

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fourth Session — Seventeenth Legislature
22nd Day

Tuesday, March 5, 1974.

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. E. C. WHELAN: (Regina North West): — Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to introduce to this Assembly two groups of students from the constituency of Regina North West. They are located in the west gallery, the first group I am pleased to introduce, Mr. Speaker, is made up of 53 Grade Eight students from the R. J. Davidson School. Their teachers, Mr. Duperreault and Mr. Peever are with them. The second group of students, Mr. Speaker, is from Saskatchewan House, their teacher, Mrs. Zikman is with 14 members of the class from the Institute of Applied Arts and Science.

Members join me I am sure, in welcoming them and expressing the wish that their stay with us will be both informative and educational.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. W. A. ROBBINS: (Saskatoon Nutana Centre): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to take this opportunity to introduce to the House a group of students from Bishop Murray School from Saskatoon. I believe they are in the Speaker's Gallery. I realize that these pupils came to Regina today in company with another school and I think another Member will bring greetings to that group shortly. My understanding is Mr. Neiman is the teacher with the group from Bishop Murray. I know this school very well, it is within a block of my home. I often skate on their rink at night. I know a number of the students, I think I would recognize some of them who live in the neighborhood.

I hope they have a pleasant stay in the Legislature today and I hope to meet them for a short period around 3:10 out at the Well. I sincerely hope they have a safe journey home.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. J. G. LANE: (Lumsden): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to join with the Hon. Member in welcoming these students from Bishop Murray School. I have a very close relative teaching there, namely my mother. It gives me a great deal of pleasure to join with the Hon. Member in welcoming them to this Legislative Assembly.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. R. ROMANOW: (Saskatoon Riversdale): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to join with my colleagues in welcoming the students from St. Dominic School who as I understand it, accompanied students from Bishop Murray.

March 5, 1974

St. Dominic is located in Montgomery Place in my constituency and the students are accompanied, Grade Seven and Grade Eight students, accompanied by their Principal, I believe, Mr. Lord. He is present also in the Speaker's Gallery.

I am sorry that I likely won't be able to join the students for a few minutes because of the proceedings in the House this afternoon, but I certainly want to share the sentiments expressed by my colleague from Saskatoon and the Members opposite that they have an enjoyable and entertaining time and have a nice trip back to Saskatoon.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

GOVERNMENT PURCHASE OF PRIVATE BUSINESSES

MR. H. E. COUPLAND: (Meadow Lake): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders- of the Day I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Kowalchuk). I understand that negotiations are under way or completed for the purchase of three private businesses in the Meadow Lake Provincial Park. I am wondering is it the policy of the Department to eradicate all private business from the provincial parks in the province?

HON. J. R. KOWALCHUK: (Minister of Natural Resources): — Mr. Speaker, no it is not this Government's intention to eradicate all private business within provincial parks, but in this case it was of very extreme importance that we proceed to deal, on a voluntary basis, to purchase these three businesses. It was freely negotiated and I think it was a real good job done.

SOME HON.MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. COUPLAND: — A supplementary question, will these businesses be leased out for operation or will they be run by the Government and be a place for a lot more civil servants?

MR. KOWALCHUK: — This decision will be made in due time. We haven't completed negotiations yet and we will be making these decisions in due course.

NOTICE FOR PRIORITY OF DEBATE

MR. J. C. McISAAC: (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with I would like to ask you, Sir, and Members of the House for leave under Rule 17 to move a motion seeking priority of debate for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance.

Briefly, Mr. Speaker, that matter is the continuing dramatic and drastic decline in the prices received by producers for finished beef cattle in the Province of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. McISAAC: — Very briefly, Mr. Speaker, a check of the one market that is closest to home for me, the North Battleford Livestock Pool Market, shows beef prices for finished beef January 18th to be \$53.50 per hundred. That gradually declined, \$51.60, \$51.50, \$48, \$47, \$45, \$43 yesterday and \$44 today. A decline of approximately \$9 in a five to six week period, Mr. Speaker, representing a financial loss per animal of \$90 to \$100. Mr. Speaker, I think this continuing dramatic decline in the face of rising feed costs and other rising costs that the producer is faced with deserve consideration under this Rule.

Mr. Speaker, here is the subject matter for your consideration and I ask for leave to debate that particular matter.

MR. SPEAKER: — The Hon. Member has submitted in writing the subject matter of the topic which he raised. Under Standing Order 17(2) it states that two hours' notice must be given to the Clerk of the Assembly so that it can be properly taken into consideration. So I believe that at this time I shall take this as notice for tomorrow.

MR. McISAAC: — Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the fact that two hours' notice wasn't given. I realize that there is provision to allow proceedings and I certainly accept your ruling in that respect.

MR. D. G. STEUART: (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Members opposite recognize the serious situation. I would be amazed if they weren't prepared to give leave.

HON. R. ROMANOW: (Attorney General): — If I can speak to that, I don't think it is a matter of us giving leave, it is a matter of the Rule which I would invite the Opposition sometime to read.

MR. E. C. MALONE: (Regina Lakeview): — If I may, the Rule provides that you can waive the notice and I would ask the Members opposite to give leave for you to waive the notice.

MR. ROMANOW: — That's right, it does provide for waiving of the notice, Mr. Speaker, but the reason for the waiving is some- thing that would have occurred within that two hour period which wouldn't have allowed the giving of the notice. Otherwise why would the two hour notice provision be in there. Do you mean to tell us that this is something that arose in the last two hours? This has been kicking around by the Liberals for the past one month, by the Federal Liberals.

MR. T. M. WEATHERALD: (Cannington): — The matter that the Attorney General understandably being a lawyer wouldn't understand is that the market report came over today at 12:50 which was a substantial reduction today in the price of cattle . . .

March 5, 1974

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WEATHERALD: — . . . and which is within the time limit prescribed and that is precisely why the motion is brought in now.

HON. J. R. MESSER: (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order, I have been in this Legislature since 1967 and we have had a number of priorities of debate and on every occasion without exception, Mr. Speaker, there has been the two hours' notice given. In this particular instance there has been a loss in regard to the livestock producers for some time. It hasn't happened within the last two hours, in fact, there have been a number of pleas made to the Federal Government to attempt to correct that and nothing has been done. Only now do the Members opposite decide over their dinner that they want a priority of debate and I agree with you, you take notice now and the decision comes from yourself tomorrow at the next sitting of the Legislature.

MR. SPEAKER: — Members will be aware that under Rule 17 the Speaker can waive notice. Also under Rule 17 there are certain rules that the notice must comply with. I don't want to take the action either for or against the motion and the matter of fact that the Hon. Member stated the price of beef, I don't imagine it will change too much between today and tomorrow so I would suggest that I will take notice of motion that I will be in a position by tomorrow to see whether it complies with the rules and make a ruling which will not set a special precedent for the House, but will comply with the rules of the House.

QUESTIONS

PROVINCIAL COMMUNITY PASTURE FEES

MR. E. F. GARDNER: (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to ask a question of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer). Last year you will recall that the provincial community pasture fees were raised by the Minister about 22 per cent. I am wondering if in view of the problems besetting the cattle industry today would the Minister of Agriculture give us assurance that he will not add to the burden by again raising the rate for 1974?

MR. MESSER: — Mr. Speaker, in response to the Member for Moosomin's question I will not give him any assurance that there is not going to be an increase.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Hon. Members will allow me to respond to the question that was asked by the Member for Moosomin. Had it not been for the inactivity of the former Liberal Government for years in administering the formula that set the rates and the charges for community pasture fees there would have been no such significant increase last year. As the Members opposite know, Mr. Speaker, there is a formula to

be adjusted on a yearly basis in regard to cattle prices and that formula established what the carrying capacity and what the charge was for cattle in community pastures as well as grazing land. Because they never had the guts to raise those fees before we came into power in 1971, we had to adjust them in a most significant way, hence the large increase. The members and the patrons of those pastures know what the formula is and they know that it directly relates to the amount of money that beef is selling for on an average over the past six months for a given year and it will be up to this Government to make a decision if there will be an increase in light of an increase coming last year. We are now considering that but I cannot give the House assurance at this point in time that there will not be an increase or for that matter if there is an increase, how significant an increase there may be.

MR. GARDNER: — Mr. Speaker, if I may ask a supplementary question. It seems then that the Minister is saying that he doesn't intend to hold the pasture rate in spite of the problems of the cattle people. I should like to ask the Minister if it is his purpose to deliberately make it as tough as possible for the cattle people at this particular time to soften them up for The Natural Products Marketing Act which I am sure he has in mind for them. Does he feel that if they have as many problems as possible it is going to make it easier for him to come along and force them under The Natural Products Marketing Act as he did the hog producers about a year ago and the barley producers a few days ago? The question is, is it your intention purposely to do nothing for the cattle people so that they are in a position where they would be more receptive to The Natural Products Marketing Act?

MR. MESSER: — Mr. Speaker, the answer to that is no. No more so than the Liberal Government when they sat back and did nothing in regard to pork prices of 15 cents per pound in 1969 and 1970.

OUTLOOK IRRIGATION PROJECT

MR. J. WIEBE: (Morse): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to direct another question to the Minister of Agriculture.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Boy, he's getting it today.

MR. WIEBE: — In face of the near crisis conditions facing cattlemen in the southwest and central part of the province due mainly to the hay shortages and the inability of this NDP Government to move hay from northern Saskatchewan into the southern part of the province and the pathetic whining and crying which they are doing to Ottawa, hopefully trying to blame Ottawa for their inability in Saskatchewan, is the Minister of Agriculture finally prepared to admit his folly in the cancellation of the Outlook irrigation project? And immediately, because of the increased revenues which this Government will be receiving this year, will he assure the cattle producers of this province that they will continue with that irrigation project to ensure future fodder supplies in years ahead?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: — Mr. Speaker, the Government of Saskatchewan and the Department of Agriculture is aware of the problem in southern Saskatchewan pertaining to shortage of fodder supplies, hay supplies, and I suggest that they have done everything in their ability to find hay in northern Saskatchewan. For the information of the Member for Morse (Mr. Wiebe) there is a shortage of hay in many areas in northern Saskatchewan and it is not simply a case of moving hay or fodder from northern Saskatchewan to the areas of short supply in the South. We have identified several months ago where there are surpluses of hay in the North which could be moved into southern Saskatchewan and we notified livestock producers in southern Saskatchewan of that hay and attempted to help them in every way possible to move that hay to their operations or to the areas that are in short supply.

The Member makes reference in regard to the South, Saskatchewan River Irrigation project. He has made reference to this on some occasions over the past months, and has suggested some short-sightedness in regard to the intentions of the Government to not continue the project on the west side, and that, in some way that contributes to the shortage of hay at this point in time, Mr. Speaker. This is absolutely ridiculous.

The Member for Morse, as do all Members sitting to your left, Mr. Speaker, know that there are 50,000 acres of land on the east side that are open to irrigation, that are not yet irrigated because there is not any desire by the farmers to have them irrigated. And we have stepped up programs in order to enhance and encourage farmers to irrigate on the east side three-fold in comparison to what they did as a Liberal Government a few short years ago.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: — Yet the farmers in the area have chosen, because of the economies of grain production, to grow dry land crops rather than irrigate. And the Government cannot force them to irrigate, nor is it our intention to force them to irrigate. So until those 50,000 acres are at least assumed to be under development for irrigation, or will be undertaken to be irrigated, there is no reasonable reason for the Government to continue or expand irrigated lands on the west side, for which there is no guarantee they will be put under irrigation.

MR. WIEBE: — Supplementary question. The Minister of Agriculture has not answered my question in which I stated that, "Is he going to reinitiate this Outlook irrigation project?" Here again he has demonstrated the ineptitude of that Government there. They are blaming Ottawa for what's happening to the agricultural industry in this province, and here he is turning around blaming the farmers of Saskatchewan because we don't have irrigation at Outlook. It is not the farmers, Mr. Minister, at fault; it's the fault of this Government because they are not providing the opportunities for the people of this province to take advantage of irrigation.

Mr. Speaker, in case he forgot my supplementary question, which I asked, is he going to answer the initial question which I said — "is he going to reinstate the Outlook irrigation

project in the forthcoming budget?"

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order!

MR. KRAMER: — Are you going to continue to allow this House to be run like a shambles during the question period?

MR. SPEAKER: — The Speaker can only ask for the co-operation of the Members. He can't force it.

MR. MESSER: — In response to the Member for Morse's supplementary Question, may I again say to him, that there is a very large acreage on the east side that is available to be irrigated, yet there has not been an attempt to irrigate that acreage.

MR. STEUART: — You haven't encouraged it.

MR. MESSER: — The Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, says that we haven't encouraged it.

MR. STEUART: — That's right.

MR. MESSER: — We have introduced programs that would encourage irrigation, at least three-fold in comparison to the kind of programs that they had when they were in Government a few short years ago.

When we stopped the construction work on the west side, I did not say that the project was terminated. I said it would be open to constant review and whenever there was an indication that farmers in the area wanted to expand and take advantage of further irrigated acreage, we would continue to develop the program. As it is now, we still have a surplus of 30,000 acres and there is no irrigation taking place on that, so it would be short-sighted of the Government to start developing more acres when we haven't been able to utilize what we have already developed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MOTIONS FOB RETURN

RETURN NO. 135

MR. J. G. RICHARDS (Saskatoon University) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return No. 135 showing:

For the years 1964 to present, the rates for natural gas charged by the Saskatchewan Power Corporation to: (a) Saskatchewan potash mining companies, and in particular Kalium Chemicals Ltd., (b) Prince Albert Pulp Company Ltd. (since date of commencement of operations), (c) residential consumers.

He said: — Mr. Speaker, I trust we can be quite brief with this. I would like to give a little background information to the Motion and in the end I shall move a Motion for Return to

March 5, 1974

provide the Legislature with the material about rates charged by the Power Corporation to Saskatchewan potash mining companies, and in particular Kalium, the Prince Albert Pulp Company and to residential consumers.

Mr. Speaker, the general situation with respect to natural gas is that it is a highly valuable fuel for heating purposes, and in the present context it is severely underpriced relative to other sources of heat based on a cost per BTU calculation.

In Canada, despite the increase in reserves, the static index, that is, the number of years of supply that we have at current rates of consumption, has declined from 39 years of supply in 1956 to 23 years in 1973.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in the particular Saskatchewan context, we are faced with a situation of not being able to meet our own consumption needs. We produce about 52 billion cubic feet and we consume about 114 billion cubic feet, and part of the problem, Mr. Speaker, is that we have got a grossly distorted pricing system. According to Oil Week, we have residential rates in 1972 in the order of 79 cents for a thousand cubic feet, ranging down to a mere 30 cents per thousand cubic feet for industrial users. What this Motion for Return is trying to get at is the precise nature of this rate structure in order that we, in the Legislature, and the people in Saskatchewan in general, can enter into the debate about what should be the pricing policy for natural gas, which is obviously, a key energy source, and if we don't, I submit, establish a pricing structure which is more reasonable, we shall find ourselves very rapidly exhausting this valuable resource.

In Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, out of a total consumption in 1973 of 114 billion cubic feet, residential consumption amounted to a mere 20 — approximately one-sixth. We had commercial — 16 billion cubic feet; industrial — 37 (another gross waste), we were using in the order of 40 billion cubic feet in actual power plants that generate other forms of energy.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us look at the Kalium situation in particular. We've got the Kalium Mine, the only mine using a solution mining technique, which according to virtually all the engineering reports, is grossly inefficient relative to room and pillar technique, which is dependent upon using a very high amount of cheap energy because its process is to put a hot solution down into the ground, bring it up, and then you have to evaporate it by heating it, and according to the sketchy information that I have, until 1971 or 1972, Kalium was getting away with 22 cents per thousand cubic feet for their price of natural gas compared with the residential consumer who was paying up to four times as much in the order of 80 cents. I understand that now there is a new scale which is starting at 35 cents per thousand cubic feet for the first six million, then going down, I haven't got the complete details.

I think the Legislature would like to have them for, according to some calculations which were done for me, the present rate structure allows for something in the order of one-twentieth of a cent profit per thousand, cubic feet for a grand total of \$10 a day out of the Kalium operation. I think that it is clear that the kind of pricing structure which provides cheap natural gas to wasteful industrial users, while charging a high price to the logical user (the residential

consumer) is a gross distortion of our priorities. Something should be done to set this right.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move, seconded by Mr. Meakes, an Order for Return as showing — Return No. 135.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: — It's been moved by the Member for Saskatoon University, seconded by the Member for Morse (Mr. Wiebe) that an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return (No. 135) as shown.

The Member for Morse isn't in his seat now, but he was when the Motion was seconded. He walked out since that time. Is the House ready for the question?

HON. K. THORSON: — Mr. Speaker, so far as I am aware, it . . .

MR. RICHARDS: — Mr. Speaker, a point of information. I don't want to confuse the matter. I had arranged with Mr. Meakes to second this motion, who was in his seat when I rose, I believe, and it was not the Hon. Member for Morse. I don't want to implicate him in something with which he is not wanting to be involved.

MR. SPEAKER: — If the Hon. Member would write so that I can read it . . .

MR. RICHARDS: — My apologies, Mr. Speaker.

MR. KRAMER: — The Member did say Mr. Meakes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. RICHARDS: — Mr. Meakes is not in his chair. Is it agreeable that one of the other Members of the 44 sitting on that side of the House would be agreeable? I understand that Mr. Meakes had cleared it with the Whip.

MR. GROSS: — I'll second the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: — The Member for Assiniboia, has he agreed to second this motion seeing Mr. Meakes is not in his seat?

HON. MEMBERS: — Gravelbourg!

MR. SPEAKER: — Or from Gravelbourg!

MR. THORSON: — Mr. Speaker, so far as I am aware, it has never been the policy of any Government of Saskatchewan to make the kind of information that is requested in this Motion, the subject of an Order for Return of the Legislative Assembly.

Such matters, of course, do arise in the course of the deliberations of the Crown Corporations Committee, when matters of rates charged by the Saskatchewan Power Corporation for

natural gas and electricity are very often reviewed and discussed.

It is very difficult for the Saskatchewan Power Corporation in carrying out all of its responsibilities in the province, which include negotiating rates for electricity and gas with various kinds of customers, to carry on those negotiations very successfully, if there is to be full information about all matters respecting rates that are presently being charged or in the process of being discussed with a view to making changes in the rates that are being charged.

Now, having said that, it will be clear that I propose to ask the Assembly to defeat this Motion. May I hasten to add that this kind of matter is certainly proper for raising in the Crown Corporations Committee. I have always taken the view, and many Ministers of the Crown in Saskatchewan have taken that view, that every Member of the Legislative Assembly is entitled to full information about any aspect of the operations of any Crown agency, but some of those Crown agencies involved in commercial operations cannot but be prejudiced if all aspects of their rates and costs are made public.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it has been the time honored custom in the Crown Corporations Committee to offer to Members of the Assembly, in camera, full information on the understanding that they will not make it public in such a way as to jeopardize the commercial position of the Crown agency.

So with that explanation, Mr. Speaker, I urge the Assembly to defeat this Motion.

MR. RICHARDS: — Mr. Speaker, we have an obvious precedent for this kind of information being provided to the House in the successful attempt of the Legislature last year to get the details of the contract negotiated between SEDCO and Intercontinental on the basis of Government participation in that corporation. The Crown corporation was involved in directly making the contracts. I think the Minister's remarks that this is something appropriate only for the Crown Corporations Committee a mere wangling and weaseling and attempting not to provide the Legislature with perfectly legitimate public information. If there is a subsidy to private corporations involved in the pricing structure, the rate structure for natural gas, it is perfectly logical for the Legislature to inquire into the matter and to discuss the matter as energy is obviously a crucial public issue of the day. And for the Minister in charge of the Power Corporation to offer to provide information in camera to Members provided that they don't reveal this information, is to try and make us accomplices in whatever nefarious pricing policy the Power Corporation is engaged in.

I am not particularly interested in being part and parcel for some shenanigans going on in the Power Corporation, over giving low rates to private corporations — I want to see a public discussion in this Legislature and for the people of Saskatchewan about what is the rate structure.

I think we have seen once again the secretiveness of the way the Crown Corporations are being conducted. The idea behind public ownership is that the public knows what is going

on. The NDP in Ottawa, year after year, calls for disclosure of relevant financial information. What kind of credibility does the NDP have when it gets in power — it refuses to provide that kind of information? This is precisely the kind of" information which is perfectly legitimate for this Legislature to ask for.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Legislature to support the Motion and provide the Order for Return. Motion negatived.

