

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fourth Session — Seventeenth Legislature
12th Day

Friday December 14, 1973.

The Assembly met at 2:30 o'clock p.m.

On the Orders of the Day.

INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL DELEGATION

GOVERNMENT FINANCED CHILD CARE CENTRES

MR. J.G. RICHARDS: (Saskatoon University) — Mr. Speaker, I should like at this time to welcome to the House this afternoon the people here representing groups acting for day care. I have often had the opinion this Legislature was an institution for day care for grownups. I hope we will soon have an appropriate institution for children.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

HOG COMMISSION PERFORMANCE DEFENDED

MR. T.M. WEATHERALD: (Cannington) — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I should like to direct a question to the Minister.

I have in my hands a copy of the December 11th issue of the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix and the headline is: "Hog Commission Performance Defended."

Mr. Speaker, this statement is made by the General Manager of the Hog Marketing Commission, Michael Ziloway, commenting on a speech made by George Loken, MLA for Rosetown.

The question, Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer). Is this going to be a continuing policy of the Government to have employees participate in the debates that have taken place in this Legislature?

HON. J.R. MESSER: (Minister of Agriculture) — Mr. Speaker, in response to the Hon. Member's question, Mr. Ziloway is the Manager of the Saskatchewan Hog Commission. It is an independent agency of the Government. If he chooses to respond, Mr. Speaker, to statements made by Mr. Loken, I would say that it was not within my right, nor the Government's right, to tell him that he does not have that particular right.

MR. WEATHERALD: — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Would the Minister tell us how that could possibly be an independent agency when the Government, last spring, gave them \$400,000 and this December gave them \$150,000?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

PAY FOR NEW YEARS AND CHRISTMAS TO BE DENIED

MR. RICHARDS: — Mr. Speaker, I have a question which I should like to direct to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Snyder) in the absence of the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Taylor) the Minister responsible for the Public Service Commission.

There came into my possession a memo from the Chairman of the Public Service Commission, which purports to deny to all Government employees, pay for the statutory holidays of New Years and Christmas. Now this is clearly in violation of The Labour Standards Act, and the regulations under it pertaining to the definition of a public holiday. My question to the Minister is: Will he examine this matter? I have a copy of the memo for him. I hope he will make sure that the employees are not denied their full rights under The Labour Standards Act? It is hardly befitting the Government, if it wants to establish the best labor policies in the country, that this go on within Government.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! The Member must ask a question, not make a speech.

HON. G.T. SNYDER: (Minister of Labour) — I think the Member made this point once or twice and I would have to indicate to him that the suggestion offered by the Public Service Commission is in error and I have already made an effort to draw that to their attention. The Labour Standards Act is explicit in that with the 24th not being worked, it in no way compromises the employees' rights to paid statutory holidays as they are provided on the 25th and 26th.

MR. RICHARDS: — A supplementary question to that, Sir. I take it that the memo of December 7th is inoperative due to your present statement.

MR. SNYDER: — Yes. I think you're right in assuming that.

COLLAPSE OF OIL EXPLORATION PLANTS REVEALED

MR. C.P. MacDONALD: (Milestone) — I should like to direct a question, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Thorson).

I am sure that he has seen the headline in the Leader-Post, "Collapse of Oil Exploration Plants Revealed", which indicates the collapse of a Saskatchewan organized company, mostly Saskatchewan and western Canadian capital, and also the cancellation of a \$3 million exploration program, or drilling program in Saskatchewan. I should like to ask the Minister, with the announced impact of this new legislation on the private sector of the oil industry, is he willing now to set aside this Bill and not ram it through the House until he has had an opportunity to discuss with the private sector just exactly what their feelings and reservations are about this proposed legislation?

HON. K. THORSON: (Minister, of Industry and Commerce) — Mr. Speaker, I am sorry I haven't had the benefit of seeing any Leader-Post headline this morning. I have been out of town since about 7:30 this morning and I just got back about 20 minutes ago and I am sorry, I don't know what he is talking' about at all.

MR. MacDONALD: — I should like to suggest to the Minister that I advise him to read this. They aren't big companies . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order:

MR. MacDONALD: — A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I should also like to say the Premier indicated yesterday that one of the reasons for ramming it through this Legislature . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — What is the question?

MR. MacDONALD: — I just want to preface my question. I'll make it as brief as I can — was the loss of \$1 million a month . . . does not the Minister feel that the cancellation of a \$3 million drilling program, the cancellation of a company, the possible loss on bonus bids, could cost the Province of Saskatchewan far more than one million dollars a month?

MR. THORSON: — Mr. Speaker, our Premier, in his usual modesty, I think put the lowest possible figure on the amount that we would lose if we don't pass this legislation. I think it will be much higher than \$1 million per month that we will lose.

TABLING OF FIRST ANNUAL REPORT OF THE SASKATCHEWAN LAND BANK COMMISSION.

HON. J.R. MESSER: (Minister of Agriculture) — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day it is my pleasure to table the first annual report of. the Saskatchewan Land Bank Commission.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: — Mr. Speaker, this was a program that, when it was introduced, we said we would be treading on untrod ground and it was certainly a bold step in pioneering legislation. It has proven the establishment of new farm units, Mr. Speaker. It has allowed an opportunity for older farmers to retire with dignity and pass their land to direct descendants . . .

MR. J.C. McISAAC: (Wilkie) — Order! Is the Minister tabling a report or is he making a speech, or moving a resolution? It doesn't matter but let's not . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — As I understand it, the Minister is tabling a report, and if he makes a statement on tabling a report, then some Member of the Opposition has a right to make a statement

back as long as they stay within the contents of the report.

MR. MESSER: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If I may, very briefly continue my statement in regard to the tabling of this report. It is one of the many significant undertakings of the Government which has provided opportunities for rural stability, both social and economic. The program has in fact, Mr. Speaker, been accepted by people in Saskatchewan and, in fact, beyond expectations. The information that is in this report, Mr. Speaker, is both detailed and extensive. It lists the locations of the land that were purchased by the Land Bank Commission; it lists the amounts of money that were paid for those parcels of land; it lists the averages that were paid per acre throughout the province. In fact, Mr. Speaker, it goes beyond answering all the questions that the party to your left were so eager to obtain last year. It is, Mr. Speaker, another example of a Government that's not afraid to disclose its dealings or its activities.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. E.F. GARDNER: (Moosomin) — Mr. Speaker, we were pleased to have this report and the Minister's apology, along with it. We realize that there is probably a lot of information in it that is going to rather embarrass him and we look forward to looking at the report very carefully. We have, of course, a number of reports substantiated of people throughout this province, young needy farmers who have had the Land Bank come in in the last few months, grab some land from right beside them while they were away making financial arrangements with the Farm Credit Corporation. The Land Bank has come in with the taxpayers' money and outbid them on this land and we will be very interested in taking a look at the various transactions to substantiate the information we have.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MOTIONS FOR RETURNS

RETURN NO. 43

MR. J.G. LANE (Lumsden) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return. No. 43 showing:

- (1) Whether the Government made any investigations under the Direct Sellers Act in the year 1973 to November 30.
- (2) If so, (a) the number; (b) the names of the persons investigated; (c) the disposition of each investigation; and (d) the reasons for each particular disposition.

He said: I have asked certain questions as a result of investigations under The Direct Sellers Act. For the information of those Members of the House, The Direct Sellers Act was brought in in 1965 by a Liberal Government. It was designed to regulate certain abuses in direct sellers, transient sellers, etc., etc. And, a year ago we asked this very question and we did get a reply from the Minister of Consumer Affairs (Mr. Tchorzewski). We are now trying to find out the results

of investigations under that particular Act. I am sympathetic with the comments of the Minister last year that people that are investigated that are found not to have breached the Act, or are in compliance with the Act, or have adjusted their practices accordingly, that that information should not be made public, and I think that is quite proper. But I feel too that the public should have and should be made aware of those companies that are abusing the Act, that have breached the Act. One of the best things to curb abuses in the future is public knowledge and that is the type of information that we are asking.

Mr. Speaker, as I said, we have asked for certain information, we would like in particular to know the names of those companies and the names of those individuals that have breached The Direct Sellers Act and that information should be readily available. It should be supplied to the people of Saskatchewan.

HON. E.L. TCHORZEWSKI: (Minister of Culture and Youth) — Mr. Speaker, I think as the Member has indicated that there was a similar question on the Order Paper last year, to which we, in fact, did provide the necessary information by an answer.

I cannot totally agree with the Member with regard to (b) in the motion — the names of the persons investigated — because in the wording of the motion it requires that all the names of those persons who, in fact, have been investigated be disclosed. In the investigations which are conducted from time to time by the registrar under The Direct Sellers Act, this is done as part of the duties of the registrar administering the Act. Every investigation does not necessarily disclose the evidence of an offence and for this reason, as we indicated in the answer last year, the names of persons investigated under the Act are not published. However, the information to the public concerning the status of the licences of any direct seller or concerning any convictions or charges arising out of an investigation commenced by the registrar are available in the department. But because of the nature of the motion and the question, Mr. Speaker, I must ask the Members of the House to support an amendment. I move, seconded by my seatmate Mr. Cowley (Minister of Finance) that all the words after the word “showing” be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

(1) Whether the Government made any investigations under The Direct Sellers Act in the year 1973 to November 30.

(2) If so, (a) the number; (b) the disposition of each investigation; and (c) the reasons for each particular disposition.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

RETURN NO. 44

MR. T.M. WEATHERALD (Cannington) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 44 showing:

The amount the Prince Albert Pulp Company Limited paid to the Government of Saskatchewan during the year 1972

for: (a) stumpage dues; (b) ground rental and fire prevention; (c) fire suppression; (d) other specified purposes.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this motion calls for what the Prince Albert Pulp Company Limited paid to the Government of Saskatchewan in the year 1972. The Prince Albert Pulp Company is now obviously one of the most successful enterprises in the Province of Saskatchewan and I think it is of interest to everyone to disclose the financial advantages it is giving the people of Saskatchewan.

HON. G.R. BOWERMAN: (Minister of Northern Saskatchewan) — Mr. Speaker, the Return No. 44 seeks some specific information with respect to the revenues that the Government of Saskatchewan receives from one single corporation, forest corporation, and that is the Prince Albert Pulp Company. Identical information with respect to another individual corporation, Simpson Timber Company, is requested in Return No. 45.

