

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Third Session — Seventeenth Legislature**  
**72nd Day**

**May 4, 1973.**

The Assembly met at 10:00 o'clock a.m.  
On the Orders of the Day

**WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**MR. D.H. LANGE (Assiniboia-Bengough):** — Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Reg Gross, MLA for Gravelbourg who is at a meeting presently and will not be in for about half an hour or 45 minutes, I should like to introduce a group of grade eight students from Wymark School. They are 33 in number. They are 33 in number. They are accompanied by their principal, Mr. Finlay, Mrs. Finlay, chaperone, another teacher and the bus driver, Allan Wiens. I hope that they have a most enjoyable morning. It is rather a pity that they couldn't have come, perhaps in June, when we will still be sitting when the weather will be a little better.

**HON. MEMBERS:**— Hear, hear!

**QUESTIONS**

**MAILING ADDRESS FOR 'HOUSEHOLDER' MAIL**

**MR. D.W. MICHAYLUK (Redberry):** — Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Government Services (Mr. Brockelbank). Before I do so, I want to make reference to a clipping from the Regina Leader-Post under the dateline of May 2, 1973 where it shows a picture and in bold type it says, "Who Should Pay". I want to ask, Mr. Speaker, the following before I ask the Minister . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Members have been asked not to read statements from papers first.

**MR. MICHAYLUK:** — Well, in order to ask the question I want to make reference to this picture. It is a picture which shows a huge pile of mail to be mailed, presumably to be mailed out from the Office of the Leader of the Opposition to householders in Saskatchewan. It says, "Who Should Pay". Presumably it makes reference to a pamphlet mailed out by the Leader of the Opposition to every householder in Saskatchewan and the content of that is cause for concern.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — . . . The Litter Act.

**MR. MICHAYLUK:** — Apparently from the office of the Leader of the Opposition.

I should like to ask the Minister of Government Services the following question: Was this mailed under the free mailing privileges? How many pieces were mailed? Were they mailed to the 15 constituencies represented by Liberal MLAs in this House? Who authorized the literature contained in the letter? And what was the total cost to the Province of Saskatchewan?

May 4, 1973

**HON. J.R. BROCKELBANK (Minister of Government Services):** — Mr. Speaker, I was a bit alarmed by that myself when I saw that picture. I did some investigation. Mr. Speaker, I happened to find . . .

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Speak into your mike!

**HON. MR. BROCKELBANK:** — I know the Members opposite want to hear every word, Mr. Speaker. Upon investigation I find that this was mailed under the free frank and privileges of this Legislative Assembly. I find in answer to the Member's question that there were 263,534 pieces of mail. That mail, Mr. Speaker, in answer to the Member's question, was not mailed just to the 15 constituencies represented by the Liberal Party in this House but to all constituencies in Saskatchewan represented by all Members.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. BROCKELBANK:** — The piece of literature contained in the letter was authorized by the Saskatchewan Liberal Association. The cost of that to the Government . . .

**MR. LANE:** — How do you know?

**HON. MR. BROCKELBANK:** — It is very simple. The Hon. Member asks how I know. Because I received one. I checked the postage meter. I found it was mailed under the mailing privileges of this House. It is very simple to find out how. The cost to the people of Saskatchewan of the mailing of that piece of literature was \$8,506.02, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. MICHAYLUK:** — I should like to ask the Minister a supplementary question.

**MR. McISAAC:** — The Member has already asked.

**MR. MICHAYLUK:** — It seems unusual . . .

**MR. McISAAC:** — He has already asked . . .

**MR. MICHAYLUK:** — A supplementary question has always been allowed.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — A supplementary question can only be asked for clarification of the first question and it cannot be a second question.

**MR. MICHAYLUK:** — Mr. Speaker, this is precisely what I intend to ask, for clarification. It seems to be an unusual practice to me. Mr. Speaker, was this type of mass mailing by any Leader of the Opposition done at any previous time in the past? Has the Leader of the Opposition done any mailing during the current Session, any other mailing during the current Session?

**HON. MR. BROCKELBANK:** — In answer to the supplementary question. This has never, to my knowledge and to the knowledge of the employees,

been done before. The amount of mailing that was done by the Leader of the Opposition over and above that mailing was 112,932 pieces of mail.

**MR. E.F. GARDNER (Moosomin):** — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask a question of the Minister of Government Services in this regard? First of all, does he recall last year that the Member for Cannington and myself asked him specifically if we had permission to send mail out to householders, bundled up to a post office and say 'householder'? Does he recall that he agreed that this was in order? Does he also agree that we represent 45 per cent of the people of this province in all constituencies, not in 15 constituencies, but in all of the constituencies in this province? We, therefore, should be entitled to send material to all of these people if we desire. This is just an indication that the Opposition is doing a good job. If it wasn't done before, it is an indication that perhaps previous Oppositions weren't doing a good job, weren't as effective as we are now.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. A.E. BLAKENEY (Premier):** — Mr. Speaker, if I may make . . . I can answer on behalf of the Government any question directed to the Government. May I have two points? One, in answer to the Member for Moosomin . . .

**MR. WIEBE:** — Order!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — I beg your pardon? In answer to the Member for Moosomin, whether mass mailings were allowed last year, they never were before when those people sat. I tried as Leader of the Opposition and was refused household mailings by those opposite.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — We permitted it last year but it is clearly being grossly abused and we will have to re-assess the position.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — That's point number one. Secondly, I and all Members of this side of the House represent all the persons in our constituencies. The suggestion that the Member opposite represents anybody from Regina Centre, I resent.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. G.B. GRANT (Whitmore Park):** — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I may comment on this mailing piece . . .

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Is that a point of order?

**MR. SPEAKER:** — That is not a point of order.

**MR. GRANT:** — Mr. Speaker, I think the answer is quite evident that the people of Saskatchewan are appreciative of this because

May 4, 1973

I just happen to have a letter that was received this morning. I don't know the lady and she is not my constituent. She comments on the pamphlet.

I admire the present methods of the Opposition. It is working hard and consistently for the preservation of democracy in this province. I feel sure they will win the next election.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

## **ANNOUNCEMENT**

### **MEMBERSHIP OF THE UNIVERSITY ADVISORY COMMISSION**

**HON. MR. G. MacMURCHY (Minister of Education):** — Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce the membership of the University Advisory Commission. The Advisory Commission is chaired by former Chief Justice Emmett Hall, a Melfort district farmer active in the co-operative movement and a former Board of Governors member and Stewart Nix, a farmer from Grand Coulee and former president of the SSTA.

The Commission's terms of reference are very broad and will permit investigation of all options with power to receive representation and call witnesses. I might just for a minute read the terms of reference to the Members of the House.

The purpose is to examine the administrative structure of the University of Saskatchewan as set out in The University Act, being chapter 80 of the Statutes of Saskatchewan, 1968. Proposed revisions of that structure as suggested by the report of the university's joint committee on organization and structure, revision suggested by Bill 90 introduced at the 1973 Session of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan and other systems of government administration for the University of Saskatchewan and such other matters as appear relevant, from interested parties, to report to the Government suggested changes in the present university of government and administration which may be better designed to meet current and future needs.

The committee is at work this morning. They are holding their first meeting. We anticipate a report in time for legislative changes in the next session of the Legislature.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. C.P. MacDONALD (Milestone):** — Mr. Speaker, I only want to add a word. I am pleased with the calibre of the commission that has been established, both of these gentlemen certainly should make a contribution. But even more important, the Opposition is certainly pleased that the Government has finally recognized that it is important that the University of Saskatchewan is something that is not the prerogative of the NDP but is the responsibility of all the people of Saskatchewan and that the people particularly from the university community will now have an opportunity to have an input into any changes in the organization and basic structure of the university. We are pleased. I hope now they will listen

when the university community and the people from all over Saskatchewan have an opportunity to place an input into these changes in re-organization and it will no longer be an opportunity for a heavy-handed imposition by the Government of Saskatchewan.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

## QUESTIONS

### KAMSACK OIL REFINERY

**MR. STEUART (Leader of the Opposition):** — Before the Orders of the Day I should like to ask a question of the Premier. Just a quick comment. I was rather amazed when he said that I don't represent anybody in Regina. I thought when he spoke the other day, and I always thought, when you are elected as the Government you represented everybody. When you are elected as the Opposition you also represent everybody. I hope by his own indication when he tried to mail to the householders and he says we stopped it, I thought it was a prerogative, Mr. Speaker, what this House can do or what they can't do, not the Government. I hope he reconsiders that because it is a form of censorship. If the pamphlet we sent out breaks some rule then I think we should be informed by Mr. Speaker. If we can fall into order, we will. But I hope the Government doesn't use its heavy hand to censor the right of the Opposition to represent everybody in this province, that's our job.

I should like to direct a question to the Premier about the situation in Kamsack in regard to the refinery. I do that with the knowledge that the Minister of Industry is in here but I think this is of such importance that the Premier should answer for the Government. It looks now as if the effort of the group of business people or generally the private citizens in Kamsack is not meeting with success. They have difficulty with bank loans and it looks very much as if that very important industry to Kamsack and to that part of the province is on the verge of closing up. It has been in business for about 35 years, it has employed as many as 60 people. It has made money over the years. I think it can make money again. I have been informed that they can do a tremendous amount of business. They have been short of working capital. I think if the Government can get involved in Intercon, get involved in the steel mill, they talk about saving our small towns, that it should move into this situation with whatever it needs to save that industry. If, in fact, they come back and say, well, we have looked into it, it is just an unviable unit, it just can't be saved, that would be one answer. My question is, is the Premier prepared on behalf of the Government to say that he will have an immediate investigation, broader than they have had and go to the same lengths they have gone in other areas to save that industry for Kamsack and for that area.

**HON. K. THORSON (Minister of Industry and Commerce):** — Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, I think I ought to respond to that. I may say that the Leader of the Opposition is not well informed of the state of affairs at Kamsack. As recently as last night an arrangement was made that representatives of a group of Kamsack are to meet me this afternoon and

we are to discuss the progress they made yesterday in negotiating with Canadian Propane. It is simply not accurate to say that these efforts at the local level are not meeting with any success. It is essential that we carry on some discussions and negotiations with Canadian Propane or at least that the local group do that and the local group want to report to me and talk to the Government about what our position may be with respect to the latest developments in their negotiations with Canadian Propane.

**MR. STEUART:** — I am pleased to hear that. I mean that very sincerely. The information I have is that both the bank and the credit union negotiations have broken down, sort of ceased. Really now, the only avenue that is open to the local people to keep that industry going is the Government. I am pleased with what the Minister has informed us and I hope the negotiations go well.

#### **CONTRACT RE EXPORK CANADA WEST LIMITED**

**HON. J.R. MESSER (Minister of Agriculture):** — Mr. Speaker, several days ago some Members of the Opposition asked whether the Government of Saskatchewan would table the contracts between the Province of Manitoba and Saskatchewan re the formation of Expork Canada West Limited. I said at that time that I did not feel that the Government of Saskatchewan or the Hog Marketing Commission in Saskatchewan had any reasons not to table the contracts but I would first like to contact Manitoba to see what their views were in regard to the matter. I have done that and we have arranged jointly to table the contracts, both in Manitoba and Saskatchewan today. So it is with pleasure that I table the contract between the Province of Saskatchewan and the Province of Manitoba in the establishment of Expork Canada and also the contract between the Manitoba Hog Marketing Board and the Saskatchewan Hog Marketing Commission in the formation of Expork Canada West Limited.

#### **BUFFALO PACKAGE EQUIPMENT**

**MR. G.B. GRANT (Regina Whitmore Park):** — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. It is reported that Buffalo Package Equipment of Saskatoon has encountered some problems in dealing with the Provincial Government. Of Saskatchewan whereas they had apparently better success over in Alberta, and as a result it appears that there could be a movement of that business from Saskatchewan to Alberta, which would be regrettable because any time anything like this happens it creates a bad image. I was wondering if the Minister would comment on the background of this, whether the report is correct and how serious it is.

**MR. THORSON:** — Mr. Speaker, I don't have a complete and up to date report. But the reports I heard on the news media last night on the television news are not accurate in the sense that it is reported that the local spokesman in Saskatoon for the Buffalo Packaging Company stated that the Government of Saskatchewan had not responded to their request for a loan. I know that on the

25th of April of 1973 the Board of Directors of SEDCO approved of a loan financing an accommodation for this company, as I understood it, on terms which they requested. The information was communicated to the Board of Directors of that company in Edmonton the following day. I think it is untrue to say that this company made its decision, if it has made that decision, not to proceed with the expansion plan in Saskatchewan or to remain in Saskatchewan but to go back to Alberta with all of its operation. It has other operations in Alberta and it is an Edmonton based company. It is not true to say that its decision to make that move, if indeed it is going to make the move, is based on a lack of an offer of loan financing and accommodation on the part of SEDCO as an agency of the Government of Saskatchewan. There must have been some other factors which influenced them in making that decision or influenced the local manager in the statements he made.

**MR. GRANT:** — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. There may have been other reasons but that is the reason the spokesman gave in the news release which is most regrettable if it is wrong. I assume that there must be an element of truth in it or else he wouldn't do it. Could the Minister tell us how long these negotiations went on that were culminated on April 25th? When was the application made and how long did it take to process it because that was his point, the delay in processing.

**MR. THORSON:** — I hope perhaps to make a fuller statement to the news media later in the day when I get all the information in hand. I know that the latest negotiations on the proposals of the company and what we would be able to do started about the third week in March. The decision of the SEDCO Board was made on April 25 of this year.

## **ADJOURNED DEBATES**

### **RESOLUTION NO. 19 — TO BRING THE POTASH INDUSTRY UNDER PUBLIC OWNERSHIP**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. Richards (Saskatoon University):

That this Assembly urges the Government of Saskatchewan to consider the feasibility of bringing the potash industry under public ownership.

**HON. E.C. WHELAN (Regina North West):** — Stand.

**MR. STEUART (Leader of the Opposition):** — Mr. Speaker, I wonder why you are standing this particular motion? I should just like a little explanation. We should like to proceed with this.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — When the House decides to stand there is nothing the Chair can do about it.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — The House hasn't decided.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — The House decides unless people object. If there is

some objection then the Speaker poses the question but there was no . . .

**MR. STEUART:** — Well, then I object.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — that's fine. The Hon. Member for Regina North West asked leave to have this matter stand. Agreed?

Motion agreed to stand on the following recorded division.

**YEAS — 33**

**Messieurs**

Blakeney	Brockelbank	Cowley
Dyck	Pepper	Matsalla
Meakes	Michayluk	Faris
Wood	Byers	Feduniak
Smishek	Thorson	Mostoway
Romanow	Whelan	Comer
Messer	Kwasnica	Rolfes
Bowerman	Carlson	Lange
Kramer	Engel	Oliver
Larson	Owens	Kaeding
Kowalchuk	Robbins	Flasch

**NAYS — 14**

**Messieurs**

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

**ADJOURNED DEBATES**

**FIRST REPORT OF THE SELECT STANDING COMMITTEE ON  
PUBLIC ACCOUNTS AND PRINTING**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. McPherson (Regina Lakeview) that the First Report of the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts and Printing be now concurred in, and the proposed amendment thereto by the Hon. Mr. Thorson, that the words “concurred in” be deleted and the word “received” substituted therefor.

**MR. C.P. MacDONALD (Milestone):** — Mr. Speaker, I adjourned this debate the other day on the proposed amendment by the Minister of Industry and Commerce (Mr. Thorson) and seconded by the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) of the province. Mr. Speaker, when I examine the amendment and examine the implications of it, I am outraged. I think that every Member of this Assembly should be outraged.

I should like to say what this amendment does, Mr. Speaker, is, in other words, it says to the Member of this Assembly that we whitewash a report of the Provincial Auditor, supported by the Government of Saskatchewan and that we absolve the Minister of Industry and Commerce. The most outrageous thing about it is that it is moved by the man who had been criticized, the Minister of Industry and



Commerce himself.

I want to point out who are the members of this committee, Messieurs McPherson, Brockelbank, Carlson, Engel, Hanson, Kaeding, Lane, McIsaac and Meakes. I want to point out to you, sir, that there are eight members on this committee who are Members of the Government and there are four members who are Members of the Opposition.

I should also like to point out to you, sir that when this report was concurred in, in committee, the chairman, Mr. McPherson, said, "Now gentlemen, could I have a motion approving this report?" Mr. Meakes, "I would so move." Mr. McIsaac, "Seconded." Moved by Mr. Meakes, seconded by Mr. McIsaac, all in favor, carried unanimously by all members of the committee. And what was that report? I should like to read what the auditor had to say:

On February 3, 1972, an advance payment of \$12,000 was made by the Department of Industry and Commerce on account of a printing order for 250,000 "Travel Guides, 1972". According to the invoice submitted to the department the \$12,000 represented a provision for an advance payment on the order placed with the supplier. The goods were ordered and had not been received by the Department of Industry and Commerce at the date of the advance payment although they were subsequently received on March 23, 1972 when the final payment of \$16,894 was made. There was no evidence of a formal contract with the supplier providing for a payment before the completion of the work. Therefore, it would appear that the payment of \$12,000 was made without proper authority.

Mr. Speaker, the most unusual thing about this is that we have appointed an auditor in the Province of Saskatchewan to examine the books and be the watchdog of the people of Saskatchewan. The very interesting thing about the auditor's report this year is that he selects two departments, the Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation and the Department of Industry and Commerce, both of these departments under the direction and responsibility of the Minister of Industry and Commerce, the Member who has moved that this report be not concurred in.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, the most interesting thing is the fact of the subject matter on this particular criticism of the watchdog of the people of Saskatchewan. It does not related to any illegality in relation to an independent company. It does not related to an illegality to someone who normally does business with Saskatchewan, that is not normally affiliated or concerned or tied up with the Government of Saskatchewan. This particular problem is related to the ownership of the company that is owned by the NDP. On top of that, this company is not only owned by they are receiving government business without tender. We find now that not only do they receive government business without tender, not only are they receiving \$50,000 or \$60,000 worth of government business a year, not only have they throughout the years received hundreds of thousands of dollars in payments of taxpayers' money, the vast majority of it without tender, now we find that here the Minister of Industry and Commerce, seconded by the Attorney General, asks us to stand up in this House and approve that kind of an illegal payment, to absolve the Government of Saskatchewan and the NDP for the

payment to Service Printing that was not only done without tender but it was done in an illegal fashion.

In asking us to do this, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Industry and Commerce has done a very unusual thing. Had it been done by another Member opposite, to stand on his feet and suggest to the Members of this House that perhaps the language used by the auditor's report was in reality not being a criticism of the individual Minister but of the Government as a whole, which indeed it was, had another Member stand on his feet and asked us to reword and rephrase it because it might have become a personal insinuation, it might have made a little sense. But for the very man who is the subject of this criticism to stand up and make this amendment, I think, is an insult to every Member in this House. Mr. Speaker, I am going to be extremely interested to find out what the mover of this report is going to do on this vote. I am going to be extremely interested to find out what the other members of the Public Accounts Committee are going to do because I suggest to the House the seriousness of this problem is one that if the Members of this Assembly vote for the amendment by the Minister of Industry and Commerce and seconded by the Attorney General, that they will destroy once and for all the effectiveness of the Public Accounts Committee in this Assembly.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MacDONALD:** — And that is the real issue.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — You Members have done that.

**MR. MacDONALD:** — Done that with your partnership. It was moved by the Member for Touchwood (Mr. Meakes) and concurred in unanimously.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Where does it say illegal?

**MR. MacDONALD:** — Oh, listen to the Attorney General. Read the proceedings of the committee. And not only that, it was nothing to do with remarks of Members from this side of the House that the amendment relates to. This amendment refers to the report of the Public Accounts Committee, not to the statements of the Member from Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod) or anybody else in the House. That's what it refers to whether or not the report will be concurred in and that was moved by the Member for Touchwood and received unanimously by every member of the Public Accounts Committee.

The issue here, Mr. Speaker, is a serious one, as to whether or not the Public Accounts Committee can now and from this time forth dispense with its duties and responsibilities when it comes into here, the very purpose of its task and its role in the legislative process will be destroyed by a Government majority who do not like a personal criticism.

I should also like to point out that the Government has only been in office two years. This is the first time, Mr. Speaker, that I can remember when the auditor of the Province of Saskatchewan has come out and offered criticism — the first time — on two occasions in this particular report. And now the Government jumps on its feet when the very watchdog, the watchdog of the public of Saskatchewan, the watchdog of the

people of Saskatchewan comes out and offers some criticism they then turn around and destroy his effectiveness and destroy its effectiveness of the Public Accounts Committee. I say to every member of the Public Accounts Committee, it will be interesting to see what kind of honor and what kind of sense of responsibility you have. It will be very interesting indeed and I suggest that every member of the Public Accounts Committee on this side of the House and everybody in the Province of Saskatchewan will be watching very carefully to see how each member on the Public Accounts Committee votes on this particular amendment when they try to absolve themselves by their own majority of the criticism of the watchdog of the people of Saskatchewan.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. A.E. BLAKENEY (Premier):** — Mr. Speaker, I regard this debate as an important one. I regard it as an important one for a number of reasons put forward by the Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald). I differ with the Member for Milestone in many things but I do not differ with him on the essential point he puts forward now, that we, and all the Members of this House, have an obligation to see that the Public Accounts Committee operates effectively as a watchdog for the people of Saskatchewan, to see that every assistance is given to the Provincial Auditor in the conduct of his duties. There will be occasions in which the Provincial Auditor will make criticisms of Government, when the Government will feel that the criticisms are unwarranted. This happens frequently in Ottawa as we know and it is going to happen here. We, as the Government, will nonetheless take the position that the provincial Auditor, unless we feel that he is very far off the mark, should be supported. And we now take that position.

We take the position also that the Public Accounts Committee should be free in a relatively non-partisan way, as any committee of this Legislature can be, to report to this House on the conduct of the affairs of the Government as they come under review by that committee. We did that on the Public Accounts Committee. As the Member for Milestone has pointed out very clearly, the Government has a majority on that committee and if the Government had wished, no doubt they could have attempted to influence the Government members on that committee to so amend the report that it would not reflect on any particular act of the Government. But we didn't take that course of action. We thought that any government ought to be willing to accept criticism put forward by members of a committee who are acting primarily as Members of this House and not as any member of any particular political party. Accordingly, when the report of the Public Accounts Committee came in, it was supported, as the Member for Milestone indicted, it was supported in its terms by the Members on both sides of the House when they acted in the committee.

Any fair reading of the report of the auditor indicates that his basic complaint is that a payment was made before the goods were received and this was not authorized by legislation or the Treasury Board orders. And I think the evidence is clear that that happened and that it was not authorized and that it should be criticized and it was criticized. It happens hundreds of times in a year in some millions of payments, I suspect, that the Government and its agencies makes in the run of a year. Many, many of them are made not strictly in accordance with the

May 4, 1973

provisions of the Department of Finance Act or the Treasury Board orders. This is not, however, to suggest that the auditor should not search out those payments and should not criticise them and should mention in very clear terms in cases where he thinks these payment should not be made. He did that. Member of the committee, from our side of the House accepted the criticism, agreed to the criticism being included in the report and it was brought in in this House.

We then had the chairman of the committee introduce the report into the House and he made his comments on it, very proper comments, I thought. And we had other Members of the House, the Member for Touchwood (Mr. Meakes) who had, as I recall it, moved or seconded that the report be adopted in the committee, spoke in this house. But we had another Member of the committee in this House, the Member for Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod) and he saw fit to comment on the report of the committee in a way which, at least in my judgment, very clearly misrepresented the terms of the committee report and not only that, very clearly reflected, not on the method of operating his office, but I thought on the personal integrity of a Member of this House. I don't know what words you put on language like that, and I' quoting from the uncorrected Hansard, and he used phrases like, "the most open-handed banditry I have ever seen."

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Shame, shame! You should be ashamed of yourself.

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — "This Government is simply and deliberately stealing money from the people of Saskatchewan." I say this very clearly, money from the context, it was clear that these comments could be directed at only one Member of the Government. From the context it was clear that these were directed against the Member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. Thorson). And I want to say this. Even if they were directed at me as the head of the Government, I know of no time in the history of this province, and I say this advisedly, when a report has been introduced in this house from a committee which has criticized in a personal way the integrity of a Member of this House by a committee of this Legislature without giving that Member even an opportunity to appear before that committee, without his even being called before that committee.

