out of order so the subamendment didn't exist in reality.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:16 o'clock p.m.