Mr. Speaker, we have in Saskatchewan four major soft wood forest harvesting corporations that contribute to this province from the various commercial uses that they make of the forest. These four corporations, as you may know, Mr. Speaker, are the Meadow Lake Sawmill, The Saskatchewan Forest Products Corporation, Prince Albert Pulp Company and Simpson Timber Company Limited. In order that a complete revenue picture may be obtained for the Hon. Member from Cannington and that the information may be available for the public as well, it is our considered opinion that the Returns Nos. 44 and 45 should be amalgamated into one Return and that the other producing corporations such as the Saskatchewan Forest Products and the Meadow Lake Sawmill should also be included to provide a much broader base for the perspective of the soft wood utilization revenues that are returned to our province. In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, Return No. 46 requests certain specific information relating to the quantity of soft wood used by one of the single wood using corporations, that is Simpson Timber Company. We have also considered it to be in the interest of the Hon. Member from Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) and the public that they should have the annual cords of soft wood that are utilized by the other three major corporations as well. Therefore, in order that this might be brought about we would therefore incorporate that kind of an intent into our amendment in Return No. 44 and provide all the information which is requested plus some additional information which has not been asked for but I think would be useful in comparison for any analysis that the Member may want to make or any analysis that the public in its use of this material may want to make as well.

Mr. Speaker, I would, therefore move as seconded by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Snyder):

That Return No. 44 be amended by deleting all the words after the word “showing” and substitute therefore the following:

1. The amount paid by Simpson Timber Company, Prince Albert Pulp Company, Saskatchewan Forest Productions Corporation and Meadow Lake Sawmill to the Government of

Saskatchewan in each of the fiscal years 1970-71, 1971-72, 1972-73 for the purposes (a) stumpage dues; (b) ground rental and fire prevention; (c) fire suppression; (d) other specified purposes.

2. (a) The number of cords of wood utilized by each company and corporation and (b) the portion of each production taken from (1) white spruce and (2) other species.

MR. SPEAKER: — The question before the House is on the Order for Return motion moved by the Member for Cannington for Motion for Return No. 44 for which an amendment has been offered by the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Bowerman). Now the amendment, in principle, covers the questions asked in Order for Return 45 and also in 46 showing the information requested. But I do not believe an amendment is in order to strike out another Motion which is on the Order Paper unless the Hon. Member will agree that the other two should be dropped because the information will be supplied with one answer, otherwise you've tied three up in one which is two other additional motions. Is the Member prepared to agree that this will answer his three questions?

MR. WEATHERALD: — No, Mr. Speaker I prefer them to stay separate.

MR. SPEAKER: — I would have to rule then that the amendment is out of order because . . .

MR. STEUART: — Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I would move, therefore . . .

MR. STEUART: — Mr. Speaker, I was on my feet first and I would like to talk to this I know what the Minister is up to.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! Let's get the procedure straight if we can. I believe that this is out of order because it seeks to include other motions. What I was wanting to ask the House — this just came to me I have had no time to peruse it. If the House would be prepared to let me reserve my decision I should like to take a look at it and actually come up with some rulings as to whether it does or it doesn't because I don't want to say that they are in order or they are not in order until I have had time to check the ruling. I ask the House permission to reserve my judgement until a later time on these three motions covered by this amendment.

MR. STEUART: — We are, of course, quite prepared. I think that is very reasonable and very fair. This does not preclude I presume then the debate on the next two motions. This is just your ruling on the amendment made on this first motion.

MR. SPEAKER: — I will have to sort this out . . . my first reaction is that the amendment would be out of order because it deals with

other motions, because other motions may be discussed. Yet on the other hand this amendment could be wide enough to discuss the subject matter of the whole three. As I say I have requested permission to withhold my judgement until I have had further time to look at it and bring in a ruling so the Members can act accordingly.

MR. MacDONALD: — . . . the next two motions?

MR. SPEAKER: — Not at this time, I am requesting the next two motions stand at this time until I have had a chance because we will only get into continued confusion on them.

MR. STEUART: — Mr. Speaker, I think it is quite reasonable that you ask for time to consider the amendment that has been put forward by the Minister of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan on Return No. 44. The next item on the Agenda is Return No. 45 and we haven't come to that yet. His amendment did not deal with Return No. 45.

MR. ROMANOW: — He is asking it to stand.

MR. STEUART: — But we haven't even considered it yet. You are asking that we stand Items No. 2, 3 and 4.

MR. SPEAKER: — Yes, because if this amendment is in order it covers the subject matter of the other two, of Item 3 and Item 4. It covers the subject matter there. And if that is the case and the amendment is in order then the whole works is open for debate. If it isn't in order then we have to revert back to Item No. 2 and the other two are not covered. I am not in a position at this time to give a clear cut ruling as to say what should be done.

MR. McISAAC: — Surely, Mr. Speaker, and I think your point with respect to considering the validity of the amendment is a good one but surely there is no way you could rule out debate as it were on Item No. 3 or Item No. 4 at this point in time when they haven't yet come up. They'll be called and the Member given an opportunity to move each of those Returns as they come up.

MR. SPEAKER: — I am not ruling out the debate, what I am asking is that the House will permit me to allow those other two Items to stand until I have had a look at the whole works and the whole three will be back for discussion at a later time when we have had a chance to sort it out.

MR. MacDONALD: (Milestone) — Mr. Speaker, I hope you are not precluding any Member speaking before you make your ruling. In other words giving an opportunity for Members on this side of the House to speak as to why this particular ruling should be made one way or the other.

MR. McISAAC: — On a Point of Order, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest

that when you do have an opportunity to examine the motion made by the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan, that I will think you will find this amendment out of order in that it is covering a couple of points on two other motions that have yet to be raised. That in itself I would think should put it out of order procedurally never mind the question with respect to the information. I have no quarrel with what he is attempting to provide. The Motion as it stands merely asks for some specific information. I suppose if the Hon. Member for Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) wanted a good deal more information on other companies and so on and so forth, he would have asked for it, or asked another question as he does down the line and I would suggest that the amendment is too broad in scope and when you do consider it, it will be ruled out of order.

MR. SPEAKER: — The question before the House now is, it is requested by the Chair that Items on the Paper 2, 3 and 4 be allowed to stand until I have had a chance to study the implications of this ruling so that I can bring in a ruling so that we won't get into this entanglement in future days. Is that request agreed?

Agreed Items 2, 3 and 4 will stand.

RETURN NO. 47

MR. J. WIEBE (Morse) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 47 showing:

The mileage of the Provincial highway system at September 30, 1973: (a) in total; (b) according to surface treatment: (i) paved; (ii) oil treatment; (iii) gravelled; (iv) dirt.

HON. R. ROMANOW: (Attorney General) — Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Highways (Mr. Kramer) is not in the Legislature this afternoon. He's on Government business elsewhere and I have been asked by his department officials to introduce an amendment which really changes only the date of the request for the information. The information date requested is as of September 30th, 1973 and I am advised that from a departmental record standpoint, April 1 would be the appropriate period of 1973, backdating it to April 1, 1973 rather than September 30, 1973 to provide that information. I think it is an easier way for them to provide that information. So with that brief explanation I think it will give all the information that the Hon. Member wants plus more from April, 1973.

I would move that Return No. 47 be amended as follows, seconded by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer):

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

The mileage of the Provincial highway system at April 1, 1973: (a) in total; (b) according to surface treatment: (i) paved; (ii) oil treatment; (iii) gravelled; (iv) dirt.

MR. WIEBE: — Mr. Speaker, in speaking

to the amendment I can certainly realize the problem that the department may find itself in because of its year end, however, by answering the question on the date of April 1st, 1973, it really doesn't give me the information which I have requested. I already have the information on hand as of April 1st, 1973 and this was answered by the Minister of Highways in the spring, 1973 session. My main reason for asking this question is to find out the total amount of highways that were constructed during the current year 1973. There should be no problem for the department in ascertaining how many miles they had constructed because they had budgeted for so many miles in the spring. It would be a matter of checking to see what contracts were completed. I oppose the amendment asking for the information as of April 1st. However, I would agree if the Attorney General would change his motion to have the date set at December 12th or December 14th as of today's date. The reason why I am saying this is that all of the highway construction in Saskatchewan has now been completed for over a month and I think that this information should not be too large a problem for the Department of Highways to give to me.

HON. J.R. MESSER: (Minister of Agriculture) — Mr. Speaker, I hope that all Members of the Legislature will realize that we have a small problem in that the Minister of Highways is on Government business and is not in attendance at this Session at this time and it is difficult for some other Minister of the Crown to be able to decide as to whether or not we can effectively provide the information that the Member from Morse (Mr. Wiebe) has asked for. I would therefore ask, because we are in that difficult position, to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

RETURN NO. 48

MR. H.E. COUPLAND: (Meadow Lake) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 48 showing:

Whether the Department of Social Services made any payments whatsoever to Carmen Jones of Meadow Lake. (2) If so: (a) the purpose for which these payments were made; (b) the amount paid to him; (c) whether the department entered into a contract with this individual. (3) If a contract has been entered into, the terms of the contract.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, with respect to Return 48, as I have indicated already, the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Taylor) is in Ottawa for a first conference in 15 years on Social Services and Problems of Corrections. I am sure that all Hon. Members would agree with me that that is very important business to attend to. Frankly, I am not able to say whether or not this question can or can't be answered. In order to ascertain the advice of the Minister end to give him an opportunity to speak to this I would beg leave to adjourn. the debate.

Debate adjourned.

RETURN NO. 49

MR. T.M. WEATHERALD (Cannington) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 49 showing:

- (1) Whether any source emission surveys of the Prince Albert Pulp Company Limited Pulp Mill have been undertaken by the Department of Environment.
- (2) If so, their findings.

He said: I think this is an important question, Mr. Speaker, because we are finding out that many of the projects, such as Simpson Timber, MacMillan Bloedel at Hudson Bay and Prince Albert Pulp Company are turning out to be excellent operations and were all started under the previous Liberal Government. We are also finding out that much of the propaganda put out by our NDP friends is turning out to be extremely inaccurate. I think that this question will show that much of the propaganda that they put out about the pollution problems at Prince Albert Pulp Mill during the last election campaign was also faulty. That is why I ask for this Return.

HON. N.E. BYERS: (Minister of Environment) — The question as worded by the Hon. Member requesting information re source emission surveys is not really precise as to whether the Hon. Member from Cannington is seeking information about the quality of the air, or the quality of the water or the quality of both in the vicinity of the Prince Albert Pulp Mill. I want to say to the House that in no way do I want to deny the Hon. Member from Cannington or any of his colleagues any valuable information that might be used in the pollution section of his speeches for Liberal gatherings or whatever he wants them for this winter. As his question is not clear I do want to propose an amendment that will in effect provide information which we have related to air quality and to water quality at the Prince Albert Pulp Mill. I expect that these figures will show that there has been a considerable improvement in the effluent quality of the water following the introduction of secondary treatment late in 1971. I would, therefore propose to provide specifically the information which I think the Hon. Member is requesting but is not specifically stating so in his question.