RETURN NO. 155

MR. G. B. GRANT (Regina Whitmore Park) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return No. 155 showing:

Under the Saskatchewan Succession Duty Act: (a) the monthly collections during 1973; (b) the number of estates that were involved; (c) the number of beneficiaries that were involved; (d) the number of estates that were valued between \$200,000 and \$500,000; (e) the number of estates that were valued between \$500,000 and \$1,000,000; (f) the number of estates that were valued over \$1,000,000.

He said: — Mr. Speaker, before moving this Motion I should like to make a few comments.

I think it is quite evident to a good many people in this province that the imposition of succession duties on beneficiaries under certain conditions residing in Saskatchewan has had a detrimental effect on the residency of estates in Saskatchewan. It is quite well known that there has been a considerable movement of people to the Province of Alberta in order to bypass the incidence of this tax in one way or another, either by their families establishing residence there or by establishing residence and making gifts. As I recall last year the figure supplied was somewhere in the neighborhood of \$2 million — give or take, I might be out a little bit, but not too much, and it seems to me that this is a considerable price to pay for the loss of these people to Saskatchewan when we are desirous of holding our population (not necessarily increasing it, but we would like to hold it). That is really what prompts me to move this Motion to ascertain if this is really the big revenue producer that the Government anticipated it would be. It strikes me that last year the amount of revenue received hardly justified the end result.

Mr. Speaker, moved by myself and seconded by the Member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 155 showing.

HON. W. A. ROBBINS: (Minister of Finance): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a few comments with respect to the words of the Member for Whitmore Park (Mr. Grant). I realize, as I am sure all Members of this House realize, that we have argued consistently that succession duties should be under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government and that it should be applied uniformly across the country. Obviously there would be some problems in terms of tax havens, if that is not done. I note that the Member for Whitmore Park makes

March 5, 1974

remarks with respect to people moving to Alberta and there may be some who have done that. I had contacts with people in Saskatoon two years ago who told me that they were moving to Alberta because of The Succession Duty Act. Last year they told me they were moving to Alberta because of The Succession Duty Act. I still see them around Saskatoon. They are still living in Saskatoon. That doesn't deny the fact that there may be some people who will move under those circumstances and obviously they are at liberty to do so.

I think, also, the principle of succession duty is sound. It is a reasonable principle and on that basis we feel that The Succession Duty Act is a reasonable Act and a reasonable Bill.

I might say that I should like to move an amendment to this particular Order for Return, seconded by my colleague Mr. Byers, but I should point out that the basic reason for this amendment is because the information cannot be supplied in the way in which it was asked, because it was asked that information be supplied on a monthly basis. Collections are not reported on a monthly basis and the Member, I am sure, is familiar with the fact that the federal authorities do the collecting for the co-operating provinces which include the Maritime Provinces, Manitoba and Saskatchewan. This information comes back on a quarterly basis and, therefore, the amendment will read as follows:

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

(a) the quarterly collections during 1973 under the Saskatchewan Succession Duty Act; (b) the number of estates from which some amount of duties were received; (c) the number of estates that were assessed for succession duty purposes during the period from April 1st, 1975 to September 30, 1973 that were: (i) of a value between \$50,000 and \$200,000; (ii) a value between \$200,000 and \$500,000; (iii) a value between \$500,000 and \$1,000,000; (iv) a value in excess of \$1,000,000.

MR. GRANT: — Mr. Speaker, a question on the amendment. I wonder if the Hon. Minister meant to omit the number of beneficiaries who were involved. It is not included in the amendment.

MR. ROBBINS: — No, I don't think that was the intention. I am sorry if it was missed.

MR. GRANT: — Yes, I would like to have that included.

MR. ROBBINS: — Well, I don't know of any reason why it couldn't be given. I may be wrong. I will have to check with the Department.

MR. GRANT: — Mr. Speaker, I didn't hear quite clearly what went on on the other side of the House and possibly you did. Could you convey to me what the Minister said in regard to that.

MR. ROBBINS: — I just said that I don't know why it isn't there and I can check with my officials to find out. That is all that I can tell you at the moment. I didn't even notice that it wasn't there. I thought I was reading off identically the same thing except for quarterly collections instead of monthly collections.

MR. GRANT: — I don't know what the procedure is but I think this should be held over until that point is clarified because it is important information. If he doesn't wish to amend it we will have to move an amendment to the amendment.

MR. BROCKELBANK: — Mr. Speaker, I should like to give this matter some attention and for that reason I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

RESOLUTIONS

RESOLUTION NO. 7 — STABILIZATION PLANS FOR FARM COMMODITIES

MR. L. LARSON (Pelly) moved, seconded by Mr. Thibault (Kinistino)

That this Assembly requests the Federal Government to establish permanent stabilization plans for all farm commodities based on cost of production, and in particular, to immediately join with the Saskatchewan Government in its temporary Hog Price Stabilization plan to convert it to a permanent long term plan in order to guarantee fair returns to all hog producers.

He said: — I think it is again rather timely, Mr. Speaker, to raise this question of stabilization. I think it is equally timely to urge on the Federal Government that a permanent stabilization plan be established for all farm commodities. The experiences of the last while have shown very clearly that it is necessary to have this kind of stabilization program.

The acceptance by the Federal Minister of Agriculture that this is also a need certainly ought to encourage this Legislature to pass this Resolution asking for farm stabilization.

As a long time associate in the struggle to impress the dire need for stabilization for farm income at a level where it will give some assurance of viability to the industry, I welcome the opportunity to move this Resolution. While at the present moment, the price of grain is relatively good, we all recall the very grim past when farmers were producing at a loss. To add insult to injury, we all recall the LIFT Program and the utter confusion and hardship that it has created. Equally vivid in the minds of farmers is the aborted stabilization program conceived by Otto Lang and his associates a couple of years ago, the principal effort and aim of which was to stabilize poverty and do nothing to accommodate rising costs and other related factors.

March 5, 1974

The struggle for farm income stability is a long and sad story. It dates back to the earliest days of farming in Saskatchewan. From this struggle has emerged some of the most important farm organizations as well as some very powerful and influential farm leaders.

Although these men and their influence were able to establish some very important and valuable principles and some important and valuable organizations both in the realm of commercial enterprises such as the United Grain Growers, Sask Pool, Federated Co-ops, the Canadian Wheat Board, Federation of Agriculture, the Farmers Union and others, they were never able to establish an effective income stabilization program or principle: These men throughout the years carried on a continuing battle for parity prices, deficiency payments, as well as a host of other attempts in their struggle for the income stabilization principle. Needless to say that battle is not yet won, so the fight must go on with the violent fluctuations of today's economy and farm income it is not possible for the industry to remain viable or even to survive.

MR. LANE: — Farmers don't believe that.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order!

MR. LARSON: — I wonder if the farmer, across the way for Lumsden (Mr. Lane) will go out and cultivate his field or maybe clean his barn or something. It would be much more interesting for the House to watch him do that.

MR. LARSON: — Mr. Speaker, what makes the situation even more intolerable is the fact that all price factors are out of the hands of the farmer.

He is one of the very few left in today's organized society without any bargaining muscle. World markets, to a large extent, establish grain prices. The bargaining power of the farmer in this arena is very small. In the area of production costs the farmer's bargaining power is also very minimal. These costs are by and large established by business enterprises which are concerned with a balance sheet than any other factor.

The ability of farm organizations to influence the ups and downs, the demand or the lack of it on the international markets is just not possible. They have neither the manpower nor the political power to do this. Even the Federal Government is not able effectively to control these factors. Therefore it is imperative to have a federally sponsored and federally financed stabilization program that has an established sum of money available for it that can be used to relieve the inevitable fluctuations that occur in the farm income picture.

Such a program must be implemented if the industry is to survive. That this principle is sound and acceptable has been demonstrated several times and in several places. Canada is one of the few remaining places that has failed to accept and implement this principle.

That this principle is accepted by this Government has been demonstrated. We have not only consistently asked for implementation of this principle, but we have acted. When it became obvious that there was some trouble ahead for the hog producers last summer and fall, the Minister of Agriculture not only consistently urged the Federal Government to act, but proceeded to establish a realistic floor price for hogs. This is very popular with the producer in times of insecure prices and high costs. There is just as great a need for a similar program with regard to cattle. The cattle industry at the moment is going through some of its most trying times. It is now faced with having to pay realistic prices for the feed that they need for these cattle.

Members opposite will no doubt be yelling that a floor price be established for beef. However, they at the same time know only too well that this is not practical or possible. What this Government has offered to do and will continue to do is to co-operate with others and the Federal Government to bring about as soon as possible a full national income stabilization plan that will cover all major farm commodities wherever grown in Canada. This program is vital if the industry is to survive.

The present Minister of Agriculture has on several occasions indicated his willingness to adopt this kind of program. I feel that it is, therefore, very timely for this Legislature to pass this Resolution and to offer full co-operation in its implementation.

I therefore move, Mr. Speaker, this Resolution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. E. F. GARDNER: (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to say in connection with this Resolution I would hope that the Federal Government will stay away from any association with the Saskatchewan Hog Marketing Commission when they look at stabilization plans.

We all know that the Hog Marketing Commission is one of the most unpopular programs that have come before the farmers of this province in a number of years. The Minister has attempted to make it a little more palatable in the last few months by sending a cheque out from the Hog Marketing Commission with his own signature, very large and bold letters right across the middle of the cheque, so there is no doubt that they are going to associate the cheque with Mr. Messer. However, in spite of this obvious attempt to make the Hog Marketing Commission a little more palatable, people are still fed up with it; we have many, many long time hog producers going out of the business simply because of the Hog Marketing Commission. I should hope that in no way will the Federal Government associate themselves with this particular Commission.

People have come to me who have been in the hog business for years and said they are now fed up with the red tape.

March 5, 1974

"When the Government of the Province of Saskatchewan is going to regulate and run my hog business I am quitting." They just sell out their breeding stock and leave their hog barns empty and this is happening all over the province and every Member over there knows that it is happening throughout the province. The chief reason is because the farmer is fed up with the red tape and control that the Hog Marketing Commission has over his business.

I would certainly hope that the Federal Government stays away from that program.

Mr. Speaker, I am rather surprised that this Resolution appeared on the Order Paper because the Members opposite should be the last ones to ever want to bring up the stabilization plan. This is something that they should hide their heads in shame when they hear about it. They should rather try to sweep this under the rug and forget about it.

The message that I get from the people in the country is that farmers, in general, are fed up with political bickering and programs that affect them. And they are fed up with the NDP continually bringing partisan politics into important agricultural issues. There are about 75,000 farmers in this province.

The Saskatchewan Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) interferes in almost every federal issue. He sends out NDP propaganda to every farmer in the province, all of these 75,000. This is done at taxpayers' expense. We have many examples of this and any of you who are farmers have received these messages.

You look back at the ones you received several months ago and you see how ridiculous now they are. The ones he sent out on the feed grains situation for example, statements he made that are obviously completely not in accordance with the facts. This is well proven in the months that followed since he sent these out. A good example of this is the rapeseed vote. Any program that is suggested by the Federal Government is automatically opposed by this NDP Provincial Government strictly for political reasons. They don't care whether the program is good, or whether it needs improvement. If it is suggested by the Federal Government they are automatically against it.

Mr. Blakeney, Mr. Messer, Mr. Romanow put NDP politics first and the interests of the farmer second. They have done this on many occasions. This became very obvious with the Federal stabilization plan. The stabilization plan proposal was a classic example of NDP political interference in the affairs of the Saskatchewan farmer. The stabilization plan proposed by the Hon. Otto Lang in 1971 was basically a rather straight forward type of plan. It simply said that a fund would be set up to pay money out to farmers in years of low production, poor markets or poor prices. The stabilization fund would be made up in a very simple manner. The farmer would pay two per cent of his gross sales of grain. From the Federal Government four per cent of the farmers' gross sale of grain would be contributed. So this was really the basis of the stabilization plan. The Federal Government would put in four per cent of the gross sales of grain; the farmer would put in two per cent. This money would go into a fund and would be available for the farmers. The details of when it would be paid back etc. were

relatively unimportant. The significant point was that all of this money would be available to farmers when they needed it plus interest. This money would be set aside for the farmers. The plan was long overdue and should not have been postponed for any reason political or otherwise.

In 1973-74 the Federal contribution should have been \$150 million on gross sales of an estimated \$3,700 million grain sales. Where else would we ever get a chance as farmers to get a direct financial contribution of \$150 million put into a fund for the benefit of the farmers of this province. In the past two years the farmers would receive a Federal and I stress Federal contribution of over \$200 million. The farmers had an opportunity to get this large sum of Federal cash and they were entitled to it. But did the farmers get this \$200 million when this works out certainly to about \$3,000 for each Saskatchewan farmer? Of course, the answer is no, they didn't get the \$200 million.

In the fall of 1971 this NDP Government sabotaged and destroyed the Federal stabilization plan. They boasted about it publicly. I recall specifically the Attorney General getting up in this House, it is on the records of this House, he said we did it, we take credit for it and we are glad. They boasted about it publicly, they took credit for its destruction at that time. The records of this Legislature indicated clearly that they destroyed the 1971 Federal stabilization plan. I should like anyone to get up in this debate and tell us again that they did it and how they did it. I should like them to repeat the statements they made at that time when they said they were taking credit for destroying the stabilization plan. Those chiefly responsible were the NDP Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Messer, the Attorney General, Mr. Romanow. They were the ones who made the arrangements that got the NDP farmers from south of Regina organized and destroyed the stabilization plan. Because of their actions we will have no stabilization plan, we still have no \$200 million contribution from the Federal Government. Mr. Speaker, no two men in history have ever cost the Saskatchewan farmer so much money. No one can deny that the farmers lost this \$200 million due to the action of the NDP. I think this is perfectly obvious to everyone and I am sure that when the Members opposite get up^ they will also agree that they would have got this \$200 million, the farmers would now have it if they had let the plan go through at that time.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the farmers of this province will look at these two NDP Cabinet Ministers and decide in their own minds which they would rather have, Mr. Romanow, Mr. Messer or \$200 million. I believe that most farmers would give you a pretty quick answer to this question. If this question was put directly to the farmers they wouldn't have to think too long to give you an answer.

Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government will likely reintroduce the stabilization plan in the next few months. I personally hope that it will not be greatly different from the original plan. I hope that we are still going to get the four per cent contribution from the Federal Government in cash which will be double the contribution that will be made by the farmers. This was the basis of the original plan and this was a direct contribution from the Federal treasury. I hope that this is incorporated in the plan when it is reintroduced. In spite of

March 5, 1974

the fact that we have lost this for two or three years, we have lost this \$200 million, I hope that at least it will get started now.

Events have proved that beyond a doubt the NDP took the wrong stand on the previous stabilization plan. They were not on the side of the farmers. Another example of this of course is the rapeseed vote, they obviously took the wrong stand on the rapeseed vote. In this case the NDP Government spent thousands of dollars of the farmers' money to promote a plan that the farmers themselves rejected by a democratic vote. You know in any other type of organization the people at the head of the organization would resign if a democratic vote showed that they had been wrong as surely as they were wrong in this case. We got letters sent out at government expense, tens of thousands of dollars spent by the Department of Agriculture in this province trying to promote something that the farmers themselves in a democratic vote said that they didn't want. This is exactly what happened. The Minister of Agriculture in this case simply bet on the wrong horse. The NDP Government and the Minister of Agriculture again were not on the side of the farmers. So we would call this time on the Government to be constructive, to forget politics and to accept their responsibility to the farm people of this province. We hope that this time the NDP will co-operate with the Federal Government and accept the stabilization plan which will be of great benefit to our farmers in future years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. I. W. CARLSON: (Yorkton): — Mr. Speaker, the former speaker on the other side of the House made a few comments that I should like to deal with. He says he hopes that the program that the Federal Government has indicated it is going to bring in will be similar to the one they introduced a couple of years ago. I know that the farmers in Saskatchewan don't hope that. I know that this Government will certainly oppose it if it comes in in the same form as it was introduced originally. I must say that I am glad that the Federal Government has indicated a willingness to bring forth a stabilization program, I hope they are prepared to listen to western Canadian farmers, farm organizations, prairie governments and bring forth a realistic program, a program that will stabilize the agricultural economy at a level that will be beneficial to all of Canada, not only the farmers who are producing the products, but also the consumers. I believe consumers have as much at stake in a stabilization program as do the producers. Just a little bit of reasoning will indicate that if there is a stability in supply there will not be as much fluctuation, in the prices to the consumers as we have seen in the past few months.

The consumer always seems to be the one getting the short end of the stick. When prices go up at the market, if you are talking about meat, specifically beef, as the price goes up for live beef, it is up within a couple of days in the supermarkets, when the price goes down again it takes weeks before the consumer gets any benefit of that reduction. Stabilization is important not only to the producer but also to the consumers of agricultural products.

There are a few more points that I should like to deal with, some of the comments the Member for Moosomin made, and a few

more suggestions of my own which I should like to deal further with at a later date. I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

RESOLUTION NO. 8 — FEED GRAINS POLICY

MR. I. W. CARLSON (Yorkton) moved seconded by Mr. Owens:

That this Assembly requests the Federal Government to immediately restore the pricing authority of the Canadian Wheat Board as it relates to domestic marketing of feed grains and quickly develop a feed grains policy that ensures fair and equitable prices within the Province and across Canada, under a system that leaves all of the powers of the Canadian Wheat Board intact.

He said: — Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of my speech I will be moving Resolution No. 8. But first I want to develop my arguments as to why the pricing authority should be returned to the Canadian Wheat Board for domestic marketing of feed grains.

During the last Session in February of last year I moved a resolution calling on the Federal Government to establish a national feed grains policy that would provide three basic principles.

1. It must provide a guaranteed price for feed grains through a Grains Income Stabilization Program, such price to take into account production costs.
2. Establish a Feed Grains Reserve Bank which will guarantee delivery opportunities to feed grain producers and which will guarantee a supply of feed grain to livestock producers at all times.
3. Establish equitable price relationships for feed grains throughout all of Canada.

Since that time we have heard a lot of talk about feed grains. We now have an interim federal feed grains policy. However, it certainly doesn't resemble any suggestions made by this Legislature or this Government. The feed grains policy that was announced by Otto Lang was obviously developed by his Liberal colleagues from Quebec. I would think by now all Members of this House should be familiar with the principles of the Federal policy. I don't intend to repeat it in any detail, but I should like to point out some features that are of great concern to me.

First, the Agriculture Products Board is being directed to enter the market as an additional buyer. The price at which the Board will offer to purchase feed grains will be the estimated halfway point between initial price and the expected final price. Since during this crop year, at least, when supplies are extremely short, off-board grains should be selling at something close to the export equivalent price the entry of the Agriculture Products Board indicated price must be interpreted as an attempt to lead off-board prices down from what they would otherwise be.

March 5, 1974

Secondly, the Canadian Wheat Board will be directed to sell feed grains in other parts of Canada on the basis of the formula of off-board prices in Saskatchewan plus transportation and handling costs minus the feed freight assistance. This is of concern from two points of view. First the activities of the Agriculture Products Board appear to be intended to establish low off-board prices in order to ensure that the East will get cheap feed grains that it has been promised. Secondly, and more important, forcing the Canadian Wheat Board, which is an orderly marketing agency, to determine its selling price on the basis of small disorganized off-board market that is inconsistent with the principle of orderly marketing.

Third, after August 1974 the private grain trade will be permitted to by-pass the Canadian Wheat Board by purchasing directly from farmers and elevator companies. The Federal Government's directive to the Canadian Wheat Board to base its domestic sales in eastern Canada on the off-board price in the prairies is a regressive policy. It is a regressive policy because an orderly marketing agency is being directed to base its selling price on an unregulated market functioning outside of the purview of the Wheat Board as a result of deliberate government policy. It is a regressive policy because the Prairie grain producer will be forced by the Federal policy to subsidize the eastern buyer of grain, since the Wheat Board cannot price domestically at levels consistent with world prices.

It is estimated that barley may be sold for as much as a \$1 a bushel less than could be obtained through the export markets during: 1973-74. The total loss of revenue to the Prairie grain producers as a result of this policy is expected to be approximately \$50 million.