**MR. STEUART:** — Never even mentioned his name.

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — I think that's not good enough, Mr. Speaker. I say this, I ask you as Members to reflect what position it puts you and me and every Member in this House in if a committee can sit and bring in a report which reflects on the personal integrity of a Member without even giving him an opportunity to comment before that committee on his side of the story. And I say that has never been done and I say it is totally at variance with all of the parliamentary procedure of this country. I say it violates all of the rules set out in the Bourinot and Beauchesne. I say the committee didn't do that. I say the committee didn't do that. I say the committee reported in a way which suggested that an error of office procedure was made. And I say that the committee said nothing which could support the allegations made by the Member for Albert Park.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Absolutely nothing! And I want to say this. I believe that the Member for Milestone was right in his views that we should support the Public Accounts Committee. I think the committee did a good job. I think they did a good job under their chairman. I think they conducted their affairs well. And I give them credit for backing up the auditor in his criticism of the Government. And I give the Government Members on that committee credit for being willing to bring in a report which criticized the Cabinet. And I say that's fair enough. We're not immune from mistakes and we're therefore not immune from criticism.

And I think we should back up the committee and I think we should back up the committee by accepting their report and I think, therefore, that the Member for Souris-Estevan was hasty when he moved that report not be concurred in. But I don't think it's possible for us to concur in the report if it bears the interpretation put forward by one of the Members, the Member for Albert Park because I think that would be: (a) a total distortion of the report; and (b) a total negation of all the customs and practices of this Legislature and every other Parliament in the Commonwealth. And because I believe that and because I want to adopt the essential position of the Member for Milestone, I am going to move, seconded by the Hon. Member for Kelsey (Mr. Messer):

That the amendment be further amended by deleting all the words subsequent to and including the word "word" and substituting therefor the following:

"words 'received and concurred in on the specific understanding that the report does not support the interpretation placed upon it by one member of the committee, the Member for Albert Park and his remarks in this House', be substituted therefor."

That is my motion.

My position is perfectly clear. I believe that we should accept the report. I believe we should concur in the report as I interpret the report and as I know members of the committee interpreted the report and we can only do this by divorcing ourselves from the interpretation put on it by one member of the committee in this House, the Member for Albert Park. And I say this very clearly. Our choices are this, our choices are to say that report means what it says, that they strongly criticize the procedures but they make no personal imputation of wrongdoing, that's what I think it says, and I'm prepared to accept it on that basis because I agree that an error was made. Or alternatively reflecting on one Member of this House without giving him any opportunity to appear before that committee to put his point of view. If the committee meant that, if the committee meant to personally reflect on any Member of this House without giving him an opportunity to put his point of view, then I think the committee acted wrongly. I don't think the committee meant that. I am making clear what I think the committee meant and I am accepting the committee's report.

And I want to say this. I want to say this, if the Member for Albert Park meant what he said in this House then when he,

May 4, 1973

in that committee did not demand to give the Member whom he reflected upon an opportunity to sit in this House and put before the committee his point of view then that Member for Albert Park acted in a way which is totally, totally at variance with the tenets of common decency.

**MR. LANE:** — Why didn't your Members call him?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Because they did not impute any improper motives. They weren't running around using words like that, they weren't running around slandering people behind his back. They weren't running around saying things by indirection which they were unwilling to say to his face except in this House. And I say this. I don't believe the other members adopt that point of view. I don't think they do. I think they are prepared to say that there was an improper act and that they censure the improper act and that they will not go farther. And I ask all Hon. Members to accept this resolution, to reject what can only be considered an allegation of impropriety and I ask all Hon. Members in the interests of the traditions of this House to accept this amendment. It does what the Member for Milestone asks, it asks us concurring in the report, it specifically disassociate this House from, I think, quite improper, and with every deference to Mr. Speaker, I think unparliamentary language and I think it makes clear what I think is a pretty important principle, that Members of this House be free from personal criticism of their personal conduct by committees of this House unless they are given an opportunity to answer those charges in committee.

I want to say one thing further. If Members oppose or if any Member of this committee feels that it is proper conduct, and I want to say this very seriously, if any member of the committee feels that it is proper conduct for a committee to reflect to this extent on the personal integrity of a Member of this House without giving him an opportunity to reply, then I think that Member should resign not only from this Public Accounts Committee but all other committees of the House.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Because surely it's not possible for us, surely it's not possible for us to carry on our business in this House if committees are going to report in a manner which at least someone says personally reflect on Members of this House without giving them an opportunity to reply. But as I say, I don't think the Public accounts Committee did that. So far as I am aware only one or two Members takes that view and I am going to ask the members of this committee to disassociate themselves from the interpretation placed upon it by one member of the committee, the Member for Albert Park, and having done that I am going to ask all Members of this House to accept the report, to concur in the report so that we will support the auditor, we will support the Public accounts Committee but we will reject the totally improper allegations and interpretations of that report placed upon it by the Member for Albert Park.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. STEUART (Leader of the Opposition):** — Mr. Speaker, we've just witnessed a rather remarkable performance by the Premier, a rather remarkable performance in attempting to bail out one of his Ministers.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. STEUART:** — A rather remarkable performance on behalf of the Premier attempting to whitewash the Government's action. A rather interesting performance by the Premier in attempting to drag a red herring into this debate and into this whole question to try to divert the public's attention from the real issue here.

Let's look at the real issue, let's look at what the Premier said. For the first time — maybe not the first time, I don't know — but for the first time that I can remember the Government was criticized in this report of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts. It might not have been the first time. Maybe it wasn't. I hope it wasn't because from time to time the auditor, when were the Government, criticized us for some of our actions and it was reflected probably in the report of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts. But for the first time in my memory, the first time that we could find the record, a Member of the Government, the Minister of Industry, rose in his place and attempted to thwart the report and have it really, in effect, rejected by the Members of the Legislative committee.

Now let's see what really happened here. The auditor went through the accounts and he called attention to a payment by the Government through the Department of Industry to Service Printing, the company owned totally by the NDP, a payment that he said was made wrongly. The Premier admits this. He said that all Members have a responsibility to see that the auditor has the freedom and the independence to criticize the Government. He said, like in Ottawa, the auditor will, has and will continue, we hope, from time to time to criticize all Governments if he thinks they are wrong. That's his job. The Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) said the auditor is a watchdog on behalf of the public, on the way the public's money is handled and, in fact, how the Government, the administration of the Government, the Cabinet does handle the money in a proper way according to the rules laid down by this Legislative Assembly which has the power, of course, to change the rules any time it wants, but having set the rules, we then give a certain measure of independence to the auditor so that he can, in fact, see that the Government carries out the will of the Legislative Assembly, that is, the will of the people. Then he went on to say his Government concurs in this whole principle. The Government Members have whitewashed the Government by squelching or not bringing in the report, the criticism by the auditor.

The Premier said that the auditor's report was right and this criticism was just and well founded. The Premier admitted that the payment was made when it should not have been made. He said that all the NDP Members also agreed. And the chairman, Mr. McPherson, the Member from Regina Lakeview introduced the report, spoke on it properly and it was supported by Mr. Meakes who is also on the committee.

Then what happened? The Member from Albert Park

(Mr. MacLeod) rose in his place and he debated that report. He made certain statements about whom? He made certain statements about the Government. In all the language the Premier talked about, talking about theft or mismanagement or illegality, the Member for Albert Park continually referred to the Government not to the Minister of Industry (Mr. Thorson). After he had finished speaking the Minister of Industry came in the other evening and he made quite a long speech. And he made a very impassioned speech. He said that his honor had been challenged, his integrity had been challenged, and he ended up by quoting some verse from Shakespeare, some lines from Shakespeare about — they could attack him if they wanted, his reputation, they could take his purse, that was trash — I don't know about that but if they attacked his reputation, they were really attacking him.

The he made an incredible motion. A motion that, in effect, would reject the unanimous report of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts. The Attorney General agreed in that and he seconded it. That the Government realized what they had done. They took a look at Mr. MacLeod's speech, they took a look at the total picture and they realized that they had painted themselves into a corner.

One of their Members of that Government got up in an attempt to whitewash himself and he really hadn't been accused of anything more than the total Government have been accused of something. He then attempted to whitewash himself and the Attorney General, in a moment of ill-conceived and misplaced loyalty to that Member, seconded the motion.

So they rather hoped that some way or another they could get off the hook. So the Premier comes in with this motion. It tries to say we will reject what the Minister of Industry has suggested in his amendment but we will, in fact, accept and concur in the report because we don't want to be accused of destroying the impartiality of the committee or hampering the independence of the auditor because they know the serious consequences that would flow from that action. And so they try to load the whole blame for what they have done, for what their own Government Members, the position they put themselves into, on to the shoulders of the Member for Albert Park.

Let's keep this sorted out very clearly what we are talking about here. We are talking about two or three very separate things. One, we are talking about accepting and concurring in the report. And the report has absolutely nothing to do with the speech that any Member on any side of the House might make about it.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. STEUART:** — I want to clear that up very definitely. If Mr. MacLeod, the Member from Albert Park in his speech — I want to make this very clear — in his speech, Mr. Speaker, if he went beyond the bounds of proper parliamentary language, if he, in fact, said things that shouldn't have been said, if he made false accusation against any Member, then the first line of defence, of course, for the Member whose honour or integrity has been attacked, the first line of defence of course is, Mr. Speaker, who is here to keep order and keep us within the bounds of proper parliamentary procedure.



In fairness to the Speaker, debate goes on very rapidly and goes on very fast and there is cross-fire and it is quite conceivable that he could miss this statement or any statement. He is only human. And when he does bring us to order and has a difficult time with both sides of the House, and no one probably more than myself, it is conceivable that he could miss it.

The next line of defence is, of course, the Member himself or any Members of the Government side, or the Opposition, who feel that any Member has gone beyond the bounds of proper parliamentary procedure and has attacked and said things that are unparliamentary. They can rise in their place and draw it to the attention of the Speaker on a point of privilege or on a point of order. Nobody did that.

The next line of defence that this House has is a Committee on Elections and Privileges. If any Member on either side of the House says something that he should not have said or goes beyond the accepted laid down practices of parliamentary procedure that Member can be hauled before the Committee on Elections and Privileges. He can be heard, the evidence for him can be presented, the evidence against him can be presented, and then he can be judged by that committee, made up of both sides of this House and representing not the Government or not the Opposition but the Members of the Legislative Assembly. They can if they wish after having heard both sides of the case and having heard the Member in question, censure that Member. That line of attack or that line of defence, if any defence is needed, is still open.

And I suggest, Mr. Premier, that had you not been trying to bring in a red herring, had you not been trying to bail out your Minister of Industry and your Attorney General, that is the line of attack that you should have taken.

If you, in fact, sincerely believe that the Member for Albert Park did something and said something in this House that was unparliamentary, took unfair advantage, smeared the honor of any Member, got away with it so to speak, skipped past the Members opposite, slipped past the Speaker, then you have and you should know and I am sure you do know that line of attack or defence, that recourse is open to you.

You haven't done this. You have chosen to come in and bring another amendment that says, in effect, while we accept the report of the committee because you don't want not to accept it, because you know the consequences that will flow out of that action, but some way or another we will pin some blame on the Member from Albert Park and he should resign.

Well, I want to tell you something. If anybody should resign over this incident, it should start with the Premier and then to the Minister of Industry and then to the Attorney General. And I say this because I am going to look and have this House examine exactly what the Member for Albert Park said.

The Member for Albert Park didn't accuse the Minister of Industry of theft, of illegality, he accused the Government. And why did he accuse the Government? He accused the Government not because of the auditor's report, but what the auditor's report was all about. He accused the Government of illegality and what amounted to theft and what amounted to — in his words, stealing from the public purse by handing without tender to

May 4, 1973

Service Printing, a company they totally own, an NDP company, the profits of which go back into the NDP for the advancement of their own political party. That is exactly what he said:

The report of the committee in very gentle terms condemns the activity of the Government.

That is what he said on page 2825. He went on to say:

Now, Mr. Speaker, what has happened on numerous occasions is that we on this side of the House have condemned the Government for its almost thumb-to-nose treatment of the Opposition, for a thumb-to-nose- treatment of the people of Saskatchewan . . .

Again, off of these refer to the Government.

. . . for its . . .

The Government's.

. . . hand in the pocket of the people of Saskatchewan.

He goes on to say that what this Government has done by this activity is, it has:

. . . taken unto itself a profit of some \$5,000 or \$6,000 for its political party . . .

Not him the Government's political party.

. . . it has done so without the least bit of embarrassment. It has done it in the most open-handed banditry that we have ever seen.

Now nowhere in this, and that is what the Premier quoted as being unparliamentary, that is what the Premier said smeared the Member from Estevan (Mr. Thorson). That is what the Premier said smeared the Minister of Industry. In fact, Mr. MacLeod doesn't mention the name of the Minister of Industry except on page 2824 when he talks about the report. Before that he went into detail about why the auditor was forced to make this report. All he accused the Minister of Industry and his department of there was that they made the payment in a wrongful manner. And they did. Even the auditor admitted that. The auditor said that and the Premier said that. So nowhere in his speech did the Member from Albert Park accuse the Member for Estevan of banditry or having a hand in the public purse or stealing. But, if he did, even if he did, it had absolutely nothing to do with this report and the Government's acceptance or rejection or watering down of this report.

It is a speech mad by a private Member, free speech, his opinion, that in his opinion the Government has done something wrong, in his opinion this Service Printing is an on-going sore on the body of the public politics in this province and an open scandal and that is his opinion. If it is wrong then you should censor him and you have got the instruments to censor him. I say he is right and we support him. But it has absolutely nothing to do with the individual, the Member for Estevan, except as much as that he is a Member of the Government and must share equally with all the other Members of the Government the blame for this on-going scandal.

Mr. Speaker, it is also worth noting that at the time of this report, at the time of this incident, Mr. Thorson, the Member for Estevan had only been a Cabinet Minister for less than a month prior to that particular wrongful payment. And so I don't think in any way could he have been connected with the placing of the order with Service Printing. That, in itself brings back the accusation very clearly to the Premier and the rest of the Cabinet.

But again, let me make it very clear, in this whole debate we are not really debating whether the Minister of Industry did anything wrong, we are really not debating whether the Member from Albert park did or did not break proper parliamentary procedure. What we are debating is the method in which this Legislative Assembly shall handle reports brought to it by the Standing Committee on Public accounts. And again, I want to repeat that the issue of Service Printing and the Government's handing business to them is one issue. The issue of the auditor's statement and the auditor's independence and the report that flows out of the report of the Standing Committee, that comes out of his report to that committee, to this House is a separate and distinct issue.

So let's make it very clear. We do not intend to support this amendment. We will not support, of course, the amendment that it amends. We shall support the original motion. And no amount of legal trickery, no amount of fancy little talks by the Premier, no amount of semantics will change the issue, will draw the attention of the public from the real issue, that the first time this Government had its knuckles rapped, they reacted like school boys. They reacted like someone who was really caught with his hands in the cookie jar, with his hand in the till and they made a very, very foolish move.

The Minister of Industry had every right to make the speech, and don't tell us that he didn't get a chance to be heard. He spoke in this House for almost an hour defending the Government and defending himself. I don't know whether he needed defence; he felt he needed defence. We've even heard rumors he might resign. I don't think he should resign. He was only a Minister for less than a month when this deed happened. I don't think he had anything to do with placing or handed the business out to Service Printing. If anybody should resign over this sorry, sad, ugly little incident, it should be the Premier and the Attorney General. I say no amount of whitewash and no amount of tub thumping by the Attorney General that we will hear in a few minutes, I am sure, saying, you people when you were the Government put out contracts without tender, and of course, we did. You people when you were the Government did this and did that. But let me tell you . . .

**MR. ROMANOW:** — You are going to hear about it.

**MR. STEUART:** — Well let us hear about it then. And you can dig up anything that you want. You can talk, you can bring all the red herrings, you can go back as you do all the time when are caught out. You can say, "But you Liberals did it, so if you Liberals did it, it must be all right for us to do it."

Sure we gave out tenders, there is no question about that. The question of giving out tenders over the years without

contracts is one that every Government does and we did. You stand in your place keeping this issue of Service Printing in mind. Show us where we ever gave or where a Government, ours, any other Government ever handed, without tender, business to a company wholly owned by a political party in power to take the profits and the profits I am sure were extremely high to be able to taxpayers' money for the advancement of their own political cause. I don't care what the Members opposite bring in. I don't care what they say in here. The issue still remains that we are debating should this Legislative Assembly accept without comment the report of the Legislative Committee, the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts which criticizes in rather mild terms, I would say, the Government's handling of money in a certain incident or should it not. The issue of whether the Government should have given business to Service Printing, the issue of what the Member from Albert Park has said are distinct and separate. The public will judge the Government as they judged our Government on the handling of public funds. We have a Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections. We have a Speaker to judge the actions of any Member of this Legislative Assembly and if the Member has done something wrong, then I challenge you to take him before that committee and we will gladly appear in his defence.

He said nothing wrong. He said the truth. He did not go after the character and attempt to assassinate the character of the Minister of Industry. He attacked the Government on their handling of public funds and rightfully so. He should and the Members opposite should keep their eye on the main issue.

What we are debating here is the acceptance, traditional acceptance, the free and independent acceptance of the report stemming out of the criticism. The proper criticism, admittedly proper criticism by the auditor of the actions of the Government opposite.

**MR. P. MEAKES (Turtleford):** — Mr. Speaker, I realize that I have spoken on the motion so I will only be able to speak to the amendment. I will certainly endeavor to keep my remarks, they are going to be short, but I will speak to the amendment and to the amendment only.

I have spent quite a number of years as a member of the Public Accounts Committee. I have always felt and taken the stand in the committee that the mistakes made by the Government, whether it was my political party or the other, should be commented on. I agreed to second the report when it came to this Legislature. I felt that there was need for the comment that was in it. I said when I spoke before and I say again, I listened carefully to the mover of the motion and I agreed with everything that he said in it. I am not going into a long argument but I want to make it clear and I speak for myself, and I believe I speak for the other Government Members at the committee and I believe they are quite capable if they wish to put their position on the record.

I listened carefully to the comment of the Hon. Member for Albert Park in regard to item eight of the report and those remarks to me did not radiate either the evidence that we had heard in the committee or what he committee reported in the House. I don't think, Mr. Speaker, that we take the original committee report, as such, without taking into consideration the remarks of the Member for Albert Park. I do feel

it was an attack, a personal attack, on a Member of this Legislature.

I will admit that for many days I had been torn and I found myself in the impossible position that I was going to have to support a motion that I had seconded in this House.

I felt that, taking into relationship, I repeat again, I don't think you could consider the report without the debate that went on. And the debate that went on, the remarks I say again of the mover of the motion who I believe has been a good chairman of the committee, I personally feel much better to support the amendment so that we can concur in the report of the committee which I think was a good one.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. J.E. BROCKELBANK (Minister of Government Services):** — Mr. Speaker, I just have a few words to say on this particular amendment which is before us.

As I was coming back into the House I heard the Leader of the Opposition complaining about contracts awarded without tender. I think that it is common knowledge to everybody in this House including the Leader of the Opposition that every printing company in the city of Regina has contracts awarded to them without tender. And it is done by this Government to them without tender. I object to the Leader of the Opposition attempting to twist the facts to fit his case because, in fact, this is a practice that has been carried on for many years by both Governments.

I think, Mr. Speaker, and I am sorry that my action on the committee and my attendance at the committee was not as good as could be expected because of other duties and responsibilities, however, at the time that I was in attendance in the committee, I never at any time got the impression that the Member for Albert Park was bringing to the attention of the committee that the Department of Industry and Commerce or the Minister in charge of that department should be called before the committee.

So, therefore, I object to his comments in this House drawing attention to something that should have been drawn to the attention of the committee. Therefore, I find myself in the position of being able to accept the report of the committee but not being able to accept the comments of the Member for Albert Park following the report of the chairman of the committee in this House.

I just wanted to make these few points clear, Mr. Speaker, as a member of the committee and as someone who had some responsibility for the Queen's Printer which awards contracts without tender and which awards contracts with tender to all printing companies under all governments.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. J.C. McISAAC (Wilkie):** — Mr. Speaker, I want to speak for a few minutes on the subamendment and forgive me, Mr. Speaker, if that ranges a little bit to the amendment that is also before us. I have

spoken on the motion earlier in the debate.

I want to ask the Members of the House to consider for a moment the reason that we have the amendment before us to change the word “concluded” to “received”. The main motion asks us to concur in the report. This is what has happened since 1939 to this year. I think there was one exception when some difficulty in the last day in the house when the report was only received and not concluded in and not debated. As I say that has been done for about 30 years in this House with respect to this report of this particular committee.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, I haven’t perused the committee reports but surely there must have been contentious comments throughout the years that one way or the other the Government of the day may not have liked or may not have approved of.

I will review again the membership of the committee. It is about eight to four in favor of Government Members. I point out again that the report was adopted unanimously. It was moved by the Member for Regina Lakeview (Mr. McPherson), my colleague, a man who I think has done a tremendous job as chairman of that committee. And I am not sure that the Premier said exactly this, but surely he intimated that was his opinion also in his remarks on this debate.

My concern with the amendment is, Mr. Speaker, that it condemns all of the committee members and particularly the chairman and the vice chairman.

**HON. MR. BROCKELBANK:** — It does not.

**MR. McISAAC:** — It does, the amendment with respect to changing the words “concluded” to “received”. It is a slap on the committee, particularly a slap of the chairman because, and I will read the recommendation as I think it is worth going back to, briefly read the section in the recommendation that caused the debate that we are not in. Item eight and it goes on to say and I will quote directly:

The committee notes such action with strong disapproval and recommends adherence by all departments of the Government to the controls which are presently defined.

Now, Mr. Speaker, those are firm words but they are not strong nor inflammatory words. I suggest that statement fits very well the case that was referred to in the upper part of that same provision, number eight.

I am glad to hear that the Premier did get up and reconsider the amendment with respect to concurring versus receiving and I well appreciate the sensitivity of the Minister of Industry in this case, I really do, because he felt, I am sure, that he was attacked or insulted, if you like, by some of the comments of my colleague from Albert Park. He had his opportunity, Mr. Speaker. He got up in the debate and spoke, I believe for almost two hours before supper and for a good, long period afterwards defending what he took to be an attack on his personal integrity and I am sure that if I felt the same way I certainly would get up and defend my personal integrity being attacked in this House at any time. That we can understand and that we can appreciate.

The point is, Mr. Speaker, if he wasn't satisfied or isn't satisfied today that he has rectified any injustice or any comments that has been made on him, neither of these amendments is the approach for him or the Government to take. Neither of these amendments is the approach to take. So I would hope the House will not only defeat the amendment but defeat the subamendment because the amendment takes a slap at the committee. It doesn't condemn the Minister particularly. The subamendment that we have been asked to look at by the Premier, in this case, we are taking an unfair slap at the Member for Albert Park (Mr. McLeod) who got up in a free wheeling debate and interpreted the report as he saw fit, Mr. Speaker. We have heard dozens of speeches in this Legislature, some from the Members at the back, from Nutana South (Mr. Rolfes) and others who got up and made allegations on any and all subject, made pretty valid, free-swinging allegations. It is not a new theme in this Legislature, Mr. Speaker,. It is not a new theme and it wasn't against the Minister either. The remarks of the Member for Albert Park were not against the Minister. They were against the Government at large for what he saw as a trend that we have seen for a number of years in this province with respect to this Government and its dealings with the Service Printing Company. And it is the remarks of the Member for Albert Park that prompted the concern and prompted some of the amendments that we are now dealing with.

Mr. Speaker, I want to suggest that the allegations made by the Member for Albert Park haven't really been denied in any sense. We haven't heard any great denials that the NDP have indeed been giving special treatment to Service Printing, yet it is a very, very touch point with the Premier, the Minister of Government Services and all other Ministers. You didn't deny it when you were up but it is a very touchy point with Members opposite, Mr. Speaker. I can appreciate their sensitivity in this point but I suggest they take the absolutely wrong course in this respect.