I move seconded by the Hon. Mr. Thorson (Minister of Industry and Commerce) in amendment thereto:

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

- (1 (a) Whether any air emission surveys of the Prince Albert Pulp Mill Company Limited have been undertaken by the Department of Environment or the Saskatchewan Water Resources Commission. (b) If so, their findings. 2 (a) Whether any effluent quality surveys of the Prince Albert Pulp Company Limited Pulp Mill have been undertaken by the Department of Environment or the Saskatchewan Water Resources Commission in the period January, 1971 to November 30, 1973. (b) If so, how many times were effluent samples collected and what was the monthly average biochemical oxygen demand (BOD)

based on data acquired by or submitted to the department or Commission.

This will provide the information both before and after the installation of the improved effluent treatment facilities at that mill.

I hope that that is a clearer statement of the information sought by the Hon. Member. I would ask him to accept the information in that form and I think he will find that the water quality is a good deal better since the installation of the effluent treatment equipment up there. I would hope that he and the House would agree to that amendment.

MR. D.G. STEUART: (Leader of the Opposition) — Mr. Speaker, let me say that we are pleased that the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Byers) is prepared to give us this information, unlike the Minister of Natural Resources who apparently in his efforts to amend is attempting, I think, to hide and confuse the clear cut information we wanted in the last three returns. I think it is very important that the public recognize two or three things about the pulp mill. First, the vicious attacks mounted on the Prince Albert Pulp Mill by the NDP when in Opposition, about the 70 per cent owners of the pulp mill, Parsons and Whittemore, talk about a rip off and about raping our forests and polluting our rivers and the air, have strangely abated and stopped since they became the Government. Had this been true, then they are very delinquent in their responsibility in that they haven't done something about taking over the ownership of the pulp mill. Not only have they not taken over the ownership but we find out now that they have advanced Parsons and Whittemore, Mr. Karl F. Landegger, chief owner, United States of America, New York, about \$2 million to buy a local firm.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! I think we are getting away from the amendment. We must stay to the amendment.

MR. STEUART: — I'll stay to the amendment. Over \$1.5 million to buy a chemical plant that belonged to a co-op.

I also want to say . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! I think the Hon. Leader of the Opposition realizes that we can't have a wide ranging debate on an amendment. He must stick to the material of the amendment.

MR. STEUART: — I just want to say, Mr. Minister that the secondary treatment was put in and came into service in late 1971, bought and paid for and constructed during the time when we were the Government. When the mill was first built it was constructed with primary treatment for its effluent. It was always in the plans that secondary treatment and eventually tertiary treatment would be developed on the site of the pulp mill. This has been done and I am pleased it has been done.

I don't know what has been done about air emissions. I go to Prince Albert and the odor from the Pulp Mill is still

apparent when the wind is from the east, just as it was when we were the Government. I look forward to seeing the report on air emissions. I want to make it very clear that in regard to the Prince Albert Pulp Mill, the plans for the control of water pollution that have been completed and are now a fact of life were in fact always part of the plans of the Prince Albert Pulp Mill. The plans were started in 1970 as a matter of fact and completed in 1971 and came on stream in late 1971. If they are successful, and I understand from reports they have been successful, then again I join with the Member from Cannington to say that it gives the lie and proves to be a lie that was propounded by the NDP in the last campaign about the Prince Albert Pulp Mill, an institution and a company that has done a great deal for the people of Prince Albert and the people of that whole northern area.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — I rise in this debate just very briefly to say that one must say a word or two in rebuttal to the Leader of the Opposition with respect to the comments he made on pollution and the pollution emissions from the Prince Albert Pulp Mill Company.

I am glad to see that the Hon. Minister of the Environment has proposed this particular amendment which will give us not only air emission survey results but water effluent emission results. I am confident that what the public will see once the information is tabled pursuant to the Order, is a very significant decrease in the effluent emissions coming from the Prince Albert Pulp Mill since the middle part of 1972, the early part of 1972 and beyond.

The Leader of the Opposition says that this information will put an end to what he calls the lie, the NDP lie about water pollution. That doesn't happen to be the case, Mr. Speaker. Everybody in the Province of Saskatchewan will remember in the latter part of 1970 and early 1971 and into 1971 that samples of water supply were being shown to the people of the Province of Saskatchewan were water which was dirty in color, brown in color. One didn't have to be an expert to know by very cursory examination that the water certainly was very greatly polluted. Any time I went to the Prince Albert area they were complaining against the Prince Albert West Member at that time, who happened to be the Deputy Premier, urging him to do something about this water pollution problem. The Member from Prince Albert West was being petitioned on a regular basis by the residents of Prince Albert and area to have the pollution situation straightened out. He refused to act. In 1971 when our party and when members of the province got concerned about the pollution that was emanating from the plant they took action.

I don't want to get involved with the financial deals. This isn't a matter of the finances, Mr. Speaker. I am not going to discuss the giveaway, that the liberals have had habits of doing during their seven years. I refuse to get into that area of discussion. I could make a tremendous speech about the Liberals giving away from the public purse funds to support industry, but I am not going to do it, Mr. Speaker, because that is not in order.

I do want to say, to make it absolutely clear that this

information I am sure will show that the effluent is now satisfactorily under control at the Prince Albert Mill thanks to the good works and the good efforts of the Minister of Environment and the Department of the Environment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. A.R. GUY: (Athabasca) — Mr. Speaker, I certainly don't want to be out of order like the Attorney General who was speaking to this motion. I am not going to mention to the public of Saskatchewan the \$6 million that the NDP gave to Parsons and Whittemore. I am not going to mention the money that was lent to them just a few months ago, because I don't know whether any of that was spent on pollution control or not.

I was interested in what the Minister said and also what the Attorney General said about the effluent that was presented here in this Legislature by Members of the NDP. This effluent of course was taken before it went through the primary treatment, and Members opposite know that because it was taken by NDP supporters trying to embarrass the Government when they were in the process of getting the greatest industry that this province has ever seen.

I was interested in the comments of the Minister when he said that there has been an improvement in the effluent, because we were telling the then Opposition and the people of Saskatchewan that pulp mills could be constructed to provide jobs and to provide opportunities particularly in the northern part of this province and that pulp mills could provide the incentive to people who had been on unemployment and been unemployed for many years. We did point out to the Minister at that time that if governments were as sincere as the Liberal Government was, and has been proven to be by the fact that the Minister said that the effluent has improved in the pulp mill. We told them that we could provide the controls necessary for any pulp mill in this province to provide jobs and revenues to the province. They were disbelievers. Today it is surprising how they have changed their thinking and have changed their attitude towards this great industry and it could have been a much greater industry in this province if Members on the other side of this House had not sabotaged it.

I am very happy to support the amendment of the Minister of the Environment that will provide the information that we have said for years, we said it when we were the Government, we said it when we were in the Opposition before, that there is room for at least two or three pulp mills to provide jobs and to provide revenues, but the NDP took parts of this province and subjected them to poverty and to unemployment from now until eternity.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. GUY: — Effluent control can be mastered, we have the technology. We have proven it in the Prince Albert pulp mill. We could have proven it in other pulp mills if the NDP had not destroyed them. It goes to show, Mr. Speaker, that what we have said for many years that the NDP are more concerned with their political future than they are of the welfare of Saskatchewan people. We can control the effluent, we have, and

the Prince Albert pulp mill today is providing jobs, providing revenue and is the greatest industry that this province has ever achieved, and it came under a Liberal Government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. E.G. GARDNER: (Moosomin) — After listening to the Attorney General it almost sounded as if we were back in the 1971 election campaign. You remember, of course, at that time that pollution was a big issue, and particularly pollution in the North, they claimed of course that the Prince Albert Pulp Mill was polluting northern Saskatchewan. The facts have come out after this and we have subsequently found that the pulp mill was not polluting the air and was not polluting the water at any time. The NDP was simply wrong in the election campaign. You know about that same time the Federal Government designated the Prince Albert Pulp Mill as a standard for all Canada. Any mill that was built in Canada since, the Federal Government said that it would have to meet the high pollution standards of the Prince Albert Pulp Mill. It is quite obvious that the Prince Albert Pulp Mill wasn't then and never was unduly polluting the air, or water of northern Saskatchewan. I think for that reason it is very, very important that we get the information that was asked for by my colleague in this question.

MR. BYERS: — One additional point, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — The Minister has already spoken in moving the amendment, he can't speak again.

MR. C.P. MacDONALD: (Milestone) — Mr. Speaker, I don't want to prolong the debate because everyone has said just about everything concerning the argument. There is, however, one point that I don't want the public of Saskatchewan to overlook. It is this. In 1971 during the election campaign the NDP went up and down the Province of Saskatchewan, accusing the Liberal Government and the Liberal Party and Parsons and Whittemore and Karl F. Landegger of polluting the North Saskatchewan River and doing untold damage to the Province of Saskatchewan. The point I want to make is that there are only two treatment processes in the Prince Albert Pulp Mill, a primary and a secondary. Both of them were installed by a Liberal Government, there has not been one major installation of any type for treatment of the water effluent in the Prince Albert Pulp Mill put in by the NDP since they became the Government. I think that proves the lie that my colleague, the Member for Athabasca has indicated. One thing must be done, the people of Saskatchewan should be made very aware that there are no additional treatment facilities for the effluent in the Prince Albert Pulp Mill, none whatsoever since the NDP has taken over the Government of the Province of Saskatchewan. Those little bottles that they ran around with, that came out before it went through the primary treatment system are a clear indication of the kind of politics and the kind of deception that they took part in 1971.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. G.R. BOWERMAN: (Minister of Natural Resources) — I want to make a point with

respect to the Members who have spoken from the Opposition benches.

Anyone who has lived in northern Saskatchewan particularly those downstream from the Prince Albert Pulp Company Limited in Prince Albert will know that the effluent which was pouring into that river in the years since its start up until 1971 was not only contaminating the river, but it was killing the fish and the people of Cumberland House were required to stop their prime resource of fishing at Cumberland House because of the effluent and because of the problems of pollution in the Saskatchewan River. I suggest to you as well, Mr. Speaker, that the criticism which was coming on the Government at that time for the pollution which was being poured into the river was even taking the paint and the other metallic material off the aeroplane floats which were parked in the river at Nipawin and below Nipawin. Now that is a fact of life. The Member from down in the Moosomin country (Mr. Gardner) who really couldn't find his way north of Regina is now trying to stand in this House and declare that there was no pollution. I suggest to you that people living along the river were critical of the pollution in that river and its major cause was by the pulp mill and there is no way that the Liberal Opposition can get around that.