Mr. Speaker, this is a regressive policy because the West's comparative advantage in livestock production will be determined. The subsidization by the prairie grain producer also means that the integrated grain livestock producer is at less of an advantage than he would otherwise be. This type of diversified farm accounts for well over 90 per cent of the prairie livestock production. As a result a continuation of the policy will result in a livestock production shift from diversified livestock farms in the prairies to specialized eastern feeding enterprises purchasing both feed grain and feeder animals in the prairies. This is clearly inconsistent with the provincial and federal objectives.

Mr. Speaker, of all the ridiculous policies that have originated out of Ottawa in the recent months this is the worst. In one breath, Mr. Lang says that everyone should sell to the Canadian Wheat Board since prices will be strong in the next breath he is saying the Agriculture Products Board is authorized to purchase this year on an emergency basis to protect farmers from distressed prices. This kind of talk is complete nonsense because Mr. Lang knows full well that the only farmers selling at distressed prices this year will be those misled into selling at the prices established by the Agriculture Products Board.

Hopefully no one would be foolish enough to sell to the Agriculture Products Board, but needless to say many of them are. This is giving Mr. Lang a basis for his claim in eastern Canada that grain can be bought in the West at unrealistically low prices. It can be assumed that he hopes to use these

prices as a basis for forcing the Canadian Wheat Board into selling cheap feed grains into eastern Canada. When Mr. Lang is in Saskatchewan he will deny that the policy was developed to provide cheap feed for the East. But what does he tell the farmers in Quebec? In Quebec, prior to the Quebec provincial election I might add the farmers were promised cheap feed grain. I have an article from the Free Press Weekly dated September 22, 1973 the headline reads, "Quebec Union Threatens Steps on Feed Policy." I quote:

Quebec farmers apprehensive about federal implementation of the feed grains policy are prepared to take some imaginative steps if the government continues to hedge on the promised feed grains cost reductions, said the president of the 50,000 member Agriculture Producers Union. Paul Coutier told a news conference here last week that those promised cuts must be made. He was referring to a September 15th deadline set by Ottawa to implement the Interim Feed Policy.

Mr. Lang must think he is living in 1874 instead of 1974 if he thinks he can get away with this kind of double talk.

Mr. Speaker, I have spent considerable time discussing and criticizing the Interim Federal Policy. It appears that the only way we can prevent the second phase from being implemented next fall is at the polls. It is obvious that the Liberals in Ottawa will not listen to any voice from western Canada. They don't listen to the Farmers' union, they don't hear the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, they refuse to consult the provincial governments. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if they will hear ballots, dropping in ballot boxes next spring. They may lose some men, however, it may also be too late for some of them. Mr. Lang might very well retire from, politics with the consent of the majority of his constituents. Wouldn't that be a fitting reward for his efforts like Operation LIFT, Feed Grains Policy and his discriminatory rapeseed ballot.

However, in case the Federal Liberals do decide to listen, I should like to make some constructive suggestions. Maybe some of the Members opposite will convince their friend Otto that he should pay some attention to Saskatchewan for the sake of the Liberal Party if nothing else.

An entirely new Feed Grains Policy should be developed and should retain the Canadian Wheat Board as the sole marketing agency for prairie feed grains.

When the Wheat Board was established its objective was to sell prairie grains at the maximum possible on behalf of the prairie farmers. This principle must be maintained. All sales by the Wheat Board whether domestic or export must be pooled so that every farmer selling feed grains gets a fair share of the various markets. Our quota system for delivering must be maintained by the Board to give equal opportunity to each and every farmer. We must maintain the Canadian Wheat Board, as I have indicated as the sole agent for western feed grain producers. Now I recognize and I'm sure that most farmers do, that the eastern feeders are faced with similar problems. What they need is one united voice to purchase grain on their behalf. They too can benefit from a single agency.

March 5, 1974

We already have the Canadian Livestock Feed Board, which should be given the authority to purchase on behalf of all eastern feed grain users.

Thus you would have the Wheat Board negotiating on behalf of the grain producers and the Livestock Board negotiating on behalf of the livestock feeders or the feed grain users of eastern Canada. I am sure this procedure would produce more equity for each and every single farmer in Canada. Every grain producer would be treated equally and every feed grain user would pay a similar price.

Mr. Speaker, I know that the farmers of Saskatchewan want orderly marketing and the stability it provides. No doubt the farmers of eastern Canada would also welcome a program that would provide them with some stability based on this kind of a reasonable approach, based on a negotiated price.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Elrose that this Assembly request the Federal Government to immediately restore the pricing authority of the Canadian Wheat Board as it relates to domestic marketing of feed grain and quickly develop a feed grains policy that ensures fair and equitable prices within the province and across Canada, under a system that leaves all of the powers of the Canadian Wheat Board intact.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. T. M. WEATHERALD: (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, today I listened with interest to the Member for Yorkton (Mr. Carlson). I wasn't surprised, I was disappointed, extremely disappointed in his remarks. Customarily the NDP when they find themselves in a jam usually appeal along the narrow, political, religious bias against Quebec, and unfortunately once again he entered into his speech with that narrow, parochialism against the people of Ontario and the people of Quebec, which we have so customarily come to get to know in this legislature.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WEATHERALD: — It isn't surprising and shouldn't be of any surprise that their success in Quebec and east of Quebec has been negligible when one considers the narrow, parochial view of Canada, and particularly their views of the people of Quebec, that constantly creep into every speech of theirs in this House.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words about the Feed Grains Policy, because the Feed Grains Policy that has been enunciated by the Federal Government, while I don't think it's perfect, I believe it's a substantial improvement over anything that we've had in the past. And if you take a look at some of the political comments emanating from the Provincial Government here it is obvious that most of their posture has been based along political lines and not really with any particular desire to develop the Feed Grains Policy for Canada as a whole.

First of all, the first document we got, September 12, shortly after the federal announcement, we got a Feed Grains Policy paper from the Province of Saskatchewan at the taxpayers' expense with Mr. Messer's name on it, issued to all farmers in

the Province of Saskatchewan. Much of it is inaccurate and is of a political nature, which was forewarning to the people of Saskatchewan and indeed as far as the Feed Grains Policy was forewarning that the arguments would be along political lines rather than on any rational basis.

But it's interesting to note, very shortly after that, what is said in a number of publications about utterances coming from the Province of Saskatchewan. An article in a report on business by James Rusk. The debate about Feed Grain Policy in Canada has been entirely political and concerned with votes. That's one reaction to the Provincial Government's enunciation.

Another, Mr. Speaker, that I should like to bring to your attention, is from the Winnipeg Tribune, August 17, 1973. This is the one where the Deputy Minister of Agriculture walked out of the meeting and we have had words of wisdom from the Attorney General on his moving from the meeting. I think the explanation given at the time was that he had to attend another meeting. Well, this will be one of the first meetings that any Deputy Minister has ever gone to, to represent the Province of Saskatchewan in negotiations with the Federal Government, where he tended to stay so short a time, because the headline in the Winnipeg Tribune said, "Western Leaders Bolt Meeting on Feed Grains".

The meeting of western agriculture spokesmen and the Federal Government was little more than an hour old when Mr. Uskiw accompanied by the Saskatchewan delegation walked out. A little more than an hour old. The explanation that the Attorney General gave us was that the Deputy Minister of Agriculture here had to go to another meeting. Well, he sure didn't intend to represent Saskatchewan long with those negotiations if he only took an hour to do so. In other words it was a political set-up to begin with and he was simply carrying out the orders he had before he left the Province of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WEATHERALD: — It's interesting to note that neither delegation from Alberta or British Columbia left the discussions and they continued at some length. It's also interesting to note that the only Deputy Minister attending those meetings was the one from Saskatchewan who had any comments for the Press afterwards other than Mr. Uskiw. The Deputies from both Alberta and British Columbia declined comments to the Press.

So we can see that mostly the opposition to a possible feed grains policy for all Canada got started on a political basis rather than anything of a substantial note.

Now I want to review for you just a few moments of the lineup that's been forthcoming on a feed grains policy, the suggested policy that has been given.

First of all in the Western Producer, Thursday, February 28, it's interesting to note what the Canadian Federation of Agriculture annual meeting here said. It was held on the 18th to the 21st of February, 1974.

March 5, 1974

The Canadian Federation of Agriculture was unable to agree on a feed grains policy for Canada and in fact decided to make no statement whatsoever as far as their policy was concerned. I'd like to read to you from the Western Producer on February 28.

On the recommendation of the Board of Directors the contentious feed grains issue was not debated at the Canadian Federation of Agriculture's annual meeting here February 18 to 21. Instead a statement was approved by delegates, recognized as divisions, within the Canadian Federation of Agriculture on this issue, the long and fruitless debates in past years and agreed not to tackle the thorny problem on the convention floor.

Well that is approximately slightly over a week ago, Mr. Chairman.

It's interesting to also note that Mr. Lockwood, Vice- President of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool at the meeting said:

The feed grains issue is a contentious issue that has been discussed at great length for many years. It has to be recognized that the Canadian Federation of Agriculture has within it both sellers and buyers of feed grains. The sellers have worked out what they can live with but this is not acceptable to the buyers.

He supported the Board recommendation not to introduce any feed grains resolutions. So it's obvious that the Canadian Federation of Agriculture was unable at their meeting to offer any better program than has been suggested up until now.

So we can follow through, Mr. Speaker, by looking at who has endorsed a plan, I don't see a plan precisely like the one that's proposed, but along those lines. For example we have the Palliser Wheat Growers in a press release issued saying:

The Palliser Wheat Growers express its general approval about the short term and long term proposals.

And it should be noted that the Palliser Wheat Growers is essentially an organization that represents grain producers and this is important because they would not be representing the cattlemen in the sense of a feeder wanting a substantial amount of cheap grain.

The Saskatchewan Stock Growers, Mr. Speaker, represented the other side of the coin. The Saskatchewan Stock Growers in a press release issued, said that they approved of the government's long term Feed Grains Policy made public by the Federal Government recently. In fact, in their press release which I have before me the stock growers approve, quote:

The long term Feed Grains Policy was made public by the Federal Government recently. Points raised by the stock growers papers included several essential features necessary in the program, which included the movement of grain freely over boundaries and a marketing system that would ensure buyer users a stable supply and a maximum access. Regional advantage was also another consideration which they said should be adhered to.

Now we have the Saskatchewan Stock Growers, also the United Grain Growers, as I previously quoted, in their annual meeting of delegates that Mr. Runciman and some 500 in Alberta, collectively all endorsed the principles that were suggested for a feed grains policy for Canada and it was interesting to note that these delegates freely endorsed the policy on their own. In other words there was no pressure put on the top for them to particularly accept the federal policy.

Now, I want to come to the position of the Government of Alberta which I think is extremely important. In actual fact, Mr. Speaker, the Government of Alberta has asked that the Federal Government institute the present interim policy immediately. Their latest position has been that they would like to see the interim policy immediately converted to one of being a permanent policy. They have suggested a few modifications and these are perfectly legitimate, but essentially they have suggested a policy somewhat along the lines that has been proposed for all of Canada. I think this is important because I want to now read to the House some information which I think is of great interest and it certainly was of substantial interest to myself, because I have listened to the Premier of Saskatchewan (Mr. Blakeney) and the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) and most recently the Member for Yorkton (Mr. Carlson) talk about the damage to the meat industry in Canada, how cheap freight rates helped eastern Canada and so on and so forth. Their apparent position has been that low freight rates have allowed for the shipping of live cattle east so that they would be processed in the east. They have alleged that cheap grain would help develop the livestock industry in the East at the expense of the West. But in actual fact statistics prove beyond a doubt that the largest livestock producer by a great and substantial margin is the Province of Alberta, Mr. Speaker.

I have with me the slaughtering statistics of cattle in Canada in 1973 and I think these statistics, (I wish the Premier was here, because I think he's been off on a wild goose chase and his high priced staff in the office haven't been doing much in-depth research for him), but it's most interesting to note that if you compare Alberta with Ontario and Quebec for example, Mr. Speaker, you'd find in the month of January, 1973 for example, Alberta slaughtered 86,000 — I round these figures off — slaughtered 86,000 head of cattle. The Province of Quebec slaughtered a total of 11,000 cattle in the month of January, 1973. The Province of Saskatchewan slaughtered 12,000. It's interesting to note that in the month of February, 1973 the Province of Alberta slaughtered 87,000 cattle, Quebec slaughtered 11,000. Not even one-seventh of what the total slaughterings were in the Province of Alberta. Ontario slaughtered 65,000, some 25 per cent less than the Province of Alberta.

I'm going to read you March, 1973. March — 109,000 in the Province of Alberta; Saskatchewan — 15,000; Ontario — 86,000; Quebec — 17,000. Mr. Speaker, there wasn't one single month in the year 1973 that the Province of Alberta did not slaughter more cattle than the Province of Ontario, and in practically every single month slaughtered seven times the cattle slaughtered in the Province of Quebec.

It's also interesting to note that the Province of Saskatchewan in practically every month slaughtered as many cattle as did the Province of Quebec.

March 5, 1974

When we talk about shipping cattle east to eastern Canadians because of low freight rates and cheap feed, the facts of the matter simply don't bear this out. The Province of Alberta is slaughtering more cattle per month than any province in Canada and has been for some time. The Province of Alberta is Saskatchewan's main competitor as far as the beef business is concerned.

What is interesting to note — and I think of substantial interest to any one attempting to develop in the livestock industry and in fairness to the other provinces — what is interesting to note that last year the four western provinces, British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba, slaughtered 1,742,000 cattle. There were only a total of 126,000 cattle shipped from those four western provinces to eastern Canada for processing. One hundred and twenty-six thousand or 7.6 per cent of the total cattle that are available for slaughter were shipped east out of the four western provinces.

Mr. Speaker, if we had kept every single one of those in the west, in the four western provinces including the Province of Saskatchewan, for slaughtering we wouldn't have operated one packing house the size of Canada Packers. I think this shows that the bogey man that the NDP love to throw around and talk about how the East is getting the benefit of grain feed subsidies, subsidies on live cattle, it's shown beyond a doubt that the cattle industry has not been particularly moving towards the East, in fact, it's staying here in the West and most of the cattle are being slaughtered here in the West once they are ready for kill.

I want, therefore, in that context to mention to you once again the Province of Alberta's position as far as the Feed Grains Policy is concerned, because their position as of just the last two weeks has just simply been that not only do they want the policy to go into effect, they want it to go into effect immediately and will negotiate for a few modifications for the future.

I would suggest to the Member for Yorkton (Mr. Carlson) that when he talks about a feed grains reserve bank that we already have one. It's in every elevator in the Province of Saskatchewan and all you have to do is to get it out of there. So we have got a pretty good feed grains reserve bank. ^Barley is in practically every single elevator across the province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WEATHERALD: — Mr. Speaker, I have attempted so far to pinpoint where the opposition comes from. It would appear that most opposition to the policy has originated either from the Farmers Union, to some extent with Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, but even in that particular instance as I already read what Mr. Lockwood said, the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool is rapidly modifying its position on feed grains as far as our province is concerned.

I want to speak now for a little while about the market for feed grain. First of all if we start off with ten bushels of feed grain, Mr. Speaker, it would soon be shown that one bushel of that would be sold in eastern Canada to eastern feed grain producers. It could also be shown that two of those ten bushels

would likely be sold for export and there is no suggestion so far as exported feed grain is concerned. It will be carried on under the Canadian Wheat Board, as it has been for the past years.

There are left seven bushels of feed grain out of the ten used right where they are grown. In other words, out of every ten bushels of feed grain grown in Saskatchewan the larger part is used in our province and I think that amount is even higher in the Province of Alberta. So what we are really talking about is approximately ten per cent of the feed grain grown in western Canada. It is hard to see how this would seriously disrupt any particular market for grain if it is sold as has been proposed in eastern Canada. It is also apparent, I think, that once the policy is in effect that the very people, in all likelihood, will be transporting and selling feed grain in eastern Canada (and I say in all likelihood because it will take time to prove this) will almost certainly be such co-operatives as the United Grain Growers and the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool. I would think that most likely the elevator companies which will be the ones that distribute feed grain, will buy feed grain here in western Canada and will arrange for shipment (which will still be under the Canadian Wheat Board) to the eastern provinces. It will, I think, present the co-operatives with an admirable opportunity to correct some of the grievances that I have heard them talk about at many of their meetings. I don't know how many meetings I have gone to of the Wheat Pool, or United Grain Growers, and listened to farmers talking about how much a farmer in Ontario had to pay for feed grain and what a terrible price the producer out here got for the grain. So here is an admirable opportunity for us to correct any injustices that exist between what the producer here in the West gets, and what the producer has to pay for it in the East, because our co-operatives can enter that market and reduce the margin that we have so frequently heard at meetings was unfair to both producers, at the consuming and the growing end.

Later on in this debate I want to present some arguments and some improvements that we think can be made to a feed grains policy, Mr. Speaker. So with those few remarks I would beg leave to adjourn debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

Debate adjourned.

RESOLUTION NO. 9 — POLICIES AND OPERATIONS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF NORTHERN SASKATCHEWAN

MR. A. R. GUY (Athabasca) moved, seconded by Mr. Boldt:

That this Assembly urges the Saskatchewan Government to immediately convene an independent or judicial commission to inquire into all aspects of the policies and operations of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan.

He said: — Mr. Speaker, it gives men great pleasure today to have the opportunity to move this Resolution calling for an inquiry into the activities and policies of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

March 5, 1974

MR. GUY: — A year ago at this time DNS was one year old and it had growing pains, which were causing concern to the residents of northern Saskatchewan — the Indian and Métis organizations that were trying to deal with it, the employees, in fact the NDP supporters and others in northern Saskatchewan were concerned about the direction in which the new Department of Northern Saskatchewan was going.

For that reason, at that time, I urged that an inquiry into the activities of the new department be carried out and, of course, it was ignored at that time by the Premier and the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan (Mr. Bowerman).

I also introduced a bill which I thought (and Members on this side of the House thought) would assist the Government in carrying out the commitments which they had made to the local people when they first set up the Department of Northern Saskatchewan. The proposals were two in number. One was that there would be local participation in the development of policy and secondly that there would be local consultation. Now these two recommendations were included in a bill which I introduced last Session of the Legislature and they were also turned down by the Government. The result, of course, has been that in the past year the unrest, the number of problems and the dissatisfaction in the DNS have increased to unparalleled proportions. If they had taken my advice and we had that inquiry earlier, the need for an inquiry today, of course, would probably not be nearly as great. However, at the present time the formal investigation of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan is of the utmost urgency.

Now I could use information today gathered by the Liberal MLAs, but I believe that the Government possibly would have thought that that was biased information, so I am prepared to use today reports, press releases, comments of people and groups that have been involved with the Department of Northern Saskatchewan since its inception two years ago. I must say that I appreciate the close watch that the Press is keeping on the development and the activities of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan, because I have some 28 clippings here that I want to refer to this afternoon, that- have come from various newspapers, not only in Saskatchewan but across the country.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. GUY: — They have given the reports, they have shown the unrest and the dissatisfaction of a number of groups that I wish to refer to this afternoon. Now these groups, and the Press, of course, these press clippings, refer to people who have no political axe to grind, therefore they can't be considered political bias. I think that you will find when I am finished that there is an urgent need, and certainly justification, for an investigation into the policy and problems and development of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan.

The demand for an investigation into the work of the DNS started with an editorial in the Prince Albert Herald on February 5th, 1973, when the editor of the Prince Albert Herald referred to my legislative resolution that I moved last year, and went on to say:

Mr. Guy asked for a legislative committee to investigate the new department. Of course, none will be established, but Premier Blakeney would be wise to at least demand some accounting of what is going on in the North from DNS Minister Ted Bowerman and his Deputy Wilt Churchman.

We have certainly been disappointed at the obvious lack of policy of the new department and this lack of direction has had an effect on the morale of the Department of Natural Resources which Mr. Bowerman also heads.

In the name of justice, we urge the Premier to at least look at the situation and if changes are demanded then be enough of a leader to make those changes.

Well, of course, that was a year ago, the Premier refused to take the action that was suggested, he refused to take a look at the Department or make the necessary changes with the result that we have seen a year of unrest which we have never seen in the history of this province before.