I want to comment for just a moment on one thought expressed by the Premier. He felt that the committee and the committee members did a cowardly thing by not calling the Minister into the committee. He thought that it was very unfair to the Minister in this sense. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think it was meant — I am not sure the records will show — that it was considered that we call the Minister in the committee. It was mentioned outside of the records, very briefly. I know that his staff must have told him that the department was on and up for discussion, this matter of Service Printing and of his signing the memo. Surely, it must have come to his attention. I now, Mr. Speaker, that his colleagues, seven or eight Members who were on the committee, surely must have told him that this issue was being debated. They well could have moved a motion. The Minister could have come himself because it certainly wasn't a brand new report to him when he saw it tabled in the House. He must have been aware. We know very well he was aware.

I think then, Mr. Speaker, we look at the subamendment that is before us and we find out that this arose directly, we are now down and begin to see where we are getting these things from because we appreciate and can see the Government's concern over the remarks of the Member for Albert Park with respect to Service Printing. Nothing to do with the report with respect to this Government and their dealings through the years with Service Printing.

May 4, 1973

And now we find out the real concern of the Minister of Industry and the real concern of the Government opposite is with respect to comments made by the Member for Albert Park and their dealings with Service Printing Company.

Mr. Speaker, I must oppose the amendment with respect to “receiving” versus “concurring” and I must also oppose the subamendment with respect to censoring, in essence, the Member for Albert Park.

Mr. Speaker, there are ways and means and neither of these two amendments are the proper way to deal with any comments made by a Member, either on that side of this, that any other Member doesn't like. It can be referred to the Committee on Elections and Privileges and that is the place and that is the time. I suggest and I want to ask all Members to turn down both of these amendments and not slur the committee of Public Accounts, not slur the chairman or any of the members on it and leave that committee, the auditor and the auditor's report back at the level they have been for years in this House and not use this report to get at one Member for alleged statements and if they don't like that there are many other ways of dealing with it, proper channels that have been here for years.

**HON. MR. BROCKELBANK:** — Mr. Speaker, will the Hon. Member permit a question before he resumes his seat? Is it your understanding that no one on the committee issued an invitation to the Minister of Industry and Commerce to appear before the committee?

**MR. McISAAC:** — No one Member, Mr. Speaker. His department was there and the Minister could be there if he wants and you are well aware of that. There were eight members that could have well asked. A motion could have been made. Certainly the Minister wasn't ignorant of the fact that his department was before the committee. There is no question about that.

**HON. E.I. WOOD (Minister of Municipal Affairs):** — Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few words in regard to the matter that is before us. I am a little interested in this committee. I think it is a good one. I think it is one that has been developed through the years and I think the development is a good one. I am very sorry to see the use that is being made of it and the controversy that is arising at the present time in regard to it.

I say these things, Mr. Speaker, because you are well aware that I was the chairman of this committee for three years while I was a Member of the Opposition. And many good discussions were had on the reports that were brought into the House.

It appears to me, Mr. Speaker, that today there are about three reports before us, really. We have before us the report of the Provincial Auditor which was given to the committee. And we have the report of the committee that came into the House in regard to the report of the provincial Auditor. And then we have also the interpretation that is put on the report of the Provincial Auditor and the report of the committee by the Members opposite. I think these are the three things that we are discussing.



If you go back to the first one, the report of the Provincial Auditor, you will note there and I have to admit that there are more than one Minister of the Crown that is under discussion, that the Minister of Industry and Commerce was not the only one. We have a couple of counts here against the Department of Municipal Affairs. One is in regard to the payment of moneys to the City of Flin Flon, Manitoba on behalf of the Flin Flon Hospital.

These payments were made on April 30, 1970 and on May 25, 1971. As you are well aware these will be in the time before I became Minister of Municipal Affairs. I think that if they were not justifiable actually, I think that there is a fairly good excuse here. It is my understanding that the City of Flin Flon was requiring that a certain portion of the costs of the hospital should be paid by Saskatchewan residents on behalf off Saskatchewan residents who were using this hospital. It was found upon discussion with the Department of the Attorney General and the Department of Health that the Department of Health was not authorized to make such payments and the only department that could be authorized to make such payments was the Department of Municipal Affairs.

**MR. LANE:** — Are you saying the Flin Flon Hospital is part of the Liberal . . .

**MR. WOOD:** — I beg your pardon. If the Hon. Member will stand up and speak in the microphone, I might get the question.

At any rate this payment was made through the Department of Municipal Affairs on the strength of a Cabinet Minute. The Provincial Auditor takes the stand that there was no Order-in-Council passed and he says, he is of the opinion that these grant payments have been made without authority. I think there was a good, justifiable reason and I am not standing on my feet at this time to criticize the former Government. As the Minister of Municipal Affairs I think it is up to me to say that this was done in good faith by the department at that time. But I am saying that the statement made by the Provincial Auditor in regard to that transaction is exactly the same as what the Provincial Auditor said in regard to the payment by the Department of Industry and Commerce. He says, "It therefore would appear that the payment of \$12,000 was made without proper authority." This is what he said, he said, "Without proper authority." And on the other one he said, "Without authority." I don't know what is the difference. In fact, I think the one without proper authority is maybe a little stronger wording than without authority.

There was another instance under the Department of Municipal Affairs which was done since I became Minister back in September 9, 1971. I should like to explain to the House here that in this instance we were authorized to buy two houses in Fox Valley for our program in regard to Indian people who are working and we were obtaining housing for them. We did buy the two houses back in — this again before I was Minister — back in October 1969 but it was found that one of these houses was too small for the Indian family and we had arrangements to sell it to someone else. The deal had been made and we understood that someone was buying one of these houses and we then proceeded to buy a third house with the understanding that we would still

only be having two houses. But after the deal was consummated in purchasing the third house, the one offering to buy the second house backed out, and we were left with three houses which we have since rectified and have obtained an Order-in-Council from the Government. But what I want to say is this, again, was made without authority and I think the criticism by the Provincial Auditor is just as strong in each case, in one case as it is in the other and I don't think that there is any reason that we should be saying that the Provincial Auditor is such and so in regard to the Department of Industry because he has said practically the same things in regard to the Department of Municipal Affairs on items which I should like to submit are not of too serious a nature.

But the Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) was saying that no charge of any such kind had ever been made while the other Government was in office. Well, I have here with me, Mr. Speaker, the report of the Provincial Auditor for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1967. And I have here item 21 — payment for goods or services before goods are received or services are rendered. What does that say?

**MR. STEUART:** — Did we try to amend the report?

**MR. WOOD:** — Payment for goods or services. He went on to say, if I may read this, Mr. Speaker, if I might read this item:

It has been a practice of several departments to pay for goods or services in advance, particularly in the last month of the fiscal year. In order to prepare the voucher in such form as to be passed by the Audit Services Branch of the Treasury Department declaration in the form as required by the Treasury Department states that the goods have been received or the services rendered. This declaration is signed by a responsible official of the department concerned. On the basis of this declaration and other criteria the Treasury Department forwards the covering cheque to the supplier named on the voucher. In view of the fact that several months elapse in some cases before the goods are delivered or the services are rendered it is recommended that this practice which is contrary to The Treasury Department Act be discontinued or allowed only in very exceptional circumstances; that when it is allowed some means be devised whereby the payment is withheld from one supplier until the goods are received or the services rendered so that the Government is not vulnerable in cases of financial failure of the supplier.

The Provincial Auditor back on 1967 says that the departments were doing lots of this sort of thing. And here it is in plain English that he is criticizing such action and I submit, Mr. Speaker, that what is being criticized so harshly by the Members opposite in regard to the Department of Industry is exactly the same thing as what the auditor was criticizing back in 1967 when the Hon. Members were the Government.

**MR. STEUART:** — That's not the point.

**MR. WOOD:** — Not the point! I want to go on and say,

Mr. Speaker, that the committee did choose to make some comment on this and I am not saying that they shouldn't. I think that the committee was right in bringing this to our special attention.

**MR. STEUART:** — What year was that?

**MR. WOOD:** — This year, this last year, the one that we are talking about, the report that is before us and I am not criticizing the report. I think it should be approved and I think the report is a good one, but I do want to say that there is no justification for the kind of words that were used by the Hon. Members opposite in criticizing the Minister of Industry and Commerce in regard to this report. The same type of language used by the Provincial Auditor has been used in other cases in the past, in other cases in the same report, and in other cases in the past in regard to the same offences.

**MR. LANE:** — No.

**MR. WOOD:** — Yes, payment before goods were received or services rendered, he says is a common practice under the former Government. The auditor noted it and I don't have the report of that day before me but the auditor, Mr. Hodsman at that time, reported to the committee on this and says, "This is a practice that should be stopped." The same way as was pointed out in regard to this one, but did anybody on our side get up and accuse the Government of stealing? Of course not. It's not the thing to do and I think that the subamendment which we have before us is a good one. It says that we accept this report but we don't condone that kind of language in this House in regard to someone who is not considered by the auditor to have committed that type of an offence. The language used by the auditor is the same as has been used in regard to other types of things of this kind and it is also the same type of an offence as was committed earlier by the Government departments when the Members opposite were the Government.

I submit this is a good subamendment and I certainly intend to vote for it.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. D.M. McPHERSON (Regina Lakeview):** — Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a few words. I should just like to answer the Minister of Municipal Affairs. He mentioned that we didn't bring in the report criticizing all departments and I should just like to point out to him item 8. Under 10(iv) of the Provincial Auditor's Report it was reported an advance payment of \$12,000 was mad. In our report, Mr. Speaker, we pointed out that the committee notes such action with strong disapproval and recommends adherence by all departments of government to the controls which are presently defined.

I just wanted to point out that we hadn't done that.

**MR. C.P. MacDONALD (Milestone):** — Mr. Speaker, I have one comment on the subamendment. I think the subamendment is worse than the original amendment

May 4, 1973

because it ties a report of a committee to the debates of this House. It is a threat to free speech. It says that what happened in the debates in the House will be subject to the approval of a committee report and I don't believe that the Member for Swift Current (Mr. Wood) can accept that. The debates in this House are free-swinging an open to the debate from any Member.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Libellous and slanderous.

**MR. MacDONALD:** — That's right, very often, very often. But to suggest that no Member of the House can get up and speak in a debate and when that debate is concluded that the Government will decide on what that person says in the debate whether or not he accepts a committee report is a terrible thing.

**HON. W.E. SMISHEK (Minister of Public Health):** — Mr. Speaker, may I comment — Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether we can have some order, please? If the Hon. Member from Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) wants to make a speech, I would suggest that he rise in his place and make a speech.

Mr. Speaker, the immediate references by the Hon. Member from Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) saying that by adopting this motion we will deny and impair free speech, I think the Hon. Member is also aware that it is unparliamentary in this House to accuse Members of such things as theft unless one can prove it. It is unparliamentary to use language like 'liars' unless one can prove it and perhaps this is the real issue in this debate.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say a number of things in regard to this debate. First of all, I had the privilege of being on the Public Accounts Committee for a period of about six years. I now know how the committee functions. I think this is a good committee. We have revised the rules over the period of years whereby the committee meets in camera, where it can call witnesses, where it can get information and where it can submit a report to the Legislature for consideration.

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) during his debate said that this is the first time that such a report was received from the auditor.

**MR. STEUART:** — Oh no, I didn't.

**MR. SMISHEK:** — Yes, you did.

**MR. STEUART:** — Point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. I said it had happened lots of times but this is the first time the Government had used its power to try to amend it, deny it. This probably has happened lots of times.

**MR. SMISHEK:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to concur with the remarks of the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Wood) where he has drawn to the attention that from time to time departments act and spend money where there is a lack of authority, that there is lack of regulation and I know that during the period of six years that I was on the committee the Provincial Auditor

brought practically every year some references where there was lack of authority, where there were some administrative procedures that were followed that were not within the rules, that there were, for example, trust funds that lacked the support of administrative authority under the laws, but no one came from the Opposition at that time in this House and accused the Government of theft.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make a couple of references while we are on this debate, outside the particular issue, very briefly, which I think are pertinent to this report and I would ask the Public Accounts Committee in the future to keep a watchful eye and a close examination of the gross budgeting procedures. I say that because I was very interested in having a gross budgeting procedure introduced as a method of financing and as a matter of accounting. This year the Government introduced the gross budgeting system. I note that the committee has not made any observations on the decision that was made and perhaps it would have been premature because the committee really examines the activities of the Government and the expenditures for the year previous.

One other suggestion that I should like to make to the committee is that they take into consideration that in the future the committee might consider early in their activities or sitting what departments they will be calling for appearance before the committee. I say that because my experience this year has been that our people in the departments spent a lot of hours getting prepared to appear before the committee as I am sure every department does. This meant really an expenditure of public funds to a considerable magnitude in getting prepared. I think it would be to the public advantage if notice were given to the departments that will be called so that this expenditure would not have to be made if the department is not going to be called. So I ask that this be considered by the committee in the future.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I now want to refer back to the main issue of this debate and this amendment. Mr. Speaker, I take strong exception to the remarks that were made by the Hon. Member for Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod). I do that based on the examination of the report of the committee and on examining the report of the auditor. Firstly, what does the auditor say?

Therefore, it would appear that the payment of \$12,000 was made without proper authority.

Note the words, "it would appear". Similar language was used by the auditor in previous years where he felt there would appear not to be proper authority. In looking at the committee's report there is somewhat different language and I don't think it was necessarily intention. It was reported that the advance payment of \$12,000 was made without proper authority on February 3.

The Hon. Member from Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod) then went far beyond what the auditor said and what the committee observations were on this particular matter. The Hon. Member in his debate accused the Minister of Industry and Commerce (Mr. Thorson) and the Government of theft. Let's take a look at his remarks, Mr. Speaker. He said that what has happened is the Government is simply and deliberately stealing money from the people of Saskatchewan.

May 4, 1973

Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Albert Park is a lawyer. I think he is aware that to make this serious charge of theft against anyone is a serious charge and had he been making that kind of charge outside of this House, not using the immunity of this House, he perhaps could be liable to court action. But the Hon. Member not only accused the Minister of Industry and Commerce . . .

**MR. LANE:** — Whom did he accuse?

**MR. SMISHEK:** — Well, he accused me of stealing as well.

**MR. LANE:** — As a Government.

**MR. SMISHEK:** — Yes, as a Government Member. And I want him to prove the charge that I have stolen a single penny of public funds. I want him to prove this accusation that I, as a Member of the Crown, stole any money, unless he prove it, unless he proves it in this House, outside of this House and in the courts of this country, I submit he is obligated to hand in his resignation.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. SMISHEK:** — And I will tell him this, that if he proves the charge that I have stolen one penny from this Government, I tender my resignation willingly.

Mr. Speaker, this Member is using the immunity of this House to slander people, to slander this Government for whatever purpose, I don't know. Mr. Speaker, I had a lot of respect for the Hon. Member from Albert Park but I am afraid that unless he withdraws the charges he has made, my respect and regard for him is going to gradually disappear, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, you know when I entered politics a good friend of mine who was the Dean of this House, the Hon. J.H. Brockelbank, who attended that convention said that there are three prerequisites that he looked for in a candidate, in a Member of the Legislature. The words have always stuck in my mind. He said what he looked for in a candidate and in an MLA is honesty, integrity and ability. And I think those are important requirements of a Member of the Legislature.

One other reference was made by a good friend of mine, that in addition to those three prerequisites there needs to be some humility in a Member of the Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, obviously the Hon. Member in his display and in his remarks sort of lacked those prerequisites when he was making those accusations. Perhaps it was in the heat of debate and in the heat of discussion. If that is the case then I can forgive him because like all other Members from time to time during the heat of debate and discussion we do have a slip of the tongue and we make statements that we later regret. We do have an opportunity to withdraw them. Just the other day I made a statement that after I sat down I felt it was inappropriate and I stood up in my place and withdrew the statement.

We give the Hon. Member from Albert Park a chance, an opportunity to withdraw those charges that he made because they

are unparliamentary, they are false, they are completely misrepresenting the report of the committee, completely misrepresenting the report of the auditor. Mr. Speaker, he still has the chance if he wants to vindicate his own honor. You know, Mr. Speaker, a man and his methods are inseparable. Mr. Speaker, the methods that the Hon. Member from Albert Park used, I submit, are dishonorable and are unparliamentary and he is going to be judged on the basis of what kind of a man he is on this particular question unless he rises in his place, unless he withdraws and apologizes to this House for the kind of irresponsible and unparliamentary way he behaved in this House the other day.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

Subamendment agreed to on the following recorded division:

**YEAS — 37**

**Messieurs**

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

**NAYS — 13**

**Messieurs**

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

The debate continues on the amendment as amended.

**MR. K.R. MacLEOD (Regina Albert Park):** — Mr. Speaker, it would seem that a word or two would be in order to try to clear away some of the fog that has been brought to bear on this issue by the Government Members. And let there be no mistake about it, Mr. Speaker, I will not unsay what I have said.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MacLEOD:** — If the tender Minister from Estevan (Mr. Thorson) so desires I will go outside this room, I will go before television cameras of any other place he should choose and I will accuse again the Government of misuse of public funds. I assure you that those who talk about payment without lawful authority or without proper authority are talking about two entirely

different situations. They talk about payments without lawful authority or without proper authority to a hospital somewhere, to some stranger somewhere, that's an entirely different situation and the Members know it, than a payment to their own privately owned Service Printing Co. There is a big distinction in the minds of every lawyer, every fair-minded lawyer in this House and every fair-minded lawyer outside the House. Every fair-minded citizen knows that there is a big difference between payments to strangers and payments to your own, privately owned company. The Attorney General and the Hon. Minister, the tender Minister from Estevan, know very well what conflict of interest is. They know very well what dealing not at arms length is. They know very well what talking about payments to some stranger dealing with the Government is entirely different from dealing with yourself.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MacLEOD:** — What is this nonsense I've heard this morning, what is this foolishness? I refer the Hon. Member to page 246 of the Standing Committee's verbatim report and I look in here and I said:

Having regard to the fact that the payment is illegal, in fact according to section 58 of the Act, would the words "such illegal action" be appropriate?

Now did the Members object? Mr. Mostoway said this:

I don't know why you would want to put in "illegal". I think you are getting the point across the way it is.

Indeed I have. Mr. Meakes says:

Without property authority is the same as your term "illegal".

That was said by the Hon. Member for Touchwood. He admits that "without proper authority" means the same as the term "illegal". So what is the touchy Minister talking about? Well, I'll tell you what we are talking about, we are talking about the use of public funds to subsidize the printing company of the Government. I don't mean the printing company of the people of Saskatchewan, I mean the printing company of the party opposite, the New Democratic Party. A great distinction has to be drawn because what is good for the Service Printing Company is not what's good for the people of Saskatchewan.

Why do I object to that payment being made? I'll tell you why. I have in front of me a pamphlet issued in the June 23 election. "W.H. Wally Coates", and it says on the bottom, "Printed by Service Printing Company." another one, "New Deal for People", one that we have talked about quite a bit. Here it says on the bottom of the back page, "Service Printing Company," and so on. What is happening is that this mischievous group of people are deliberately using public funds for their own election purposes. They are taking the people's money, they are helping to fatten the profits of Service Printing Company so that next election it may have the advantage of this money, these profits generated on Government business so they can print additional pamphlets for their future election. That is what we are talking about.



Now that isn't the worst. What happened here was very simple. I reviewed the activities of that particular voucher in some detail and I acknowledged at the same time that it was the payment to Service Printing Company that was important and the Government has done everything possible to divert the attention from the real issue. No fair-minded person reading my remarks could ever assume or believe that it was anything more than a blanket accusation of the Government and I do so accuse them. They have misused funds of the public, they have betrayed a trust.

Now I want to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that something did occur rather cowardly. I should like to refer the Hon. Members to the remarks of the Minister of Industry and Commerce, page 2944 of his remarks. At the bottom he said and he quoted that memorandum:

Re: Service Printing Company — Invoice for Travel Guides. This is to advise you that I approve the \$12,000 advance payment on the contract of Service Printing Company in this connection as required.

This was directed to Mr. Switzer and signed by the Hon. Minister of Industry and Commerce. He says, and I quote:

It is very clear from reading my memorandum that I did not as the Member for Albert Park would have me believe, authorize this payment.

What kind of nonsense is that? What the Minister has done is turn the responsibility from himself to a person who is a public servant and who cannot come in here to defend himself. That indeed is a very cowardly activity. I read further on page 2944, he says:

Mr. Speaker, if there was no contract on which an advance payment could be made, no one could read my memorandum as saying that a payment should be made even if there was no contract.

He says further:

If this advance payment was illegal as he suggested, if it was made without the benefit of a contract, then no one, Mr. Speaker, can hid behind my memorandum which approves payment only on the contract.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what he is saying is, if there was no contract my memorandum was cleverly drawn to draw attention away from myself, to put the burden and responsibility back upon Mr. Switzer, the public servant, a man who cannot come in here. That indeed is unfair, and since he used the word cowardly I would suggest that is a cowardly act. Mr. Switzer can't defend himself but his memorandum says if there was no contract, by the very words of my memorandum you have no authority to pay it. Is that the kind of Minister we have in Industry and Commerce? Not only tender but he turns the blame to the civil servant. What kind of a man have we got as our Minister?

Now our Liberal says we do not ask for his resignation but I am not so sure that he ought not to resign. Mr. Speaker, it was said that I did not reflect on the Minister and I did not reflect on the Minister. I reflect on the Government and I do

May 4, 1973

impute bad motive to the Government inside this House and outside this House. But there is some talk that Members should be free from personal criticism about their personal conduct. Well, there are two Members in here today who have not shown any reticence in the past in that respect.

Now I suggest that one of the issues here today is the question of the awarding of contracts without tender to Service Printing Company. Any commentary about this whole debate that does not include the words "Service Printing Company" does not fairly represent what I say and what I am telling this House. I do not in any way withdraw the challenge to the Government to debate this publicly outside this House. I challenge them to stop using their own private printing company for Government business and I further say that I have no intention at any time of withdrawing it but I do wish to state that the Government has deliberately tried to divert attention from the real issue today.

The main issue today is the question of the integrity of a committee. The main issue today is the integrity of the Public Accounts Committee to report to this House and have its report concurred in and no attempt to divert attention from the Government's misconduct and no attempt to put some smear upon a private member will in any way evade the issue. The petulance of the Minister has got the Government in trouble, the petulance of the Minister coming in here, maybe without even telling other Members of the Government that he intended to submit an amendment, got the Government into a bind. The Government is in a box on this particular thing because they know very well that it is the first time the Government has been slapped on the wrist and they can't take it. The Government received a condemnation from the Provincial Auditor, it received a slap on the wrist from the Public Accounts Committee and they are not prepared to concur in it without attempting to draw off attention onto some other Member. They are trying to smear another Member.

I would suggest to you that the committee does not have to use severe language. In fact, it is not customary. I quote from page 17 of a Report of the Special Committee on Public Accounts Procedures in 1964, and it says this:

Normally the reports are written in the language of understatement. Censure takes the form of regret and recommendations are phrased as suggestions.

We don't criticize the committee for understating the matter. And it says, again on page 17, referring to the British system: the Treasury censures departments of government and it says this:

Where the committee has roared mildly as a sucking dove, the Treasury roars like a Libyan lion.

And I did have the pleasure to contribute something to the roar which will increase as the Government continues to use public funds for Service Printing Company, as the Government continues

to ignore the pleas of the Opposition to discontinue that despicable practice, it will continue to roar to the point where in the next election this Government will be replaced by Member on this side of the House. And I can assure the Hon. Members at that time if the Provincial Auditor finds fault with our procedures, slaps us on the wrist, we will not seek to divert attention from our own misconduct by attempting to attack an individual Member of this House. And I challenge the Members opposite who have no read these words to read them. And the word is the Government, the Government was misunderstood, the Government has misused public funds and therefore, Mr. Speaker, with regret I will not support the amendment as proposed by the Government.