Yes, pollution has diminished in the river to this point in time and it is because of the implementation of the secondary treatment facilities there. I suggest to you that even after the implementation of the secondary treatment facilities to the plant in Prince Albert, Mr. Speaker, that in addition to that it was necessary when I was Minister of the Water Resources Commission to take additional action against the Prince Albert Pulp Company almost to the point of bringing them to a shutdown before they would stop acid spills and then pouring that effluent into the river. I suggest to you it was not only the secondary treatment, but it was the positive action of this Government that brought about the clearing up of the river.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. J.C. McISAAC: (Wilkie) — Just one word in reply to the Czar of the North, the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan (Mr. Bowerman). He is trying to confuse the issue of whether or not there was pollution from the effluent of the Pulp Mill at Prince Albert with the fact that there definitely was pollution of the Saskatchewan River from a chemical plant in Saskatoon, mercury poisoning, that had nothing whatever to do with the Prince Albert Pulp Mill in Prince Albert.

MR. BOWERMAN: — Two different rivers, you don't even know that!

MR. McISAAC: — Mr. Speaker, this is the kind of pollution the Minister is talking about killing fish. He is referring to a totally different incident, which shows I suggest how much he knows about the North or about the rivers of Saskatchewan. As far as pollution, Mr. Speaker, the Minister for Northern Saskatchewan should be a bit of an expert because he has done pretty well at polluting things himself in the North.

MR. WEATHERALD: (Cannington) — I wish to inform the House . . .

MR. BOWERMAN: — You are not closing the debate you are speaking on the amendment. You opened the debate and you must stick strictly to the amendment. You cannot roam on the topic, you must stick to the amendment.

MR. WEATHERALD: — I should like to make some remarks regarding the treatment facilities. If you look in Hansard, the Minister of Natural Resources (Ross Barrie) you will find an announcement showing in 1971 prior to the election, the announcement of the secondary treatment facilities, which proves beyond a shadow of a doubt that the treatment facilities that have made the water what it is today was announced long before the Government changed.

The second point that I should like to make is that it is well known that there were dead fish in that river long before the Prince Albert Pulp Mill was built. The Prince Albert City along with various other cities, smaller cities along that river, had been dumping sewage in that river since the beginning of their days on the banks of the river. So I just want to say in regard to the amendment, the amendment itself is quite satisfactory, but the NDP Government has not done anything whatsoever since the election to clean up the river that had not been announced prior to 1971.

HON. J.R. MESSER: (Minister of Agriculture) — Just a short point on the amendment. The Members to your left, the Opposition, have been talking about the Government trying to play politics in regard to pollution. Well, Mr. Speaker, for any who sat in the House as a Member of the Opposition prior to 1971, it's not a question of the Government of the day now playing politics, but the Members to your left playing politics as Opposition Members and playing politics as a government of that day.

Yes, they did inaugurate a secondary treatment plant for Prince Albert. But, Mr. Speaker, they know full well as does every Member sitting on the Government side of the House that it was because of the pressure of the Opposition of the day that they installed that treatment plant.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: — If there was one single theme in the session before we went to the election in 1971 it was in regard to pollution. Pollution from pulp mills and development of our forest products and it was because of that debate and because of the pressure of other interested citizens in Saskatchewan and the Opposition of the day that the inaugurated a secondary treatment plant at Prince Albert. It was not in operation until after the government changed.

The second issue, Mr. Speaker, which we have to keep in mind is that certainly there were regulations that were in force and in place at that time, but the government of the day, the Liberal Government prior to 1971 didn't have guts enough to enforce them. Since that time we have forced the Prince

Albert Pulp Company to live up to their obligations in regard to pollution regulations and that's why there has been a considerable improvement in regard to the pollution of the river in that area.

Amendment agreed to.

MR. WEATHERALD: — Mr. Speaker, I just wish to reiterate what I said earlier, is that the announcement of the plans for the emission control that resulted since 1971 were announced in the session of the 1971 Legislature and those plans were carried out and, of course, they were effective because the engineering that was installed was effective in controlling pollution.

The other point that I should like to make is in regard to what the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) had to say. He indicates pressure from the public. Well, I should hope that we won't have to all rise up in arms to get the Qu'Appelle Lakes cleaned up, which are a disaster area at present. And they have been a disaster in all the time that the Government has been in power and I hope to bring them a sealer of water next summer to let them take a first hand look at it.

Motion as amended agreed to.

RETURN NO. 50

MR. A.R. GUY (Athabasca) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 50 showing:

The population figures of Saskatchewan at the dates: (a) June 25, 1971; (b) June 25, 1972; (c) June 25, 1973; and (d) September 30, 1973.

He said: I think these are figures that all people in Saskatchewan would be interested to have. We have heard several sets of figures from time to time as to how many people actually are leaving the province. We know that they are leaving at very regular and in very significant numbers. We know that there has not been one new industry since 1971 under the NDP Government. We know that the birth rate in Saskatchewan is declining and when you take the declining birth rate with the exodus of people which is continuing at an ever increasing rate, that the population trends for the future of this province are very dim indeed. In fact, we have a report by the Federal Government this year that says within the next 20 years our population could be down another 50,000, 60,000, maybe as much as 80,000 or 90,000. I think this is very serious.

So, therefore, I think it's in the interest of all Saskatchewan people to have the absolute figures provided by the Government, so that we will know the extent of the exodus which is continuing, which the Government opposite promised to end if they became the government. They did, and instead of ending it the numbers leaving the province are continuing to go in droves and what is even more unfortunate, they are young people, they are trained people, who cannot find jobs in Saskatchewan, because there are no industries, there have been no industries and the question of population in the province is a very significant question today. I think in the Lakeview by-election, that that was one of the issues, was the decreasing population. The fact that there is no opportunity for young

people over in the Lakeview or any other area of Saskatchewan to find jobs, to stay at home, to raise their families, they've got to be always on the move out of the province, they can't find jobs in Manitoba or British Columbia for similar reasons. The NDP governments there are failing to solve the problems of unemployment. Therefore, we will be interested to get these figures as they have been requested here to see exactly what the trend in population, how fast it is going down.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, the Premier has asked me to move an amendment to this and I am going to because I believe that the people of Saskatchewan would be very interested indeed in population loss figures. You will note that the question asked by the Hon. Member from Athabasca relates only to January 25, 1971. I think it's important for the people of the province to know and for the Members of this Legislature to know, especially for the new Member from Lakeview (Mr. Malone) to know if he campaigned indeed on population loss, what the population loss was really like during the Liberal years, 1964 to 1971.

I should like the Member from Lakeview to know, as I'm sure all the people of Saskatchewan already know, if he doesn't know, if he campaigned on that, that in the years 1968 to 1971 the population loss in the Province of Saskatchewan reached an all time high for people leaving the Province of Saskatchewan. This was when we had a free enterprise government of the highest order. Probably the most free enterprise government of all the free enterprise governments anywhere in North America. These Members opposite, when they were in government, gave away all the financial opportunities they could to private industry. They did everything they could to get jobs in private industries in the Province of Saskatchewan and, yet, Mr. Speaker, the statistics show that the population loss, take, for example, in the year 1969 to 1970, was about 21,000 people in that period alone and then it continued downward. Over 15,000 people in the year subsequent to that. Something in the order of 30,000 to 35,000 people left the Province of Saskatchewan in those years, 1968, '69 to '71, middle '71 to '72. Those are facts, Mr. Speaker. We're not prepared, we're not concerned about showing the figures as they relate to 1971, '72, '73, since the years we've been in power. We are going to show them and there is still a loss of people in the Province of Saskatchewan. No one denies that. We do face economic problems. Some of these economic problems I think can be overcome if the Federal Government is prepared to co-operate with us, in such areas as freight rates, in such areas as Department of Regional Economic expansion, in such areas as incentives to industry and a population policy for the Government of Canada which seeks to limit the large growth in urban centres. That's what the Calgary Western Economic Opportunities Conference was all about. The western provinces realize that if we are going to get jobs and if we're going to keep people in the western prairie basin, we're going to need the assistance of the Federal Government to rectify some of these long standing injustices which have up to now been a barrier to us, to overcoming this very problem that we are discussing this afternoon.

I do want to point out to you, Mr. Speaker, that the Speech from the Throne said that there were something like 2,000 more manufacturing jobs last year alone created. I think that this is not perhaps as good as Members opposite would like, not as good as any of the Members on this side would like. But

I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, just one whale of a lot better than anything the Members produced when they were in government and occupying the Treasury benches.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — And so, while I say the job is a difficult one, to stem population loss I think it's important for the people of Saskatchewan to know the true facts and since I don't think that the motion tells us the true facts I should like to move, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Messer (Minister of Agriculture) an amendment to Return No. 50:

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

July 1 of each of the years 1968-1973 inclusive according to the population estimates published by Statistics Canada.

You will note, Mr. Speaker, by that amendment that we will give to the Members of the Opposition all of the information that they ask, plus we will give them information that they didn't ask. And if I were in their place I wouldn't ask it either from 1968 to 1971.

MR. D.G. STEUART: (Leader of the Opposition) — Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak on the amendment because when I finish speaking I intend to make a subamendment which will give us information from 1964.

Now, one of the pieces of misinformation that the NDP have spread around this province, and in some quarters unfortunately have been able to get away with is, that the population dropped when we were the government. I want to make it very clear that from 1944 to 1964 we had a CCF Government, the predecessor of the NDP, and population in this province went steadily down. We became the government in 1964. In the years 1964, '65, '66, '67, '68 the population of this province rose. Now granted, beginning in '69 and '70 it went down. We had tough years in agriculture, we had tough years, tight money, high priced money and we had a recession in the country which affected this province. But, I want to make it very clear as these figures in the subamendment will show when we see all the facts, that there were in fact more people in the Province of Saskatchewan, the population in the Province of Saskatchewan was higher in 1971 when we left office than it was when we came into power in early 1964. There were more people in the Province of Saskatchewan when we left office in 1971 than there were when we came into office in 1964 and that is a fact. It's an undeniable fact.