Then on February 22nd, 1973, another group decided to make their views known concerning the Department, and it was a group of teachers. This was in the Leader-Post, February 22, 1973:

Teachers in northern Saskatchewan, although they are satisfied, are unhappy with the policy that is developing and the people who administer it. Teachers from north- western Saskatchewan discuss shortcomings of the new department in education policy, decided to express their feelings in letters to editors of newspapers. The letters said the Department is not developing along the lines described by Art Towill, Assistant Deputy Minister (he was then -he's not now — he was demoted after that) when he toured the North before the Department was formed. The people of the North were told that the idea behind the new department was to facilitate liaison between the residents of the North and the political entities that were to serve them. Despite being told that input from residents would be essential to development of policy, teachers have found their views ignored and educational decisions being made by department field workers who are not responsible to either the Director of Education or the northern school board.

As a result of no changes forthcoming as far as the teachers were concerned, more than 100 teachers left the North last June and I suspect there will be an equal or larger number leave the North at the end of the coming year.

Now the Métis Society of Saskatchewan has been foremost in the criticism of DNS, and there is no reason why they shouldn't be, as a large number of northerners are of Métis origin. They believe the Minister and the officials are the main problem as far as the Department of Northern Saskatchewan is concerned. On August 4, 1973, headlines appeared in the Leader-Post saying:

Replace Government Officials and Improve Relations — the Métis Society of Saskatchewan.

March 5, 1974

The Métis have called for the replacement of top officials in the Department of Northern Saskatchewan to improve relations between the Government and northern natives.

They went on to say:

It is our duty to inform you that as long as Mr. Bowerman remains Minister of Northern Saskatchewan, and Mr. Churchman remains Deputy Minister, the Department will not have the confidence, support or co-operation of either the Métis people or the majority of the native people in the North.

Well, at that time the Premier had the opportunity to act – he refused to do so, with the result that Mr. 'Powerman', I mean Bowerman has the reins of power for northern Saskatchewan and there is still no credibility that he has been able to provide to the Métis Society who represent a large number of northern people. No changes have been made, there is no improvement in the relationship.

Then in August, the first of many claims of the employees and former employees of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan became known. We had a press release in the Prince Albert Herald on August 4:

Former DNS Employee Claimed Department is a Failure.

Three of the four community development workers recently released by the Department of Northern Saskatchewan have released information which they say illustrates the hypocrisy of that Department's program. The three stated that even on the basis of the objectives which the Department has set for itself, it has been a total failure. The responsibility for the Department's lack of credibility and acceptance among native people of the North must be placed square on the shoulders of G. R. (Ted) Bowerman, Minister in charge of the new Department and his Deputy Minister — J.W.(Wilf) Churchman.

That was the first of the number of employees from northern Saskatchewan who have determined and decided the Department is a failure, at least from the view of employees who have worked for them.

Now, by October, even the Minister himself was realizing that there was a situation developing in northern Saskatchewan which he had to take some steps to try and cope with. He was beginning to feel the heat so he decided to take the Press on a tour of northern Saskatchewan to brainwash them, so that the press releases would, perhaps, be a little more favorable towards Mr. 'Powerman', but the Press (I'm happy to say) were too smart for him. So was the Métis Society. They made sure that the true facts were presented to the Press when the tour finally took place. And again we have headlines:

Ex-employee Says Government Programs Failing in North

In a Leader-Post interview, Tuesday, Dennis Poudrier said the Department staff has failed to get to know the North and built a bureaucratic ghetto in La Ronge, DNS's northern headquarters.

He said the Department was created to give the North a voice in Government, but DNS staff has made no attempt to tour Indian reserves or towns to learn of northern problems.

That's another ex-employee who feels that the failure of the Government has been one of large degree.

And then as I say, the tour took place and we have then headline:

Minister's Northern Media Tour Criticized Heavily

This is from Flin Flon.

A tour of northern Saskatchewan by Department of Northern Saskatchewan Minister Ted Bowerman and news media representatives from across the province has come in for heavy criticism from the Métis Society of Saskatchewan, representatives of the newly elected northern municipal council and three social workers from Flin Flon.

At a press conference in La Ronge early Thursday, the Métis Society again publicly called for the resignation of Mr. Bowerman and his Deputy Minister, J. W. Churchman. All three groups alleged the DNS has lost its credibility with northern people and said the tour only takes newsmen into communities where Government policies have been successful, or where Federal jurisdiction precludes provincial intervention.

The Métis Society accused the Government of inaction in economic development, for failing to provide adequate housing and of refusing to pay compensation to communities that have lost their fishing livelihood.

What is the reason for the press tour one of the Métis Society members asked? Mr. Bowerman, Mr. Churchman and DNS have lost a lot of credibility with northern people.

Then he goes on to point out what the tours hoped to accomplish as far as the Minister was concerned. He said:

You are going to start your tour in La Ronge. Ask to see the houses the Government employees are living in which are separate from the community, and all called 'the ghetto'. Then ask to see the housing that is being started here for the people. Then take a look at the schedule — you will be taken to mines in communities which have very little to do with DNS.

The Métis Society said the tour should have included La Loche, which would have shown lack of economic development; Sandy Bay, where the people have no electricity in spite of being within a few miles of a major power plant; or at Co-op Point where one family of 15 is living in a one-room shack.

So there was the type of criticism which the Minister got on a tour where he hoped to whitewash the Press, but I say the Métis Society and others were a little too smart for him at that particular moment.

March 5, 1974

From then on the Press reported things as they saw them, or as they were told by northern people, rather than as Mr. Bowerman wanted them to.

There was a report which came out at about that time which also was given wide publicity by the Press. The Star-Phoenix, particularly, gave excellent coverage to this report, and again the headlines in the paper were:

The DNS Failed to Meet Initial Objectives-Report.

The credibility of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan is being questioned by a report which accuses the Department of failing to live up to its original objectives. The report alleges political patronage in appointments, deplorable planning on the part of DNS and the lack of communication between the Department and northern residents.

It further states:

This was demonstrated once again by results of the Northern Municipal Council election in October, which saw four Métis candidates elected. It is alleged these candidates campaigned on an anti-DNS program.

Then another report that appeared in the paper said:

The Report Charges DNS Goals a Myth.

The report was prepared by people presently living in the North, or working for DNS, so it came from reliable, credible staff and credible people who have got together to present this report on the situation as it was developing in northern Saskatchewan.

Now this was an ideal time, you might think, for Mr. Bowerman, the Minister, to answer some of the charges which have been made. They had been made during the spring, they had been made during the media tour which had finished about a month before, now they were being made through a report that had been issued by northern residents. But how do you suppose, Member for Moose Jaw (Mr. MacDonald), how do you suppose the Minister answered these charges?

MR. D. F. MacDONALD: (Moose Jaw North): — How did he?

MR. GUY: — He didn't!

MR. MacDONALD: — He didn't?

MR. GUY: — He didn't, that's right. Here was the opportunity to answer the charges of the Métis Society and former employees, and he refused to do so. Do you know whom he blames? Well, it says here in the Star-Phoenix of November 5th:

Bowerman Describes DNS Press Reports as Being Prejudiced.

He blamed the Press. Oh yes! The Press was wrong, nothing he did was wrong. It was the Press.

Press reports which criticized the Department of Northern Saskatchewan have been dismissed.

They were dismissed as prejudiced by Ted Bowerman, Minister responsible for the Department. At a one and a half hour press conference in Regina today, Mr. Bowerman criticized the Star-Phoenix for printing stories which criticized the Department.

In other words, this little empire that our friend was building is beyond criticism. Nobody ever criticizes the empire that Mr. 'Powerman' has developed for himself. It took him one and a half hours in Regina, at a press conference, to show why his little empire shouldn't be questioned by anybody. Unfortunately he has got the Premier and the Attorney General wrapped around his finger, so that they too are closing their eyes to a bad situation that is developing in the North.

HON. R. ROMANOW: (Attorney General): — How far do you want these to go back?

MR. GUY: — From the day that DNS was started.

MR. ROMANOW: — I just want to go a little further.

MR. GUY: — Well, go ahead, go right ahead.

Referring to news stories in the Star-Phoenix quoting a critical report on the Department, Mr. Bowerman said because the story came from an anonymous resource it could have been written by anyone, including the journalist responsible for the story.

He also said he was told — he was told, he didn't have any proof . . .

Stories resulted from discussions that the journalists had in a beer parlor in Flin Flon.

How low can the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan stoop in trying to slander and slur the Press for making statements about his little empire in northern Saskatchewan?

Even that one and a half hour press conference was a little more than what most thinking people (and in particular editors) were prepared to accept, and so it was only a few days for editors to make their position known. We have an editorial on November 7, shortly after his press conference which says: "Answer Ineffective".

One and a half hours of press conference — answer ineffective. Without attempting to judge the veracity of the criticism of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan which the Star-Phoenix published last week, it must be said the reaction of Ted Bowerman, Minister responsible for the Department, was a major disappointment.

March 5, 1974

In a lengthy Regina press conference, Mr. Bowerman failed to reply to the criticism, or to deal with it in any positive way, but instead chose to criticize the Star-Phoenix for its role in the affair.

Then it concluded its editorial:

Now, Mr. Bowerman, if you can forget about the injury you have suffered at the hands of the Press, perhaps you can tell the people of Saskatchewan what is really going on in the North. And if you cannot, perhaps a Royal Commission will be the answer.

So here is another responsible editor calling for an investigation and an inquiry into the activities of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan.

That wasn't the only editorial — another editorial much along the same line appeared in the Prince Albert Herald of the same date. It says:

Evasiveness won't Solve Problems in the North

Ted Bowerman and his Department of Northern Saskatchewan have been under fire for some time. Last week further fuel was added to the fire with the release of a report questioning the credibility of the DNS and accusing it of failing to live up to its original objectives. The report was prepared by people currently working in the Department and others living in the North.

It goes on to detail some of the criticism that I have already mentioned which appeared in other press releases and other editorials. But it ends up (and here I think is a significant part of this editorial);

The proper approach by Mr. Bowerman at this time would be to show a genuine interest in what is happening and attempt to iron things out now before the situation worsens and the Department fails.

But again, the Minister, in his little ivory tower, refused to consider the editorials of the newspapers that are very closely involved with keeping an eye on the development of northern Saskatchewan and they are in almost daily touch with northern residents.

Well, then a few days later, November 7th, we have another group that's unhappy with the Department of Northern Saskatchewan, and that's the outfitters this time. The outfitters want voting rights. We have a lot of outfitters who spend six or seven months of the year — they have invested their life savings in northern Saskatchewan in developing the tourist industry, but Mr. Bowerman said that they shouldn't have any vote when it comes to choosing the Northern Municipal Council. They've spent all their money, they spend their summers, they spend all their hard-earned cash and their energy and their time, but Mr. Bowerman says with the stroke of a pen, 'no — they are not going to have the right to vote in municipal elections'. Well he knows that they vote according to the facts, and that's something which Mr. 'Powerman' doesn't wish them to have. So that's another group that wants some satisfaction,

some inquiry, from the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan.

And then we come to the Northern Municipal Council election. You remember last spring the Minister made a great point of bringing in the legislation that would set up the terms of reference for the Northern Municipal Council, when the elections were all over and the smoke died away, we found that four out of the five had the support and the approval of the Métis Society of Saskatchewan. Of course, Mr. Bowerman said, 'but the Métis Society — we don't pay any attention to them'. It's about time he paid attention to the Métis Society, because whether he wants to acknowledge it or not, they have a presence in northern Saskatchewan, whether they live in the North, or whether they represent the Society here in the South, they still have a presence there that has to be reckoned with.

But one of the reasons that the Northern Municipal Council was to be elected in the first place was so that they could run the affairs of the North. The Minister promised they would be elected by the local residents, they would have their own opportunities to run the budget, to run their own affairs, and the first thing that we see in the paper after they have had their first meeting, Mr. Bowerman is interfering with them again — "Salary vote termed irresponsible" (Bowerman). So here it is, the heavy hand of the Minister, in their very first meeting, their very first resolution that they passed as the Northern Municipal Council has now been vetoed by the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan.

Since that date I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, the credibility of the Northern Municipal Council, of course, has gone to nil because they know that everything they say and everything they do is still related to whatever the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan wants them to do. So they have no more autonomy, no more authority today than they had before the northern municipal elections were ever held.

Well, then we find that after about three months of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan looking into the activities of some of their former employees, we find that some of the DNS employees get reprimanded. "DNS Employees Reprimanded for Criticisms."

Three Department of Northern Saskatchewan (DNS) who prepared and released a report critical of DNS policies and practices in the North, have been reprimanded by the Department officials, one of them said Friday.

But what was interesting that in December of 1973 was a letter appearing in the Prince Albert Herald from a Sister Patricia Traynor in Sandy Bay who praised the Department, but she never got reprimanded. So it appears that as long as you praise Mr. Bowerman, there are no reprimands, but if you dare to criticize his little empire, then you are not only reprimanded, but you eventually get dismissed from the Department. That's the fair and equal justice that Mr. Bowerman believes in as far as the employees of his Department are concerned.

MR. BOLDT: — They got fired, didn't they?

MR. GUY: — They got fired.

March 5, 1974

Then we all remember that we had the Meadow Lake merchants protest DNS tardiness — up to six months that the Department of Northern Saskatchewan have delayed paying bills, and it isn't because they are running out of money, because they are spending money up there like drunken sailors, however, they are not paying their bills. They have got the merchants up in arms. A later report by the Deputy Minister said they are only one month behind. I know that that's a complete falsehood because I was in La Ronge just a week ago and I saw bills that are not only six months old, but they are over a year old and have not been paid yet.

Then we come to another interesting criticism of the Department, and guess where this criticism came from? Well, it came during the NDP convention: "NDP Executive Told to Investigate Housing Contracts."

The newly elected executive council of the Saskatchewan\ New Democratic Party have been handed the job of investigating charges that the contract for construction of Government housing in La Ronge was awarded on a patronage basis, after charges of pork-barrel politics in awarding the housing contract to Delta Holdings, were levelled at the Department of Northern Saskatchewan by northern delegates at the meeting.

Interesting also that Premier Allan Blakeney and most of his Cabinet voted against the motion for the investigation. All the rank and file NDP supported it and those who had something to hide were the ones who tried to get it taken off the floor of the convention.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Did you vote against it, Roy?

MR. GUY: — No, I think Roy voted in favour of it. I think Roy and the Ministers that are trying to take over as Premier voted in favour of it.

MR. ROMANOW: — I want to go back to contracts in 1969 now.

MR. GUY: — That's fine. But I also find it rather interesting that the Premier has been away for a day and a half and there have been at least seven Cabinet Ministers try out his seat in the last 15 hours. I don't know whether that's significant or not, but I thought I would just throw that out just as a matter of interest. Now I saw the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan spend the longest time of all and the Minister of Government Services (Mr. Brockelbank) has tried the seat out three times to see whether it would fit.

After that charge that was made by the NDP executive, and after our Liberal MLAs' visit last year, we find that at least one of the officials in the Department of Northern Saskatchewan would welcome a probe: "Independent Probe Welcome — Official."

An independent investigation into the Department of Northern Saskatchewan would be welcomed by Art Towill

the Department's Associate Deputy Minister.

And if you look in subsequent press releases you never find that term 'Associate Deputy Minister' used again, because about that time they appointed a new Associate Deputy Minister and where Art Towill is today, no one knows, but he's down with the rank and file somewhere. So the motto is — don't ask for an independent probe of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan or Mr. 'Powerman' will get to you before the night is through.

Mr. Towill went on to say:

There are some problems with the morale of DNS employees, he admitted.

Well, I guess the morale among DNS employees increased substantially after he received his demotion as a result of his call for an independent probe.

Following the new year we find that matters became even more serious, as the first sit-in in Buffalo Narrows occurred. "Natives Occupy DNS Office."

This was in the Star-Phoenix of January 18.

An occupation of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan offices in Buffalo Narrows over reduction in cancellation of welfare payments has resulted in a list of demands from the occupying natives.

So now the militancy and violence is starting to come forth, the result of the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan's failure to act on any of the justified problems which have been brought to his attention during the last nine months. And, of course, the Minister, not wanting to accept any of the responsibility for the sit-in — guess whom he blamed this time?

AN HON. MEMBER: — Who was it?

MR. GUY: — Well, I'll tell you. There are a couple of interesting ones.

Métis Sit-in Termed Power Play — Official Blames Society.

Mr. Bowerman said he arrived in Saskatoon at midnight and has tried, without success, to contact DNS officials in La Ronge to learn more about the demonstration.

He didn't know anything about it — his officials were out for lunch, so how do you expect 'The Powerman' to know what's going on when he can't even get in touch with his own officials. But, he knew that these officials were right and that the Métis Society was wrong. It was a power play, that's what it was. Then the most interesting thing of all was the next day — January 18, Mr. Bowerman's reports:

Waffle Using Métis Like Pawns.

He even brought the Waffle Society into the sit-ins in Buffalo Narrows.

March 5, 1974

I think the Waffle is determined it is going to get after Ted Bowerman and it is encouraging the Métis Society of Saskatchewan to do the same, Mr. Bowerman said.

The Minister suggested those who are organizing demonstrations and complaining about Government policy in the North are representatives from the Métis Society.

So instead of accepting his responsibility, again he blames the Métis Society and throws in another joker in the deck — he now blames the Waffle organization for the sit-ins and the unrest and the things that are going on in northern Saskatchewan.

You'll notice that again he blames everybody but himself, then the sit-in moved on to Saskatoon and we have:

Indian and Métis Sit-in in Saskatoon

The influence of a sit-in at a government office at Buffalo Narrows has spread to Saskatoon. The Tuesday press conference by leaders of the Buffalo Narrows Action Group also charged government patronage, bribery and mismanagement.

This is the first time that bribery has become involved in the criticisms of the Métis Society.

Dennis Poudrier a former employee of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan, and currently a consultant for the Métis Society, said residents of La Loche were bribed with emergency food vouchers into supporting the DNS position at a public meeting in that community on Monday. They (meaning the social workers) paid these people \$50 a piece, then they called a large meeting. They agreed, after having received their \$50, so that the sit-in wasn't worth the risks they would have to take in terms of the possibility of being refused government services.

That was the Minister's approach to the sit-in when it had moved to Saskatoon.

It is not surprising that the Métis Society and the people of La Loche and Buffalo Narrows were a little upset about the lack of government action as far as their welfare allowances were concerned, because on February 25 they picked up the newspaper and they saw, "Contract Offer Ratified by Government Employees' Union". For months and months the people of northern Saskatchewan have been asking for a very minimal increase in their social welfare allowances, and we find that one of the terms of the agreement that had been ratified, was a 50 per cent increase in northern allowances for government employees. It is all right for the southerners to move north and get a 50 per cent increase in their northern allowance, but don't, for heaven sakes, give the northerners any increase in their welfare allowances. That would be terrible. After all, we've got to keep the white bureaucracy on top of the pudding. So it is not surprising that at that time there was another sit-in and this sit-in took place in La Ronge and again it was on the same basis — welfare, lack of economic development, lack of housing. They looked at the housing in La Ronge, looked at the number of houses that have been completed by the Minister of northern Saskatchewan, and the protest continued. How do you suppose

the Minister got around this protest? He said to people who were protesting — "You don't really represent the people of northern Saskatchewan, therefore, he can't meet with them." He can't meet with them because they aren't really the qualified people who should be representing the North. So as a result of that the Métis protesters then refused to meet with the Minister. I think that they were probably closer to being right — that he doesn't represent the people of northern Saskatchewan and, therefore, they refused to meet with him.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. GUY: — Well, this refusal by both the Minister and the Métis Society to get together and try and resolve the problems, of course went on to . . .

MR. LAKE: — Where is the next sit-in?

MR. GUY: — Well, the next one is in La Ronge. Again, this time, militancy threatened unless plans improved. It was at this time that the sit-in at La Ronge had a gun cache in order to back up their demands. But again, our friend Mr. 'Powerman' refused to take any action and there was nothing done. In fact, when he and the Premier were asked if they would attend a meeting, he said, "I'm sorry, we're too busy".

MR. LANE: — They could light a case of dynamite under them.

MR. GUY: — I don't think it would make that much difference. First of all it wouldn't budge him and secondly, if it did he wouldn't have any answers.