Amendment as amended agreed to on the following recorded division:

**YEAS — 34**

**Messieurs**

Blakeney	MacMurchy	Matsalla
Dyck	Pepper	Richards
Meakes	Michayluk	Faris
Smishek	Kwasnica	Gross
Romanow	Carlson	Comer
Messer	Engel	Rolfes
Kramer	Owens	Lange
Larson	Robbins	Oliver
Kowalchuk	Cowley	Feschuk
Baker	Taylor	Flasch
Brockelbank	Wood	Byers
Kaeding		

**NAYS — 13**

**Messieurs**

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

Debate continues on the motion as amended.

**HON. E.L. COWLEY (Minister of Finance):** — Mr. Speaker, I have only a few very short words to say on this. I have listened with interest to the debate. I was on the Public Accounts Committee last year. I think Members on both sides of the House agree that this is an important committee. That it has an important role to play for both the House and the public.

I was very disappointed in the attack adopted by the Member for Albert Park in the debate on the motion of the Public accounts Committee, on the Report of the Public Accounts Committee. I must admit I was in somewhat of a quandary when we had a motion to receive rather than concur. I think it is important that we be able to concur in the report. I feel confident that I can concur in the report but I certainly couldn't concur in the way in which the Member for Albert Park interpreted the particular report.

I think the subamendment and the amendment as now

May 4, 1973

passed deal adequately with this. I would hope that the Public Accounts Committee can continue next year and carry on what I think is a very important task that it has before it. I think possible that we have arrived at the best possible solution and I would hope that the Members opposite can see fit to support the motion as it now stands.

**HON. A.E. BLAKENEY (Premier):** — Mr. Speaker, I simply want to add my words to those of the Member for Biggar, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Cowley).

**MR. SPEAKER:** — You cannot close the debate on the subamendment as the debate is running concurrently.

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — That may be. My judgment was that I spoke on the subamendment to the amendment. I didn't realize that removed me from speaking on the main motion. It may. I ask for a ruling.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — At the time I ruled that the debate would be concurrent.

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Both on the amendment, the motion and the amendment? I realize the motion was concurrent on the amendment and the subamendment. I am not denying that. I just didn't realize the debate on the motion and the amendment was concurrent. If it was then I have no right to speak.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — My thinking on this would be when the Hon. Premier rose to speak, the question then before the House was the motion and the proposed amendment which were being debated concurrently.

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — If they are debated concurrently, I have no right to speak.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — In order to rise at that time you had to be speaking to those motions to which the latest subamendment was moved. So therefore, the Premier has exercised his right to speak on this debate.

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — I agree with your ruling, Sir. I hadn't realized that the debate on the amendment was proceeding concurrently with the debate on the main motion. If it was, I clearly have no right to speak.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — It was proceeding concurrently.

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Fine. I hadn't appreciated that point and I . . .

**MR. MacDONALD (Milestone):** — Mr. Speaker, did you announce that when the amendment was introduced? I don't believe, if my memory recalls, Sir. You did announce the subamendment would be concurrent with the amendment, but I do not recall you saying that the amendment

would be concurrent with the main motion.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — It was concurrent. It is a way at arriving at an alternate conclusion and, therefore, when you arrive at conclusion A or B, the two must be debated concurrently. So it was concurrent and so as the subamendment because this became an alternate solution. In all cases, I ruled that they were being debated concurrently.

**MR. McISAAC:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Anyone who spoke after the subamendment was moved by the Premier, he would be speaking on the subamendment an the amendment. Are you saying that anyone who spoke on the subamendment after it was made, that he is speaking on all three, motion, amendment and subamendment? That's at variance with the practice in that sense, is it not, Mr. Speaker?

**MR. McPHERSON:** — Can we call it 12:30, Mr. Speaker?

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Was the Hon. Member rising to speak or on a point of order?

**MR. McPHERSON:** — I am just rising on a point of order to call it 12:30. Close the debate then.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — If the Hon. Member is rising to speak to close the debate then I shall call it 12:30. I don't now whether he is rising on a point of order.

**MR. McPHERSON:** — I wasn't rising o close the debate, Mr. Speaker,. I would like to call it 12:30.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I shall call it 12:30 before you can get up.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

The Assembly recessed from 12:30 until 2:30 o'clock p.m.

## **PRESENTATION**

### **MR. McPHERSON AND MR. PEPPER**

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Before the House resumes its normal routine of business, at this time the pages would like to make a presentation to some of the Members of the Legislature. I hope the House will allow me to deviate at this time. It is not normally within our rules. Is that agreed?

**MR. McISAAC:** — Mr. Speaker, we will allow you at this time.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

May 4, 1973

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker, in light of the fact that the Member for Lakeview (Mr. McPherson) is likely to speak, I hope the line of communication has not been cut.

The Assembly resumed the debate on the First Report of the Public Accounts Committee.

**MR. D.M. McPHERSON (Regina Lakeview):** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to thank the pages for that direct line. Aub. (Mr. Pepper) and I have walked many miles and we have communicated pretty well and I want to thank the pages for thinking of us.

Mr. Speaker, in rising to close the debate on the Report of the Selection Standing Committee on Public Accounts, I should like to briefly review for the House the terms of reference of the Saskatchewan Public Accounts and Printing Committee.

The terms empower it to examine and inquire into all such matters and things as may be referred to it by this Assembly and to report from time to time its observations thereon, with power to send for persons, papers and records and to examine witnesses under oath.

Saskatchewan's terms of reference do not differ substantially from those of the British and Canadian Public Accounts Committees.

In reviewing the report of the Public Accounts Committee since 1939, Mr. Speaker, you will find that the report has been concurred in every year since that time. The one exception was in 1964 when the report was not brought in on time until the last day of the session and the committee had to ask leave of the Assembly to adopt the report.

Mr. Speaker, the pattern is there. The committee does its work going over department after department with the Provincial Auditor. Treasury Department officials write their reports after having heard from the department officials and making recommendations.

That is exactly what happened this year, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Meakes and I were to prepare the final report along with Mrs. Harbottle and bring it before the committee for final approval. This was done. On April 12 the committee met to approve the final report. In attendance at the final meeting of the committee were myself, Messieurs Carlson, Mostoway, Owens, Kaeding, McIsaac, MacLeod and Meakes. The report was approved by the committee without one dissenting vote. The Select Standing Committee presented the report to the Legislature on April 13. On Tuesday, April 17 the concurrence motion was moved by myself, seconded by Mr. Meakes.

For the Legislature I want to review the auditor's report briefly regarding the Department of Industry and Commerce and the committee's report to the Legislature on the same item. I also want to read to the House the authority for the auditor's report. And I think everyone should listen to this because it is very important. Under section 58 of The Treasury Department Act it states as follows:

No payment shall be made for the performance of work or the supply of goods whether under contract or not, in connection with any part of the Public Service unless in addition to any other voucher or certificate that is required the deputy of the appropriate Minister or other officers authorized by the deputy certifies (a) that the work has been performed or the material has been supplied, or that the work has been performed and the material has been supplied and that the price charged is according to contract, or if not specified by contract is reasonable, or (b) where a payment is to be made before completion of the work under a contract that the payment is in accordance with the contract. 1965, c4, s6.

The excerpt Mr. Speaker, from Mr. Lutz's report to the 1972 Legislature was and I think a lot of the Members have read this very carefully, and I would like to repeat it:

On February 1, 1972 an advance payment of \$12,000 was made by the Department of Industry and Commerce on account of a printing order for 250,000 "Travel Guides 1971". According to the invoice submitted to the department, the \$12,000 represented an interim billing to cover stock, typesetting and wages. There was no provision for any advance payment in the order placed with the supplier. The goods ordered had not been received by the Department of Industry and Commerce up to the date of the advance payment, although they were subsequently received on March 23, 1972 when the final payment of \$16,894 was made. There was no evidence of a formal contract with the supplier providing for a payment before completion of the work. Therefore, it would appear that the payment of \$12,000 was made without proper authority.

Now those are Mr. Lutz's words in his report to the committee.

The first draft of the committee's report was prepared and we met on this. It was read to the committee and we went over it item by item. Item 8 read as follows:

In item 10(iv) of the Provincial Auditor's report it was reported that an advance payment of \$12,000 was made without proper authority on February 3, 1972 by the Department of Industry and Commerce on account of a printing order for 250,000 "Travel Guides, 1972". The committee notes such action with strong disapproval and recommends more defined controls by the Department of Industry and Commerce.

This copy was shown to Mr. Meakes, the vice chairman and then we went back into the committee. I would just like to review the verbatim so that everyone will see how thoroughly the committee dealt with this particular item. This had been presented to the committee and the first one to speak on it was Mr. McIsaac, and he said:

That's all right.

Mr. Meakes: I have no quarrel with that.

Mr. Owens: I wonder why you picked the one department. I know this is the department at fault but if you say, okay, we are going to watch the Department of Industry and Commerce, supposing some other department does it?

The Chairman: This was pointed out by the auditor. He pointed this out for this department.

Mr. Owens: Would no other department do it?

The Chairman: Well, I think he would report it if another department had done it. If there is something wrong in a department he reports it to the committee. The committee calls in the department and follows it through and that's exactly what we did.

Mr. Owens: And if it happens again in another department, you would do this again?

The Chairman: That's right, be it Agriculture or whatever it is, the auditor who is doing his job and pointing it out and then the committee investigated it and you have the verbatim in front of you.

Mr. Owens: Very good.

Mr. Meakes: I can live with it.

Mr. Mostoway: I guess you have to.

Mr. Jacoby (from the auditor's department): Mr. Chairman, my comment is something along the same lines, if it would be proper to say "more defined controls by the Department of Industry and Commerce". I am wondering if that shouldn't be the Department of Finance. This payment was made contrary to provisions in the Department of Finance and, after all, the Department of Finance made the payment. It seems to me that control rests with them.

Mr. MacLeod: I believe the two points raised are both well taken, both Mr. Owens' and the official's point. The fact is that this certainly was in three departments, the Department of Government Services, the Department of Industry and Commerce and the Department of Finance, because it involved three departments and the Department of Finance was merely the one that ended up paying the cheque that the others approved. I wonder if we shouldn't alter it a little bit. Maybe we should identify all of the parties involved because we are simply using the same heading as that used by the Provincial Auditor and putting it under the Department of Industry and Commerce.

Mr. Chairman: Why don't we say by the Government and get them all?

Mr. MacLeod: We could say by the Government, yes.

Mr. Owens: By various departments.

Mr. MacLeod: Well, I was thinking back up here on the fourth line, "by the Department of Industry and Commerce, The Queen's Printer and the Department of Finance", so that we identify the three involved and at the last line,



“by the Government”.

Mr. Meakes: I’m not really arguing but, “without proper authority on February 3, 1972 by the Department of Industry and Commerce”, and as I understand it, that was where the proper authority was not given.

Mr. MacLeod: Initially.

Mr. McIsaac: I think, Mr. Chairman, there’s a good point There’s no question that Mr. MacLeod and Mr. Owens made a good point. I think when you first look at the rough draft, Mr. Chairman, and you’re thinking of not getting too broad, you could write three paragraphs on it.

The Chairman: That’s right.

Mr. Meakes: I personally like what Mr. Carlson recommended, “more defined controls by the Government”, but I have no strong feelings on it.

Mr. Lutz: “By all department of Government”.

The Chairman: You mean right at the end?

Mr. Lutz: Yes.

Mr. Meakes: Sounds good.

Mr. Lutz: In other words, try to prevent this in the future.

Mr. Owens: that’s the point I was going to raise.

The Chairman: I think it’s a good point too.

Mr. MacLeod: Having regard to the fact that the payment is illegal, in fact, according to section 58 of the Act, would the words, “such illegal action”, be appropriate?

Mr. Mostoway: I don’t know why you’d want to put in “illegal”. I think you’re getting the point across the way it is, really.

Mr. MacLeod: It wouldn’t hurt to identify it as being an action contrary to section 58.

Mr. Mostoway: I would skip anything else.

Mr. Meakes: “Without proper authority” is the same as your term “illegal”.

The Chairman: What Mr. MacLeod is pointing out is that Mr. Lutz on page 140 said this is not legal.

Mr. McIsaac: The implication in the first statement, Mr. Chairman, is that it’s illegal.

The Chairman: Well, what is your pleasure? Do you all like the way we’ve amended this now?

Mr. MacLeod: Certainly, we wouldn’t want to embarrass the Government by putting in the word “illegal”, I suppose.

May 4, 1973

The Chairman: Is that agreeable then on eight?

Which happened to be the section.

Mr. Chairman: Now, gentlemen, could I have a motion approving the whole report?

Mr. Meakes: I would so move.

Mr. McIsaac: Seconded.

Now the final draft of the section approved by the committee reads as follows:

In item 10(iv) of the Provincial Auditor's Report it was reported that an advance payment of \$12,000 was made without proper authority on February 3, 1972 by the Department of Industry and Commerce on account of a printing order for 250,000 "Travel Guides, 1972). The committee notes such action with strong disapproval and recommends adherence by all departments of the Government to the controls which are presently defined.

Mr. Speaker, from the above it can be seen that the Public Accounts Committee worked well together to prepare the final report for the Legislature and this is what was brought in. It is a very serious matter when the Minister of Industry and Commerce moves an amendment to receive a report which was unanimously reported from the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts and the formal motion by myself was a concurrence motion, seconded by Mr. Meakes.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. McPHERSON:** — I feel, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Industry is not only reflecting on the Public Accounts Committee but also reflecting on the Provincial Auditor and his staff who speak for the Government. The auditor speaks for the Government. Again, I say the Provincial Auditor reports to the Legislature and the Public Accounts Committee to examine and inquire into such matters as may be referred to it. This is why the Department of Industry and Commerce was called. The Provincial Auditor pointed out the payment for the printing was made without proper authority.

I want to point out to the Legislature, Mr. Speaker, that I said Mr. Switzer in the committee meeting on Industry and Commerce that he didn't have to speak for the department and that the Minister could be called. Not one Government Member, I want the Premier to notice this, gave notice to call the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Not one Government Member said, "Let's call Mr. Thorson in." To me it is a principle of the committee report, that is what we are really dealing with. The final report, that alone is the one that is important. We are not dealing with the remarks of the Member from Albert Park (Mr. McLeod) and I really do not want to see the issue of the report taken under attack. I think we should stick to the report as brought in before the Legislature by a good committee.

Mr. Speaker, I have no choice, if this report is not concurred in, but to resign because I think the people of Saskatchewan look to the Public accounts Committee and the

Provincial Auditor to see that the funds of the province are handled in a proper manner.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. McPHERSON:** — To me, Mr. Speaker, this is like the committee and I like to work hard on it and all the members did work hard. But I am sincere, if the report of the Public Accounts Committee is not concurred in by the Legislature, I will resign and the vice chairman should resign along with me. I urge every Member, Mr. Speaker, to support this motion of concurrence so that we can run this House the proper way and see that the Public Accounts Committee does its job again.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

Motion as amended agreed to on the following recorded division.

**YEAS — 35**  
**Messieurs**

Blakeney	MacMurchy	Faris
Dyck	Pepper	Cody
Meakes	Michayluk	Gross
Smishek	Byers	Feduniak
Romanow	Whelan	Mostoway
Messer	Carlson	Rolfes
Snyder	Engel	Lange
Bowerman	Owens	Oliver
Kramer	Robbins	Feschuk
Kowalchuk	Cowley	Kaeding
Baker	Taylor	Flasch
Brockelbank	Richards	

**NAYS — 11**  
**Messieurs**

Steuart	McIsaac	Lane
Coupland	Weatherald	MacDonald (Moose Jaw N.)
Grant	MacLeod	Wiebe
MacDonald (Milestone)	McPherson	

**ADJOURNED DEBATES**  
**SECOND READINGS**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. MacDonald (Moose Jaw North) that Bill No. 73 — **An Act to amend The Trade Union Act, 1972** be now read a second time.

**MR. K.R. MacLEOD (Regina Albert Park):** — Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on this primarily because of the remarks of the Hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Snyder) which I felt did not properly set forth the intentions of the Bill, the basic underlying intentions of our party or the Member who moved the Bill in the first place. I believe that the Hon. Minister of Labour has demonstrated in his remarks that he has an excellent 19th Century mind when it comes to labor matters. The Minister and other senior leaders of the labor movement have established a union established clique. It is established for political purposes. It is not accidentally that the former

May 4, 1973

Minister, Mr. Davies, the Member for Regina North East (Mr. Smishek) and the Minister of Labour himself all have had a long career as senior officials in the labor movement.

Now what has happened is that some of these very senior people, and I would not want my remarks to cover them all, but some of these senior people have traded politics for partisanship. I have no objection to the Minister or others in the labor movement having an interest and a real concern in politics. But they do not have a sincere interest in politics. They have traded it for partisan New Democratic politics and as such they have failed the public. They have sold out their right to be a senior and responsible movement in Canada. I should like to give three example of how the unions have thereby failed their membership.

The Corporation and Labour Unions Returns Act filed and compiled for the last available year was 1970. It demonstrated that \$1 out of every \$3 paid by union members to international unions was kept by as a profit in the United States. Thus more than 30 per cent of all union moneys paid to these unions does not ever come to Canada. The remainder of the money, of course, does come back in salaries to union officials, to pension benefits, to strike benefits and other miscellaneous expenses incurred by the union in Canada. But 30 per cent or more of all dollars paid remains in the United States of America. Because they have sold out their right to criticize, union leaders have failed in criticizing the foreign and multi-national corporations to include multi-national unions. They have been very selective in their criticism and they have been unfair and they have eliminated criticism of a group that needs to be criticized equally with the multi- corporations. The unions thereby demean themselves and the union leaders demean themselves. They have sold out their right to be credible. That's the first example. Because of the position they have taken in politics they have failed to express the real concern which many of us have for the control over the pocketbooks which is held by multi-national unions.

The second example came when the Parliament Committee on Food Prices held its hearing earlier this year. Unions presented a very lengthy and to a certain extent, good brief. But the unions did not deal with a very major subject, namely, the effect of labor and wages as a factor in food costs. Labor unions talked about everything except what they know or should know most about, namely, wage costs. Labor, in fact, talked about everything except labor. I attribute this failure not to a failure of unions to understand these things but the fact that the unions themselves have traded in a senior and respected position in Canadian life for a narrow partisanship. In fact, the Members of the senior labor organization, the senior officials have themselves either captured or have been captured by the New Democratic Party. They have therefore lost their credibility. It is a shame that this sort of thing has occurred. It is a shame that the Minister of Labour should exploit unions for narrow political purposes and it is a discredit to him and to those people who co-operate and deal with him in his activity. People are tired of this kind of union leadership.

In a recent issue of Time magazine, April 30, 1973, in complimenting the United Mine Workers for a change in their attitude in a more aggressive and enlightened leadership they started their commentary as follows, and I quote:

Unions have lost much of their vibrancy and clout in recent years. The big reason many critics of the labor movement say is that union leadership has become calcified in its complacent enjoyment of power and increasingly remote from workers in factories and mines.

That is an apt description of what is happening to some of our labor unions in Canada aided and abetted by narrow politicians such as the members of the New Democratic Party who are utilizing unions for their own narrow political purposes.

I want to give another example of the failure of unions. Unions in their concentration on politics have let down their union members. When the Chrysler Corporation transferred a plant from Regina to Winnipeg recently a number of their union members consulted me personally. Their problem arose not through unfair activity by the company, they acknowledged that the company was acting fairly and reasonably and would do whatever it could to help them. The main failure was that they were transferred out of one local without getting protection in another local. Now the difficulty, Mr. Speaker, quite apart from the difficulty of speaking with the jackdaws across there, the difficulty, Mr. Speaker, is that unions are not so concerned with union members as they are concerned with union leadership and the political establishment clique that has arisen and has taken control of these unions.

Now I want to suggest that this will undoubtedly be taken and misrepresented by the Members opposite as an anti-union statement. I should like it perfectly clear that it is anti-New Democratic and to the extent that union leaders have sold out to the New Democratic Party, it is anti-union leadership. I believe and I have believed that the war fought in the 19th century is over but the New Democratic Party wants to continue to fight World War I on the union front. The war is over, people now support unions. The time is long past when this narrow partisanship should have occurred. Today we need an enlightened and mature union leadership. We need an enlightened and mature union leadership to give to Canada the kind of advice and assistance and to demonstrate the kind of strength in the Canadian fabric that an enlightened union leadership can give. It cannot give that union leadership so long as it sells out to the New Democratic Party. Of course, this is recognized by many people. The political lesson, of course, is that the New Democratic Party wishes us to learn that you sell out your principles. They want us to learn that you should infiltrate organizations for narrow political purposes. You should, therefore, sell out ordinary citizens. I want to say to the Members opposite that the ordinary citizen today is getting sick and tired of big, unenlightened business, and that does not include every business, and it is sick and tired of big unenlightened union leadership and that does not include every union.

I suggest to you that the ordinary person will no longer tolerate, the time is coming when he is getting so fed up with big labor and big business that he has no concern for the ordinary man, that the ordinary man will shake the tree and will shake out some of those bad union leaders as it will ultimately shake out these bad business leaders and union leaders. They should be coupled together because they are so narrow.

These three examples that I have given, the example that not once have I heard a Members opposite, not once have I heard

May 4, 1973

the Minister of Labour get up and complain about the 30 per cent profit taken by international unions from Canadian workers. Not once have I heard that. He would if he was an enlightened, responsible leader who was more concerned about the labor man than he is concerned about his position as a party politician. Not once have I heard him and his colleagues complain about big business, multi-national corporations. The fact is your credibility is slipping, it is going down the drain and your honor is going with it.

Now I want to suggest that it was a shocking thing that the members of the New Democratic Party and the labor political establishment, that group which sold out to the New Democratic Party, had failed on the first possible opportunity following the 1964 election, without giving the Liberal Party any chance to demonstrate what it had in mind, had passed a resolution waging war upon the Liberal Government and then it spent the . . .

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — It wasn't the first one.

**MR. MacLEOD:** — The Hon. Member may not be informed, but the first resolution passed by the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour in Saskatchewan in 1964 following the election was a resolution which called for the immediate and early defeat of the Liberal Party. That was a declaration of war by labor leaders on this Government. It was a declaration of war instigated and inspired by narrow, bigoted politicians in the New Democratic Party. That was before the Liberal Government had done any act of any kind to antagonize labor.

The difficulty is that there is a union establishment. Last July Messieurs Laxer and Watkins challenged the union leadership in Ontario. They said the union leadership has become responsible to no person. The report to no riding, no constituency, and they for all practical purposes, do not report to the unions. Laxer and Watkins made this prime attack for the very reasons I have set forth. It is not unknown to the people here that the union leadership in Ontario being so captive by the New Democratic Party moved to expel people who had opposed the position of the New Democratic Party. As a result there is a degrading of the union movement.

I call for a more enlightened union leadership. I call them to chuck out the New Democratic Party members who have them in their grip. I suggest to them that the time has come for them to mature, grow up and become part of the later part of the 20th century. I hope that when my children grow up and join the work force they can become members of an enlightened, strong, good corporate citizen union. As a result I suggest that the union establishment clique look around and recognize what has happened and avoid the paranoia which I see all too apparent. The definition of paranoia for those that are unaware is "a rare chronic psychosis characterized by systematized delusions of persecution". And there is no group that has a more systematized delusion of persecution than that narrow, small, hopefully small, group of New Democratic Party people who have seized control of our unions. Consequently, Mr. Speaker, I support this motion. It is a Bill intended to protect the ordinary worker.

I recognize how terrible that is to some of the Members opposite. Some of the things I have heard in this House convince

me that the Members opposite have very little concern for the worker. They have a maximum concern for the New Democratic Party. They have a maximum concern for the senior union leadership which is, in concert, working as cohorts of and is captured by the New Democratic Party. The time has come to return unions to the union man, the time has come to return unions to the worker.