Now, let me point out that it was the NDP who went to the people in 1971 and said they would reverse this trend. And the trend when we went out of office was downwards. No argument about that. The trend has continued downward. Now the Attorney General talks about industry. We have pointed out in this House that one of the most fortunate facts since the NDP came to office in 1971, in June of 1971, that because of the upsurge in agriculture, we have prosperity. No thanks to

the Provincial Government, no thanks to the NDP, thanks to unfortunate circumstances in other parts of the world that have caused a food shortage. Thanks to Otto Lang and the action he took with the Wheat Board, thanks to the fact that the Wheat Board was under the direction of Otto Lang, yes, and the farmers know it. Farmers of all political faiths know this. The fact that he instituted a more vigorous sales policy through the Wheat Board and the Federal Liberal Government began a policy of making more credit available to all nations in the world. Thanks to those facts, also thanks to Operation LIFT that put our grain-handling system in shape for the first time in years, we have seen in the past two or three years the greatest upsurge in agricultural income that we have ever seen in the history of this country. We have seen, Mr. Speaker, thanks to that, we have experienced the greatest sales of all grains at the highest prices that we have ever had in the history of this country. These are facts, they don't need to be attested to by the NDP or the Liberals or anyone else. The farmers and the people of Saskatchewan know it.

We've never seen \$5 wheat, we've never seen \$10 flax, we've never seen \$2 or \$3 a bushel for barley and we've never enjoyed the sales that we've had these last few years, or the ability of our handling system, our railroad system and our handling system to operate it. So, we have had a very good year this year. We had a very good year last year, in fact, we have had the most prosperous years in agriculture that we've ever seen in the history of this province.

But let's take a look at what's happened on the other side of the coin, to the rest of our economy. We have today, Mr. Speaker, a prosperity that is based, strictly and almost totally on the upsurge of agriculture. The other part of our economy, the diversification of our economy just has not continued under the NDP as we were able to develop it under the Liberals. When you start in the far north of this province, in the mineral industry, you find that northern Saskatchewan, with the exception of welfare and Government spending is dead. Mining exploration has almost ground to a halt. There have been no new mineral finds in this province to give employment and add to our population since the NDP came to power. You look at resource development in the central and southern part of our province. The story is again the same. We're debating an oil Bill. You find that our oil reserves have gone down. You find employment in the oil industry has gone down. You find that oil prices have gone up, that's the only thing they can point to that has increased since they came to government in regard to gas and oil.

So, the NDP, has not even in this very prosperous time been able to maintain our population, they have not even in these very prosperous times been able to give jobs to all our young people who want them. In fact, our population decline has continued. Granted the population decline these last two years has not been as rapid as it was in the two years before the NDP came to power, but if you look at the total picture of when we were the government from 1964 to 1971 you will find that there was more basic industry, there were more potash mines, you'll find that for the first time in years oil discoveries went up, you'll find that for the first time in years we got more industry in here which provided more employment. So when we left office the population of Saskatchewan was actually higher than when we took over.

But in the last election the NDP went up and down this province and said to our small towns we will do something about the population, we will reverse the trend, we will save the small towns, we'll save the family farms and what's happened? Family farms have continued to disappear. You look in the small towns, sale after sale, farmer after farmer, forced to leave farming in the Province of Saskatchewan. You go to our small towns and you find that small town after small town is continuing its downward trend. People are evacuating or being forced out of rural Saskatchewan. What does that mean? It means that in spite of the agricultural prosperity brought on first by world events over which no one in Canada could possibly have any control and second by the vigorous, enlightened policy of the Federal Liberal Government we do have prosperity. The NDP have not been able to couple that national prosperity to a planned, industrial and business development in this province. In fact, on the contrary they have continued since they came to office to drive out business and industry with the result that the job opportunities in this province have not been produced, have not been developed, have not been presented to our people and our population, even in these relatively good times the population has gone down. The actions they have taken recently in regard to the timber industry and to the oil industry where they have broken their word and torn up contracts and seized and grabbed power and businesses, will not only continue this trend I suggest, Mr. Speaker, but as a result the population trend will continue to go down even more rapidly as long as the NDP is in power in this province. I think it is true that the only answer is to defeat them at the next election. Return this province to a government that will look at all sections of our economy, will look at the whole picture and do its best to encourage people to come back here. Show initiative, show new drive and return the province to some sort of freedom, some sort of hope, some sort of real honest development.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. STEUART: — Mr. Speaker, I wish to move — no I just bent down for a moment. It's hard to tell when you're as short as I am whether I am standing or sitting, that I admit. I move, seconded Mr. Grant (Regina Whitmore) that the amendment be further amended:

That the words "1968-1973" in the first line be deleted and the words "1964-1973" be substituted therefor.

MR. J.G. RICHARDS: (Saskatoon University) — Mr. Speaker, the debate which we have been engaged in in the last 10 or 15 minutes is the kind of debate which brings the Legislature into disrepute. The idea that either of the political parties whether the NDP or the Liberals or the Waffle, we haven't yet had our chance to show our bit, but we will, but neither of the political parties have been the major explanation of population changes in this province and it is enough to make any moderately intelligent citizen hold his head in his hands and cry. Obviously in a capitalist society as we live in today, the forces of corporate direction and international price movements of grains and oils, and discoveries of mineral resources are the reasons for the rise and fall of communities. And for us to fiddle around on the edge of this

and try and blame one another, is the most demeaning kind of politics which is not going in any event ultimately to produce a situation where we can hopefully through our political institutions make some serious changes.

Mr. Speaker, I should like the Assembly to take this debate to its logical absurdity and move a further subamendment to the effect that 1963-64 be deleted and we go right back to 1901 and thereby will be able to lambaste the Liberals, the Progressive Conservatives, the CCF and the Liberals when they come back again. We will discover the most rapid rate of population growth was in the first decade of the century when for the first half of it we were not even a province but part of the North West Territories. The logical conclusion from that is presumably that we should give up our provincial status and go back to being a colony in order to have a more rapid rate of growth.

Therefore, seconded by Mr. Weatherald (Cannington) my honorable seatmate . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. RICHARDS: — . . . who is at pains to elaborate that he has agreed to second this further subamendment in order to facilitate this illuminating debate, I would move:

That the word “1964” be deleted and the word “1901” be substituted therefor.

MR. SPEAKER: — The question before the House is on Order for Return No. 50, to which an amendment was moved by the Attorney General and the Minister of Agriculture. A subamendment was then moved to that amendment by the Leader of the Opposition and the Member for Whitmore Park (Mr. Grant).

The rules are quite plain and distinct that on any motions before the House you can have one amendment and one subamendment, but you cannot have a second subamendment until the first subamendment is disposed of, so I rule the sub subamendment as offered out of order.

MR. RICHARDS: — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order, if I told the Hon. Leader of the Opposition that the population in Saskatchewan in 1964 was 926,000 . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order!

MR. RICHARDS: — Mr. Speaker, I wanted to invite the mover . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order!

MR. RICHARDS: — . . . of the subamendment . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order!

MR. RICHARDS: — . . . to change the dates to 1901 . . . so that . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! I thought the Hon, Member could read the rules, but if he can't he can listen? When I am standing on my feet asking for Order, you are out of order, you have exercised your right to speak on this debate, you have no further right to speak on it. This subamendment is out of order. The discussion continues on the amendment and the subamendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. K. THORSON: (Minister of Industry and Commerce) — Mr. Speaker, it's been another revealing afternoon. The Liberal Party in Saskatchewan has demonstrated again that it never forgets anything. Never forgets anything. Never learns anything.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. THORSON: — The Liberal Party has never forgiven the people of Saskatchewan for catching on to them in 1971 and turning them out of office.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. THORSON: — They still feel it is some aberration of nature. Somehow, it shouldn't have happened. They never accepted the right of people in a democratic society to turn them out of office and bring in a new government. And now they want to go back as they have been doing this afternoon and plough the old ground and re-fight all of the election campaign of 1971 as though somehow or other they can turn the clock back (which I am sure they would like to do) and correct what they think was a mistake made by the people of Saskatchewan when they turned them out of office.

Mr. Speaker, it was no mistake.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. THORSON: — And this afternoon's performance by the Liberal Opposition in this Legislature has demonstrated again that it was no mistake.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. THORSON: — The people of Saskatchewan did the right thing when they turned them out of office in 1971.

Now, the Leader of the Opposition isn't even content to rely on facts, he has got to invent some of his own. He would like us to believe somehow that for instance the LIFT Program that that was a good thing. That was a good thing for the people of Saskatchewan, the LIFT Program. We heard him this afternoon in this debate, he said, "That cleaned up the grain-handling system."

Mr. Speaker, did the grain-handling system need cleaning up?

AN HON. MEMBER: — It did.

MR. THORSON: — It did. Well, then why was it that the farmers of Saskatchewan had to bear the burden cleaning it up?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. THORSON: — Think where the farmers of Saskatchewan would be today if they had the grain they could have produced except for the LIFT Program.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. THORSON: — It was the Liberal Party in Ottawa cheered on by the Liberal Party in Saskatchewan which forced our farmers to reduce the production of foodstuffs under the LIFT Program. And, why? Because the Leader of the Opposition in Saskatchewan said the grain-handling system had to be cleaned up. Apparently it was no responsibility of the grain-handling system itself or the Federal Government; just with the efforts of Otto Lang and the Liberal Party in Ottawa and in Saskatchewan to make the farmers bear the burden of cleaning up the grain-handling system under the LIFT Program.

Mr. Speaker, let's get some of the facts about the population statistics clear. I am looking at the publication of the Division of Vital Statistics of our Department of Public Health and there they show that the population in 1964 was 942,000 people in Saskatchewan. That is the year the Liberal Government came into office. In 1971 when the Liberal Government went out of office, the population was down by 16,000 to 926,000.

MR. STEUART: — It was 1965.

MR. THORSON: — Well, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition says it was 1965. The publication I have in front of me says 1964 and it says 942,000 people were in Saskatchewan in that year. But at the end of the Liberals' seven years in office, in 1971 the population was down to 926,000. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is quite true that in the first years that the Liberal Party was in office, the first term that is from 1964 to 1969, the population was increasing. It was increasing each of those years. Unfortunately it was increasing at a slower and slower rate each year and by 1969, it was declining. It took that long apparently under the Liberal Party in power in Saskatchewan for the previous increase, the rising trend, to be slowed down and finally under the Liberals turned down. So that the loss from 1969 to 1970 was 18,000 people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. THORSON: — The next year it declined another 13,000. That brings us to 1971 when the New Democratic Party was elected by the people of Saskatchewan, when the Liberals were turned out and in that next year up to 1972 the trend in population loss was slowed down, so that it was only 10,000. Going into the next year of 1973, the population loss was only 9,000.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident when the figures are in for 1974, we will see that a still smaller decline in the population has taken place.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. THORSON: — Everyone knows that job opportunities are increasing in the province, not only in the agricultural sector but in the non-agricultural sector. You read newspapers from across Canada, you see the stories telling about the job opportunities that are looking for people in Saskatchewan. You pick up our local newspapers, you see the ads and you know that there are jobs available in Saskatchewan and that there are more opportunities in Saskatchewan.