Well, finally the last report I have here was from another group and this was the Social Workers Society of Saskatchewan who were concerned about the firing of a social worker in northern Saskatchewan, who again, had had the audacity to even suggest or criticize anything that Mr. Bowerman or his Department did. So he got fired.

MR. LANE: — Did they have a sit-in?

MR. GUY: — No, they haven't yet, but the Saskatchewan Association of Social Workers and the Saskatchewan Council of Anti-poverty Organizations today both levelled criticism at the Department of Northern Saskatchewan over the firing of social work supervisor Art Baalim of Creighton. In supporting Mr. Baalim who was fired last week the society says there is sufficient evidence for the people in Saskatchewan to demand an unbiased investigation into the activities of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan.

So unless the Premier and the Minister pay more attention I am afraid that these unfortunate events are going to continue to occur and that eventually someone will end up being seriously hurt and we shall all end up being sorry.

So in summary, Mr. Speaker, I think that all thinking people at least will agree that I have presented sufficient

March 5, 1974

evidence to justify an inquiry immediately. We have heard complaints from the Indian and Métis organizations, from the social workers, from teachers, from business men, from the Press, from employees past and present, from NDP supporters and concerned northern residents. We have heard accusations of failing to live up to objectives and goals, of political patronage, of appointments in awarding contracts, deplorable planning, inefficiency and lack of communication, low credibility, racist attitudes and hostility. Surely these complaints and accusations demand some action by the Premier.

The question is: will he shirk his responsibility, bury his head in the sand and ignore the situation that could lead to serious trouble in the future? If there is nothing to hide he should welcome an investigation, and if there is something to hide, then the people of northern Saskatchewan and the people of the rest of Saskatchewan are entitled to know.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. GUY: — The type of inquiry is not important as long as it is independent of the Government and the Department of Northern Saskatchewan. The responsibility lies heavily on the shoulders of the Premier to see that the accusations, grievances and complaints receive their immediate investigation and action.

For more than one year matters have gone from bad to worse. The time for action is now. Unanimous support of this Resolution by this Legislature may be the prod that the Premier needs to carry out his responsibilities in this regard. On that basis and that context, I therefore urge unanimous support of this Resolution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. R. ROMANOW: (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, we have just finished hearing, I think, well in excess of an hour . . .

MR. GUY: — No, it wasn't.

MR. ROMANOW: — Well it only seemed well in excess of an hour, because it was a boring recitation of newspaper clippings and some of the statements advanced by the Liberal Opposition in past speeches.

One of the interesting things about this debate that has happened from time to time is that nowhere have the people of Saskatchewan heard yet what the Liberal Party proposes by way of a policy or action with respect to the Department of Northern Saskatchewan or northern Saskatchewan. No one from the Party opposite . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! I think that Members will be better advised if they would let speakers on both sides have their speech without constant interruptions. I believe the mover was given very good courtesy with a lack of interruptions. This could be a serious debate and I would hope that Members will give other Members the courtesy of making their speech without interruption.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I was about to say that I don't think that anyone in the Province of Saskatchewan really knows what the Liberal Party would advocate with respect to a policy for northern Saskatchewan. We don't know yet whether or not their alternate approach would be a Department of Northern Saskatchewan or whether it would be a different administration still within the Department of Northern Saskatchewan or what they would do with the attempts to begin to organize the elected community representatives in northern Saskatchewan. We don't know precisely what they are going to do with respect to northern Saskatchewan if they should ever get into office again.

I suspect, Mr. Speaker, that we don't hear from the Liberals opposite as to what their approach and policy is because they don't have an approach or policy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — I suspect that we don't hear from the Liberals opposite as to what they think positively can be done because their approach is to let things rest the way they have let them rest, Mr. Speaker, for seven years when they were in office.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — We don't hear now, when they are in Opposition, how they feel the native people should organize themselves to overcome their economic and social injustices that they have been battling for years, regardless of the political party in office. We don't hear that now and I suspect because this is an extension of their program and their policy from 1969 to 1971, which was a do-nothing policy, which was a policy of divide and conquer, a policy of increasing welfare payments every time before a general election of the province was called. It was a policy of selling out all of the timber and rich natural resources of the Province of Saskatchewan — not to our native people, no, but to New York entrepreneurs, to Toronto and Montreal entrepreneurs. That is what their policy was for the Department of Northern Saskatchewan, hopscotching along.

MR. WIEBE: — Talk about what you are doing.

MR. ROMANOW: — I'll come to that in a moment. And so all that they can say is what they have been saying with respect to this particular Resolution — the need for a judicial inquiry or an independent inquiry.

Mr. Speaker, the idea is absolutely laughable. The idea advanced by the Members opposite, coming from the Members opposite and their record of indifference, their record of absolute discrimination by neglect, coming from them, it is absolutely laughable and everybody in the Province of Saskatchewan knows it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — Is there any credibility for the Members opposite to

come forward now to ask for a judicial inquiry in the face of this overwhelming evidence of lack of action; this indifference by neglect. What evidence is there? It comes, Mr. Speaker, from a bankrupt party, composed of bankrupt political party members who have no ideas as to how to advance their policies for the North. It comes from the Member of Athabasca (Mr. Guy) whose proclivities with respect to the judicial inquiries and the calling of them are well known by all of the people in the Province of Saskatchewan. What credence or what believability would the people of Saskatchewan have in a resolution advanced by anyone of those Members sitting opposite I ask you, Mr. Speaker. I suggest not one, not one person who looks at this matter objectively and the complex problems would lend any credence to this statement, this request by the Liberal Members opposite at all.

Mr. Speaker, when they talk about the questions of the difficulties of northern Saskatchewan and the people of northern Saskatchewan, of which there are hundreds I am sure everyone admits, and of which there have been mistakes and errors and which everyone admits, when they talk of the need for a judicial inquiry I say the actions of seven years of Liberal indifference speak louder than the words of Liberal politicians opposite.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. J. C. McISAAC: (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Privilege. The Hon. Member is accusing a former Member of this House, the former Premier, of doing nothing in his seven years as Premier of this province. The Hon. Member full well knows that there was no Premier and no Provincial Government who made a greater effort on behalf of Indian and Métis people, than the former Premier Ross Thatcher. For him to stand here and try to sell that lie to this House is a breach of privilege, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! I think that is part of the debate and it can be brought into debate.

MR. McISAAC: — . . . for the Hon. Member to cast aspersions and tell lies about the very sincere efforts of a Member who is not here to defend himself.

MR. ROMANOW: — Well, it seems all right for the Hon. Member opposite who is leaving his chair, to cast aspersions on this Government but not all right for us. It seems that it doesn't cut two ways for the Hon. Member for Wilkie. You are here to defend your Government. I am accusing you when you were on the Treasury benches. You get up in this debate and you tell us what you did for seven years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — You did absolutely nothing! So don't come on and call us names. It is an absolutely hypocritical approach by the Member opposite. He lowers himself in the eyes of this Legislature and all the people of the province. All of you Members in the front rows who have had a hand in this policy,

a hand in the seven years of inactivity, you have a chance to get up and defend yourselves. I challenge you to defend your- selves.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to say, again, what I said a moment ago just before I was so rudely interrupted by the Member for Wilkie. Seven years of Liberal inaction speak louder than any Liberal words of any Liberal politician today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, what does the Hon. Member say today to call on support for this question for a judicial inquiry? He calls on the Star-Phoenix." He calls on the Leader-Post. He calls on two or three other sundry articles. He calls on certain quotations from groups in society, calls on quotations from one or two individuals. I tell you, Mr. Speaker, I had to smile to myself when I saw the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) get up and call to witness for the judicial inquiry, the Métis Society of Saskatchewan, especially when just a couple of days ago the Liberal Party opposite was calling in to question the expenditures of the Métis Society of Saskatchewan and urging the Government to call a judicial inquiry into those expenditures. That is what they were doing yesterday when there was no one else in this gallery. But, today, their position is that they call the Métis Society to question now.

Mr. Speaker, I had a bigger smile when I saw the Member opposite talk about even calling for support, they called on everybody in support and they even went so far as to call on the Waffle in support of the judicial inquiry. Did I hear them call on the Waffle for support?

AN HON. MEMBER: — Yes.

MR. ROMANOW: — Why I even thought that they would have called Next Year Country in support, Mr. Speaker. Did they call Next Year Country in support or not? See what happens, Mr. Speaker.

There has been no analysis of the statements made by the Hon. Member in presenting the case for a judicial inquiry. None whatsoever! He just simply comes before this House, recites clippings for over an hour, for nearly an hour, newspaper clippings, any statements made by anyone and then asks the House, a responsible body, to accept those statements with- out any criticisms or judgments on his part or advice on his part.

Mr. Speaker, I say that the call for the judicial inquiry coming from the Members opposite can only be best described by some people in northern Saskatchewan, quoting from the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix, Friday, November 30th as hypocritical.

The Member opposite doesn't live in northern Saskatchewan. He says that he was in La Ronge lately. I don't know when he was lately in La Ronge. I know that he is running now in the constituency of Rosthern and that is his privilege, I don't criticize him for that in any personal sense. I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that there are people who call this Motion by the Liberal Party sheer hypocrisy, which does not add one

March 5, 1974

iota to overcoming the problems that all of us have, regardless of being Liberal, NDP, Waffle or Métis or FBI. All the problems are there for all of us to help to overcome after the long standing years of inequity and injustice in northern Saskatchewan. We are not going to get at this by the type of actions by the Member opposite.

The Premier, in 1972, when he set up the Department of Northern Saskatchewan said that the aim of the Department was to help the people in northern Saskatchewan, and I quote his words:

To develop their interest in self-government and their skills and decision-making, an essential task to assist them in this way.

This has been the policy, the basic policy of DNS. In the end, it is the people of northern Saskatchewan who will matter and not the administrative structure. I think, Mr. Speaker, we are seeing evidence that the people of northern Saskatchewan are developing a keen interest in self-government. The people of northern Saskatchewan are beginning to organize. They are beginning to speak out. They are beginning to stand up for their rights. They are beginning to make demands and that is precisely what the expectations and hope of this Government was and is for DNS.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — I don't even think the Métis Society, Federation of Saskatchewan Indians, anyone you would call on, would deny the statement that I make. Basically three years ago or so, the people of the North were silent as they had been for generations. They expected nothing very frequently and they got nothing from government.

In order for us to understand what is happening in the North, we have to understand the process that is going on. It is a process that groups of underprivileged people go through when they begin to realize that there is something, and there must be something, that can be done about the situation to assist them. And it is not unreasonable or unnatural for them to expect that the Department of Northern Saskatchewan should be a first target. Why would it be unreasonable or unnatural to expect that DNS would be a target? This is the first sort of organized effort, the objective being to help the native people and the people in the North to organize themselves, and why wouldn't these people organize themselves and use the target of DNS? It is part of the way to develop the awareness in self-government. If you organize against DNS it is a good way to start organizing. It is easy for people who don't understand this process or the Liberals who don't want to understand this process, to blame the dissent on the NDP Government. It is very easy for the Member for Athabasca to say, who doesn't understand this particular process or who understands it but refuses to accept it and wilfully betrays it. It is very easy for him to say that there is something wrong with the NDP, that there is patronage and all the other stuff, and ask for a judicial inquiry, failing to understand the basic aspect of what is happening in northern Saskatchewan.

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that if the NDP had not become the Government, I think that absolutely nothing of any meaning would have been done to help the people of the North. I say that white colonialism would have continued. I say that northern resources would have continued to be given away by the Liberals to American corporations. I say that if the NDP had not been elected, acute social problems would have been allowed to fester and to compound and to be neglected and to be ignored. But I also say to you, Mr. Speaker, that it is the NDP, this Government, this Minister, Ted Bowerman, which has had the courage and the foresight to start the process of debate going. Once that started, to start the protests and the self awareness, I want to tell my friends opposite, no matter what happens in 1975 in a provincial election, I predict that it's a process that not even you people will be able to reverse. A process of native people and people of the North organizing for themselves to control their destiny and all the difficulties that are attached to this.

I say to you that we are seeing two things happening in the North, Mr. Speaker. One, we are seeing the beginning of the dismantling of a colonial structure. We haven't got any- where near it. The Member for Lumsden (Mr. Lane) laughs. I am not saying that it has got anywhere near completion. Nobody is saying it. But it is the beginning of the dismantling of that process, partly by the DNS, partly by the people of the North in opposition to DNS and in the times of the protests and the politics of protests have developed. Secondly, I say that we are seeing the encouragement of our native people and the development of the native people taking over their fair share of power and responsibility. And rightly so. We are seeing many of them saying that we are not going fast enough. That's the basic fact of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan. Liberals may not want to analyse it that way. Maybe society might not agree with it fully. The Federation of Saskatchewan Indians may oppose it but they are organizing and they are being heard and that is a fact of the DNS.

The fact that there are problems, Mr. Speaker, doesn't warrant the calling of a judicial inquiry to undo all of this that we have begun. We don't want to go back to the old Neanderthal outlook of the Liberal Party from 1964 to 1971, sticking their heads in the sand and forgetting there is such a thing as northern Saskatchewan. We don't want a Liberal Party or an approach in this province that seeks to stifle the interests and the voice of the North. Absolutely not. I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that there are in my judgement great accomplishments despite the difficulties that have been experienced in the Department of Northern Saskatchewan. Great accomplishments in northern Saskatchewan and I'll come to them in a moment but you won't accept them.

Somebody mentioned the protest at Buffalo Narrows. The Member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy) talked about the protest in Buffalo Narrows. Yes, there was a protest there. Also a letter that the Minister is kind enough to lend to me dated September 10, 1973. A list of 241 names of Buffalo Narrows' residents protesting the demonstration to the Legislative Building. They want the Government and the people to know that they in no way represent northern people. I don't want to get into that aspect of it. I'm just not in a position to say whether they do or not. I am not going to comment on that but I do want to comment

March 5, 1974

that there are 241 names on this petition and I'll table a copy of it I am sure the Minister has no objection to it. Not 14 or 15 Liberals sitting in Regina but 241 people from Buffalo Narrows.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — I know that there are many problems with respect to getting economic development under way. I wonder if the Member for Meadow Lake (Mr. Coupland) reads his own newspaper, The Meadow Lake Progress. In case he doesn't, I draw to his attention a newspaper article, November 21, 1973. I can table a copy if you want. "Big Changes Occur in Beauval . Pictures, some of the examples of some attempts at economic progress that I think have been going well. Did you read that, Member for Meadow Lake? Do you deny that? Of course he doesn't deny that. He accepts that "There are economic actions that are continuing in this area. I have a letter here also forwarded from the Uranium City Chamber of Commerce. Again, you judge whatever value you want on the Uranium City Chamber of Commerce but in my judgement they do represent some people of the North. I am not going to belabor it but again they say that the DNS is at least beginning to unleash these types of force that I have talked about. That's a fact.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are going to be difficulties in the North. There are going to be administrative governmental difficulties in the North.

MR. LAKE: — Will you table that?

MR. ROMANOW: — I'll table a copy, yes, a photocopy. You can have all those materials that I have tabled there. The Hon. Member doubts that that is the letter.

But I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that we realize that there are administrative problems. Why, even the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) when he was Minister of Public Works his department experienced I think administrative problems with_ respect to government activity and government construction in the North. The Member for Athabasca wouldn't deny that. I m sure he wouldn't. For example, Mr. Speaker, in 1970 I am advised by the Minister of Government Services, that there was a school to be built at Wollaston Lake. The Department of Public Works, of which the Hon. Member for Athabasca was the Minister in charge said the estimated cost would be \$28,300. Three companies responded to public tender. I'm not going to name them other than to tell you that the low bid came in at \$26,900. The next bidder came in at \$28,400. The next one came in at \$28,500. Now on August 18, 1970, all the tenders I am advised were rejected because they had failed to state the date of the completion of the project at Wollaston Lake. It was supposed to be 42 days to the completion of the project. That was on August 18th they were rejected. On the same date, August 18th, a contract was awarded to the high bidder and the final payment was made, not what the bid was for \$28,500, but a little bit over \$28 822. I want to emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that the low tender was rejected because they couldn't complete the Wollaston School project in 42 days. So how long do you think it took the man who got the project to complete it? 406 days!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — Now, Mr. Speaker, I suppose that somebody could say we need a judicial inquiry into this. Someone could say that we would like to have some people under oath as to all about this. But I don't think that's the right way to go because I realize as the Hon. Member for Athabasca does that in these types of situations in the North if you try to use local people, you try to use local contractors, you've got weather problems, you've got road problems, you've got supply problems, you are going to have problems like this, just like we have problems administratively. But no one gets up here and calls for judicial inquiry.

Mr. Speaker, I honestly don't want to get involved in this business of recitation of activities that went on in former administrations in the past. Whatever the Opposition may think of me I feel awkward in saying this because it has an implication and a connotation that I don't want to convey. My point that I want to make is that there are administration difficulties and there are errors and the Member for Athabasca and his Government made them honestly and legitimately and our Minister and our Government may make some errors honestly and legitimately. But, is the answer to call a judicial inquiry? Is the answer to get up and take the political position that the Liberals do and to call for a judicial inquiry? I am sure that even my friend for Saskatoon University (Mr. Richards) would reject that approach and will reject that approach. We are not talking about political tactics as I am sure the Member for Saskatoon University will agree. We are talking about concepts and directions to liberate and start the people of northern Saskatchewan on the road to true independence as we are asking for them to do.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I could go through what I think are some excellent accomplishments in the DNS in one short year. Just think of the start up problems, Mr. Speaker, of getting a deputy minister and an administrative staff and getting the accounting procedure, just the forms set up. Just think of the difficulties that are inherent in that. You even set up a bureaucracy with that, you know, and bureaucracies can offend people. That's an unfortunate fact. Luckily in the North we are getting some counter forces against these bureaucracies. But just imagine the start up difficulties, Mr. Speaker, in one short year. What do we see? A Northern Municipal Council elected. I ask the Liberals when is the last time you people passed legislation for the election of a Northern Municipal Council? When was the last time you people talked about having elections and democracy and elected people speak for the North? When was this? The Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) can get up and pooh-pooh that ail that he wants, and he can throw any innuendo he wants on the elected people. He can say that four people were against Ted Bowerman or four people were for him or one was against him. What does that matter? What does it matter? There are five elected people who speak for the North and if they are against Ted Bowerman or against the DNS they will be heard. That is why we set up the legislation for them to be heard.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — The Member opposite keeps on telling us that somehow we should be overlooking this. Is this cause for an inquiry? Because there are four people who are elected and given the democratic right to voice their complaints against the DNS, somehow he says that this is a cause for a judicial inquiry. I say that is a reason why not to have a judicial inquiry because the procedure and the laws work. How about a Northern Development Advisory Council being established to include Northern Municipal Council members and representatives of organized people in the North, trappers, fishermen and teachers and the Métis Society and the FSI and so forth? How about local community authorities? Procedures are being established to ensure full participation and consultation with local community authorities by the DNS. How about northern school unit boards, previously appointed by the Government? Now it is being recommended that they be filled by election. Is it 21 nominated for the board at Ile-a-La-Crosse? Twenty-one people nominated by the people of Ile-a-La-Crosse. Not by Liberal politicians sitting in Regina, but by the people in Ile-a-La-Crosse. That's what we did. We increased the budget and transferred it to the board. Why does the Member get up and say that there are some teachers who are protesting the change-over to DNS, that we should have a judicial inquiry? We are setting up some local school board authorities and what does the Member for Athabasca say, we should have a judicial inquiry. He cites that as evidence for a judicial inquiry. Mr. Speaker, they are showing their old proclivities again to quash local and regional autonomy. They did it in other fields when they were in power and now they seek to do it here.

What about economic development? Economic Development Fund Regulations were passed in the summer of 1973 to establish providing loans and grants to northern residents and organizations. Economic development, I say, is on the upswing in the North. Not fast enough, I agree. No one says that. But I can give you many examples of sawmills and jobs that are being generated and loans being advanced, wood cutting operations, cabin and boat rental operations, garage operations, taxi operations, commercial trucking operations, commercial trapping and fishing operations and nobody can deny that. Nobody, not even the Liberals opposite, not even in their wildest dreams. If the Press gives this even the slightest bit of credence the people of Saskatchewan won't accept any of the statements made by the Liberals opposite. How about a Prospectors' Incentive Program? Training, contract prospecting, a first step in developing northern people and getting their participation in the development of mineral resources. Training farms, adult education and training. For example Ile-a-La-Crosse recognized the need for someone to be able to repair the growing number of oil furnaces being used.' Plumbing and heating along with electrical training is scheduled for Ile-a-La-Crosse. All right, maybe it's not there yet but what did you do in seven years? At least we've got it on the go.