Consequently, Mr. Speaker, I support this motion. I would suggest that if it does not accomplish its intended result we would be glad to accept changes. Some were suggested. We received the most ridiculous condemnation possible from the Minister of Labor. He has belittled himself. He has demonstrated that he is not prepared to make reasonable suggestions for the improvement of legislation. I might add that throughout the 70 odd days of this Session the Liberal Party has constantly made suggestions for the improvement of legislation. We have constantly condemned bad action and suggested alterations. I must say that some of the Ministers have been enlightened enough to accept those suggestions. Regrettably, when we bring legislation to the House we get no suggestions from the Minister of Labor. We get no assistance, no concrete helpful suggestions at all. We get narrow political partisanship. As a result the speech by the Minister of Labour belittles himself, it demeans the union movement and convinces us more than ever that the union tree is going to be shaken sooner or later by the ordinary man who, as I say, is sick and tired of big labor and sick and tired of big business.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. W.E. SMISHEK (Minister of Public Health):** — Perhaps if there is anyone in this House who should collect all the dictionaries that there are and find the meaning and definition of the word paranoia, I think it is the Hon. Member from Albert Park. Because as we have seen him in the last two weeks obsessed with the idea of taking the big, dirty, old Liberal brush and try to smear people in this House, in this Legislature, he has also resorted this afternoon to smear the trade union movement. One would have thought that the Liberal Party would have learned after 1971 but I guess it is like the spots on a leopard, they never change. It appears that is the position of some of the Members at least of the Liberal Party in their attitude towards labor. I would invite the Hon. Member to come and listen. He is very anxious to make speeches of accusation of people but when it comes down to listening and learning something, he immediately skips the House.

Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, I am surprised that the Liberal spokesmen are resorting to the same accusations against the trade union movement as they did prior to 1971. In fact, I am sure that the majority of their membership and the majority of their supporters are not in agreement with the kind of accusations that Members in this House are making against the trade union movement, or at least some of them. At their own convention following their resounding defeat in 1971 what did their convention say? That it was time for the Liberal Party to reassess its position and its attitude toward the trade union movement, that they should take a more enlightened approach and recognize that the trade union movement is an important organization for the working people and deserves the support of their own party. Apparently the Hon. Member from

May 4, 1973

Albert Park is still harping to the day of the pre-1971 when practically every day we heard an attack on the trade union movement from the Government Members and the back benchers of the Liberal Party.

Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member (Mr. MacLeod) made references about the Minister of Labour not being responsible. I think it hardly requires an answer. The Hon. Member from Albert Park has demonstrated again his own irresponsibility and I would suggest that he be somewhat more humble in his accusations of other people being irresponsible.

Mr. Speaker, the remarkable thing is that the Member for Albert Park made no reference at all to what is in this Bill. All he did was attack the trade union movement, attacked its leadership. He said that the trade union movement is corrupt and is irresponsible, yet he never named a single person. Remember that this Trade Union Act applied to the workers in the Province of Saskatchewan. I think that the trade union people would like to know to whom he is referring, to which trade union leader in the Province of Saskatchewan is he referring that is irresponsible. Is it the president of the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour? Are they the various representatives of the trade union movement in the Province of Saskatchewan? Is it the 300 and some local union presidents in the Province of Saskatchewan that are irresponsible and are corrupt whom he accuses? I should like to know. Name one person to whom you direct our remarks of being power hungry, of being corrupt. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the members of the trade union movement will be interested in the remarks of the Hon. Member for Albert Park. In fact I would suggest to the Minister of Labour and to Members who are representing working class ridings that they get a copy of that speech and circulate it among the membership to demonstrate once and for all that really the Liberal Party hasn't changed, some of the people have changed but its philosophy apparently and its position and its anti-labor attitude has not changed whatsoever.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I think we are getting too far away from the debate here. I realize since the outset of the debate on Bill 73 we have been wide. I should like to read from Erskine's Parliamentary Rules:

Debate on second reading of a Bill must pertain to the principle of the Bill only and not to the administration of the department or of other Bills. The debate must pertain to the principle of the Bill and the debate cannot cover the entire effects of the parent Act.

I realize the debates have gone wide. Members start answering other Member's questions. It was wide by the mover, wide by the Minister of Labour when he spoke. I think that we have got to bring it back to the principle of this Bill if we are going to keep the debates in order.

I would ask the Hon. Member to kindly keep his remarks to the Bill. I realize it puts him in a difficult position because the debate has gotten too wide which I should not have permitted in the first place.

**MR. SNYDER:** — On a point of order. Mr. Speaker, I should like



to draw your attention to the fact that during the entire time the Member for Albert park was on his feet he was not in order for 30 seconds. Surely, the Minister of Health, in replying should be deserving of a degree of latitude in order to reply to some of the allegations made by the Member for Albert Park. You didn't choose at that time to bring him to order. Surely, the Minister of Health should he the opportunity to reply.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I said the Speaker was too lax in the first place. We have had about six speeches and every one exceeded the limits as to what should have been on this debate. I am asking the Minister of Health to confine s close as he can realizing that it is difficult under the circumstances.

**MR. SMISHEK:** — Mr. Speaker, it is somewhat difficult under the circumstances when people of the opposite side don't talk about the Bill at all but choose to accuse the total trade union movement. Really, Mr. Speaker, it appears that the purpose of some of them bringing in this Bill is that they would have an opportunity to attack the workers of this province, to attack the trade union movement and attack its leadership.

Mr. Speaker, let me close by specific reference to the Bill. Perhaps the Hon. Member for Moose Jaw North (Mr. MacDonald) is not aware of the implications that he was suggesting. Maybe it is because he got his legal advice from the Hon. Member from Albert Park. Because I think had he really considered the implications of this Bill, I really doubt whether he really believes in the kind of proposal or the kind of a situation that this Bill would leave the trade union movement, the workers' organizations as well as employers in.

What he is proposing in this Bill is to have an open season at any time and at all times for raiding, for activities going on by the employers and the employers' agents and by those who may from time to time have some differences with the local union, to continually sign petitions and have an ongoing campaign to undermine the local union and at the same time disrupt labor relations in a particular plant.

What he is proposing is that at any given time a group of 25 per cent of workers can make application to the Labour Relations Board for decertification. At the present time, certainly there is provision in The Trade Union Act that if the workers wish either to change a union or to decertify a union, there is within the 60/30 day period of the Collective Bargaining Agreement or anniversary dates of the certifications to make application, providing they have the majority of support, to have the Labour Relations Board to decertify that union.

The provision has been in the Act for many years. I think that it is a provision that has worked on its function. But to have a provision which would disrupt at any given time the established labor management relations will not be in the interest or benefit of the employer, employees or the general public.

Really, what he is trying to create is complete chaos and confusion in industrial relations. He is also saying that employers may be allowed to contribute and to assist in these kinds of activities to undermine the union. I don't think that

May 4, 1973

this kind of thing is practical. This kind of provision does not exist anywhere that I am aware of. It is an anti-trade union Bill of the worst type. Mr. Speaker, that we have seen for a long time. I do ask the House to soundly defeat this proposal. I would hope that the Hon. Member for Moose Jaw North in between now and the next session of the Legislature meets with some of the trade union leaders, find out that they are just as human as he is, in case he hasn't rubbed shoulders with the trade unionists.

May I also advise him that even in the profession that he has come knowledge of, at the present time he may be interested in knowing that the Saskatchewan Medical Association is circulating application forms among the doctors asking them to sign a form authorizing the SMA to become their collective bargaining agent in every sense of the words as a legitimate trade union movement.

Mr. Speaker, that is the right of the SMA. It will depend on time whether or not the doctors will choose to sign those applications. The Hon. Member is not aware perhaps that soon the members of the legal profession may be taking the same action and perhaps they will be interested in reading the kind of scurrilous remarks that were levelled against the trade union movement by the Hon. Member for Albert Park.

**MR. D.F. MacDONALD (Moose Jaw North):** — Mr. Speaker, I should just like to assure the Member who just sat down that I have rubbed shoulders with union leaders. I think I rubbed shoulders with every union leader in Canada right in my own constituency during the last election.

May I start out by saying that I was disappointed in the remarks and the attitude of the Minister of Labour (Mr. Snyder) when he entered this debate. Certainly, I was not surprised, just disappointed. We, on this side of the House, have come to expect this type of attitude from the Minister. It seems that he cannot make a speech without becoming angry and cranky. I guess he deserves some of the same.

I was sorry that I missed the speech that he made but I did read it and I understand that the tone he used was much worse than the words he used. The Minister of Labour produced quite an outburst against this Bill and I think the reason for the outburst has become very obvious when we consider the remarks that he made. The Minister has become very sensitive and this shows up in his remarks. He finds himself a very unpopular Minister of Labour, unable to communicate with either management or employees. He has become hung up with solely union management. The Bill before us has, therefore, struck a very sensitive nerve. This Bill and the Minister's reaction has exposed his insensitivity to working people.

I should like to recount some of the things that the Minister said when he was speaking in this debate. He starts out by saying that his party is entirely committed to doing things in a democratic way and that we, in the Opposition, are bringing in an anti-democratic amendment.

On this point we can see why the Minister is so sensitive. He professes to be committed to the democratic way but his actions have not indicated this and the proposed amendment exposes him.

The amendment guarantees the democratic right of individuals and the Minister, for political reasons is unable to accept the amendment. This embarrasses him because he has professed to be committed to democracy for working people.

He then goes on to try to justify his lack of concern for employees by saying that the law profession and the medical profession have dictatorial powers over their members. He says that these professional groups are a little group of potentates, as he calls them, that have fantastic powers over their membership, that there is no kind of democracy in professional groups and that this somehow justifies the position of the Minister.

The Minister believes that the professions are not democratic and therefore there is no reason why employees should have the democratic process granted to them. The inference of the Minister was that two wrongs somehow make a right. This is a ridiculous and embarrassing stance for the Minister to have to take. No wonder he is so touchy and sensitive. No one could make such an inference and be very comfortable doing it.

The Minister goes on to talk about the underlying principles of The Trade Union Act. I covered this when I introduced the Bill and I will repeat it again. The principle, as I see it, is embodied in clause 3 of The Trade Union Act and I shall read it. I am sure that not very many Members over there have read it. It reads:

Employees have the right to organize and to form, join or assist trade unions and to bargain collectively through a trade union of their own choosing.

And this is the underlying principle and the principle that I support. The Minister believes that employees should join a union of his choice. That is the basic difference. I believe that employees must be given free choice, must be left to choose by themselves.

The Minister and the Government opposite believe that they can do the choosing better. The Minister says that the Bill would encourage internal friction and labor unrest. Let me remind Members of this House that the rating clause was already in The Trade Union Act. I didn't originate it and I didn't introduce it. But I think these words tell us something about how the NDP feel about the question of unionization.

To suggest an amendment that allows freedom for individuals, would somehow encourage internal friction and labor unrest and inflame labor-management relations as the Minister of Health just said is an admission by the Minister and other Members that they have no confidence in unions of the collective bargaining process. He obviously thinks that the trade union movement is in trouble, that it is full of dissension and that the union movement could only operate successfully by denying basic freedoms to the working people.

Well, this conception of the union movement is a real revelation to me. I think the Minister and the Members opposite are mistaken. I think they underestimate the labor movement, and I think they have received bad advice.

The trade union movement is strong and it is able to stand

May 4, 1973

on its feet and remain democratic. I was disappointed to learn that Members opposite feel that the trade union movement might collapse if employees were allowed democratic rights.

The argument then goes on to say that my amendments are unnecessary because there is already a mechanism that has been set up specifically to deal with the process of decertification and that this is section 5(k) which covers the rescinding and amending of certification or orders. Of course, this is true. The Labour Relations Board has that power. I pointed this out that this power already exists. However, arguments from Members opposite quite purposely have ignored the fact that these amendments simply ensure employees the right to ask the Labour Relations Board to use these powers.

The Trade Union Act gives the right to the Labour Relations Board to amend or rescind. But any Members who have even a passing acquaintance with the act will realize that there is no procedure for employees to bring the question before the Labour Relations Board. The only procedure open to employees at this time is a procedure that is fraught with potential danger.

The amendments simply supply a clear path, free of peril so that employees can make their desires known. If this provision should weaken or destroy the trade union movement as has been suggested then the movement must surely be in a weak position and I don't believe this to be the case.

It has been said that the amendments in Bill 73 would have the effect of taking away any meaningful way in which the labor organization could control and discipline its membership. This is absolute nonsense. The proposed amendments still allow a union to expel a member. The amendment, however, doesn't give the union the right to fire a man from his job, a right that they now have.

The example of an employee dropping a bomb on a union hall and then not being able to discipline this member is absolutely stupid and childish. If the Minister thinks that this amendment would give any person the right to bomb a building, he is naive beyond belief. This illustration that he used negates his whole speech and whole argument and makes it hardly worth considering.

I should like to answer a question posed by the Minister when he entered the debate. He asked where the motivation for this Bill came from. He suggested that somehow it could only come from a group of right wing die-hards. This tells us something about the Minister.

We find that the Minister has good communication with the union leaders and has become their mouthpiece. However, it shows us that the Government opposite has lost all touch with the rank and file working people.

The motivation of this amendment came from people, not from some monolithic organization, not from a giant multi-national corporation or from an international union. It came from ordinary people, the people that I represent and the people that the Liberal Party represents. I don't apologize for this. I feel that the huge unions and the huge corporations are able to stand on their own two feet and look after themselves.

If Members opposite feel that they have to prop up the international unions or feel that they have obligations to these organizations, then fine, they can try and live with this. However, I intend to support the people who I represent in my constituency.

If Members opposite will talk to people and even read the paper, they will see where the motivation for this Bill comes from. The Minister wants to know where the motivation comes from. I will give him an example of where it came from. This whole illustration goes up to Yorkton where the Morris Rod Weeder plant has been organized. I just want to tell the Minister what people there feel. I should like to quote Mr. Fred Neibrandt. I think Mr. Neibrandt is a member of the Chamber of Commerce, a former CCF MLA for Yorkton and a member of the delegation. He said:

The Government is leaning over backwards to accommodate labor.

This is what he said on April 29 of this year. Mr. Neibrandt told Mr. Nystrom:

This city is more riled up over this matter than you think. Mr. Morris has done more for Yorkton, for Saskatchewan and for agriculture than any other individual. He urged Mr. Nystrom to take the message back to the Government. He said that the Chicago style tactics that unions came out with have no place here and it is later than you think.

That is where the motivation comes for this kind of legislation. It comes from members of your own party, from working people from all over this province. They want fairness and justice.

I conclude by saying that the motivation for opposing this Bill was evident in the remarks of the Members opposite. The motivation is entirely and purely political. It was summed up by the Minister. He suggested that somehow unless I didn't listen to the union organization, I may not be re-elected. That somehow I should do what union management wants, to forget about the rights of employees, if I want to be re-elected.

Well, apparently re-election at any cost is the object of Members opposite. I do not share the same objective. I am prepared to represent the people of my constituency to the best of my ability and according to their needs regardless of the consequences that I might suffer from an illegitimate campaign that the Minister is trying to initiate.

I conclude by urging all Members to support this Bill.

Motion negatived on the following recorded division.

**YEAS — 11**  
**Messieurs**

Steuart  
Coupland  
Grant  
MacDonald (Milestone)

McIsaac  
Weatherald  
MacLeod  
McPherson

Lane  
MacDonald (Moose Jaw N.)  
Wiebe

**NAYS — 32**  
**Messieurs**

Blakeney	Brockelbank	Faris
Dyck	Pepper	Cody
Meakes	Michayluk	Gross
Smishek	Byers	Feduniak
Romanow	Carlson	Mostoway
Messer	Engel	Rolfes
Snyder	Owens	Lange
Bowerman	Robbins	Oliver
Kramer	Cowley	Kaeding
Kowalchuk	Taylor	Flasch
Baker	Richards.	

**ADJOURNED DEBATES**

**FIRST REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON STATUTORY INSTRUMENTS**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. Lane (Lumsden) that the First Report of the Special Committee on Statutory Instruments be now concurred in

**HON. W.E. SMISHEK (Minister of Public Health):** — Mr. Speaker, I should like to draw the attention of the Legislative Assembly to the following provisions of the bylaws made by the Saskatchewan Pharmaceutical Association. It is by law 14/11/2, and let me quote.

A pharmacist shall not advertise or permit any person to advertise on behalf of the pharmacy which he operates prescription prices, discounts, price preferences, charges for professional services either directly or indirectly by quotation, comparison or otherwise.

Mr. Speaker, it is appreciate that the Members of all professional associations are subject to some restrictions relating to advertising in that certain kinds of advertising is considered to be unprofessional. The professional pharmacist as a retail vendor of drugs and medicine seems to be in a somewhat different position than members of other professions. All Members of this Assembly are or could be concerned about the high cost of drugs to the public. It seems to me that these costs might be reduce at least to some extent by competition between pharmacies as is the case with the retail sale of other commodities. The reduction of these costs through competition could probably be best accomplished through some form of advertising. I do not object to the pharmacist being subject to some restrictions relating to advertising. However, I do believe that some forms of advertising, Mr. Speaker, might be an effective way of reducing the retail cost of drugs. The bylaw I have just quoted is stated so broadly that it would seem to prohibit any kind of effective advertising or information in regard to prices.

Mr. Speaker, I therefore would recommend for the consideration of the Members of this Assembly that this particular bylaw not be approved by this Assembly because of its provisions being so very broad. Now, for the information of the Members, I would point out that any of these bylaws will cease to have any effect if they are found by the Legislative Assembly to be in any way prejudicial to the public interest.

Mr. Speaker, I therefore move that the motion be amended by:

Adding after the word “in” the following words: with the exception of article 14/11/2 of the bylaws of the Saskatchewan Pharmaceutical Association which the Assembly finds to be prejudicial to the public interest.

I so move, seconded by the Hon. Attorney General (Mr. Romanow).

**MR. J.G. LANE (Qu’Appelle):** — Speaking to the amendment I regret that this is the approach taken by the Member opposite with regard to this for the simple fact that upon receiving his request in committee it was the wishes of the committee, first of all, to decide whether we had the powers to call the Pharmaceutical Association to appear before the committee. On the advice of legal counsel to the committee it was decided that the committee did not have the power to call the Pharmaceutical Association. I suggest two things. That first of all this is very unfair in that they haven’t had a chance to be heard. Members of the Government in giving the committee powers to call people, I think it is in our report that we didn’t have the power to hear these people. As a consequence I think this is very unfair, the proposed amendment. I think that the Pharmaceutical Association should have the right to appear and give their impressions. We do it for the medical profession. We do it for all other professions. We don’t know what their stand on this is. I can see an obvious weakness on the question of advertising because the question of advertising is going to hurt and hit the small pharmacist who won’t be able to compete. Now if that is the intention of the Government opposite then obviously we are going to get this proposed amendment. I am not convinced that this thing is as black and white as the Hon. Member submits. I would hope that the Hon. Member would reconsider and withdraw the amendment for the simple fact that I think it is very unfair to criticize somebody that the committee, on legal advice to the committee, didn’t get a chance to hear.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — What about Kim Thorson?

**MR. LANE:** — The Attorney General raises that. The Hon. Member from Regina Lakeview (Mr. McPherson) has said that it was presented to the committee and the Government Members did not see fit to bring Mr. Thorson before the Public Accounts Committee.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — The debate is on this amendment only.

**MR. LANE:** — Yes, I think I had a right to reply to the remarks of the Hon. the Attorney General, Mr. Speaker. We know how the Attorney General stands on the rules and what the Speaker thinks about the Attorney General on the rules, so if you will just let things ride.

Again, we think this is very unfair. You are forcing the committee after concurrence by members of the committee on both sides of the House on the report of the committee, you are forcing the Opposition to vote against the report of the committee because it is an unfair procedure that you are taking.

There are obvious weaknesses in ruling out the question of advertising for pharmacies, one of them being that it is going to hurt and harm the small pharmacist who will not be able to compete with the large pharmacies which are looking forward to advertising. They have been trying to change it for some time. The large multi-national pharmacies look forward to advertising. If it is the Government's intention to protect the large national pharmacies as opposed to the Saskatchewan ones, obviously they are going to put this amendment through. We cannot support the amendment.

**MR. J.C. McISAAC (Wilkie):** — Mr. Speaker, just a word or two about the amendment brought in by the Minister of Public Health. First of all, and I don't say this is a reason why the Minister shouldn't bring it in, personally I was unaware of the report and I was unaware of the Minister's objection to this particular bylaw until such time as he got up in the House here a few moments ago. I would suggest this, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister and other Members of the committee and the House, to stop for a minute and let's have a look at this.

What he is proposing is a pretty far-reaching kind of change. We all know that pharmacists have long deviated from the age old day when they were mixing with mortar and pestle and so on, that the pharmacist of today is a far cry from the pharmacists for whom perhaps some of these regulations were framed. But surely to make a move of this kind at this time without a good deal further thought given to it is not going to solve the problem. We know that pharmacists have been in business, they were the first inventors of the super market almost. They have fishing tackle, everything right straight through in their shops, but I want to suggest that to go ahead with the amendment that is before us is going to benefit Woolco and Eatons and so on. It is certainly not going to help in any way the small pharmacists, in fact it is going to hurt them. Mr. Speaker and Mr. Minister, I should like to see you reconsider that motion at this point in time. Put the whole matter over to the committee for a more thorough study than it has been given and give it an opportunity for some consideration on both sides. It is too big a thing to make a move on. The move that is suggested by the Minister isn't going to resolve anything, it is going to compound matters and get into a war in that respect that we don't need and don't want. I appreciate your concern in a sense for those people, I suppose, that wish to reduce rates to be able to say so, but I don't think to act hastily on the amendment that the Minister of Health put before us is the answer at all at this point in time. I would ask the Minister to reconsider and consider withdrawing that amendment, Mr. Speaker.

**HON. R.J. ROMANOW (Attorney General):** — Mr. Speaker, might I just say a few words very briefly to the amendment. I have already spoken on the min motion. What happened was this. This committee looks into regulations that are passed by agencies of government to check for their legal regularity and I stress the words "to check for their legal regularity".

I was notified by the Minister of Health that he personally and the officials in his department object to one provision only, that's article 14/11/2, this amendment that we are talking about, Mr. Speaker, of the bylaws of the Saskatchewan Pharmaceutical Association, and I would, as a member of the committee,



raise this for the committee's consideration. I did. The committee referred it to counsel of the committee who was Mr. Tom Wakeling. Mr. Wakeling reported to the committee in a letter dated January 23, 1973 as follows:

In conclusion, it is my opinion that the committee should not attempt to extend its terms of reference beyond those specifically set forth and it should therefore not delve into matters involving the public interest until such time as it is specifically authorized to do so. I see no great problem arising in this instance because the Minister involved is entitled as a Member of the Legislature to bring up this question of public interest on the floor of the Legislature and either have it dealt with there or have the matter referred to a special committee for consideration and report.

That's what the counsel did, that was the letter that was read in front of the chairman of the committee and in front of all other members of the committee. I recall very specifically advising all members of the committee at that time and saying that I was prepared to live by this legal interpretation and I felt that the Minister of Public Health (Mr. Smishek) had no other alternative but, as the counsel advised, under the terms of reference, to bring this matter back up as a public interest situation to the Legislature and I did so.

On February 1, I sent a memorandum to the Minister of Public Health and stood by the decision of the committee saying that we had not the power to look into it but that he as a Member of the Assembly could say that this was not a matter in the public interest and he could have his views expressed by way of the amendment or any other way at that time. That is precisely what he has done. He comes and he says we accept the report but on the basis of what counsel says, on the basis of what the committee says, and I'm sure the Member for Lumsden (Mr. Lane) would agree to that, my only alternative is to come to this House by virtue of this amendment because I, as a Member of this Assembly, object to it in the public interest.

Now before I take my seat, Mr. Chairman, I think there's nothing wrong with the procedure and I think it's fair to say that all Members on this side and on the opposite side who served as members of that committee knew of my concern on behalf of the Minister of Public Health and knew that the Minister, having been denied his right to bring it up to the committee, would like to bring it up for the floor of the House. Yes, that is absolutely right, absolutely right. That was the case and I've raised it on several occasions so, in fact, we ended up, through comments of the committee by saying well, the Minister of Public Health will have to take whatever course he sees fit in this area. But it doesn't matter in any event. There's no way that the committee could stop him from doing this any more than it could stop a member from the Liberal side getting up and quarrelling with any other professional bylaw and raising it as a public interest issue. He can do it by notice of motion, he can have a special committee, he can do anything he wants. He can do it this way just as well.