Talk to any businessman in Saskatchewan and ask him if he would like to go back to the last years under the former Liberal Government or whether he has had it better in the last two years. And in any part of Saskatchewan, in the cities, in the towns, anywhere you go in Saskatchewan, people will tell you that they are setting records in terms of business done, in terms of people employed, in terms of growth in the economy.

MR. MacDONALD: — . . . scared to turn up on Sunday.

MR. THORSON: — Mr. Speaker, I hope some of my Liberal friends will turn up on Estevan on Sunday when I meet the Oil Field Technical Society. They have cordially invited me to meet with them on Sunday. I am very much looking forward to it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. THORSON: — I am going down to Estevan tomorrow morning to speak on the radio there and I am looking forward to that very much. I am going to have a public meeting tomorrow night in Estevan and I would be delighted to speak to them in Estevan tomorrow night. The meeting is going to be held in the Nicholson Hall, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. THORSON: — I know that many of my friends are going to be there and I have many friends in Estevan and I am delighted and looking forward to meeting all of them there.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when you look at resource development like minerals, I noticed the Leader of the Opposition didn't say anything about the improvement in the potash sales for Saskatchewan. He didn't say anything about the expansion that is taking place with the new plywood plant in our forest industry. He didn't mention, for instance, the expansion that is taking place in Westank Industries. He was there at the opening, along with Senator Buckwold and some other Liberals. He missed out on the opening of the new GWG garment plant in Saskatoon the other day.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. THORSON: — Senator Buckwold was there along with myself. The new trailer plant expansion at North Battleford the other day. The cheese plant in Saskatoon that opened this year. Cheese plant in Yorkton and the cheese plant in Swift Current. All these new operations in the non-agricultural sector I think are setting a trend that is going to continue in the future. There are going to be more job opportunities in the non-agricultural sector and hopefully there are going to be more job opportunities in the agricultural sector under our farm programs, like FarmStart, and the Land Bank and the likes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. THORSON: — Mr. Speaker, I couldn't pass up this opportunity to set the records straight, to say and reassure the people of Saskatchewan they made no mistake when they turned the Liberals out of office in 1971. The Liberal Opposition has demonstrated that again this afternoon. I am sorry they are so petulant and petty about it and that they have not yet forgiven the people. But, Mr. Speaker, that's the way it is in Saskatchewan in the 1970s.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. D. BOLDT: (Rosthern) — Mr. Speaker, it is . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order!

MR. BOLDT: — I have got lots of time. It is apparent that you have lost control of the House, Mr. Speaker.

Air time is over and I have always been opposed to air time. Today again was a clear indication that air time is an absolute waste of public funds. I hope that the Government is going to get smart one of these days and do away with it. All the people of Saskatchewan have seen today how this House operates, and it is terrible. We have had these Motions for Returns Debatable on the Order Paper ever since the House started in November. Here one Minister asks for amendments and there is a purpose for that. They want these Motions for Returns to stay on the Order Paper while we recess so that this gives them another two or three months time so that we won't get answers even when the Session ends in March or April. That's the purpose of your amendments and they are absolutely stupid. Here the Minister of 'No Industry' gave us all the answers from 1964 and the Attorney General is very anxious that we get it on paper. The Motions for Return have been on the Order Paper for almost 12 days. One Minister I believe you said was in a correctional institution so that he can't answer.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BOLDT: — The other Minister is globetrotting somewhere, so he can't give us the answer. The result will be that these Motions for Returns will stay on the Order Paper. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that you will have control of this House so that we don't roam all over the world about statistics and try and get these Motions for Return off the Order Paper so that they

can be put to the civil service and answered. We want them answered. We don't want to have long amendments and debates about them.

MR. MESSER: — Mr. Speaker, I know that there has been some considerable debate in regard to both the motion and the amendment but I believe there are still some facts that should be brought out in regard to the question that is posed in the amendment. I therefore ask leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

RESOLUTIONS

RESOLUTION NO. 1 — ESTABLISHMENT OF GOVERNMENT FINANCED CHILD CARE CENTRES

MR. J.G. RICHARDS (Saskatoon University) moved, seconded by Mr. Lange (Assiniboia-Bengough):

That this Assembly urges Government consideration of the establishment of a network of fully Government financed child care centres to service all the families in the province, such a program to provide for: (a) universal accessibility at no charge to the user; (b) the control of child care centres by parent groups, co-operatives, community agencies; (c) twenty-four hour operation where need exists; (d) improved and well enforced standards; (e) the implementation of courses to train child care workers.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I apologize if I was in any sense out of order in that convoluted debate which occurred about the dates and the population increases and declines in Saskatchewan. I hope that we can restore some sense of honor to this Legislature for the remainder of the afternoon and that we can deal with, I trust, a good deal tri-partisan unity, with one of the major cultural changes and one of the major reforms which we should, at this juncture, be concerning ourselves.

It is with considerable honor, Mr. Speaker, that I can at this, time, rise in the House and introduce this Resolution and in some sense represent the issue about the need now, in 1973, for universal child care services in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, day care has been defined in many ways ranging from full day care programs to luncheon after school programs for children who are in school, half day programs for preschool children and occasional programs which amount to an elaborate baby-sitting scheme. There is no one precise model, but I think that all Members will agree that what we are talking about is not necessarily something which occurs uniquely during the day, uniquely during any particular hours of the day. What we are talking about are some very radical changes in how we think child care should be undertaken. Therefore, I think the expression 'child care' is more appropriate than the words 'day care' for the reforms which we have in mind.

Mr. Speaker, the petition which was introduced into the Legislature yesterday and read today, contains six principles. It talked about:

1. Universal accessibility. 2. About no direct cost to the user. 3. About 24-hour operation where needed. 4. It talked about improved and well enforced standards. 5. Courses to train child care workers. 6. Control by parent groups, co-ops and community agencies.

Mr. Speaker, what we are doing today, and what I am trying to do here, is to invite this Legislature to accept these six principles as the essential ingredients of any government program. Let me proceed through them point by point.

The first point is that of universality. Mr. Speaker, times are changing, thank goodness, and to get an indication of how much times have changed I could refer to the Hon. Member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt).

The Hon. Member for Rosthern is always a pillar in the dark, always a mad bench mark to gauge how far our society has veered to the left, to the right, up or down. I refer back to the Leader-Post of the 11th of November when the Hon. Mr. Boldt was talking about women raising children having no business working and if their husbands can't support them they shouldn't have married them in the first place. That was during a discussion at the Liberal convention about child care.

But obviously, Mr. Speaker,, women are working. To talk about the statistics just in Saskatchewan between 1971 and 1972 the number of men working on the labor force actually declined by one per cent. That same year there was a seven per cent increase from 98,000 to 105,000 in the number of women working. If we talk about the percentage of women who are in the labor force, who are working outside of the home, there is a constant increase from year to year. In 1961 — 28.7 per cent; 1971 — 36.5 per cent. These are Canadian figures and the Saskatchewan figures would be somewhat lower.

I don't think there is any question about it, Mr. Speaker, that in 1973 women and men have come to accept that the roles which they play shall not be defined solely by the men at work and the women at home. We are going to accept the fuller roles which both sexes can play of being both parents and active workers in society. And, we in society, have to adjust ourselves to those changed consequences and must take them seriously and not really just give them lip service. Because if we take those ideas seriously that the women, as well as the men, have the right to be in the work place then we should accept the converse that the man has the right to be at home if that is the appropriate decision of the couple, then the situation in Canada doesn't obviously accord to that. We have only given lip service to that idea and we have not made it a reality because we have not provided child care services.'

I quote from a Federal Health and Welfare Report on day care which concluded:

One and a quarter per cent of the children of working mothers were actually, in 1971, in child care centres.

That percentage should be approximately higher for Saskatchewan at that time and it will be somewhat higher now. At the time there were 17,400 children out of 1.4 million children of working parents who were actually in nursing homes. Prorating for Saskatchewan, that would imply that there were over

7,000 working mothers in Saskatchewan, with 50,000 children. But, in Saskatchewan in 1973, there are fewer than 900 spaces in child care centres available for children right now. There are 50,000 children of working mothers, there are 900 spaces.

Incidentally, there are over 100,000 children in the age group of pre-school 0-5. If one argument for the extension of child care services pertains to the fact that women are increasingly involved in the work force, another argument is for the children themselves, in terms of their development. More and more people have come to recognize the value of peer influence and the value of children being involved with other children in the kind of program which a good child care centre can provide.

I again, could refer to Doctor Bloom, who as a past president of the American Educational Research Association, referred to the crucial importance of the pre-school period in terms of children interacting one with the other and for later development. I quote:

Fifty per cent of all the factors that determine intellectual functioning are formulated by age four and that we would expect the variations in the environment of relatively little effect on IQ after age 8. We would expect the greatest effect likely to take place between the ages of 1 to 5. Increasingly, educators and others who are concerned with children emphasize the crucial importance of the very young years if children are to develop to their full potential and one of the ways that they can develop to their full potential is by the existence of child care centres.

Mr. Speaker, child care does not imply the abandonment by parents of their responsibility for raising children. It does mean, however, a radical change in people's expectations about how this is to be done. It implies expectations about the women's roles being out in society as well as at home and the converse. I want to emphasize that what we are about here in this Legislature, besides appropriating funds and debating the fine points of subamendments to amendments, is that we should be stating that we do accept that principle. We do accept the changing nature of society and we aren't like the Hon. Member from Rosthern, insisting on women not working and staying at home.

Mr. Speaker, it isn't just a cultural question, it isn't just a question of women deciding that they want to get out of the home and, therefore, they want child care. There is a specific economic aspect. Most of the women who work, have to work, An indication of that is the kinds of groups, which across Saskatchewan, have given their wholehearted endorsement to universal day care.

I could refer to the resolution, for example, passed by the recent convention of the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour:

Whereas working women are now a permanent sector of the labor force and are one of the most exploited and discriminated against segments.

Whereas working women with children pay up to 50 per cent

of their salary for child care.

Be it resolved that the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour press the Provincial Government to start acting as they were talking before elections, by instituting subsidized child care centres in all Saskatchewan cities, professional staff hired by the Government to provide educational opportunities for pre-school children.

This was the statement as adopted by the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour. The Saskatoon Labour Council adopted a very similar statement. It said that it supports, in principle, the establishment of day care centres for working parents and urges the Government to continue and expand the introduction of the program.