La Ronge Community College is being established and is operating. What did you do in seven years? Where was your La Ronge Community College? A regional Adult Education Office has been opened in Uranium City, Buffalo Narrows and La Ronge. Operation of a bursary program to provide post secondary education opportunities to northern residents is under study as well. Those are facts, Mr. Speaker. Can anyone deny them?

Mr. Speaker, what about housing? I could cite a long list of the works that have been undertaken with respect to housing. I can tell the Members opposite about the northern housing program designed to improve the quality of accommodation for residents of northern Saskatchewan. I can tell the Members that an agreement with Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation to provide 625 homes over the next five years has been signed. I could tell the House that the quality and size of homes have increased from previous years. I could tell the House that in the current year 99 houses are under construction and 40 per cent of these (which is probably out of date now) are complete. An additional 40 units are to be undertaken to maintain the 125 units per year commitment. These are complete, Mr. Speaker, with electrical wiring, bathrooms, kitchen fixtures and plumbing facilities. I can tell that to the Members of this House. You ask me are there enough houses for northern Saskatchewan and I answer, no. You ask me if all the people of northern Saskatchewan have housing and I say, no. But this Department has only been on the go for one year, Mr. Speaker, and look at the tremendous accomplishments made today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, the 1973 program for home construction represents over a 300 per cent increase over any other previous year in the history of Saskatchewan. That's what the DNS did.

What about the field of social services and health? Additional child welfare workers have been added to the northern staff, 90 employees generate a weekly payroll of \$10,000 to \$12,000. Next year's payroll is expected to be higher. Provision for social assistance reduced with the advent of new development programs such as at Beauval. We want to get people off social welfare. Everybody is for that objective. A child care centre is now being constructed at Sandy Bay. When was the last time you constructed a child care centre in Sandy Bay? That's when we should have had the judicial inquiry when you did nothing instead of now when we are beginning to develop them.

I could tell you about additional medical staff. What about sewer and water, planning and design systems at the village of La Ronge. I want the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy), you are to represent La Ronge still, I hope you haven't vacated that responsibility. But I want to tell the Member in case he doesn't know it that the village of La Ronge has received a \$220,000 grant, provincial, towards a water and sewer system presently under construction.

MR. GUY: — That's not the first grant.

MR. ROMANOW: — I'm not saying it is the first grant. It's an additional grant.

What about the new wells at Jans Bay, Cole Bay, Beauval, Buffalo Narrows? Wells are being attempted at Green Lake and Sandy Bay. How many years late is that in your terms? Far too late. All of us are at fault. Where were you people when this was underway? How many wells did you start in your seven years?

Mr. Speaker, I could go on and talk about roads, air strips, power, field services, schools, a new gym and science facility at Buffalo Narrows, portable classrooms at Ile-a-La-Crosse, Rabbit Lake, and so on. I could talk about all of these. Now, Mr. Speaker, sure there is criticism to be made against the Department of Northern Saskatchewan. There is criticism to be made against the Department of the Attorney General, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Health. Why don't you ask for a judicial inquiry in those areas? Knowing the Liberal Opposition, undoubtedly you would. You are that irresponsible to ask for it. Knowing you, you would do it. You are irresponsible, Mr. Speaker, beyond any imagination whatsoever.

I can't really understand why it is that the Liberal Party takes the position that they do take. I have concluded that they take this position like they do in all matters. Mr. Speaker, because — I say this sincerely now as a matter of my own view of the political philosophy of the Liberals — I think they have nothing basically, other than the vague commitment to something called free enterprise. Whatever free enterprise means. Catch as catch can. Sometime I'll work up a PA pulp mill deal with you there if I can work it out with free enterprise. That's good old fashioned free enterprise. We put up 75 per cent of the cash. The free enterpriser puts up 25 per cent of the cash. And the northern people are supposed to be happy with that. That's the Liberal development of northern Saskatchewan. I think this is the reason why we have this incoherent, nonsensical, laughable resolution before us.

The Hon. Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) talked about a quotation from the Prince Albert Daily Herald. Well, they are entitled to their opinions, but I tell you one thing. At the time of the introduction of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan Bill the Prince Albert Daily Herald was one of those which supported the concept of the single agency like DNS, to the hilt. What did you do when we introduced DNS? You know what you did. You opposed it. You opposed it then. Now you call on the Prince Albert Herald because it happens to fit in temporarily with the short-run political argument. But you don't deal one iota with what the Prince Albert Herald says about the concept of the development of the North. Not one iota at all!

Mr. Speaker, I think the people of Saskatchewan are fair-minded. I honestly believe that. I believe the people of Saskatchewan don't believe in the personal vilification of any individual in politics as the Liberal Party has engendered against the Minister of northern Saskatchewan (Mr. Bowerman). I tell the House, and I speak for myself only, that there is no man better qualified to lead the department of DNS than Ted Bowerman, that's my judgment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — I want to tell you, that Ted Bowerman, like all of us, like even the Member for Athabasca, has some failings. But I tell you Ted Bowerman lived in the North. He knows the North. He has the respect of the people of the North and he is trying full out to do something for the North. That's more than you ever did, anyone of you over there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that in my judgment, vilification and witch-hunting and innuendoes of this kind by the Liberal Opposition is falling on deaf ears. The only thing the Liberals can do is bray from a sitting position as the Member for Lumsden (Mr. Lane) does every time I take part in debates. The only thing that the Liberal Party can do is to cat-call and to name-call but not make one positive proposal for the North.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I stand behind the concept of the DNS. I want a liberated North. I stand behind Ted Bowerman. I reject this phony and specious call for a judicial inquiry by the Liberals opposite.

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

Debate adjourned.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

MOTIONS FOR RETURN

RETURN NO. 44

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. T. M. Weatherald 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.

HON. J. R. KOWALCHUK: (Minister of Natural Resources): — Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment to that motion. The amendment is to show a total concept of what the Government of Saskatchewan received from each of the major users of our forests for more than just one year; to get an accurate picture of what kind of an input is generated for the people of Saskatchewan, by whom it was generated and, for what years in the immediate past and to change from the calendar year to the fiscal year. That is the way records are kept and for comparison purposes, I propose this amendment. Mainly the amendment will provide additional comparative information, Mr. Speaker. I move, seconded by the Member for Kinistino (Mr. Thibault) an amendment thereto:

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

The amount the Prince Albert Pulp Company Limited, Saskatchewan Forest Products Corporation and Meadow Lake Sawmill Company Limited paid to the Government of Saskatchewan during the fiscal years 1969-70, 1970-71, 1971-72, 1972-73 for: (a) stumpage dues;

March 5, 1974

b. ground rental and fire prevention; (c) fire suppression; (d) other specified purposes.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

RETURN NO. 47

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. J. Wiebe (Morse) for Return No. 47 showing:

The mileage of the Provincial highway system at September 30, 1975; (a) in total; (b) according to surface treatment; (i) paved; (ii) oil treatment; (iii) gravelled; (iv) dirt.

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

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

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) gravel- led; (iv) dirt.

Amendment agreed to.

MR. J. WIEBE: (Morse): — Mr. Speaker, in closing debate on this motion, I find it rather unfortunate that the Government has decided to adopt the amendment as for April 1, 1973. It is a contradiction to a similar motion that was passed in the Legislature last year in which I asked relatively the same information dealing with the highway construction that had been undertaken during the year 1972.

As the Members opposite realize the only reason this question is asked is because we wish to find the information prior to the debate on the Budget which will be presented this week. The date has been changed to April 1, 1973. The highway estimates and the debate on the Budget will more than likely be completed by that date. I can't see why the Government is not prepared to answer or to provide this information at this date. When the motion was first proposed, I had suggested to the Attorney General at that time who moved the motion that I would be quite agreeable to have the date changed to February 1, as the case may be, which would allow them more time in which to answer this question.

This should be a very simple question to answer, almost four months. You can't tell me that the Minister of Highways does not know today the amount of highway system which he built in 1973. First of all he budgeted for it in the spring of 1973 he had the entire year to work on it and they have had four months after completion of that system in which to tabulate the information. I would hope that the Members in turn would defeat the motion as amended which would then allow me to submit another question, asking for the information as of today's date.

Motion as amended agreed to.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

RESOLUTIONS

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

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

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.

HON. G. MacMURCHY: (Minister of Education): — Mr. Speaker, when I spoke on this Resolution earlier, I indicated there are several situations in which child care services could be necessary.

These cases could be where both parents must work to make ends meet or a single parent family is forced to draw welfare to look after their children, or where there is seasonal or periodic need for both parents to work, such as in the rural parts of the province at seeding time, harvest time or pre- Christmas sales in small businesses.

Now the Government recognizes the need of many people in these situations and we are developing a program for them. Mr. Speaker, I expect Saskatchewan child care will be publicly supported, co-operatively organized and parent controlled. Just as there is a need for real parent participation in schools, so there is also a need for parent control in pre- school child care.

One of the pitfalls that child care programs must avoid is the tendency to satisfy demands as opposed to meeting needs. I believe there will prove to be a difference between those who are vocal and demanding child care and those maybe less vocal but who have a much greater need of the care. Much of the pressure for child care today comes from people at the top end of our income ladder, people whose need is social, not economic.

Mr. Speaker, I don't say that these people should be ignored, but I say that their needs should not receive the highest priority. If parent control is desirable in child care the use of co-operatives to organize the parents would, in my opinion, be absolutely ideal. The co-operative organization involves each parent directly on a 1 to 1 basis, provides for an easy movement into and out of the organization as people come and go and as children grow older in the program.

The co-operative allows parents who use the service to operate it themselves or to use an elected board. I believe that this sort of operation is preferable to a contract relationship for an agency to provide the service to the parents.

March 5, 1974

Mr. Speaker, setting up these co-operatives will pose some problems just as those with less need tend to be most vocal and demanding service, so I suspect these same people would be the first to organize a co-operative. A child care plan that hopes to reach those who need its service the most, is going to have to reach out. It will have to actively pursue those on modest wages. It will have to provide encouragement. It will have to provide start up money and plenty of organizational help. This work calls for the talents of a fair sized staff. I am not sure that the child care services, as such, should attempt to locate and hire the necessary people itself. I think it would make good sense to use the Department of Co-operative staff in this work.

Co-operatives have several new field men. I might say that it is finally catching up, strengthening after several years of starvation under the Liberal Government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MacMURCHY: — I think there is a pool of talent that is ready to take on a challenge such as a program of child care. The Department has liaison with other established co-operatives and these relationships could benefit child care groups in getting established. I think that child care should be developed on a stable foundation such as our co-operative movement offers.^ I would very much encourage the use of co-operatives as a basis of delivery. The Department of Co-operatives is a major tool for establishing the local organization.

Mr. Sneaker, child care is a new field. There are very few trained people around to operate quality centres. Most parents don't know what to expect in child care. The service will require a strong backup from an educational program. Where parents want to run the co-operatives themselves, they will have to be trained. Where the parents hire staff, they will have to be trained. Ongoing operations of child care calls for managerial and organizational skills, again, requiring training. In each case, Mr. Speaker, the demand for education is decentralized and it will be difficult, if not impossible to meet, through centralized formal programs.

Here, Mr. Speaker, I see an important role for a community college system in meeting child care training needs. Each parent group will have some unique characteristics, some special needs that a standard training program simply would not accommodate, because community colleges themselves are adapted to local circumstances, they are suited to supplying whatever the child care co-operatives, in their areas, require, they can back up the organizational services of the Department of Social Services, the Department of Co-operatives with on-site training, I think community colleges are ideal for this situation and their involvement is insured.

Mr. Speaker, the principles of parent controlled province-wide service, public support and access without penalty due to income are sound. Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to support the Resolution and the introduction of child care on this basis.

MR. D. BOLDT: (Rosthern): — Mr. Speaker, this Resolution was debated some three months ago. I believe it was on a Friday afternoon and I had left early. I did not hear any of the speeches that were made but I did read all of them and all three speakers, including the Leader of the Opposition, devoted some time in the remarks to things that I had said on some previous occasion.

I feel that the Minister of Education who spoke sometime ago on the Resolution challenged me that I should make my views known and I appreciate that remark and I certainly do not want to back down and not take part in this debate.

The reason I am opposed to government financed day care centres as this Resolution spells out, is because perhaps of my family and cultural background. I realize that this is a serious Resolution. I firmly believe in the principle that a mother's place, while the children of the family are growing up, is in the home, and no civil servant, regardless of how sincere the civil servant is, is going to replace the average good mother.

I am interested in the remark made by the Member for Saskatoon University (Mr. Richards) and I hardly think that it is worthwhile commenting on it, but for his clarification — and I don't think he is in the House — he said on a previous occasion in this House that the Hon. Member for Rosthern is always in the dark. I appreciate that this is partly taken out of context, but this is what he meant that I was always in the dark. I am sure that no other Member in this House subscribes to his remarks. Members of this House, the Liberal Party and my constituents always know where I stand. I have been elected and re-elected in four provincial elections. And if the Hon. Member for Saskatoon University will be able to earn that kind of success, then I might be able to assess his philosophy and opinions with a greater degree of sincerity.

But I realize that my hon. friend from Saskatoon University has been under tremendous strain and I really do not want to hold him accountable for all the remarks and utterances he makes in this House. He assesses himself as an intellectual, but his record of judgment and achievement falls far short of the mark, both in his teaching and political career. He is a Waffler, got elected on the NDP ticket, parted company with the NDP several months ago, sits alone as an independent of nothing and will never be back after the next election. He can say anything he likes in this House, particularly on this Resolution. He can tell the Government to spend piles of money because he knows he will never be called upon to back up what he says.

In reference to the motion, I want to make it quite clear that I am not opposed to women working. But where I part company is that I believe, with the greatest sincerity, that mothers with young children should not attempt to do two jobs at one time, and this is particularly true in the case where the husband is working.

I have heard dozens of parents say, and I am sure that all Members of this House have, "If only I had looked after my family, my daughter or son would not have gone on drugs, or run away from home, but now it is too late. I thought I needed that extra dollar to keep up with my neighbors more than they needed my love and attention."

March 5, 1974

So that is one of the reasons we are concerned, as the Government today and. I am sure the Minister of Welfare is concerned, with delinquent children, the drug pusher and the drug user, and the governments are asked to pick up where the parents fail. The governments are asked to rehabilitate these, once innocent, fine children who at one time were the greatest blessing that arrived in the home.

The Motion calls for universal coverage, with no direct costs, on a 24-hour basis. It is estimated by the welfare officials that if this program were implemented and utilized by all working mothers — and I am sure that not all would — it would cost the province over \$-100 million. I commend the Government and I commend the Minister for not plunging into this program on a 100 per cent basis as recommended by the Motion.

In the first place it can never be implemented. You just could not find one-tenth the staff that would be needed to look after these day care centres. How can anyone in his right mind even suggest that staffing would be no problem? If a mother does not want to look after her own child, what would make her think that someone else will?

If universal day care were implemented without reservations, the centres, in my opinion and I am sure the opinion of the Government, must be staffed by qualified personnel. I can imagine if one child should die for lack of, competent staff, or be injured for life, the uproar from the public would be so pronounced that I just would not want to be the Minister of that Department, nor the Government for that matter.

There is another area of great concern if day care centres are set up and that is the support we lend to the unwed mothers. I am confident that the vast majority of parents in this province, or in this country, perhaps in the world, do not want their sons and daughters involved with sex relationships outside of marriage. Every parent that has had this unfortunate experience with their child, has been left with a mark of sadness and disappointment in that home. It has also left a sense of shame, sadness and guilt upon the son or daughter. Adultery and fornication are the greatest sins as related to us in the Holy Scriptures.

Governments of all stripes have more or less shut their eyes to the immoral teachings and practices of our modern permissive society. The results are, of course, obvious and of real concern to me and I am sure to the Government. Venereal disease is running almost out of control, marriages end up in divorce as never before, and more and more children are being born out of wedlock. The fact that this is with us does not mean that society or governments have to accept that fact.

By setting up day care centres, are we then not saying to young people, to the unwed mother, "Sure, you have the child, we will look after it for you while you work at no cost to you, you just carry on, you have no responsibility."

I believe that the teaching or education, whatever you may want to call it, certainly has to be taught by the parents, but apparently some homes have utterly failed, some schools have utterly failed, some churches have a miserable record, so finally when the home has failed, the school has failed and

the churches have failed, as a last resort the government must step in and tell our young people that to bring a child into the world, there are some serious responsibilities. And one of those responsibilities is to provide for that child, a home and love. It is not the state's responsibility to look after these children, it is the responsibility of the parents. And if there is only one parent then the mother must take full responsibility.

If the single mother cannot get support from the father of the child, then, of course, I support government assistance, keeping in mind at all times that the child be taken care of by the mother. All governments, past and present, are guilty of promoting the welfare state.

Governments are guilty of taking away responsibilities from the home and the church. Homes and churches are equally guilty of shirking responsibility and are pushing it by leaps and bounds into the lap of the government. Prevention is much less costly than rehabilitation. As an example, the Fire Department is far more concerned with safety and prevention than putting out the actual fire. The same rule applies to the society in which we live. Rather than teach and enforce good moral standards, we have accepted and condoned immorality.

The parents, the society and the Government have accepted the use of the pill as a counter measure. If the pill fails you can have an abortion. If both fail, the Government will look after the needs of your wanted or unwanted child and you may feel free to follow your own career. I do not believe that this is the kind of society that the majority of us want.

Mr. Speaker, I have devoted my remarks particularly to the child of the unwed mother. I fully realize that there are fine, respectable parents who have extreme hardships and the day care centres would also be available to them. However, I do not want to withdraw from the argument that the mother in this case should be able to go out and hold down a job. I believe the Welfare Department is moving in the right direction, that low- income earners can be supplemented with assistance, without the mother being forced out of the home.

I have to agree with the Minister of Welfare that, if a skeleton program is to be implemented, it must be available to those in need only. I would be vigorously opposed to making day care centres available to those parents, free of direct cost, who would have an income away above what is considered to be the poverty level.

I also want to make my position clear as to those mothers who do work and provide their own child care. It is a decision of each individual and really none of my business to tell these parents what they should do. I am sure that most mothers and fathers have thought this matter out very carefully. I am sure that every parent realizes the benefits versus the present and future harmful and dangerous effects it might have on their children. That chance they must take and if problems arise then these parents should not blame our educational system, or the school teacher, or the church, or the government, but the blame rests solely and fully on the individual.

March 5, 1974

If the child goes astray, which many of them do, it could cost the government a great deal of money to try to rehabilitate indeed if it is at all possible to do so.

I want to say to this House that I was elected in 1960 as a Member of the Opposition, my responsibility in the ensuing years, up to 1964, was as critic of the Department of Welfare. In 1964 to 1971 as a member of the Executive Council I believe my reputation proves that I have consistently advocated in what areas the government has a responsibility and I have strongly stressed the responsibility of the individual and particularly the parent. The government has no business suggesting that they will offer to raise my child. As a matter of fact, I would not want them to do so and I hope that many parents take that same attitude.

The most important years of a child are from birth to age six. These are the years of rapid growth and development. You teach the child how to walk, you count the teeth as they appear, you teach them to take the first step, to say the first word, you teach them the first song, the first hymn and hopefully the first prayer and I don't think that these matters are the responsibilities that lie with the government or with the civil servant. It is the responsibility of the parent and I cannot stress that more than to say to every individual parent that they should realize what this Resolution really means and what we are promoting. And as I said in my remarks that if we are going to have a day care centre, certainly it must be on a very limited basis. Secondly, I don't think you can go into it on a large scale because we haven't even got nurses, trained staff, to look after our sick people let alone looking into an area where there really should be no need.

Again, I want to make it very plain that I'm not opposed to women working, females working, particularly if they are not parents, but the danger is there and we as a government, should not promote immorality. Many schools, perhaps it might not be the responsibility of the schools, but some schools, some teachers fail. There is no argument about that. I don't think it is the responsibility of the government always to pick up the pieces and try to make a citizen out of someone that the parent has neglected. For those reasons I do not support the motion as introduced by Mr. Richards.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. H. H. ROLFS: (Saskatoon Nutana South): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few words on the motion as introduced by the Member for Saskatoon University (Mr. Richards).