The Member from Lumsden who was the chairman shakes his head. What in the world does Mr. Wakeling's legal report mean? What in the world does it mean but to do it that way? Now how can you reinterpret that meaning? You know, I know

May 4, 1973

we're all testy and I'm testier than anybody and I'm sorry, I apologize, but surely you can argue against the public interest of it, that's another matter, but for the Member to raise it, he has that right.

I just want to conclude, Mr. Speaker, by making this point. What is the Minister's amendment really saying or doing? What the Minister is really doing is leaving the situation the way it is. That's the way he's doing it. If this amendment is accepted, nothing new is done because presently the bylaws of the Pharmaceutical Association allow for advertising and this is very particularly pinpointed to 14/11/2 which deals with the advertising only, it's allowed. It's the pharmacy people who come along with their bylaw, who seek now to prohibit advertising. Then the Minister says it's not in the public interest and he seeks to cut out the advertising. And if this motion is passed we revert to the way the situation presently exists. We're not writing in anything new. We will be writing in something new if we allow the bylaws to go untouched. And the thing that we'll be writing in new is the prohibition of the advertising.

Now if there's anything in competition which will help keep drug costs down, if there's anything in that theory at all, then what in the world are we doing cutting out any form of advertising? Because that's what this professional body is asking this Assembly to do, to give them the power to cut off any advertising. Now if you people believe that the cost of drugs can be kept down by advertising, and that's open to debate, I don't know whether it can or it can't. I'm not the Minister of Health to have the figures. If you think it can be done, then I think we should, in the public interest, Mr. Speaker, look directly at this amendment. And what the Minister is saying, he's saying as an MLA and as a Minister of Health, I don't think it's in the public interest, it's prejudicial for us to allow a professional society to cut out advertising specifically in the case of drugs. That's all he's doing.

So I want to close, Mr. Speaker, by recapitulating the situation. The situation is that the Minister as an ordinary MLA is adopting the report by taking exception and asking the House to agree with him on the 14/11/2 which deals with advertising.

1. Perfectly proper and I submit everybody knew this was on the horizon.

2. If this amendment of the Minister's is passed nothing new is written. The present situation remains. If we don't pass this then we are hanging something. We are allowing them to prohibit advertising and to cut it off and that is contrary to public interest and everybody on the committee knew that, Mr. Speaker, and I say with all respect to all Members, the issue here is whether or not we agree that in the public interest this is the right thing to do. Now you might not agree and you might agree, but it is the Member's right to raise this issue. I, for one, agree with the Minister of Public Health and I think article 14/11/2 that's how particular it is and only article 14/11/2 be not approved by this Assembly as being contrary to the public interest. I support the Minister's amendment.

**MR. STEUART (Leader of the Opposition):** — The Attorney General has

given us some explanation of this but I think it's unfair to ask Members of this Legislature to vote on this without having some opportunity to look at both sides of the question. On the surface of it, let me say I would agree with it. I find it strange that people who call themselves private enterprisers and who hold up advertising as one of the methods used by private enterprise to keep prices down and improve quality and so on will come before a Legislative Assembly and say, please, pass a law prohibiting advertising. And on the surface, I'd be opposed to that. I think there should be as much freedom in free enterprise as possible and I get just a little annoyed when people in business get up and spout off about free enterprise and then come to a Legislative Assembly and want us to tie the hands, their own hands, for their own purposes, and then always do it in the sacred name of the public. And believe me, bells start to ring in my mind when people come to me and say we're just doing this with the best interests of the public in mind. You know, that's when you really start looking into the fine print pretty quickly. I'd like a chance to look at this. I wonder whether we could adjourn until later this day.

### **BILL NO. 101 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE MEDICAL PROFESSION ACT**

Resolved in Committee of the Whole that Bill No. 101 — An Act to amend The Medical Profession Act be not proceeded with and thereupon under Rule 82, Mr. Speaker, put the question: "Shall the recommendation of the committee be concurred in?" — which was agreed to on the following record division.

#### **YEAS — 22**

##### **Messieurs**

Dyck	Faris	Coupland
Bowerman	Cody	Grant
Kramer	Rolfes	McIsaac
Baker	Hanson	Weatherald
Michayluk	Oliver	MacLeod
Whelan	Kaeding	McPherson
Engel	Flasch	Wiebe
Robins		

#### **NAYS — 20**

##### **Messieurs**

Smishek	Thorson	Feduniak
Romanow	Carlson	Mostoway
Messer	Owens	Lange
Snyder	Cowley	Steuart
Brockelbank	Taylor	Lane
Pepper	Richards	MacDonald (Moose Jaw N.)
Byers	Gross	

### THIRD READINGS

HON. G.R. BOWERMAN (Minister of Natural Resources) moved third reading of Bill No. 111 — **An Act to amend The Forest Act.**

**MR. H.E. COUPLAND (Meadow Lake):** — Mr. Speaker, I find it almost unbelievable that this Government would even consider bringing in such a vicious Bill as this one.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order! I must warn Members that on debating third reading the principle of the Bill cannot be debated, it's just the contents of the Bill or the effect of the Bill. But the principle of the Bill has been decided. And it does restrict Members a wide range of debate.

**MR. COUPLAND:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, in that case, I want to voice my opposition to this Bill. I don't think the Government should have brought it in. It could cause a lot of harm to the industry that we have in the province. and I hope that seeing as they are going to pass it, they will use some reason. I missed the opportunity to speak on it in second reading and I certainly want to voice my opposition to it.

**MR. STEUART (Leader of the Opposition):** — Mr. Speaker, the Government brought in some amendments to this Bill and when it announced there were to be amendments I rather hoped that there would be some change in the contents of the Bill to make it possible for the timber industry in this province to operate and to live under this Bill. But the amendments do nothing. They can hardly even be called window dressing. One amendment says, in effect, that they will leave sufficient timber so that any company can carry on its normal operations. That doesn't mean anything. It doesn't say where they will get the timber, what kind of timber or what they mean by their normal operations. This Bill, I predict, will hurt because of the clauses in it, because of the restrictions in it, because of the cancellation of every contract, every covenant, every lease, and every right that is now in existence and has been for years, not with just this Bill will hurt the timber industry and will hurt the employment and worse than that it hurt the reputation of this province.

I just want to say one final word of condemnation for this Bill. I think it's a bad Bill, it's the worst Bill that's been brought into this House this Session and we stand absolutely opposed to it.

**HON. G.R. BOWERMAN (Minister of the Natural Resources):** — Mr. Speaker, I only wanted to make a comment with respect to the reference that the Leader of the Opposition made on the introduction of the amended section that came into the Bill. That sections was drafted by the solicitors of the Parsons and Whittemore Company and was not amended by us but was put together by their solicitors and we adopted it and put it into the Bill I suggest to you that the other provisions of the Bill, the amendments that are provided in the Bill, were also drafted by

those solicitors. May I suggest to you that under the provisions of the section 19(a)(iii), the one which we were considerably criticized for, that section was not recommended on behalf of Parsons and Whittemore as a section that they wanted to have amended. Therefore, the Bill which you have before you, Mr. Speaker, is a Bill which does include some of the amendments of Parsons and Whittemore Company as drafted by their solicitors.

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division.

**YEAS — 34**

Blakeney	Michayluk	Faris
Dyck	Byers	Cody
Meakes	Thorson	Gross
Smishek	Whelan	Feduniak
Romanow	Carlson	Mostoway
Messer	Engel	Rolfes
Snyder	Owens	Lange
Bowerman	Robbins	Hanson
Kowalchuk	Cowley	Oliver
Baker	Taylor	Kaeding
Brockelbank	Richards	Flasch
Pepper		

**NAYS — 10**

Steuart	Weatherald	MacDonald (Moose Jaw N.)
Coupland	MacLeod	McPherson
Wiebe	McIsaac	Lane
Grant		

HON. J.R. MESSER (Minister of Agriculture) moved third reading of Bill No. 69 — **An Act to amend The Agricultural Implements Act, 1968.**

**MR. T.M. WEATHERALD (Cannington):** — Mr. Speaker, I should like to make some very brief remarks on this Bill.

Even though the amendments were not before us at the time of discussion on second reading, the amendments have not changed our opinion of this Bill and, therefore, we still intend to oppose it.

We have opposed the Bill on the basis of three particular aspects. Firstly, that we consider that the Bill will have the effect, it is very likely at least to have the effect, of a rise in the price of machinery as far as Saskatchewan farmers are concerned.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I must warn the Members, just as I have warned them on the previous Bill, the principle of the Bill cannot be debated, it's the contents and the effect.

**MR. WEATHERALD:** — Mr. Speaker, I am discussing the effect of the Bill with regard to the price of machinery which will rise, which I consider to be an effect of the Bill.

Secondly, we believe that it gives the Government (and in fact it does give the Government) the authority to audit the books of all general distributors in the province and this provision we also oppose.

Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, we believe that another effect of the Bill is that there is no effective appeal from the Board's decision as the Bill now stand.

**MR. STEUART:** — Mr. Speaker, I have an occasion here that deals with the effect of this Bill and it's from Mr. Bob Larder, John Deere dealer of Estevan who is the past president, immediate past president of the Saskatchewan-Manitoba Implement Dealers' Association and he is speaking of the effect. He says:

It is true that in the past two years our association did consult and play ball with the Government on many things. One which we fought tooth and nail was The Family Farm Protection act. On Bill 69 it is true that our association did have a look at it in bits and pieces, but not in its entirety, with Mr. Messer's department. After seeing the final Bill and without amendment, only partial amendments, it is very clear to me that the Government has set its course and no matter when or how often proven wrong they insist in ramming it through, even for principle only. I am sorry now that I have not fought harder on some of the agricultural issues while president of the association and I can see that Mr. Messer was only going through the motions of working with us and only on small concessions and ignoring us on things that really counted.

He goes on to say that he is speaking for over 80 per cent of the dealers of this province who oppose this Bill and say that it will have a very, very serious effect on the implement industry and on the implement service to the farmers and on the costs of machinery. It is signed Bob Larder, John Deere dealer, Estevan. He phoned this in to me today and asked me if I would convey this to the House before this Bill was given its final passage and I want to do this because I want to point out that this man who is immediate past president of the Manitoba-Saskatchewan Implement Dealers says that he has consulted with and he feels that is the feeling of over 80 per cent of the dealers in this province and is absolutely opposed to the Bill and says that it will have a bad effect on the implement dealers and a bad effect on the old question of implement service to the farmers and cost of machinery to the farmers.

**MR. H. OWENS (Elrose):** — Mr. Speaker, there must be some bad communication somewhere. I was talking to the secretary-manager of the Saskatchewan-Manitoba Implement Dealers' Association last night and he told me that the executive of the association were in sympathy with the Bill after the amendments had been made. They see no problems with it whatsoever and they think that it is a good Bill now.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. STEUART:** — May I ask the Member a question before he takes his seat? What is the name of that man?

**MR. OWENS:** — Secretary-manager of the Saskatchewan-Manitoba Implement Dealers' Association is Leo King.

**MR. MESSER:** — Mr. Speaker, I don't think the name of the . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order! I must warn the Members that the mover of the motion is about to close the debate and if anyone wishes to speak they shall do so now.

**MR. MESSER:** — Mr. Speaker, in response to the statement that has just been made by the Leader of the Opposition I am most surprised and disappointed to hear the communication that he got from Mr. Bob Larder of Estevan because Mr. Larder was a member of the delegation that met with myself and my officials on several occasions to discuss the Bill, the Bill as it was ultimately brought to the Legislative Assembly and he agreed to the Bill. I have had no communication with Mr. bob Larder up until now that he did not agree with this Bill but he has to take the responsibility of the legislation as well as I think the Government because the last communication I had with him was that he agreed with the legislation we brought forward and at no time, no time, Mr. Speaker, did he communicate to me and, to my knowledge to my officials that he did not agree with the Bill. So for him to come forward in the dying days of the Session and say now that he does not agree with the Bill, I think, is not representative of other agricultural implement dealers in the Province of Saskatchewan.

In response to the question that the Leader of the Opposition asked the Member, Mr. Owens, as to who the secretary of the Manitoba-Saskatchewan Implements Dealers is, is not relevant as to what his politics may be. The Leader of the Opposition says he is a good NDPer. That gentleman is speaking for the Saskatchewan-Manitoba Implement Dealers' Association and we have had no communication or any indication from the executive of the association or for that matter from any other implement dealer in the Province of Saskatchewan that Mr. Leo King has not acted in the bests interests or not on the direction of that association. So to say that particular gentleman, because of some political affiliation is not acting in the best interests of the organization that he represents is just not true, Mr. Speaker.

Motion agreed to on division.

## **SECOND READINGS**

**HON. E.L. COWLEY** (Minister of Finance ) moved second reading of Bill No. 123 — **An Act respecting the payment of certain sums of Money to Saskatchewan Water Supply Board.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, the Bill which is before us is the Bill which will enable the Government of Saskatchewan to reimburse the Saskatchewan Water Supply Board for losses on its operations up to and including the 1972 year, of some \$10 million.

To be very brief on this Bill, Mr. Speaker, the Water Supply Board was established in 1966 by the previous Government.

May 4, 1973

Its purpose was to develop and manage a multi-purpose water supply system. The seventh annual report of the Water Supply Board has been tabled with this Session. The report is similar to the sixth, the fifth, the fourth, and the third, a series of deficits that add up to almost \$2 million.

Mr. Speaker, it is fairly obvious that this body created by the Members opposite has a couple of problems. This Government recognized this and one thing which we have done is to have the Hunt Report prepared which has been presented, I believe, to the Members of the House.

We now have a committee which is to make recommendations on improving the operations of the Water Supply Board based on the Hunt Report and other information available to them.

Mr. Speaker, the Government recognizes that the accumulated deficit of the corporation will likely not be recovered from the users of the system. The procedure of adding deficits to the capitalization of the Water Supply Board which was from the beginning over-capitalized makes very little sense because it makes it virtually impossible for the Water Supply Board in the future to become a break-even operation although that will be very difficult even with the payment of its past deficits. Mr. Speaker, that process simply results in more interest payments and higher deficits.

This Government is committed to attempting to improve the position of the Water Supply Board. However, Mr. Speaker, before I move second reading I want to point out to the Members opposite that this is their operation. The Liberals over the years and quite recently have criticized the former CCF Government and the present New Democratic Party for the investment of public funds in public and private enterprises. I don't think there is a Crown enterprise which hasn't come under some attack from the Liberals over the years. Too much money, too little profit, poor management, not necessary, you name the reason and they have used it, Mr. Speaker. In all of these attacks the impression was left that when Liberals took office a lesson would be given on how to develop and manage a public enterprise. Mr. Speaker, I think that lesson is now available for the public of Saskatchewan to look at in their creature, the Saskatchewan Water Supply Board.

Mr. Speaker, this transaction will have the effect of reducing the loans payable by the corporation and, therefore, will reduce the annual interest bill. It will not have the effect of making the Water Supply Board a viable operation. That will be left for further developments and as I say there are different options open to the Government which will have to be considered. I am frankly not very enthusiastic about the possibilities of this Government, in spite of good management, of being able to make it a paying proposition.

Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of this Bill.

**MR. J.B. RICHARDS (Saskatoon University):** — Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this Bill. This Bill is not a major Bill. I suppose in the order of things it's a small component of the melodrama about the relationships between the Saskatchewan Government and the potash industry in this province.



The Liberals when in power created the Water Supply Board for the express purpose of supplying water to what was expected to be a much more rapidly growing potash industry. Obviously that growth was not realized. Both the private industry and the Government in this instance invested capital on the basis of growth that did not materialize. But it is interesting, Mr. Speaker, to view what is the relative rate of private versus public investment. The private potash company, realizing that the markets were not growing according to their previous expectations . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order! I think this Bill deals with the Water Supply Board and its deficits and I will not permit discussion on potash or other industries. We must deal with this: should the Legislature pay to the Water Supply Board or should they not.

**MR. RICHARDS:** — Mr. Speaker, I protest. The Water Supply Board, everybody has admitted, relates to the potash industry and was to supply water to that particular industry. I am drawing the parallel between investment made privately by the potash companies which have achieved a positive rate of return because of price fixing and a cartel system and the public investment which has not received that positive return. I am objecting, Mr. Speaker, to the principle of the public through the tax system, picking up the deficit of a Crown corporation which was expressly created for the potash industry. The parallel, Mr. Speaker, is with the Saskatchewan Pulpwood which was created as a subsidy to Prince Albert Pulpwood and, therefore, Mr. Speaker, I think that I am in order in making those remarks.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I would have to say that the Water Supply Board appeared before the Crown Corporations Committee. If Members wish to debate what was done in the various corporations that appeared before that committee, it should have been debated when the report came back to this House.

This Bill deals with a deficit in the Water Supply Board and the decision here is whether the House will or will not pick up that deficit.

**MR. RICHARDS:** — Agreed, Mr. Speaker. What I am trying to portray to the House are my reasons why I think this House should not at this stage vote funds out of the consolidated revenue in order to pay that deficit.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I rule that we cannot debate the pros and cons of potash or pulp under this Bill.

**MR. RICHARDS:** — Agreed, Mr. Speaker. We must restrict ourselves in some measure and not range entirely over the field of public administration but I think the point does relate to the principle of the Bill. I think that this House should not vote \$2 million of the taxpayers' money to this corporation at this juncture because, Mr. Speaker, I think it portrays once again the inability of this Government to come to grips with the potash industry. As opposed to extracting the deficit from the general revenue, Mr. Speaker, the Government should be

May 4, 1973

making every effort to renegotiate the contract in order that it could be earning the revenues required from the potash companies.

Now, Mr. Speaker, referring to the report mentioned by the Hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Cowley) when he introduced the Bill, the Hunt Report on the Water Supply Board, I quote from page 38:

It will be gathered that the original pricing structure was not based on costs as certain of the price commitments to the potash industry were made before capital costs were finalized.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, before they knew what were to be the costs of running the Water Supply Board the Liberals when in power proceeded to set the rates which the Water Supply Board would charge. Now the Members opposite claim to be good businessmen. What businessman establishes his price before he shows his cost price? And now we, the people of Saskatchewan, are being expected to pay for the results of this folly. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that before we should consider paying for this folly out of public funds, it is beholden upon the Minister and upon the Government to make every effort to negotiate new rates which will accurately reflect the cost of supplying water to the industries. After all, Mr. Speaker, the potash industry secured a price-fixing mechanism and a quota system to assure a positive rate of return on its capital. Why should we, the people of Saskatchewan, not in some sense share some benefit from that cartel system? It's a price system which was imposed that allowed the potash companies to reap profits and according to the scanty financial data made available they have reaped very handsome profits showing they, out of that monopoly profit earned by the cartel, should be paying for the losses of this Water Supply Board, Mr. Speaker.

I should like to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister go back to the bargaining table and before he ties his hands behind his back by proceeding with this piece of legislation, he seriously use the Provincial Government's bargaining power to renegotiate these rates on water and thereafter we can consider, if necessary, payment of some funds out of the consolidated revenue. There is no need that this folly be condoned and buried as of now, Mr. Speaker.

One final point before I take my seat, two questions very simply to the Minister. The Hon. Woodrow Lloyd, when Leader of the Opposition in 1970 moved a motion in the Crown Corporations Committee to have revealed the rates charged by the Water Supply Board to the potash companies. At that time the Liberals, then in power, refused to reveal those rates. I made a similar motion this year in 1973 in Crown Corporations and again this information was denied. Mr. Speaker, if the people of Saskatchewan are to make an intelligent decision as to whether they should be expending \$2 million of their revenue on bailing out this abomination of socialism perpetrated by the Members opposite, I think we have a right to know what is the pattern of rate being charged to the potash company. I understand the rates are wildly divergent from one company to another. I think it is beholden upon the Minister and I make this request that in summing up this Bill he give his indication that he is prepared to make public these rates.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I urge Members of this House not to pass this Bill.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. G.B. GRANT (Regina Whitmore Park):** — Mr. Speaker, I hadn't planned on getting into this question raised by the Hon. Member from Saskatoon but when one thinks of subsidies, I think the original subsidy to the potash industry probably occurred way back in the '50s by the royalty that was set for these mines, that this particular subsidy, if it can be called a subsidy, to the potash industry would be quite minor compared to the original one and I am not saying it was wrong. I think there is some justification in recognizing the need for some assistance to this rather costly exploration and development in the initial stages.

I was a little let down when the Hon. Minister of Finance made his remarks because I really didn't think he would point the finger at us and say it was our problem because I think it is everybody's problem the fact that we have a Water Supply Board here that is not so liquidating and this money in all likelihood will not be recoverable. I doubt very much whether the Hunt Report will materially affect the profit and loss picture of the board. I don't recall the Hunt Report pointing the finger at our Government to any degree. It was a combination of circumstances. I suppose a person might say you can't win them all. But the Minister of Finance said that because the whole thing was originally overcapitalized there is little likelihood of it ever breaking even and I think that is right. This, I believe, was visualized right from the start. I believe that when we set the rates for the potash company and all the other users that we did the best we felt could be done under the circumstances in order to make this water available to these different users at a cost that they could live with and still exist.

I should like to remind the House, Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Woodrow Lloyd said back in 1966, on April 4, when speaking to The Water Resources Act. He said:

Mr. Speaker, in the session of 1964 when I had the responsibility and indeed the pleasure of introducing into the Legislature the fairly extensive and very important basic legislation with respect to developing the use of water resources, it seems to me that the proposals which the Minister has put before us this morning represent agreement in principle with the basic act at that time. They represent a kind of development which many of us have been expecting and hoping and realizing is completely necessary. The proposals are ones that we ought to welcome and support.

So it is quite evident that at that time the leader of the party opposite was in complete accord with the procedure that was being taken on general principle. And he praised the kind of a reservoir that was going to be created at Blackstrap Canyon and made several other references to the work of the Water Resources Board. The part that interested me particularly was when he went on to say:

It doesn't seem to me practical to talk about plans of

May 4, 1973

this kind on a self-liquidating basis and I am not suggesting that the Bill states that or the Minister's remarks state that but there did seem to be something of an undue emphasis on the extent to which these projects would expect to be considered self-liquidating.

He read that into the Minister's remarks of the day. Mr. Lloyd continues:

My urging, Mr. Speaker, that projects which are necessary in which the benefits may be a long time delayed may not be stifled by any lack of willingness to invest public money, not to be stifled by any attempt to make the balance sheet too major a measuring stick as to the desirability of these projects.

Mr. Broten from Watrous said:

Mr. Speaker, firstly I would like to commend the Government for the action that it has taken on this water development through the Water Resources Commission.

So it is quite evident, there is more here along the same tone but I think it is quite evident that the Leader of the New Democratic Party at the time visualized that this would not be self-liquidating. I think we all hoped that the losses would not be as high as they have been. I don't think there is any choice except to support this Bill. The money has to be paid and there is no reason why the board should continue to be burdened with this excessive interest or carrying charges involved in this. It's something like the debt of the CNR and I agree with the Hon. Member's introduction of the Bill and will support it. But I just wanted him to know that we weren't prepared to take all the responsibility for this. It was a larger group that share it than us.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. COWLEY:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I have just a couple of very brief comments in response to the Member from Saskatoon University (Mr. Richards) and his proposal that the potash companies pick up the accumulated debts past and pick up the probable deficits in the future by increased rates. I think the water Supply Board serves others than the potash companies. That's not to say that I necessarily believe they are paying their full way and they shouldn't pay higher rates. I think at maximum we could hope to obtain through negotiations, etc., increased rates from the potash companies which might bring the Water Supply Board into something close to a break even operation. So I don't think we have ruled out negotiations on new rates with the potash companies through this particular Bill.