I could also refer to the Regina Labour Council. The Regina Labour Council said and I quote:

The executive and members of the Regina Labour Council wish to record their complete support for the attached petition (which refers to the petition presented to the Legislature). We are concerned with a lack of adequate day care facilities, in the Province of Saskatchewan.

We go from there and I should like to quote a very interesting letter from Mrs. Phyllis Trotchie who is an educational counsellor for the Métis Society. And, again, it is an indication of the concern about Métis people for the provision of adequate child care facilities in the province. I quote;

I work for the Métis Society of Saskatchewan as an educational counsellor. Through our program we place people into upgrading classes, trade courses and university. Over half of these students are women, many of them are single parents hoping to provide a better way of life for themselves and their children. By the same token many are married and living with their husbands, but their reasons for going to work or school are the same.

Not a day goes by that these women don't have baby sitting problems. They have resorted to poor baby sitting arrangements in order to go to work or school. These baby sitters quit suddenly, don't show up for work and, generally, are very unreliable, which only harms the child more than anyone. These women apply for work or school and when it is time to start they can't locate a half-way reliable baby sitter, or worse yet, they start and then later have to drop out because of the old baby sitting problem. In this day and age of social reform these people, and some of them are men, shouldn't have to put up with these problems. Good day care is just not available for these people. The existing ones are too few in number and too expensive. The quality of some of these may also be questionable. We must have good day care facilities available for these people at a price they can afford to pay. These will benefit the child, who is most important and our most precious possession. The present Government's failure to act on this matter leaves me to think they may have the same attitude as Mr. Dave Boldt. I hope the present

Government acts soon before it is too late. After the election the Liberals may be the ones to appeal to and Mr. Dave Steuart seems to have the right attitude to day care.

You will be glad to know that, Dave. You got a compliment from the Métis Society.

In referring to the Métis Society, let me go once again to UCWIC, the Unemployed Citizens Welfare Improvement Committee, Mrs. Helen Crudwick, president:

The lack of readily available adequate child care is leaving especially women on low income no choice but to stay home, locked up with their children and getting on each others' nerves.

It is dramatic statements like that and I could also quote from People for Child Care Action Committee in Saskatoon and a pamphlet they are distributing:

It is our feeling that child care should be recognized not only as a necessary service to the structure which is tremendous potential for improving the quality of life for all families in communities. To that end we feel that child care, like Medicare, should be transferred from the realm of a social service to that of a public utility.

Mr. Speaker, we see that groups ranging from Women's' Liberation to groups who are explicitly involved with the problems of working women and working parents, generally, all of these groups recognize and are demanding that there be universal accessible child care services in the province now. Now this Legislature has the chance, this afternoon, by a show of unanimity to support such a motion. Also in the New Democratic Party, I might remind them in their New Deal for People in 1971 and even before that, that the Hon. Member for Regina North West (Mr. Whelan), wrote in his letter to the Leader-Post recently claiming that he was involved in promoting day care as far back as 1968. I wish you well, Ed, in the progress of that program within the caucus.

In 1971 in the New Deal for People it promises to provide child care centres for children of working parents and provide after school programs. Come the 1971 NDP convention there was an excellent resolution, and I shall just read the first sentence:

In place of the present Child Welfare Act as it relates to day care centres, government financed community controlled day care centres be established.

The New Democratic Party declared itself in the New Deal for People in a resolution at the convention in 1971, in a resolution at the convention in 1972, to be unambiguously in favor of universally accessible day care programs. But, Mr. Speaker, why was it necessary that in 1973 we come back again to day care resolution within the New Democratic Party convention and this time the resolutions have to complain about inaction by the Government and insist upon immediate action. In 1973:

Be it resolved that this Government take immediate

action to set up child care centres throughout the province . . .

and proceeds to describe what further action should be taken.

Mr. Speaker, we have had many words from the New Democratic Party, going back to Mr. Whelan's statements about it in 1968. We have the statement in the New Deal for People, the statement in 1971 convention, the statement in the 1972 convention calling for enactment upon the resolution in 1971, and the statement in the 1973 convention calling upon enactment of the 1972 resolution, calling upon enactment of the 1971 resolution, calling for an enactment of the promise in the New Deal for People.

But still on the 14th of December, 1973, the only concrete public statement which I know of, which the Government has with respect to day care is a letter from the Minister which appeared on October 31st in the Star-Phoenix, in which the Minister admits there are obvious needs, that there remain many unanswered questions and that he hopes to be able to answer them soon.

Well, I certainly wish the Minister well and I hope there will be answers soon. I'll return to the question about what the Government is intending to do according to my knowledge, in a minute.

Mr. Speaker, there are obviously criticisms that have been levelled at the idea of a universal accessibility. One of the major criticisms is the argument of who will use it. Will it merely be a program for the middle class, will it merely be a program for lazy housewives who don't want to do their job of being parents? Apart from the implication and the snide reference, which is implied in such criticisms towards women, I think there is a very simple and rational argument to the criticisms of universal accessibility. Provided that we fund such programs through progressive taxation, the program need not constitute, in any sense, a subsidy of the poor to the wealthy. And from the point of view of the child, to force an unhappy mother to stay home when she does not want to be home with her child, is not in the best interest of the child.

Another question about criticism of the universal accessibility idea is the question of need. It has been alleged by certain officials in the Social Services Department that because there exist unfilled spaces in some of the day care centres now, obviously the need is not as great as I portrayed it and officials can quote figures that in 1972 the utilization of the existing spaces was only 65 per cent. The answer to that, Mr. Speaker, is that the bulk of the present centres, or private centres have very inadequate programs because of which many parents are reluctant to place their children. But for the few good child care centres which do exist, they all have waiting lists. For example, there are the Family Service Bureau in Saskatoon or the Regina University Child Care Centre in Regina. To take the waiting list for the child care of the Regina University, with 25 spaces they have a waiting list which ranges between 10 and 25, between 40 and 100 per cent of capacity.

The second principle, Mr. Speaker, that I want to emphasize is the idea that this should not involve a direct charge to the user. Obviously, there is no such thing as a free lunch.

There is a certain reactionary economist colleague of mine who is famous for having said that and that truism obviously goes. Somebody has to pay for child care services as nothing is free.

I think that if we recognize the principle of child care as being as integral and as important to society in 1971 as the principle of universal and free access to public education, for example, was to previous generations, I think we should not apply a means test to this type of service.

Again, when we talk about the question of whether such a program would amount to the poor subsidizing the rich, whether the middle class would use child care centres and not the poor, one ought to take into account that even though a family may be earning a middle class income, given the relationships within a family, the woman may very well still be exploited within a family whose income is adequate, nominally, to pay for child care.

I think that we have to recognize this is one of the things which we are learning and one of the great aspects of inequality in our society which we have failed previously to address ourselves to and that is the question of male-female inequality irrespective of class and income.

The third, and I trust it is a very elementary principle, Mr. Speaker, is that we should be talking about 24-hour day care when needed. There are obviously people who work not during the day, but in the night and evening shifts, and they should where needed have child care facilities available.

The fourth and fifth principles relate to improved standards, courses for training workers. I don't want to get into detail about what is needed in this domain, but obviously there is a good deal lacking in many of the present centres.

Mr. Speaker, I should like at this time to distribute two items to Members, one is a pamphlet distributed by the women and the parents involved in the demonstration today. The second item is an article "We must have Day Care" a personal and political plea written by Mrs. June Bantjes from Saskatoon. I make a special plea for Members to read this article, not for the statistics involved, not for the percentages of working women, not for any facts and figures in costs, but I think this article gives the flavor of the problems that are faced by many single women with children, and without adequate child care facilities.

Mr. Speaker, in quoting from that article I should like to refer to the problems which do exist in many of the private child care centres which are in existence and which subject to inadequate regulation are providing totally inadequate facilities. The article refers to the Peter Pan Kiddies Centre in Saskatoon:

When I arrived at 9:45 a.m. there were two workers and 25 children, five more expected shortly. All the kids were sitting in front of a television set, some restless, some listless, some gazing apathetically at the screen for lack of anything better to do, others wriggling and squirming. Two little boys started to talk. "Now Bradley be quiet, we can't hear Mr. Dressup," shouted a

middle aged helper. Most of the kids looked as though they couldn't care less about whether they could hear Mr. Dressup. They probably would have liked to be outside. Even the two-year olds had to sit still and be silent. When television was finished, the children were made to sit quietly until there was no sound from them at all before they were allowed to go and play.

Now, Mr. Speaker, people may feel that is a detailed kind of item which should not be introduced into this general level of discussion but obviously there do exist problems about what kinds of programs are required in quality as well as in quantity.

Sixthly, Mr. Speaker, I think the only way that we can really address ourselves to that problem of quality as well as quantity, is to state clearly that programs should be controlled by parent groups or other community agencies, that they should not be privately developed. I think that it is essential that we not have private child care centres, that child care be not adopted for profit. Parents should be involved to the maximum extent feasible through electing boards of directors and through being directly involved in the administration and running of child care.

Mr. Speaker, rumors abound within the Government and around the Government of those who are interested in the issue of child care, about new programs, being thought up to be introduced presumably at the spring Session in 1974. There is talk about increased expenditure. There is talk about increased subsidies, there is talk about guide lines for the number of spaces which the hope will be created. Some of these ideas, Mr. Speaker, may be excellent, some of these ideas I am very dubious about. But I think that what is lacking is the trust and the faith that people of the province be involved in this debate. I beg of the Government, before it comes forward definitely with what it has to introduce here, that it be prepared to state in a general White Paper and in general principles, what it proposes for child care services. That it allows for the flexibility of parent groups to engage in different kinds of child care as they see fit, whether they are in Creighton in the North or whether they are in Estevan in the South. And that there be no hard blueprint come forth from the Department of Social Services with which we must all agree.

In concluding my remarks, Mr. Speaker, and in moving this motion I should like to invite the Legislature today to make a clear statement of principle of what it thinks to be the minimum necessary ingredient of an adequate child care program. We can talk about the low level of subsidy in Saskatchewan relative to the higher levels in Alberta and Ontario. I don't think that we want to engage in the relative game of about who is subsidizing more or less because the answers to that are not particularly interesting. We don't want to have a program in which we subsidize somewhat more, we want comprehensive universal day care available to people at no direct cost to the user.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I should like to move this Resolution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. D.G. STEUART: (Leader of the Opposition) — Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a few words about this motion, but before I get into what I have to say, I should like to say a word or two regarding some of the remarks by the mover of the motion, the Member for Saskatoon University (Mr. Richards) about one of our Members, Mr. Boldt.