First of all let me say that I listened very intently on what the Member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) had to say and I wish to compliment him on what he had to say. I don't necessarily want to say that I agreed with everything that he had to say, but certainly he said it in a very sincere tone and I think he really believes in what he has said. But I do want to ask the Member simply this question. Would he and I'm sure he would, would he not step in if he saw a child that was severely suffering because of the irresponsibility of parents? Would he not have stepped in as the Minister of Welfare, when he was the

Minister, to see to it that children would not be penalized because of the irresponsibility of those parents? And I'm sure his answer would be yes, that he would have stepped in, that he would not penalize that child. What I would say to the Member for Rosthern that we have many such children and I for one cannot stand by and see these children suffer and grow up as people who really become bitter against society and grow up with corrupt minds and with corrupt attitudes.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that I do not support the motion as introduced by the Member for Saskatoon University and I intend to move an amendment when I finish.

I agree with the Member for Rosthern that the mother's place is in the home, but again there are mothers who do not want to remain in the home and we cannot command them to remain in the home, and if we do, I think again the children will suffer and what we must do is look at the welfare of the children. Would the children be better off if these mothers were permitted to go out and work and let someone else take care of the children either in the family home as we have provided under the new regulations or let them set up a neighborhood day care centre? I think the child probably would be much better off if that would happen. I again agree with the Member for Rosthern that the mother should not attempt to do two jobs at one time. Society in certain instances forces both parents to go out and work in order to make sufficient income to provide for their family. So really the blame has to be put on the society that we have established and I would have to say that both the Member for Rosthern and myself have had a part to play in developing that society. Really what has to be done for a certain, segment of society is to assure them that they have sufficient income so that only one of the parents needs to go out to supply the basic needs for that family. That is the problem that we must address ourselves to.

I agree again with the Member that I am not very happy with the present day morality. I'm not very happy about children being born out of wedlock. I'm not very happy with legislation which condones abortions. I just read an article today, 39,000 abortions in Canada. But again it was politicians who legislated these kinds of laws that permitted it. It wasn't the church, it wasn't the home, it was the government and I would have to say to the Member opposite and here maybe I do have to blame him somewhat because I've never heard him say anything against the originators of the abortion law. Never once have I heard him demand that the Federal Government do away with the law that permits so-called therapeutic abortions.

I'm not getting into a political argument here, I am simply saying that I don't agree with it and I'm simply saying to the Member for Rosthern that I think both he and I and all the Members in this House could do a lot by making public statements, by writing to the people that can do something about it to change those laws. I don't argue with him, I don't agree with the law, I wish it were changed, and think everybody in this House knows where I stand on that particular issue.

But I think also that we can't put our heads in the sand and say well, all right we won't support day care help or day care centres because the mother's place is in the home. I am absolutely convinced that many, many of our children from year

March 5, 1974

one to year four or five, before they enter kindergarten, need qualified staff. They need the help and I hope that the new program that our present Minister has introduced will make available to these day care centres qualified- staff so that they can use this particular time to diagnose and observe these children.

In my maiden speech, I spoke about prevention versus rehabilitation. So again I agree with the Member for Rosthern. It's much much cheaper to do prevention. And I think that the schools ought to reach out into the community, to make professional staff available to those parents who need help for their children. Not to take over, but to be there to help. It's a complicated society, we have conflicts of opinions on morality and many parents simply don't know which direction to go and they welcome some help.

I was a little bit disturbed, by an article in yesterday's Leader-Post. "Little Improvement Seen in Day Care Financing" comments Tricia Eaton. I don't know who Tricia Eaton is. Bu Tricia says that there will be very few changes, very few changes or improvements because of the extra, almost \$2 million that this Government is providing for day care. I object very strongly to the Member for Saskatoon University saying that, well that's nothing, \$2 million is nothing. I think the cost for universal quality day care is simply prohibitive. I don't think we need it and I think that what the present Minister is providing in co-operative day care will provide No. 1 that parents will be in charge. Parents will decide what kinds of day care they want and I think that is very very important. No. 2 and as the Member for Rosthern has indicated the program will provide free day care services for those parents who need it financially. Therefore, I support that particular program.

Mr. Speaker, I support day care as proposed by the present Minister. I do not support universal free day care for this province. I think that universal free day care is a low priority and I think there are many other needs to which this Government can put its money to use.

So with that, Mr. Speaker, I should like to move an amendment, seconded by the Member from Nipawin (Mr. Comer):

That Resolution No. 1 be amended by striking out everything following the word "Assembly" in the first line and substituting the following:

commends the Government of Saskatchewan for (a) providing greatly increased funds for day care; (b) devising a program which will make day care available to all income groups; (c) establishing criteria which will ensure that each day care centre is parent controlled; (d) providing a program which will be flexible and responsible to the desires of parents; (e) providing for additional grants for those day care centres which offer integrated service to handicapped and non-handicapped children.

HON. A. TAYLOR: (Minister of Social Services): — I'd like to take just a few moments on this debate. Let me say first of all that I will be supporting the amendment as put forward, which probably comes as no surprise to anyone.

The program which was announced recently will be increasing our support for day care from about \$200,000 annually to about \$2 million in the coming fiscal year. It will involve the immediate establishment of a day care branch within the Department of Social Services and will provide support for the day care of children in family settings as well as in centres. The program will also involve increases and start up grants, renovation grants and income related subsidies. Most of these went into effect on March 1st. We are at present attempting to engage personnel for the day care branch. Personnel which will number, Mr. Speaker, about 13 people.

I'd like to comment briefly on the objectives and the priorities upon which Government commitment to day care is based. I'd like to say at the outset that what we intended to offer was not in any way intended to represent free universal day care. Instead, we attempted to meet the greatest unmet need for day care in the total community, at realistic cost to the parents and the taxpayers of our province. We believe that what we have introduced is indeed a responsible fiscal policy. I might say that decisions that had to be made were not always arrived at very easily.

The Member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) is right by my own figuring, and these are not official figures, but I estimated a universal program would have cost about \$100 million a year. I did not believe and I don't think most Members of this House believe that this is the way we ought to be expending our funds at the present time.

It was also a concern to me that by providing total free universal day care we would be in effect saying to parents, either you use day care and place your children there or you suffer a financial loss. Because if the day care were totally free, including the meal a day that must be provided when the child is there for ten hours or even for eight hours, at no charge, then we are saying to the parents if you keep your child home it's going to cost you more. This seemed to me to be most unfair. I might also say that universal free day care also seems to me to be a regressive form of taxation, because it has to be provided out of general tax revenues. Low income people paying income tax would then be subsidizing higher income people in their use of day care.

The objectives that we set out for our program are as follows:

1. To increase the degree of control and participation by parents, because we believe that children are the responsibility of their parents and the parents ought to decide the direction in which their children are going,
2. To ensure a high standard of emotional and physical care of children,
3. To promote and organize the development of new services on a neighborhood and small community basis,
4. To provide day care services equally to all income groups,

5. To promote the use of services by all income groups in relation to the needs of the child, and the family.

Finally, we will continuously support and monitor the program to ensure that these objectives are met.

The priorities that we have accepted are such that the following persons will have first claim on the program.

First, a single, working parent. Mr. Speaker, I am sometimes a little disturbed when we mention the single parent to find that people automatically assume that we are talking of a single female parent. There are many men in our society attempting to raise families after the death of their wives. These men do need assistance, particularly if they are on low income, attempting to struggle to earn a living and they need some help in looking after their children. The option is for that man, or woman, as the case may be, to go on total welfare.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that there are cases, and I have known of some, where the person would be better off and the family better off by accepting public assistance and remaining at home with the children. But this is not very frequently the case.

I think it is simplistic to blame (as the one Member did although he did not really do this so definitively) drug abuse, delinquency, etc., on working mothers. It is a far more complex problem than that, and if one looks back into history, we find that it is not only the mothers who have given up something in the home, but far more extensively — the fathers. The day is not very far gone, in a rural society, an agrarian society, when the father was at home all the time, when he was in the yard working and the children were around him, and when his authority was exercised. It is all too often not mothers, but fathers, who have opted out of their responsibility.

The second group to have priority is the single parent enrolled in education improvement, upgrading or training, for the same reasons, so that they too, can better themselves and their families.

Third, a two parent family in which one of the parents is disabled, or where both parents are enrolled in educational improvement upgrading or training.

Fourth, a family assessed to have special needs. For example, a physical, emotional, mental, language or other handicap, or a family experiencing short-term crisis and emergency. We think here of the case where a mother is taken ill, has to go to the hospital, while the father works, some care is needed for the children.

Fifth, the family in which both parents are working, but on marginal income. The alternative to this is to provide some form of subsidization for income.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, personally, that our nation — Canada — is working towards this goal.

This is not to say that the program should be restricted to these persons, but rather that the emphasis in developing new services should relate more particularly to these target groups.

The program provides for two types of day care – family day care which will accommodate a maximum of five children from two weeks to five years of age, in approved private homes. Children from six to 12 can be accommodated on an out-of-school basis.

Now there is some concern for this particular aspect, Mr. Speaker. But I might say this is the most used type of day care in existence today. There are far more children in this type of situation already than in any other type of day care. Through the program we will be able to regularize this, inspect the homes where this is being done and ensure that proper care is given to the children.

Neighborhood day care will be for children from 18 months to five years of age, in specifically designed centres other than the children's own home. Again, children from six to 12 can be accommodated on an out-of-school basis. We'll provide start-up grants of \$100 a space to any new centre and \$50 to existing centres. These will replace the old \$10 and \$40 grants. We will also be providing transportation grants where they are necessary and up to \$100 per space assigned to a handicapped child, whether physically or mentally handicapped. It is our belief that the best kind of day care centre is an integrated centre where all children, handicapped or otherwise, work and play together.

Subsidies to parents will be related to income and will cover up to 75 per cent of the rate charged to a maximum of \$60 per child for family day care and 80 per cent of the rate charged to a maximum of 380 for neighborhood day care. Plainly then, Mr. Speaker, except for those in extreme need all will have to expend some funds themselves for the care of their children.

While we have attached a great deal of emphasis to parent control of day care, this is not to say that we minimize the problems of actually achieving this. Since the centres will be publicly supported we believe they should be operated on a non-profit basis. Since they are to be parent controlled they will require, in our opinion, a majority of parents on the board in order to meet this goal, we will require that all centres incorporate as non-profit centres, preferably under The Co-operative Associations Act, since we believe this provides greater stability. Centres will not qualify for grants or subsidies unless this condition is met.

I might say that those centres now operating will be given two years in which to become non-profit organizations. I have yet to hear anyone complain about this aspect, since most of the day care operators I have talked to have always told me that's the way they operated anyway.

We will also, Mr. Speaker, be appointing, in the very near future, a provincial day care advisory board, which will continue to guide the direction in which our program is going.

Let me say once again, I think it would be wrong at this moment in history, to go in the direction of the original motion and to opt for universal free day care. I believe the program that we have introduced is one which does meet the needs that are there and yet is fiscally responsible. For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I will support the amendment.

March 5, 1974

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. P. P. MOSTOWAY: (Hanley): — Mr. Speaker, I want to go on record by saying a few words on the amendment and the proposal as put forward by the Member for Saskatoon University (Mr. Richards).

Before I go on, I want to refer to the Hon. Member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) and say, and I want you to pay particular attention, that I thought that your words were wise. I thought the things that you said were to the point, and as I mentioned, wise, and certainly things that a lot of people think, but may not necessarily want to say in public. I want to commend the Member for what he said.

Insofar as the universal accessibility of day care centres as in the original motion, well, the cost factor was mentioned, and of course that would be, prohibitive, but I do want to say that certainly even if the money was available, a scheme such as that would not wash down well in which I will call 'our western society'. I think something like that — and I won't go into the details — would really and truly promote family breakdown.

As a teacher, one who has been exposed to students, who has been exposed to family breakdowns, and one who has worked in various parts of the country, I think this should be a concern of everyone. Anything that is going to promote-or possibly promote — family breakdowns, I think we should take a good hard look at. I should just like to refer Members to a CBC program on TV the other night — I believe it was on Sunday — where it was a program on behavior and learning and they were interviewing various young boys and girls — ages 7, 9, 10, 11, and they asked questions of these boys and girls who were housed in this particular school, where they had emotional problems, etc., etc. The one burning thing that every one of those boys and girls mentioned when they were asked: What would you ask for if you had a wish? The one thing that they all remarked was that they wished that their mothers and fathers were living together again. They wanted to be part of a family again.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the proposed Government program is good, and I see that it will be geared to the ability to pay for those who are experiencing hardship, and it is a principle that's dear to my heart. It would be helping people who are in trouble financially or otherwise, and this would be good. I believe that the proposed Government program will actually help to prevent family breakdown. For that reason, I think it is a good program.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly will be supporting the amendment, and voting against the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MB. D. BOLDT: (Rosthern): — Mr. Speaker, I do have the right to speak on the amendment, do I?

MR. SPEAKER: — Yes.

MR. BOLDT: — I should just like to make a few remarks regarding the amendment.

Before doing so, I should also like to state my position in regard to some of the legislation that is being passed, or has been passed at the federal level. I'm certainly opposed to it — I think many citizens are opposed to it — many doctors, many hospitals, many nurses are opposed to it and I think it's a crime that we are committing. When we talk about a government — I am the government — you are the government — the people are the government. The government is no institution, they are human beings, and whether it's the home, or the school, or the church, we as citizens are the government and let's not blame the government, we blame ourselves.

In regard to this amendment which spells out day care in a limited degree, I believe, if I were to assess the situation right, the need for day care centres are in the northern areas — at La Ronge, at La Loche, Meadow Lake — and I would doubt very much whether that's where the day care centres are going to be set up. They are going to be set up maybe in the city of Regina, Prince Albert, Moose Jaw, where they are not needed to such a degree. Surely we, as neighbors, have responsibilities. If there is a hardship in a family particularly in sickness, in a city like Regina, Saskatoon, a community like Osier, this is being done on a day to day basis, where neighbors help out each other. That is our responsibility as citizens to not always run to the government for financial aid. If this motion is being passed and the program that the Minister has outlined, as I said before, if you are going to come out with a program, then I have to agree with the Minister's intention, but I am concerned as to where these day centres are going to be established. Let's not put them in Saskatoon, let's not put them in Regina, or Prince Albert. Let's put them in the area where we have the welfare people, the people that are really in need, in need of guidance as mothers. That's where they belong. It is going to be very difficult to set them up. It is very difficult to staff them. These are the points that I would like to raise that when the government does set them up that they put them in the places where they are most needed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. A. THIBAUT: (Melfort-Kinistino): — Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to speak on this resolution, but I must agree with a lot of what has been said here this afternoon and this evening. In the implementation of a program, I think the stress of trying to see to it that it does not promote family breakdown, I think is a very important one. I can recall last year when I attended the Alcohol Commission convention here in Regina, of a young man who said the thing that he resented the most in all his life was when they took him away from his father and his mother, who were both drunks. Instead of trying to rehabilitate the father and the mother, he said, they took me away. He was a man of about 40 some years old. He said, "That, I can never forgive them for."

Now I just wanted to tell the House this particular story, because perhaps we take the shortcut sometimes and take the

March 5, 1974

kids away. But first of all before we do that, I think we should explore every possibility of trying to keep the home together.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. E. C. MALONE: (Regina Lakeview): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak to this resolution, I should like to say at the outset that I congratulate all of the Members who have spoken before me for the obvious sincerity of their remarks, and for the obvious great deal of preparation and consideration that went into them before giving them to this House.

As you are aware, I have not been in this Assembly for very long, but I must say that the remarks tonight, in this debate, have risen to a new high, compared to some of the remarks of earlier days.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, at the outset that I agree with some concept of day care. I must say as well that I disagree — either largely or to a smaller extent — with, I think, all of the previous speakers on this debate. I agree with the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Taylor) and some of the priorities that he has set in his Department. However, I disagree, and I disagree greatly with the emphasis on co-ops. I can see no reason whatsoever for not allowing private enterprise, in some form or another, to participate in day care.

However, Mr. Speaker, that, again, is typical of this Government.\

I would say in connection with the remarks of the Member who sits far to my left (Mr. Richards) that I disagree with the universality of his resolution and I think it is too wide in concept. I also disagree with the resolution in that it is too narrow in some other concept in that the resolution seems to think that day care is a glorified babysitting service for only young children. I can envisage it being something greater and bigger than this.

As I indicated to you, Mr. Speaker, I disagree basically with the co-op aspect of the plan that the Minister proposed through the news media recently. However, I do agree with some of the priorities that he has indicated that his Department will give to day care.

Mr. Speaker, I will have further remarks to make about this subject at a later date, and I would now beg leave to adjourn this debate.

Debate adjourned.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

MOTIONS FOR RETURNS

RETURN NO. 45

The Assembly resumed the adjourned' debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Weatherald (Cannington) for Return No. 45 showing:

The amount the Simpson Timber Company paid to the Government of Saskatchewan during the year 1972 for: (a) stumpage dues; (b) ground rental, and fire prevention; (c) fire suppression; and (d) other specified purposes.

HON. J. R. KOWALCHUK: (Minister of Natural Resources): — Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment to that motion. It will also provide a change from the calendar year to the fiscal year ending March 31 of each preceding year, because, again, the departmental records are kept in that manner. Also, that the proposed amendment will provide additional comparative information, Mr. Speaker.

Also, Sir, there will be the deletion of Section (d) in my amendment, which I am told is very difficult for my departmental people to compile. It could include any different number of specified purposes and would be difficult to compile.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Canora (Mr. Matsalla):

That all the words after the word "during" in the second line be deleted and the following substituted therefore:

"the fiscal years 1969-70, 1970-71, 1971-72, 1972-73 for: (a) stumpage dues; (b) ground rental, and fire prevention; (c) fire suppression."

I so move, Mr. Speaker.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

RETURN NO. 9

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. A. R. Guy (Athabasca) for Return No. 9 showing:

(1) The number of airplanes that the government owns for executive use. (2) The model of aircraft that is used for executive use. (3) The total number of flying hours of the executive aircraft for the years: (a) 1971 ; (b) 1972; (c) 1975. (4) The total number of hours of use that were made by each of the Cabinet Ministers and senior departmental and agency officials of the Government of Saskatchewan.

HON. J. E. BROCKELBANK: (Minister of Government Services): — Mr. Speaker, since the information requested in the motion cannot be supplied because records are not kept in that fashion I have prepared an amendment which will give the Member the information as near as possible that can be supplied by the Department. I move, seconded by my seatmate, the Member for Last Mountain (Mr. MacMurchy) an amendment thereto:

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

March 5, 1974

(1)When the government first purchased an aircraft to be used primarily for executive travel. (2) The model of each government aircraft used for executive travel and the length of service. (5) The total number of miles flown by each aircraft in (2) above for each fiscal year, up to November 30, 1973.

MR. A. R. GUY: (Athabasca): — Mr. Speaker, I see the reason for the amendment from the point of view of the Minister of Government Services. I wonder why he omitted to include part (^) of the original motion in his amendment, whether deliberately or whether he hasn't got the answers for it. Part (^-) reads:

The total number of hours of use that were made by each of the Cabinet Ministers and senior departmental and agency officials of the Government of Saskatchewan.

Surely to goodness he is not trying to tell us in this' Legislature that that information is not available. He has the records of how many Cabinet Ministers, he has the logs, there is no reason in the world why that information could not be provided. It may be an oversight on his part, but he didn't include number (4) in his amendment. Without that information certainly the amendment is not satisfactory to the Opposition.

MR. BROCKELBANK: — Well . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — The Hon. Member cannot close the debate on an amendment, he has exercised his right to speak.

MR. GUY: — Maybe the Attorney General could answer the question for me. I should like to have that information, why part (4) was omitted from the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: — Is the House ready for the question?

MR. GUY: — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order. I have asked a question and I would hope that in closing the debate the Minister can provide the answer. Whether we receive this information is going to determine whether we support the motion or whether we don't. We want the information that he is willing to provide, but it is only part of the information that we want. We want the additional information and surely to goodness they are not going to sit there like bumps on a log and not have anybody answer my question. Why can we not get this information? If it is not available, I will accept that answer. I want that answer before we vote on this question.