With respect to the comments made by the Member from Regina Whitmore Park when he says it is everyone's problem, that it was visualized from the start that it might use money. He quoted from speeches made by Woodrow Lloyd and Hans Broten. All I can say, if the Members opposite are going to adopt this particular tack now, that one doesn't measure a Crown corporation on the basis of whether or not it makes money but rather on other intangible things, it is certainly going to be a departure from the measures they have used in the past. I happen to agree with that approach that it might, for example, be useful for the

Government to have a Crown corporation which lost money because it provided jobs, because it was socially useful or for a whole host of other reasons, that one shouldn't measure the operations of a Crown corporation simply on the basis of a balance sheet as to whether it makes money or not. I think the Members opposite have to realize that they have continually for 30 years criticized this party for some of the Crown corporations which it was involved in which did lose money. They criticized the operations of the Power Corporation and SaskTel because they didn't make enough money at one time and they said, give us the Government and we'll make them make money. I have somewhere a pamphlet from 1971 where they indicated indeed that was their proposal. So I think if the Members are going to be consistent they are going to have not only in this case but in other cases to measure Crown corporations not only on the basis of the balance sheets but on what might be socially useful.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

**HON. R.J. ROMANOW (Attorney General)** moved second reading of Bill No. 131 — **An Act to amend The Statute Law.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, this is the amendment to Statute Law which comes traditionally at the end of every session. Very briefly, in the printed Bill of The Statute Law, section 2 seeks to correct a typographical error on a cross reference matter. Section 3 is also a printing error. Section 4, there is an error in reference in respect to the use of the words "commission" and "counsel". The appeal is from commission to counsel under this Act, where it is commission and counsel have become reversed in the printing and we seek to straighten it out.

There will be two House amendments as well as the Legislative Counsel finally goes through his work. One will be The Mechanics Lien Act which is, again strictly a printing error. One line was left out in The Mechanics Lien Act as was passed finally, just strictly left out in the printing part of it. There is another section, I can explain it in Committee of the Whole, into conformity with the SEDCO legislation that was passed earlier.

With those few words, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of this Bill.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

## **ADJOURNED DEBATES**

### **FIRST REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON STATUTORY INSTRUMENTS**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. Lane that the First Report of the Special Committee on Statutory Instruments be now concurred in; and the proposed amendment thereto by the Hon. Mr. Smishek:

That the following words be added after the word "in": with the exception of article 14/11/2 of the bylaws of the Saskatchewan Pharmaceutical Association which the Assembly finds to be prejudicial to the public interest.

May 4, 1973

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

## ANNOUNCEMENT

### QUEEN'S VISIT TO SASKATCHEWAN

**HON. A.E. BLAKENEY (Premier):** — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might beg the indulgence of the House for a moment to make a short announcement. It is a tentative announcement. This has to do with the visit of the Queen to Saskatchewan on the 3, 4 and 5 of July.

The program is by no means worked out as yet, but tentatively the program will involve a dinner on the 3rd, the night of the 3rd, hosted by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor and I understand that will be a small dinner. I am not aware of what guests will be included. On Wednesday evening there will be a dinner as we now think sponsored by the City of Regina and the Province of Saskatchewan jointly. As we now view the matter, Members of the Legislature and their wives would be invited to that dinner, that's the Wednesday night dinner on the 4th of July. We anticipate that there will be a function in the morning, probably in association with the RCMP and I am only aware of those details by report. In the afternoon another function on the Legislative Building grounds which will be sponsored by the Government of Saskatchewan. So as far as MLAs are concerned they will, of course, be welcome at the general function which will be a public function in the afternoon of Wednesday the 4th. And they will be special guests at the evening dinner on the 4th. There will be no functions on the 5th since Their Majesties will be leaving early in the morning of the 5th. I think Members who might in planning their calendar like to know just where we are. There is many a slip twixt cup and lip, I find in being at the receiving and, I think, of the plans of these Royal tours. But this is as much as we know now.

## SECOND AND THIRD READINGS

**HON. E.L. COWLEY (Minister of Finance )** move second and third reading of Bill No. 132 — **An Act granting to Her Majesty certain sums of Money for the Public Service for the Fiscal Year ending respectively the thirty-first day of March, 1973 and the thirty-first day of March, 1974.** (Appropriation Bill)

He said: Mr. Speaker, some two months ago, when I introduced the budget in this House I don't think either the Members opposite or the Members on this side of the House or the Press Gallery who have sat here with us for two months anticipated that we would be closing the debate on this particular evening or at least hoping to close the debate on this particular evening.

When I concluded that debate I indicated that I was proud of the budget that this Government had put before the people of Saskatchewan.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. COWLEY:** — Nothing that has occurred between that time and this time, including the positions put forward by the Opposition, has

led me to change my opinion.

More important, the favorable reaction which we received from the people of this province to the measures which we have introduced have made me even more confident in the direction which this Government has embarked upon.

Mr. Speaker, before proceeding very briefly to run over a few of the very major accomplishments of this Government and the programs which it has introduced, I want for a couple of minutes to comment on the criticisms made by the Opposition. Some time ago they, at the public expense as we have debated for some time, and I don't intend to go into, mailed out a little green pamphlet in which they listed the concerns of the Liberal Party and in which they put down some of their criticisms of this particular Government.

I want to use only one example this evening, just one example. As the Members are aware we introduced gross budgeting in this budget. I must say that I am disappointed that the Opposition have chosen in the literature they are putting out to compare gross and net budgeting expenditures for obvious political purposes. I quote just one little gem:

In the two years since the New Democratic Party became the Government, welfare costs have risen from \$30 million to \$90 million.

That is in the little green pamphlet and the Member from Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac) is reading it. I hope for the first time. Mr. Speaker, the first figure is the net figure, the last figure is a gross figure. The first figure does not contain the mental retardation program, the latter does. The first figure contains no grants for special care home residents, the latter does.

Mr. Speaker, in one statement, in one statement only, there is a \$36 million error, a \$7 million error and a \$3 million error. Mr. Speaker, even for the Opposition that's pretty good for one statement, \$46 million worth of errors.

Mr. Speaker, I just point out that one example. I am sure that Members on this side of the House could point out several others.

Mr. Speaker, that characterizes, I think, the criticism put forward by the Opposition at this Session.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. COWLEY:** — I should like to, on an ore positive vein, Mr. Speaker, point out that in Saskatchewan the economic situation appears even brighter today than it did two months ago.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. COWLEY:** — It appears that agricultural receipts are likely to be good this year providing we get a good growing season and reasonable crops. Mr. Speaker, this is necessary because inventories are low in Saskatchewan because of the program introduced by the Federal Liberals which many will remember, a program called LIFT. It's fortunate indeed that most farmers

May 4, 1973

are back to half crop and half summer fallow after the disastrous LIFT program that threw this out of line.

Mr. Speaker, construction activity continues to expand with public and private investment intentions on the upswing in almost all sectors. The housing sector will be up both as a result of increased activity in the private sector and I'm sure because of the new housing corporation which we've just established.

Mr. Speaker, I don't want to take three or four hours and list all of our accomplishments but I'd like to list some of the major accomplishments of this Government. In the field of individual and human rights we've established an Ombudsman, a Human Rights Commission and there's provision for a Legal Aid System. Mr. Speaker, in agriculture we have a Land Bank that's up and working and off to a tremendous start. From the mail that I have been getting I think one of the most popular programs introduced by this Government is a program which will encourage diversification through grants and loans and will provide for opportunities for our young and smaller farmers, FarmStart.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. COWLEY:** — Mr. Speaker, in spite of the protests of the Opposition, another program that I think will be a real winner in '75 along with the NDP, an Agricultural Implements Board.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. COWLEY:** — Mr. Speaker, an issue which I am sure in 1975 will be the main reason for the election of the rural Members of this province, our Hog Marketing Commission.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. COWLEY:** — Mr. Speaker, an improved crop insurance program which is breaking all records in this province for sales. Mr. Speaker, these programs exemplify the new and revitalized Department of Agriculture which is getting tot eh farmers in Saskatchewan.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. COWLEY:** — Mr. Speaker, in resource development we have established Sask. Oil. We've introduced a new Forest Act and we've announced a plywood plant at Hudson Bay.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. COWLEY:** — In economic development we've established a small business assistance program. We've beefed up our market development. We've expanded our tourist programs. And in spite of the protests of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, we've increased and maintained Saskatchewan's position in IPSCO to keep it in Saskatchewan. We've purchased shares in Intercontinental Packers.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!



**MR. LANE:** — You'd think we would pick it up and carry it across the border.

**HON. MR. COWLEY:** — Well, I'll tell you, if you take a look at some of the refineries in Saskatchewan that have been carted across the border to Alberta when you were the Government — Mr. Speaker, the purchase of shares in Intercontinental Packers is a positive step to ensure a packing industry for this province.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. COWLEY:** — Mr. Speaker, in the area of transportation and communication this Government has also moved ahead. We've announced and started a cable vision program. We've expanded our northern roads program. We've established research and transportation and we've carried out case, and I give the Attorney General, in particular, credit for this, our case strongly to the Federal Government in the area of freight rates.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. COWLEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I can mention many other programs, a Housing Corporation, community colleges, we've brought in a workable Teachers' Salary Agreement Act.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. COWLEY:** — Mr. Speaker, another program that's aroused a great deal of interest in Saskatchewan is a hearing aid program and it's here and it's under an NDP Government.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. COWLEY:** — The Members opposite talked for many years about a chiropractic care program. It's here under an NDP Government.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. COWLEY:** — Mr. Speaker, we promised a dental care program for children and it's under way.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. COWLEY:** — Mr. Speaker, the Members opposite refer to the program for senior citizens in their little green pamphlet, to the efforts made in assisting people in special care homes. This year we've provided over \$3 million worth of assistance.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. COWLEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I want to close on the note of dealing with the item that's close to my department. In 1971 our party said the property tax burden was too high. By the results of the past election it's obvious that it was too high and just another

May 4, 1973

area that the former administration had ignored. We promised that we would reduce the tax burden for educational purposes on homes, farms and small businesses to 25 mills and we have made good on that promise.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. COWLEY:** — We introduced a school grants foundation program and stabilized school grants at 43 mills. And in the last two years this has meant that the province picked upmost of the recognized increases in school operating grants, over \$30 million additional in two years. Mr. Speaker, as a companion piece to achieve our goal of 25 mills we introduced the Proper Improvement Grants last year at 13 mills, this year to the full 18 mills, that's an incremental cost for the province of \$18 million.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. COWLEY:** — Mr. Speaker, this is not a stand pat Government as the Premier said last year. We're not sanding still. We're not satisfied with all of the programs we've introduced. We're not satisfied that we have solved all the problems in Saskatchewan, but this Government has taken more action in two years than the Members opposite took in seven years.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. COWLEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I'm confident and I think all Member n this side of the House are confident that come an election, possibly in 1975, the Members opposite will be decimated and they will be lucky if they have enough left over there for a front row.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. COWLEY:** — Mr. Speaker, in accordance with Rule 48(2) I take great pleasure in moving second and third reading of the Appropriation Bill.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. K.R. MacLEOD (Regina Albert Park):** — Well, Mr. Speaker, we started with baloney back here in early February and it looks as if we're ending with baloney. The Government says and the Ho. Minister says that they're not standing still, they're not standing pat, the truth is they're going backwards. He says, We've done more in two years than the previous Government in seven," and I agree with that. They've done more damage in the two years than the previous Government could possibly do in seven years. The difficulty is, Mr. Speaker, that this Government has been handed a largesse unprecedented in the history of Saskatchewan. The prosperity is, however a national prosperity. It is due to two things. It is due to the national policies of the Liberal Government in Ottawa.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MacLEOD:** — It is due to large increases in farm income. Those two reasons are the only reasons that the Provincial Government. Has been able to spend the money that they are now spending. Thanks to Otto Lang, thanks to the Federal Liberals. There is very little real prosperity generated by this Government. Now despite the greatest increases in history, this Government is spending to the hilt. They are living not only on the current unprecedented revenues, they are living on past earned revenues, on equalization payments from the Federal Government. In this year, last year and next year, they will receive close to \$100 million more from their federal equalization payments than they have earned during he same period.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — What do they do with it?

**MR. MacLEOD:** — They are taxing our wage earners at a higher level than ever before.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MacLEOD:** — But despite the increase in taxes, despite all of this, what are they doing? They are really throwing money around on the party apparatus of the New Democratic Party. Now I want to suggest to the Hon. Minister that with the tremendous increases in provincial revenues arising out of equalization formulas, out of past payments on equalization formulas, increases in taxes, and then the unprecedented development in the economy which will produce for the province far more money than the provincial Minister of Finance has estimated, if this Government doesn't produce a \$50 million surplus in the next year, it is a total mismanagement and squandering of the people's money. The basic and fundamental problem of the New Democratic Party is that it does not plan for the future. The basic and fundamental problem is that they are planning money today hoping thereby to win the election — live today and hang tomorrow.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MacLEOD:** — The only worthwhile development in the past ten years in Saskatchewan was that produced by the Liberal Government. Can the New Democratic Party point to one development that matches in size the Prince Albert Pulp Mill? They can point to none. That is the real benefit, that is the real economic development. Now I know that this Government has scrambled about trying to encourage industry to Saskatchewan. They have tried their best but people have come to know them. The cancellation of the pulp mill, the crushing of a contract already signed, The Forest Products Act, these are Bills which demonstrate to people that you cannot trust a New Democratic Party. As a result, the Government has received no worthwhile industry, no industries of any major size. Oh sure, they've had little distribution depots, they've distributors, warehouses, things of that kind, but they've had no major industry since this party came to power. The only one that they have got is the Roumanian Tractor Plant.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — That's the only one.

**MR. MacLEOD:** — And I want the Hon. Minister of Industry

May 4, 1973

and Commerce (Mr. Thorson), the touchy Minister from Estevan, I want him to invite us all to the opening of the Roumanian Tractor Plant because I have no doubt that it will be opened in the near future. I assume that plant which is half way across the Atlantic, I assume it's there because it isn't here yet, but we expect it momentarily and we will be very disappointed if we don't get an invitation to it. Up to this point, nothing of the size of the Prince Albert Pulp Mill has been brought in by this Government and unless this Government changes its attitude and convinces the people that it has changed its way, it will get nothing. As a result people will leave Saskatchewan, the Minister will tax those people who are here and the rest of them will go to earn a decent living elsewhere.

I want to suggest that the type of Government we have is not exemplified by the comments of the Hon. Minister of Finance but more by the Minister of Agriculture when he admitted to the House that they were trying to get rid of farmers of 65 years and over. They were casting people out, useless, worthless, casting them off like an old shoe. If the way the Government has handled this Legislature is an example of the way it runs the province than the people are in for a sad time. They have showed an unprecedented clumsiness in the House. They have shown careless in the draftsmanship of their Bills. They have shown that they don't know what they're doing. They have pretensions consultation with the professions, pretensions of consultations with the university and you know what happened there. They said, yes, we consulted, they said, we consulted with the dentists, and the dentists came in and said, we don't agree at all with what you've done. They said they consulted with the university and the Bill was condemned to the point where they had to pull it out. This mismanagement, Mr. Speaker, is the kind of mismanagement which will throw this Government out after four years and I regret, regret very much that they will not leave in our hands the \$70 or \$80 million surplus that was left by the old Liberal Party in tough times. Mr. Speaker, these people have proven they don't know how to handle the resources of the province and therefore \$723.9 million is far too much to trust in their hands and I oppose the Bill.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. A.E. BLAKENEY (Premier):** — Mr. Speaker, we've had an opportunity to listen to the comments of the Member from Albert Park telling us how the prosperity of this province brought about not by the policies of this Government but by the policies of the Federal Liberal Government.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Telling us that doubtless everybody in Saskatchewan knows that it's the policies of the Federal Liberal Government that have been so successful. Well, I want to point out to Hon. Members that the people of the province had an opportunity to assess the policies of the Liberal Government not many months ago. And if the Trudeau Liberal policies were such winners what happened to the Trudeau candidates all across Canada?

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — It's not the Federal

Liberals that the people wanted. In every province in Western Canada the Federal Liberals vote went down.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Right down the road.

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — You have how many Members in Saskatchewan? One! One Federal Liberal! One Federal Liberal and you hold this out as the absolute epitome of public acceptance.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — We held our own.

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Not since the last election, you didn't hold your own. The public has made it clear as they could in 1971 that they don't like Liberals. As clear as they could in 1972 that they don't like Liberals.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — As clear s they will in 1975, they will once again say they don't like Liberals.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MacLEOD:** — Stay with the Bill.

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — The Member from Albert Park has had a sudden conversion. He's invited the Hon. Members to turn their attention to the Bill. He, on the other hand, did not talk about the Bill, and if I would have been in his position I wouldn't have talked about the Bill either.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — I would have talked about the Prince Albert Pulp Mill as he did. I would have talked about the Federal Liberals, tattered as they are. I wouldn't have tried to put up a reasoned argument about this Appropriation Bill because it can't be done.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Because the Appropriation Bill contains what was in this budge and he knows and we now and everybody in Saskatchewan knows this is a good budget and recognized as such.

Members opposite say, call an election. This represents a certain sort of foolhardiness on their party. But this is what they were saying last fall to the Federal Government, call an election. I know that as a result of that election last fall they ran first in one seat, second in one seat and third in eleven seats. They couldn't even come second in more than two seats in Saskatchewan. And this is the basis on which they say, call an election. Well, if we didn't want to put the people in Saskatchewan through a totally unnecessary expense, we would.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

May 4, 1973

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — But I want to say a few words about the Bill.

**MR. STEUART:** — A few words will do.

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — In this Bill, we take steps to strengthen the economy of Saskatchewan and take steps to alleviate hardships and improve conditions of life for all of the people of Saskatchewan and particularly those who are less fortunate than some of us. The Estimates for the Department of Agriculture will provide funds for the greatest agricultural promotion program in the history of this province. For the Land Bank we will be providing an extra \$20 million. And this program last year was the subject of bitter opposition by Members opposite but it is already proving a success and their criticism this year was very muted indeed. The Land Bank has already provide an opportunity for hundreds of young people to enter farming who otherwise would not have been able to do so. The flood of applications for people to lease land indicates that the Land Bank program was not only a good program but a thoroughly necessary program.

Notwithstanding the opposition of the Liberal Party we are determined to push forward and double the amount of land we purchase this year and to double the opportunity of young people to enter farming. But we recognize to give young people an opportunity to enter farming is not good enough. We must underpin some of the farmers who are already there. It is not good enough simply to give older people an opportunity to retire gracefully. We say that we must give something to people who are now on the land and having difficulty getting by. We believe that we have done this with emphasis on specialty crops, on hog production and livestock production generally. In order to make possible the expansion of the production of specialty crops and livestock, we are providing through The Agricultural Incentives Act generous loans and grants under the new FarmStart program. This is one more evidence that is Government is determined not only to talk about the need for preserving the family farm but to act and to act boldly to do something about it.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — We believe also that in the past many farmers have suffered loss because of unreasonable delays in getting machinery fixed, unreasonable lack of performance on conditions and warranty with respect to machinery. We want to provide through the Agricultural Implements Board protection of the nature that has been provided to workmen for many years in this province through the Workmen's Compensation Board. Now that's a new proposal. Liberals, of course, object to it. Liberals always object to any new proposal. It is not part of the traditional free enterprise approach, so naturally they will oppose it. But I say this, that in a few years this type of legislation which offers protection to farmers who need protection will be accepted not only in this province but in other farming provinces of Canada.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — We have moved to protect

farmers through orderly marketing of hogs. Members opposite of course opposed. They can be expected to oppose any program of orderly marketing of farm products. They have opposed the Wheat Board, they have opposed all methods of orderly marketing. They have opposed orderly marketing of hog production. They want us to depend on the free market and just how free the market for hogs is has been shown time and time again by Royal Commission authoritative reports. They have shown that it isn't a free market but rigged market. The only way farmers protected themselves against, yes, the Winnipeg Grain Exchange and the like, was that of a Canadian Wheat Board and hog producers now enjoy some of these same protections.

Now not only in agriculture but in forestry we are acting to make our resources produce more, more in wealth, more in jobs. We are determined that our forests which belong to all the people of Saskatchewan shall yield the most in products, employment and the economic opportunity. We have introduced legislation to bring this about, to provide funds for new programs and, of course, the legislation is opposed by the Members opposite. The Forestry Act was opposed. They have proved in the past that when it comes to deciding whether or not a group of investors from New York or people in this province should control our resources, they opt always for the outside capital and never for the local people. They proved this in Wisewood, MacMillan and Bloedel, good company but not our boys. They proved this with respect to Simpson, they proved this with respect to Parsons and Whittemore. And once again, and I didn't think I would hear it in this House, one of those Members opposite is saying we should not have turned off the Athabasca Pulp Mill. Well, we should like once again to fight yet another election on that issue.

We believe that the proper allocation of forest resources will produce more economic opportunity, more activity, more jobs and a better use of our forests. We believe that the existing industries in the forest industry can prosper. We believe there is a great opportunity for new industry using our prime forest products to produce high-grade, high-value products with a large labor input. Black spruce makes first class studs and we'll undoubtedly make first class studs.

One of the most satisfying parts of this budget is the expenditure for the Department of Northern Saskatchewan. This Government is making a determined effort to provide funds to develop northern Saskatchewan and to provide opportunities for northerners to participate fully in that development. This major department will be located primarily in the North at LaRonge rather than here in Regina. Members opposite talked about decentralization. We are, in fact, decentralizing the Government of Saskatchewan and in this regard we are moving a major part of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan into the North.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — This budget provides for major forward strides in health, provides major forward strides in assistance for senior citizens. There will be chiropractic care. In 1965 everyone of the Liberal Members who was in the House at that time voted for chiropractic care. In 1971 when we came to office they hadn't moved a muscle. Well, it is now 1973 and we have chiropractic care under a New Democratic Government.

May 4, 1973

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — We promised to provide hearing aids at greatly reduced prices and we will honor that promise. We promised to provide a dental care program for children and we have started on that road. We promised to pay the cost of basic nursing care in nursing homes and we are doing that. We are acting to deal with serious housing problems, acting by setting up a Housing Corporation. We are recognizing the special problems of senior citizens through a home repair program. These programs demonstrate the concern of this Government for senior citizens, a concern reflected not in plaques and platitudes like the old Government talked about but in hard cash and special help for senior citizens. This, coupled with the removal of deterrent fees, not utilization fees but deterrent fees, the removal of Medicare and hospital premiums for senior citizens, goes a long way to make the lot of senior citizens far better than it was in the days when those people opposite sat on the Treasury Benches.

We have acted to deal with the teacher salary bargaining mess. We have acted in a way which will, we believe, contribute to the solution of that problem. We have acted to provide educational opportunity for many people and hundreds of smaller communities in this province through community colleges. As I look at the program card on which we were elected in 1971 and see that most of the pledges we made have been honored, I recall the comments made not many months ago by Members opposite, comments which said, and I think of the one on the first pledge that we would reduce the property taxes to 25 mills. I remember Members opposite saying, you'll never do it. You'll never do it in four years. Last year we provided huge increases in school grants, massive increases in property improvement grants. This year we have provided further huge increases in school grants and I ask anyone in your constituency to look across this province and when have rates for school purposes ever been more stable than they have in the last two years?

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Certainly not when you people were the Government, certainly not when you people were the Government!

We have seen the enrichment of programs, the removal of the pupil-teacher ratio and we have seen hundreds of more jobs for teachers than there would have been had the old Liberal rule still been in force.

Not only have we added huge amounts to school grants, we have increased property improvements grants by even larger amounts, on homes, farms and small businesses, tens of thousands of homes and farms and small business will be getting the top grants of \$144, \$180 for businessmen and \$270 for farmer. For the vast majority of homes and small businesses the school mill rate will effectively be 25 mills or less.