Mr. Boldt made a statement about day care centres in Saskatoon and I disagree with that statement. There are things that I say that I am sure Mr. Boldt disagrees with and there are things that Mr. Boldt says that I disagree with. I want to say this, Mr. Boldt represents a school of thought in the Liberal Party that might be called right wing. I would point out though, for the edification of the Member who just sat down, we in the Liberal Party have always prided ourselves that we do have room for a great body of opinion within our party. I am very proud of the fact that although Mr. Boldt disagrees with some of the directions of the Liberal Party, he doesn't quit and sit on some other side of the House. He stays with his party and does his best, from time to time, to influence the direction that we take.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. STEUART: — Whether he succeeds or not is up to him.

I also want to point out, again, while I disagree with the stand that he has taken on child care centres, I respect Mr. Boldt's character in most ways. I want to point out that Mr. Boldt embodies characteristics of honesty, of hard work, of decency. I want to suggest that although the Member from Saskatoon University may have the democratic right to be as critical of Mr. Boldt as he has been and to take him to task as he has done in this House publicly, he should take a look at some of the Members opposite and some of the Members on this side, who like Mr. Boldt and many thousands of other people in this province, embody the spirit of hard work, of thrift and of Christian help for their neighbors. Mr. Boldt has been a good citizen of this province and I should point out . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order in the galleries!

MR. STEUART: — I would point out that Mr. Boldt, over the years has helped many people and he has helped them with the money that he has earned himself. There is a great tendency on the part of some people to help people with someone else's money or with someone else's work, or with someone else's energy. So I just want to point out, while I disagree on this particular issue with Mr. Boldt, I do not intend to sit in this House and see him held up to ridicule because he has the courage of his convictions about this issue and other issues.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. STEUART: — Mr. Speaker, the Member who moved and brought this Resolution into the House says that times are changing, and they are. He pointed out that we have, as a society, been slow to recognize this change in regard to the assistance that we

give to working families and their children. And we have. Our Government made some moves towards day care centres. I freely admit that they were not enough, they were neither broad enough nor fast enough but we did make some moves. I am very pleased that the Government opposite has said that they intend to advance and carry on and improve the program and spend more money on the work that has been started and I welcome this.

I look forward to seeing what they intend to do. I look forward to seeing whether they intend to fulfil the commitments they made to the people of the province before the election in the changes, in the moves, in the money they spend and the policy they bring down in regard to day care centres.

I can agree with many, if not most, of the things that the Member from Saskatoon University has embodied and placed in his Resolution before this Legislative Assembly. I do believe that we must be more concerned about the children of working parents. Working parents are a fact of life today in our society and if there is any change, Mr. Speaker, I think the change will be that in the future there will be even more working parents than there are today.

I firmly believe that we are doing a serious disservice to them and to the children involved if we fail to move, and move faster than we have in the past, in making available professionally run day care centres. I also believe that is a good move and it will be a good principle if we can involve the parents themselves, in the development of day care centres in the province.

Again, I believe that we should look at many of them as easily available as is possible and is practical. I am afraid that I don't agree with the idea of universality. I think that we have been carried away in too many of our programs with the principle of universality. We should make it very clear that we will be as generous as we can, we will be as open as we can to allow people to make use of day care centres as a development with government help and government assistance. But I quite firmly don't believe that people who have the money and can afford to look after their own children, should be subsidized. I think we should make day care centres available but I think people who can afford it and who have the money should be required to pay something towards the upkeep of these day care centres.

I think that we should make it as generous as possible. The minute you talk about this, you talk about a means test and I think the means test should be as high as is possible and is practical. I don't believe we should set a tough or a difficult means test so that we deny day care centres for anybody but the very well-off or, the very poor. The large group in the middle of whom it may be questioned whether they could afford day care centres, I don't think they should be excluded.

But our welfare programs and many other programs have tended to be hurt, have tended to cost too much and have been abused because we continually get talked into this idea of universality when we won't make decisions — I refer to the family allowances. The present Government made the decision that they pay everybody the \$20. Well I don't think that everybody should receive \$20 in family allowances. I think

that some people need more than \$20, I think some people need less than \$20.

The result of this sort of fixation with universality is that too often the people in our society that really need the help get less than they need and people who don't need it at all receive help. They take it, of course. Sometimes they have no choice in taking it. I think, very often, we give the wrong help to the wrong people and we deny other people the real genuine help that they need.

As far as I am concerned I will support the idea of more involvement of the Government in the development of good, well-run day care centres. I will support the idea of more involvement of the parents themselves in the running and the organizing and the developing of day care centres. I am going to look forward to the debate on this Resolution. I think it is a timely one and a good one. I will look forward to hearing both sides of the House, because I don't think this will be debated along party lines. Certainly it won't be debated along party lines as far as our party is concerned. It really hasn't anything to do with political philosophy. I think it has to do with the philosophy of society in general and I think that the Members on both sides will speak and talk and vote as they see the situation. I know that is what our Members will do and I look forward to this debate. I think I can support most of the Resolution. I will look forward to hearing Members on both sides of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. G. MacMURCHY: (Minister of Education) — Mr. Speaker, I rise as a member of the New Democratic Party and a Member of the New Democratic Government to speak in favor of publicly supported day care programs.

It is unfortunate that the Minister of Social Services, Mr. Taylor, is in Ottawa at a Corrections Conference. He is the Minister who has the responsibility for the child care program in his department. I am sure that he would be glad to be here and join in the debate today.

The Resolution, Mr. Speaker, that was put forward by the Member for Saskatoon University (Mr. Richards) contains many sound principles that are worthy of support. I endorse them. In fact, I understand that the Department of Social Services is now working on a program for day care. To that extent, Mr. Speaker, the Resolution is a bit behind times when it urges consideration of an idea that already has been considered, is now actually being developed.

I am prepared to endorse many parts of this Resolution. However, in some cases I believe the work has taken us beyond the concepts being put forward here and I am sure that Mr. Taylor, the Minister of Social Services will probably be introducing an amendment to add strength to this proposal.

In discussing child care it is important to remember we are not talking about something new. Child care centres already exist in the province. They exist in other provinces of Canada. Other countries have had them for years. There is no question about the need, Mr. Speaker. If there was no need

there would be no private centres in operation today. The real question is not whether there is need, but what is the best way to meet that need. I propose that the need can best be met, not by Government run centres but by centres started and operated by or through parents themselves. With public help, with public assistance, where that is required.

Mr. Speaker, there are several situations in which child care services could be needed. The most important in my opinion, is where the income of the family breadwinner, whether that breadwinner be male or female, is low and the other spouse must also work to make ends meet. A low single income should not prevent a man and his wife from having a family, but without child care this is almost impossible.

Another priority situation, it seems to me, where child care is needed to the single parent family, where the mother or the father have been deserted, the remaining parent is at home to look after the children. Many of these people are on welfare and they have no choice, unless there are adequate day care centres available they will continue to have no choice.

I was glad to hear the statesman-like approach of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart). Glad to hear his opinion. I think I agree with him that opinions of Members of all sides of the House should be heard. I think the opinion of the Member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) should equally be heard. I know that he gave a sterling defence, the Leader of the Opposition, of the Member for Rosthern, but I hope that the Member for Rosthern will speak out and be heard and not be muzzled. Not be called ridiculous, as he was once before. The question is, will he support child care so people can get off welfare, or will he favor welfare and leave the parent at home. We shall be waiting to hear from the Member for Rosthern and all Members from the other side of the House and this side of the House as well.

I think a third priority situation, Mr. Speaker, involves people who normally can look after their own children without income problems. But they have periodic difficulties. Maybe they are even on a seasonal basis and I think about rural families, rural families where the wife might be needed to help out in the seeding, or the haying, or the harvest. Often these people ask and can find a neighbor to look after their children, or perhaps there is a relative nearby. If that can be done, so much the better, but in more and more cases today, we find the young farm family has few relatives to call on for this type of support. The brothers and the sisters have moved to the city. Sociologists call it the decline of the extended family. It can mean a new need for organized day care in our rural communities to help young rural couples and there are a lot of them going out there in this province.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me the lowest priority need, is where a parent has adequate income, no seasonal needs, but merely wants to have someone else look after the children. This need should be met because everyone needs a break now and then, but I believe that in all possible cases people who have children should raise them too. A child raised by his parents, in the family, good parents who can take the responsibility seriously, this child, it seems to me, will have a better rearing, more personal attention, a better background for its life as an adult, than the one who was raised by people who are not

related to him. This sort of childhood should be encouraged. It is necessary. It is desirable to recognize that society has duties to fulfil in raising and educating children. But I believe the prime responsibility lies with the parents and that duty should be taken seriously, both with respect to child care and subsequently into kindergarten and into the schools. It would be a serious mistake to encourage public institutions to take over child rearing roles beyond the point that is legitimate and justifiable in terms of need. This is basically a duty of parents, it is the right of parents. Our program in child care and in education in this province should reflect this.

Mr. Speaker, the Resolution before us proposes 100 per cent Government financing of child care with no charge to the user. I believe that this is neither required nor desirable in a child care plan. I do not agree with the mover that the people of Saskatchewan should subsidize day care for the rich. I believe that those who have the ability to pay for child care should pay for it and I say that because child care is primarily a parental right and a duty and those who have the financial capacity to exercise this right should perform this duty. A better alternative to subsidizing those with high incomes would be to charge fees on a sliding scale. People with low incomes and high need should have access without charge. People with higher incomes should pay a partial fee and the well-off should contribute fully to the care of their children. Mr. Speaker, I believe a sliding scale of fees is both economically fair, it is also socially desirable. I say this, because when it comes to child care there is a difference between those who create demand for the service and those who need the service. I expect we will find that the strongest demand for child care will come from the people from the top of the income ladder. People who have enough income to pay for it and those whose need is social, not economic, will demand the care. On the other hand, those who need it, will be on low income, like single parents, as I mentioned a few minutes ago. It would be unfortunate, it would be tragic, Mr. Speaker, where a child care program was swamped with demands from those with less need and unable to give priority attention to those who are maybe less vocal but certainly more needy. I would oppose a flat fee. It seems to me a sliding scale of fees would help to assure that the program is able to serve the needs and not just simply the demand.

Mr. Speaker, it would be desirable to develop our parent control centres on a co-operative basis, to use community colleges to train both staff and parents in operating the centres. I should like to discuss co-operatives, I should like to discuss the role of community colleges in child care further and I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned

The Assembly adjourned at 4:43 o'clock p.m.