Now Members opposite have raised every cliché they could think of to oppose this budget. They say to the Government that we are weak and vacillating. That's what they say one day, the next day we are arbitrary and arrogant. Then they go on to say, but of course we don't object to what you are doing, we object to the way you are doing it. They say many of these



things are a good idea but they should be delayed. They should be delayed because we should take this to court. That was one of the arguments used. We should delay because we should have a plebiscite, another argument used. Delay because we should consult more, another argument used. Still further argument saying that we should be moving on and not being vacillating, they raise every possible criticism however inconsistent. I ask you this, Mr. Speaker, what positive alternatives have they proposed? What, after all, can they do by way of positive alternatives? They can't look back on their record, that sorry tattered record that was repudiated in 1971. They can't look forward and ask the public to consider any new and fresh ideas because they don't have any, so they can only be negative, they can only oppose. While they continue to be negative and continue bereft of every new idea and totally bereft of any new fresh idea, they continue to be devoid of any possible new alternative, they offer nothing to the people of Saskatchewan. While they do this, they will languish in the political wilderness to which they were banished in June of 1971.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — The people of Saskatchewan will forgive a Government if it makes mistakes, if it acts, if it attempts to deal with problems. The people of Saskatchewan elected our Government to introduce new programs and necessary programs and we are acting to meet their hopes and aspirations. We are acting in the full confidence that these programs are acceptable to the people of Saskatchewan, are welcome by the people of Saskatchewan. This budget offers new opportunities and new horizons to the people of Saskatchewan and I invite all Members of this House on both sides of the House to give this budget and this Bill their full support.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. J.G. LANE (Lumsden):** — The speech by the Premier, Mr. Speaker, is full evidence that bad things come in threes because the speech by the Premier ranks in ineptness with his defence of the Intercon deal, his defence of the ward system and now his defence of a bad budget, bad programs by a bad Government. Of the Government last year when we wound up the debate just about 365 days ago, we said that the first steps of democratic socialism had been instituted in Saskatchewan. At that time the Premier stood up and said that's not true, that's not what we are doing. But this year we have had program on program adding up to the total takeover of control of the Province of Saskatchewan started by the Blakeney Government in 1971. We started last year with takeover and control of business and shutting down any business for five days. This year they have moved into Intercon and made a bad, inept deal on Intercon. They have moved into other businesses, they made a stupid, inept deal on the IPSCO shares, shares that went down after the Government got involved. The Government moved into the question of control and took over control of the agriculture of Saskatchewan with its Land Bank and its Bill No. 50 which will allow total takeover control of all aspects of agriculture in Saskatchewan. That's the direction this Government has made clear, that's the direction that the budget evidences and that's why it is a bad budget and a bad Government. The land grab for power by the Government is extending down to the cities with the ward system without a vote. Where Members

May 4, 1973

opposite stand up and refute every principle that they supposedly hold true to their hearts by giving a vote to the people, they, in turn, ram the ward system down the throats of the cities of Saskatoon and Regina. They would do it elsewhere if they could get away with it.

Mr. Speaker, that isn't the only part of this Government. They have gone so far under the Minister of Labour to take control of trade union where it is now a wrong act for a trade union member to talk against his own union, where he will be thrown out or can be fired from his job for merely criticizing his own union and exercising his right to free speech. The Government opposite emphasized and strengthened its control over the cities by bringing in urban planning legislation which allows the cities the Minister of Municipal Affairs to tell the cities, forget what you are planning to do we'll do it because we know what is best. That's what the Government is doing. That whole direction of control has been emphasized and been backed up by the budget program implemented by the Minister of Finance.

The Government has stumbled, fumbled and bungled through 72 days. One thing has been made clear in this Legislative Session, the longest in the history of the province, is that the Premier can count on the undying loyalty of his back benchers because every time the Government does something wrong the back benchers opposite rise like sheep, their arms up and down like puppets hands as they pound their desks and agree and their hands are going up and down. When the Government takes control of agriculture they agree . . .

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. LANE:** — like sheep. When the Government brings in legislation which refutes their party principles and throws out the democratic right to vote, the Members opposite rise like sheep and agree with the Cabinet. Mr. Speaker, the direction of the Government is one of the main things that has been indicated by this Session. But another thing is the complete lack of political courage by the back benchers on the Government side, their failure to show any political courage whatsoever and stand up to the Government and its arrogant grab for control of the Province of Saskatchewan. Members opposite, when the Opposition gave valid, legitimate criticisms, threw them out and disagreed because the Cabinet under Allan Blakeney says, no, you cannot disagree. We must defeat the Opposition. Again, they didn't have the courage or political guts to stand up and say, no, the Opposition is right, we've got to vote for it. They are the group that day after day in this House have said, the Liberals were wrong, we are a New Deal for People, we are going to change all these things, we are going to give a new type of Government. Just like sheep and puppets whenever Allan Blakeney says, jump or sit down, they jump or sit down no matter how bad the Bill is and there were Bills every day during this Session. They endorsed Bill after Bill like puppets and sheep without a new idea out of the back benchers, just agreeing and agreeing when the Cabinet tells them.

Through 72 days the Government stumbled and fumbled when Bills that were improperly drafted by the Ministers opposite, they have had more House amendments in this Session than any other session in the history of this Legislature because Cabinet couldn't even take the time to draft the Bills properly.

And still the back benchers want right along with it and did everything that they were told to do.

And that is one thing that the Premier is proud of in this Session, he is proud of the undying loyalty of his back benchers as they just fell over backwards to do the Government and Cabinet fitting.

The Government has gone on record in this Session of being proud of the highest unemployment in the history of the Province of Saskatchewan, deliberately created by the Government as they cancelled job-creating programs, as they cancelled industries including the Athabasca Pulp Mill, as they stand up proud of seven per cent unemployment and seven per cent of the so-called little people walking the streets. They are proud of this. They are proud of the fact that they are the only province in the Dominion of Canada to raise personal income taxes.

David Lewis is turning over backwards down in Ottawa to try to get the Government to reduce personal income taxes, because, according to David Lewis, that will get more money down to the little people, increase spending and thus improve the economy. But the back benchers proudly stood up and agreed with the Government, implementing a budget which is the only one in Canada to raise personal income taxes against the little people of the Province of Saskatchewan. The back benchers got up and agreed and defended the Government on the Service Printing scandal. Just like sheep, they did what they were told.

Population took another drastic drop and the back benchers opposite are proud of this. They have done nothing, contributed nothing to any of these problems in the Province of Saskatchewan but the bad, stupid deals by the Government have had the endorsement, the wholehearted support and endorsement of each and every one of the back benchers and they are the ones who have to take this unfortunate, dismal record back to their people. The people are going to laugh at them right till 1975.

**MR. STEUART (Leader of the Opposition):** — Mr. Speaker, I am not going to take very long in this debate.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. STEUART:** — The Premier took quite a bit of time and he didn't have very much to say but he took quite a bit of time to say it. He pounded his little fist and he shook his finger and we found out one thing about the Premier, the louder he hollers, the poorer the case he has. I guess it was a decision that he made, all the planners back up here writing his speeches. I guess he figured, well the boys in the back row, the boys in the back row, need a little uplifting and I think they did because it has been a bad Session for the Government. What is even worse is it has been a bad Session for the people of Saskatchewan.

The Member for Lumsden said we watched this Government now and they have been in office for 20 months and they have had one theme. The Premier said that we criticized one day for vacillating. We criticized him the next day for power grabbing. We criticized him one other time for backing off. We criticized

May 4, 1973

him another time for moving in, and he is right. That has been their sad and sorry record. When we could have expected the pr to show some leadership and some intestinal fortitude, he has backed away.

When he was first elected we expected with all these so-called bright, certainly young Members, we expected to see a bright new Cabinet, and what did he do. He disappointed them and he disappointed the people of Saskatchewan. Why? Because he got pressure. It wasn't his idea, he got pressure. The story of the Premier is a sad one and a sorry one. Every time there is pressure, he buckles. That is, if it is pressure from some people whom he thinks count.

Oh, the farmers can scream and the hog producers, that they want a vote, they can ask for some say in the moving of their product but they are ignored. But he moved into the university and the president of the university and some of the faculty of the university had the intestinal fortitude to stand up to him and he backed away.

This has been a bad year, a bad Session, for the Government and a bad Session for the people of this province.

He said that we don't talk much about the Land Bank, that we aren't quite as critical of it as we were one year ago. I can tell you that we are even more critical of it than we were a year ago.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. STEUART:** — We say this to the people of Saskatchewan, this is not a Land Bank, it is a land grab. The Government of Saskatchewan has now bought close to \$30 million worth of prime land. And if they happen, by some unfortunate freak, to be in power for another five years they will own at least \$100 million of the farm land of this province.

I have watched and read some of their pamphlets. It sounds real nice. They say that at the end of five years we will lease or sell this land. They know and we know that there will be precious little of this land ever sold because the deck is stacked against the young farmer or any farmer who happens to lease the land from the Land Bank.

They say it is a new tenure system. They stood up in that place and again they supported this year, Member after Member, and said, we are not going to burden the farmers of Saskatchewan with the necessity of owning land.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we don't look on that as burden. Whether they recognize it or not, most of the people who came to rural Saskatchewan came here so they could own the land on which they toil and work. And this Government has moved, as was said in 1944 and I have a pamphlet and it says, be careful of the CCF socialists, they will take your land.

They didn't take it in 1944, they didn't take it in 1954 and they didn't take it in 1964, but they are taking it in 1972 and in 1973. Every year that goes by that they are in power more and more of our farmers will be tenants of the state. And they will not, and I repeat, they will not sell this land back to the

farmers, they have no intention. They said it is a new tenure system. It is not a new tenure system. They have it across the ocean behind the iron curtain and over there they call it by its right name, they call it communism and that is exactly what it is. More and more, day by day, more of our farmers are becoming tenants of the state. But there is little use of controlling the land if you don't control what is produced on it.

So they moved in with Bill 50 and they have given themselves more power over the farmers in what they produce. Right now, the Hog Marketing Commission, next year or the year after, a cattle marketing commission, and the year after that a sheep marketing commission. And they will have it! Don't let the cattlemen and the ranchers of this province be fooled, and I don't think they will be, they are next on the list.

This Government can and will when they are ready tell every farmer how much sheep he can produce, hogs produced, cattle produced, where it can sell them, when he can sell them and even whom he can sell them to.

Then, of course, we had the final crowing effort when they moved in with a great business acumen and they bought 45 per cent of Intercontinental Packers.

The Hon. Member from Saskatoon, the Attorney General, (Mr. Romanow applauds. I don't know whom he is applauding because that was the stupidest, biggest sellout that has happened, not in a major way but in the minor way. And they admitted themselves, privately, the NDP admitted themselves that that fine, old gentleman from Saskatoon, Mr. Fred Mendel, 84 years old, took them like no one has ever been taken before in the history of this province. in three short weeks he took them for an extra \$6 million or \$7 million and then signed them up to a contract in which he can keep on taking them, day in and day out, year in and year out, and in five years down the road they have an option to what? They will even do worse than they did today at even a worse price buying another 20 per cent of those shares.

The interesting thing is that they talk about saving industry for the province. We have seen industry after industry announce they are leaving and pull out. We brought to the attention of the House the little petroleum plant at Kamsack. And I predict right now that petroleum plant will be closed and will stay closed because this Government has not moved and I don't think has any intention to move to save the petroleum plan in Kamsack.

Now if it was a co-op petroleum plant maybe they would move, I don't know. The fact is that it is in private enterprise, in private hands, a group of private citizens have moved to save it and the Government opposite, I don't think have moved to this point and if they don't move soon it will be too late.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Lumsden (Mr. Lane) said they have proven to be an inept Government, a stumbling Government. They obviously don't know where they go. They take any plan and they leap at it. They fill this building and buildings all over the city with planners whom they brought in from all over the country. And the results, the fruition of those plans unfortunately for the people of Saskatchewan are beginning to

May 4, 1973

bear fruit. They are beginning to surface. And we are going to see, I predict, more and more of the same sort of thing that we have had in this Session.

Talk about the Act to amend The Forest Act. They stand up and boast about it. They should hang their heads in shame. It is the most disgraceful thing and the most disgraceful Act that has ever been put on the books in the history of this province. For a Government to literally tear up every contract that has been held, not just contracts that we signed, but contracts that were signed by the Government opposite when they were in power before 1964 and say that every one of those contracts means nothing, it is a clear indication not only to the people of this province that the written word of that Government is not worth the paper it is written on. Their word is no good, their signature is no good, their contract is no good.

I ask the farmers who are signing leases to beware, that if those leases with the Land bank ever come out and the Government stays in power, and God help the people of this province if they do, what will they do? They will do the same thing that they did in the timber industry.

Let's go on record as saying that the timber industry isn't all the Prince Albert Pulp Mill, it isn't all Simpson Timber, it isn't all MacMillan Bloedel. There are dozens and dozens of small operators, there are small Saskatchewan owned tree sorting plants and every one of those people have had their contracts declared null and void by the Act which was just passed by the NDP Government, and make no mistake about it.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. STEUART:** — Mr. Speaker, they talk about what they have done for young people and for the farmers. Just some little things. We mentioned kicking the old farmers out of the community pastures at 65. It is not a big thing but it is indicative. There is another thing that is maybe not so big, but it is to the people concerned. We developed a good student employment program for the summer months. We gave businessmen and we gave farmers, as well as hospitals, municipalities, cities, towns and villages, the opportunity that if they wished to put up half of the wages to give these young people a chance to work in the summer.

What happened? Mr. Snyder looked at it and he said, those farmers are making a profit on this. Those businessmen are making a profit. They are cheating. They are doing something that isn't right. So we see that this year for the first time what the program has brought about. In the first year that our Act came into practice we gave about 4,000 young people jobs, most of that with the business community and with the farmers. The same businessmen and the same farmers are now denied the opportunity under the NDP Government.

Again, it is not a big thing, but it is indicative. If it isn't owned and run by the Government it is no good as far as these people are concerned.

In The Teacher-Trustee Relations Act, Mr. MacDonald from Milestone named it well. he said that it is a time bomb and it

is a time bomb. For the first time in the history of this province the Government has moved its heavy hand in, five or them, four trustees, four teachers. I predict that kind of negotiation will lead to far more trouble than the old area bargaining ever did.

The ward system has been mentioned, the Land Bank, Bill 50, the sort of unbelievable performance with the university where they moved in and it looked as if they were going to grab control. Then some people in this province had then nerve to stand up to them and they backed off. But I warn the community, the university community, that they are not finished yet and they won't be satisfied until, in fact, they have control over that institution too.

Well, they have looked pretty sad and they have looked pretty sick. They have dragged this thing out, dragged this Session out. They brought in a record budget. All that record budget and their big spending and wonderful speeches hasn't hidden the facts. The people of this province are disturbed, they are concerned and they are worried and they have every right to be concerned and worried.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. STEUART:** — They have proven to be a bad Government, an inept Government. I want to say right now that this Opposition of 15 Members have proven just the opposite. They have proven to be a good Opposition, a strong Opposition, an alert Opposition, and I want to congratulate them. Because of the actions of this Opposition, forcing these people and pressing them with all their power, with all the people behind them, we have exposed them for what they are.

No, Mr. Speaker, we will not support the budget, we will not support this Bill, we oppose it just as we have opposed 90 per cent of the bad Bills, the power grab, that this Government has brought before the people in this Legislative Assembly.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. G. MacMURCHY (Minister of Education):** — Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to take part in this debate, the last one before we go back to our constituencies. We have done a lot of work in this Session and I am confident that it is going to pay off when I go back home to Last Mountain and go to the vote in two years time.

This Session has been a good one for education. I was glad to hear the Leader of the Opposition talk about The Teachers' Collective Bargaining Act. In a month or two we will have a settlement for 1973. It will be the earliest settlement in the last six years.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MacMURCHY:** — This legislation is going to work because it paces the facts of life in education in the province and I say that the Liberals will live to regret it, regret their opposition to it in 1975.

May 4, 1973

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MacMURCHY:** — More positively this Session we saw the Community Colleges get underway. Here is another example of the initiative of the NDP in education. The colleges are two milestones of innovation and will be an immense benefit to rural Saskatchewan in raising the quality of life there. This cannot but help to shore up the small towns. It cannot but help to maintain a strong rural industry in this province. If I had to stand on any one program in education from the many new ones in education, it would be the Community Colleges.

Mr. Speaker, the budget provides for school grants of \$101 million in 1973. The last Liberal budget was \$77 million. The New Democrats have improved this by 30 per cent in only two years and we are proud of it. But the real difference in education is not just 30 per cent more money, it is a difference in attitude.

Liberals look on education as an expense, New Democrats call it an investment. They have put a new direction in education. The school system is facing many problems with more self confidence because the Government has given us great leadership in all of the new areas. No longer is education considered a liability and a drain on our resources. It is an asset.

The morale of schools has risen dramatically and will continue to rise as the new methods we put into effect take effect. That, Mr. Speaker, is a major achievement.

I ant to draw attention to two important points in education to the Members of this House. One of them is the increase in grant support for private schools. We haven't talked much about that. Many of these schools are located in town around the province and they give a very unique flavor to education in those areas where they are located. Under the Liberals these schools were starved, starved for funds. As I recall, in the last year of Liberal Government it was \$135 per student. I am pleased that this budget contains money to raise that grant to \$225 this year.

The other point is the new differential between rural and urban students and school grants. Last year we threw out the pupil-teacher ratio and introduced a new formula based on a per pupil allowance. This year the allowance for rural students is higher than for city students to recognize extra costs for rural education. I believe this is an important distinction and while it has not received much press attention these two things are ones that will have their impact in 1975.

Now this has been a controversial Session which is not a bad thing because it indicates action. It was our Session to receive criticism and we don't mind because we have taken it for good reason and it is going to prove very worthwhile. There is a difference between the kind of criticism taken this Session and the kind of criticism the Liberals took in, say, 1968 or 1969. In 1968 the Liberals were doing negative things, raising taxes by large amounts after promising a reduction, imposing deterrent fees which brought on no tangible benefits to anyone. These were unpopular and they ha no possibility of ever being popular. Programs like the Hog Commission, Teacher Bargaining, Land Bank, FarmStart, Division System, these may be controversial



but they are not negative. They stand to become as widely accepted as Medicare and Automobile Insurance and we don't mind taking some lumps now for those kinds of things because I am fully confident they are going to prove sound and acceptable to the people of Saskatchewan after a few years of experience.

Mr. Speaker, the truth of it is, the Liberal Government just has no credibility. Is it credible for the party that brought in Bill 2 to attack Government interference? Is it credible for the party that imposed the pupil-teacher ratio and budget review to talk about local autonomy? Can the party that threatened to assert financial control of the university now call for consultation? How can people believe Liberal attacks on the Division System after what they did to constituency boundaries in 1970?

Mr. Speaker, the outcry of the Members opposite have a fog of unreality around them. They ring hollow. I doubt that the people of this province are really going to take them seriously.

Now we have heard a lot about individual freedom in this Session. Liberals seem to think they can really attack the Government for some how eroding freedom. I suggest to them that this sort of thing has never added to their effectiveness. Saskatchewan has a long tradition of joint endeavor, using Government on behalf of the people as a whole. That is what the co-operative movement is all about. It's the basis of medicare, it's the basis of Automobile Insurance, it's the basis of the Canadian Wheat Board and many other self-help vehicles our people support. The Liberals go against the grain of the province when they attack this tradition.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I challenge the Liberal Party to fight us on our record in 1975, our record in this Session. I challenge them to fight an election on the stands they have taken in this Session. I am proud of this Session and I have no doubt it's going to be a big factor in returning a New Democratic Government two years from now, Mr. Speaker.

I support the Bill.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. E.L. COWLEY (Minister of Finance):** — Mr. Speaker, it has been interesting sitting here listening to the Members in the Opposition. Unfortunately we have had about 71 days more of that experience than we need.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. COWLEY:** — Mr. Speaker, the Member for Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod) spent a little time reminiscing on some of his pet financial topics. The Member for Albert Park a little while ago said we had too big a surplus, now he says we should have a \$70 million or \$80 million surplus and I am sure he will soon be saying that we should be having a deficit and I'm waiting for that. It would be nice if the Member for Albert Park would be at least consistent in his approach to how the Government should manage the finance problem.

The Member for Lumsden (Mr. Lane) followed him and he

May 4, 1973

seemed to be talking about two or three general issues. He said the Government was bumbling and stumbling and unfortunately you now the biggest thing that has happened to this Session (it sort of rhymes with it), the Opposition has been crumbling.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. COWLEY:** — Mr. Speaker, he talked about the sheep on this side of the House who voted for all what he said were bad Bills and which I don't accept as bad legislation and neither do the Members on this side of the House.

Well, I want to talk about some sheep I do know about. The sheep who a few years ago sat on this side of the House. They sat on this side of the house, as Liberals, and they voted for a couple of Bills called Bill 2 and deterrent fees, they voted for those Bills, Bills which the Leader of the Opposition now says were a mistake. And talk about sheep, they voted for what the Opposition now admits was a mistake.

Mr. Speaker, we haven't had to do that.

Mr. Speaker, a little while ago the Boundaries Commission reported and increased the number of seats from 60 to 61. It wasn't very long after that when the Liberals tried to sneak in a 16th Member through that door.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. COWLEY:** — It's unfortunate we didn't let him stay because I think he could have done a better job this evening in winding up this debate.

Mr. Speaker, if I had to sum up the Session in somewhat unparliamentary language, perhaps, to describe the debate that has gone on in this House and the debates that have gone on in the country, I would have to say, "We beat the hell out of the Opposition."

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. COWLEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I have rearranged — they put a little pamphlet about this size and you open it up and they have got all the Members of the Opposition on the inside. I've got a new pamphlet for them for 1976 — this will hold all the Members of the Opposition, and it's just about the right size.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. COWLEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in moving second and third reading of this particular Bill under Rule 48(2).

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to on division.

## **ROYAL ASSENT AND PROROGATION**

At 11:20 o'clock p.m. His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor

having entered the Chamber, took his seat upon the Throne and gave Royal Assent to the Bills presented to him.

His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor was pleased to deliver the following speech:

It is my duty to relieve you of further attendance at the Legislative Assembly. In doing so, I wish to thank you on the work you have done.

This Third Session of the Seventeenth Legislative Assembly has been the longest in the history of Saskatchewan. You have dealt with a near record number of Bills, many of them representing substantial new directions in public policy.

Among the most significant measures are those designed to open up new opportunities for young farmers and to strengthen and stabilize the livestock industry. Perhaps most important to young farmers is The Agricultural Incentives act. Your action in strengthening The Natural Products Marketing Act will also permit livestock producers to expand their production with greater confidence in the future.

You have approved measures which will provide new direction to the development of Saskatchewan's resources, both renewable and non-renewable.

You have created a new Crown corporation which will have the power to participate in the development of the oil and gas industry in Saskatchewan.

You have enacted amendments to The Forest Act designed to improve the efficiency with which the publicly owned forest resources in Saskatchewan are utilized.

You have taken important steps to provide improved housing for low and middle income families and to assist senior citizens to repair and improve their homes. You have charged the Saskatchewan Housing Corporation with responsibility for developing these new programs.

You have introduced significant changes which have provided relief to property taxpayers. Increases in the Property Improvement Grant and increases in school grants will be paid in part by increases in the income tax and corporation tax. The effect is to shift a large share of the cost of education away from the property tax and onto tax sources which reflect ability to pay.

Several Bills have been considered and passed by you in the field of education. You have moved to extend the concept of education to include life-long learning in the province's communities through The Community Colleges Act.

You have provided a new framework for negotiating collective bargaining agreements for teachers.

You have also taken new steps in extending health care to the young and the handicapped. You have moved to implement a program of dental care for children and to provide hearing aids at cost to those who need them.

May 4, 1973

You have provided important new protection for tenants under a new Residential Tenancies Act. You have also set new landmarks in labour standards by improving vacation and maternity leave benefits.

By the passage of a completely revised Litter Control Act, and by increasing funds allotted to the Department of the Environment, you have served notice that the people of Saskatchewan intend to preserve and improve the physical environment in this province.

I commend you for your action in extending the division system to the two largest cities in the province for a trial period.

All of you have expressed your concern about the increased toll of death and injury on our streets and highways. You have given substance to this concern by establishing a Special Committee of this Assembly to consider ways of improving traffic safety.

All of Saskatchewan welcomed your action of providing funds to assist in the celebration of the RCMP Centennial.

I thank you for the provision you have made to meet the further requirements of the Public Service and assure you that this sum of money will be used economically, prudently, and in the public interest.

In taking leave of you, I thank you for the manner in which you have devoted your energies to the activities of the Session and wish you the full blessing of Providence.

The Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski, Provincial Secretary, then said:

Mr. Speaker, and Members of the Legislative Assembly:

It is the will and pleasure of His Honour, the Lieutenant Governor that this Legislative Assembly be prorogued until it pleases His Honour to summon the same for the dispatch of business, and the Legislative Assembly is accordingly prorogued.