MR. C. P. MacDONALD: (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, I think the Minister of Government Services must have failed to recognize that every person who flies in that aircraft, and every time that pilot takes off and lands he has to officially record the individuals in, the time of departure, the time of arrival. That information is readily available and can be obtained.

MR. SPEAKER: — Well I realize that the Hon. Member wanted further information. There is nothing that the Chair can do about that. Had he just risen and asked if the Minister would answer a question before he took his seat, the Minister would have been permitted. But when he makes a speech, then the Minister can- not come back and make another speech.

MR. GUY: — Could I ask the Member before he took his seat, is that information available.

MR. SPEAKER: — After two or three words are spoken, you are both out of order if you do.

MR. MacMURCHY: — Mr. Speaker, apparently the information is not available as the question is asked. There is a problem of the senior department officials travelling with the Minister, and they only log the total hours, so making all that information is not possible. That is why it has been deleted.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

RETURN NO. 16

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. Guy for Return No. 16 showing:

(1) A list of all reports and studies commissioned by the Government, Crown Corporations, Boards, Commissions or any other Government agencies since July 1, 1971 to external consultants, (b) The names of these consultants and estimated costs of their studies, (c) The number of preliminary and final reports of each of these studies, and their final costs.

(2) (a) A list of the titles of all reports and studies undertaken within the government since July 1, 1973. (b) The number of reports or studies completed. (c) The number of reports or studies pending.

HON. J. R. MESSER: (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, I move that Return No. 16 be amended thereto:

That clause "(2)" be deleted.

Mr. Speaker, the reasoning for removing subsection (2) is that I believe that a similar type of question was asked in the last session of the Legislature. The information that was tabled was in fact virtually the same as what is being asked for in subsection (1). Subsection (2) asks for (a) a list of the titles of all reports and studies undertaken within the government since July 1, 1973; (b) the number of reports or studies completed and (c) the number of reports or studies pending. I think that the Hon. Member for Athabasca is well aware that there are probably hundreds of studies being

carried out by various departments and agencies of departments that are necessary in order to further the administration of the Government. They, generally speaking, are studies that are confidential to the Government, to the department or to the agencies. The information will assist them in making the kinds of decisions that the public of Saskatchewan would wish the Government to make. I think that it would be virtually impossible when we relate to studies or reports in trying to define just exactly what would a study or report be when an agency or a department is furthering its ability to have information brought to it in order to conduct its services as it has been instructed to do.

I believe that these were the arguments that were put forward -when the similar Question was asked in the Legislature at the last sitting. At that time, we brought forward I think a sufficient amount of information which will also be brought forth by answering subsection (l) of Return No. 16.

MR. GUY: — Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments made by the Minister of Agriculture. If he provides the sane information that he provided in the other Return that would be part of the answer, that's true. Of course, we have asked since July 1, 1973, which was never covered by any other return. This is a new return covering a date since the last sitting of the Legislature.

His comments about the number of reports and I was interested when he said, there are hundreds of them, because this is exactly what we are under the impression, that there are hundreds of reports, that the taxpayers of the province are paying hundreds of thousands of dollars for these hundreds of reports. These are never made public, but are put on the shelf, and it is only a matter of providing work for civil servants who are probably for the most part defeated candidates and friends of the Government. This is why we want to know what are the reports that are being carried out, who are Carrying then out and what is the cost to the people of Saskatchewan. I think they are vitally concerned about the amount of money that is being spent in so-called research by so-called questionable researchers if I may use that term. That was the reason for the second part of this question. We would like to know how many of these reports are being carried out, who is carrying them out and particularly at what expense to the public. We have seen in the past, and the Minister of agriculture mentioned that a lot of the information was provided in an earlier return. This is true, and it caused a great deal of consternation throughout the province at the number of reports and the cost of these reports and we have never seen any action. They have been put on the shelf. They have been a make-work activity for friends of the NDP Government. This is why we would like to have it all out in the open. The attorney General says, can't you be proud of us because we are such an open government. They gave us information in the previous return which we didn't want, now they are trying to cut us off from information which is vitally important to the people of Saskatchewan. Hopefully you will reconsider and pass the motion as it appears on the Order Paper. I think the people of Saskatchewan whether there are hundreds or thousands of these reports are interested in the number. We don't necessarily care so much for the names of the reports — although we would appreciate that too — so we can follow them up and see what

great conclusions you have reached. After all you are very intelligent Ministers and hopefully you would read these reports very conscientiously and make sure that all the recommendations are enforced before the next election. There is the Attorney General reading a report right now that I am sure will be of great value. I hope that you would pass this resolution as is and not listen to the sort of hanky panky language that we got from the Minister of Agriculture.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

RETURN NO. 17

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Guy for Return No. 17 showing:

The total dollar value of Kraft products purchased through the Government Purchasing Agency or any other Government Department, Agency, or Crown Corporation for the period February -1, 1973 to September 30, 1973.

And the proposed amendment thereto by Mr. Boldt:

That the words "September 30, 1973" in the third line be deleted and the words "February 25, 1974" be substituted therefore.

HON. J. E. BROCKELBANK: (Minister of Government Services): — Mr. Speaker, I rise for the same reason on this motion as I rose on the previous one as I stated at the beginning that the information is not kept. This applies to this motion and consequently to the amendment which is irrelevant without the main motion". I would therefore ask, since the information is not maintained in the department and is impossible to obtain, that the Members defeat the amendment and the motion.

MR. A. R. GUY: (Athabasca): — Mr. Speaker, I can hardly believe the words of the Minister of Government Services. Here we see Government Members' cars with "boycott Kraft" on them. We see resolutions from the NDP convention commending their Government of their strong attitude towards boycotting Kraft projects and you mean to tell me that Government Services who are in charge of the three cafeterias in this Legislative area are not keeping track of the amount of Kraft foods that are being purchased and sold through these cafeterias. I tell you, you are going to be in trouble with your own NDP political party if you don't keep track of the number of Kraft foods because this is the real crux of the situation. We're concerned that the Government of the day doesn't keep in touch with the grassroots of their political party to the point that when the next election comes around you're all going to be turfed out. This is our concern, we are really worried about this and this is why we want to know whether you really monitor the questions that are being raised at your NDP conventions about the amount of goods that are being bought by the Government from Kraft Foods. I think it's terrible and I hope I have the opportunity to attend your next convention and make a speech on this particular subject.

MR. A. E. SMISHEK: (Minister of Health): — Mr. Speaker, I am amazed at the Hon. Member for Athabasca saying that in case of the three cafeterias that are being operated on the grounds here that the Government somehow should have the record of the Kraft products that they buy. The Hon. Member should be very well aware that the cafeterias aren't being operated by the Government. Obviously you didn't know your department when you were the Minister of the Department of Public Works. The cafeterias are operated by the Government Employees' Association. It is the Government Employees' Association through a management committee that they established, they do the purchasing, they provide the services that are here. The Department of Government Services does not do the purchasing, therefore how would they know since really that service is contracted out to the Government Employees' Association. It is quite obvious that's why he is sitting on the other side of the House because he really never knew his department.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SMISHEK: — We certainly buy a lot of food for the various institutions. The orders are placed by the institutions on the basis of food stuffs that they need. Now how would it be possible for anybody to keep track of all these items that are ordered and the various brands that come under different company names? Kraft Corporation owns a whole series of subsidiaries under different names. It would be just humanly impossible to be able to answer that kind of a question and he knows that fully well. It is a frivolous and a foolish question that the Hon. Member asked with the hope of creating some kind of political embarrassment but indeed there is going to be no political embarrassment. I do support the Minister of Government Services that this motion be defeated.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. C. P. MacDONALD: (Milestone): — It is kind of interesting that the Minister would stand on his feet and say it would be stupid to inform the institutions not to buy Kraft if we don't know what Kraft products are, but they are trying to tell everybody else in the Province of Saskatchewan not to buy Kraft. So the point is that all you have to do if you're going to boycott Kraft is to instruct your institutions and the purchasing people in your institutions not to buy Kraft products. You made no attempt whatsoever to boycott Kraft. It is nothing but a political hoax. If you say you can't control your institutions how in heavens name can you control the public of Saskatchewan?

MR. GUY: — Mr. Speaker, I only have one very short comment. I think this is a typical example of the hypocrisy of the NDP. They try to tell the people of Saskatchewan that they should boycott Kraft. They go around in their cars with their little funny stickers on the back windows trying to tell everyone to boycott Kraft. It is obvious tonight that they as the Government of Saskatchewan who are in a better position than anyone in the province to boycott Kraft have set no example and made no attempt to boycott Kraft products. As I say in the typical hypocrisy of the NDP Government towards not only Kraft products but towards everything they do as a government of this province.

Amendment negatived.

Motion negatived.

RETURN NO. 22

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Guy (Athabasca) for Return No. 22 showing:

(1) All printing contracts with their values, given to Service Printing Company, from January 1, 1973 to February 25, 1974 by all Departments, Boards, Agencies, Commissions or Crown Corporations of the Provincial Government.

(2) (a) With respect to the above the contracts that were tendered and whether the low tender was accepted in each case. (b) Where the low tender was not accepted, if any, the name of the low tender, and the reason that it was not accepted, (c) With respect to the above the contracts that were not tendered.

HON. J. E. BROCKELBANK: (Minister of Government Services): — Mr. Speaker, this question seeks information about printing contracts and I intend to give the information that the Members opposite seek. Also in this amendment that I am going to offer to supplement it by giving them a little extra information being well aware of the fact that they have illustrated the need for extra information a number of times. Consequently I move the amendment, seconded by Mr. Kowalchuk (Minister of Natural Resources) as follows;

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

Total dollar value of all printing contracts given by Queen's Printer to Regina printing firms for fiscal periods 1970-71, 1971-72, 1972-73, 1973-74- to date showing (1) (a) the total amount allotted in each period; (b) the total amount tendered in each period; (2) (a) all instances where low tender was not accepted; (b) if any, reason why low tender was not accepted.

MR. A. R. GUY: (Athabasca): — Mr. Speaker, I am not surprised that we are getting some additional information, in fact, I am very happy that we are getting some of the information for 1970 and 1971, because it will show very clearly that no printing contracts have gone to any supporters of the Liberal Party.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. GUY: — There are no printing contracts given to a printing company that is owned by the Liberal Party. This is something that will not be true for the years 1971-72, 1972-73, 73-74. We are all aware that the printing company owned by the NDP political party have been draining off funds from this Government from the day they became the Government. This is one of the worst examples of moral degradation that any government could ever fall into. To take their own printing company,

March 5, 1974

take the taxpayers' money and funnel it into it without tender, without any means of providing an opportunity for other printing companies that do not bear the NDP label to get this printing. I found it very strange, Mr. Speaker, that the other day I asked a very simple question that could have been answered in one word or probably two words, 'Service Printers'. I asked who were printing the blues and whites for this Session. It was a question that could have been answered like that and what did they do, they made an Order for Return out of it. They don't want to provide the information. I would be very surprised when that information comes back if it isn't Service Printers that is providing them because otherwise they would have been so happy to provide it overnight or in the 48-hour notice period and we would have had that answer on our desk if it had been Commercial Printers, if it had been Peerless Printing, we would have had that answer back the next day and they would have been sitting there with grins on their faces a mile long. The fact they made an Order for Return makes it pretty obvious who is doing the printing of the blues and the whites. No, they probably won't answer it until the next session, it is such a difficult question. The Minister of Government Services probably has to go back and ask four or five of his Department officials who has been doing the printing of the blues.

However, we are pleased to get this additional information and it will show, I am convinced, that there is a great deal or a great sum of money that is being paid by the taxpayers of this province that is going to a printing company that is owned and operated by the Government of the day, the NDP, that will be used for election purposes and which, as I say, is one of the lowest levels of moral degradation that any Government has ever fallen into.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. D. BOLDT: (Rosthern): — Mr. Speaker, I should just like to say a few words about this motion about Service Printers. I came into this House in 1960 as a Member of the Opposition and I don't think there is a year that this motion hasn't been on the Order Paper. I think it has been on the Order Paper every time that the House met when we were on the Opposition. I have to say this about the Members opposite, I have served on the Highway Committee, a Safety Committee with six Members of the other side of the House and I appreciate the fact that I know them a little better. I am absolutely convinced that the six Members on the Highway Committee are as honest as the day is long and I doubt very much whether the Government and the political party really think it is necessary that we have to criticize you for advertising and giving business to a newspaper that is printed and owned by the NDP. You are not going to win the election because of the money that you're going to make on the advertising. I think the backbenchers, should tell the Cabinet that this is unethical, I am not saying it is crooked but I sure think it is unethical. I know that as a member of the Executive Council this did not happen. We were not advertising in the Saskatchewan Liberal for political purposes, government ads in the political paper. I think you should rise above this criticism. What if the party loses \$100,000, maybe I can chip in a few dollars for your party if you are that hard up. I would urge you to keep the slate clean because after all you know we have to set examples.

What happens to a political party, a government or an individual, let's not kid ourselves, the Watergate affair in Washington is a reflection on every politician in the country or in the world. It is a reflection on us. I was in the States only a few weeks ago and whenever you talked about Watergate they would say, well, every politician is crooked. They are all under the same status. Well, I don't believe that, 99 per cent of the politicians are honest. If they become involved, if I was to become a dishonest politician I would say it was because the man on the street asked me to be dishonest. The most dishonest person is not the politician. It is the pressure that you get from the man that walks the street and wants the Minister to do something that isn't right. They get sucked into it. I think the former Vice-president of the United States is a typical example of what happens and once you get sucked into an area like that you have no way out. You go in deeper and deeper all the time.

I think it is very important for each individual Member of this House and for each political party represented in this House, to keep this unethical business out of our parties. I am sure that all Members of your party would be much happier if you didn't advertise with Service Printers. I am sure that your party members and all the people of Saskatchewan would recognize the fact that you are trying to correct a mistake that you made years and years ago. I would strongly recommend that you do away with that kind of business with the printing company.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. C. P. MacDONALD: (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, I only want to put forth one comment. At the fall sitting of this Session when it first opened, the Attorney General presented to Members of the House a White Paper on Conflict of Interest. Now conflict of interest is becoming of increasing concern to not only members of the Canadian public but to people right across North America and other political jurisdictions in the world. Conflict of interest is really a question as where does the influence of politicians and their right to make decisions that influence themselves and their political party begin and stop. Perhaps that is an over- simplification, but surely Service Printers is a conflict of interest to every Member sitting on that side of the House. I would suggest that if the Attorney General does not support the removal of giving government business and taxpayers' money to Service Printers he is making a farce out of his paper on Conflict of Interest. I would suggest that he has asked for comments and if there is one comment that certainly should be general from all Members of this House on his White Paper on Conflict of Interest it is Service Printers and the terrible political dishonesty that has, gone on for the last 15 years in relation to Service Printers.

MR. F. MEAKES: (Touchwood): — Mr. Speaker, I really hadn't intended to speak on this but after the remarks of the Hon. Member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) and my hon. friend from Milestone (Mr. MacDonald), I feel obliged to rise.

I want to say that I see no sense of conflict of interest in this. It is a public company owned by some 40,000 people in the Province of Saskatchewan. It is not owned by us, as Members

March 5, 1974

here, it is owned by some 40,000 people in the Province of Saskatchewan, with a board that has completely broken away from the Party and no member of that board that controls those printers are in any way connected with the Government and as such I see no conflict.

The other remarks that my hon. friend from Rosthern said, I appreciate it and I believe that he is sincere and I believe that he knows that I am sincere when I say what I have just said.

HON. A. TAYLOR: (Minister of Social Services): — Mr. Speaker, I just want to follow something that the Member for Touchwood has said. He speaks of the Service Printers as being a public company. This is very true. I happen to be a member of the co-op and I am proud of it. Does this mean that the Government should make no purchases from the co-op? I think not.

There has been no question raised, at least I haven't heard it, it hasn't even been insinuated — that unfair rates are being paid for advertising done. I think it is noticeable that this sort of charge is not being laid. We are paying for services, in the case of the Commonwealth, for wide circulation. If you want to advertise I might well say that we want to advertise in the paper with an enlightened readership.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) said that they never advertised in the Saskatchewan Liberal. Let me say from the Public Service Commission's point of view, when we advertise job vacancies we would gladly advertise in the Saskatchewan Liberal as soon as they tell us when they are going to publish on a regular basis.

MR. J. G. RICHARDS: (Saskatoon University): — Mr. Speaker, as the Hon. Member for Touchwood is wont to say, "I didn't intend to get into this debate," but an idea just crossed my mind that if the Government is really intent upon proving their willingness to place ads in different journals of different political stripes. Next Year Country is always on the lookout for a little bit of advertising revenue. I can assure the Members of the Treasury Bench that Next Year Country is read by the kind of people who might be interested in politics and government administration. It has a wide readership among civil servants and potential civil servants, read by progressive people on the left with good education, an ideal kind of market which surely the Government wants to be able to reach in its advertisements. Our advertising rates are quite reasonable and we would be able to match the Commonwealth, I am sure, in columnage prices. I would be hoping that the Hon. Minister of Government Services will be taking this offer up at the earliest occasion.

The next issue of Next Year Country will be out in due course.

Amendment agreed to.

The debate continues on the Motion as amended.

MR. MacDONALD: — Mr. Speaker, I just want to point out to the Minister that we have listened to this kind of justification for many many years and in no way can you justify a corrupt and a rotten political practice. When you compare the co-op movement — an economic movement in the consumer field — with a political party which has its specific purpose to elect you and put you on that bench, this is the height of nonsense, the height of a juvenile mind. That is all that I can say.

We have listened to you, stand up in this House for years and years and justify this position. I only say to you when that Conflict of Interest White Paper is discussed, I hope that then you will sit down and discuss your Service Printers.

MR. GUY: — Mr. Speaker, I shall be very brief. I must agree with my colleagues that I found it very disgusting the comments of the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Taylor), a Minister — and I use the term minister in a clerical sense tonight — to suggest that the co-op movement is part of the NDP. If he had thought of the co-ops in the terms of being co-ops in the name of the NDP then it would be a corrupt practice if the Government bought all their supplies from the co-ops. But thank heavens, the co-op movement in Saskatchewan today, under extreme pressure is trying to defy the attempts of the NDP Government to make them a part of their political organization.

The Member for Touchwood (Mr. Meakes) in his comments was not exactly correct. I don't know whether he was deliberately trying to mislead the House or not. He said that Service Printers was owned by 40,000 people. These 40,000 people have one share apiece probably. I think that he will agree with me that the majority of shares in Service Printing are held by the NDP, they are not held by individuals, and he knows that better than I do, because he is probably one of those Members who is holding shares at this particular time. He knows very well that the majority of shares in Service Printers are not held by individual NDP members throughout the province, they are held by the NDP and that is what makes this such a corrupt Government to get the taxpayers' money and channel it into their own political party for their own political benefit.

I am glad that we are getting the information that we have, but all the information that you provide in the world will not overcome this corrupt practice which you have fallen into and it appears that you are not prepared to mend your ways.

Motion as amended agreed to.

RETURN NO. 70

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. A. R. Guy (Athabasca) for Return No. 70 showing:

All payments made to the newspaper, the "Commonwealth" by the Government or any of its agencies or Crown Corporations from July 1, 1971 to November 30, 1973.

And the proposed amendment thereto by Mr. Boldt;

March 5, 1974

That the words "November 30, 1973" in the third line be deleted and the words "February 25, 1974" be substituted therefore.

HON. J. E. BROCKELBANK: (Minister of Government Services): — Mr. Speaker, I wish to offer a sub amendment which will give the information that the Member is seeking and additional information as well, as I know that he will be interested in additional information. The subamendment that I wish to offer to this motion is:

All payments made for the fiscal years •1971-72, 1972-73, 1973-74 to date, for advertisements by the Government or any of its agencies or Crown Corporations to (a) each Saskatchewan newspaper having greater than 10,000 circulation; (b) all other newspapers with a circulation of 10,000 or less.

MR. SPEAKER: — The question before the House on Order for Return No. 70 which was moved by the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) seconded by the Member for Rosetown (Mr. Loken) to which an amendment had been offered by the Member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) seconded by the Member for Regina Whitmore Park (Mr. Grant).

Now the subamendment which is now offered by the Minister of Government Services, seconded by the Member for Natural Resources (Mr. Kowalchuk) should pertain to the amendment because it is a subamendment. But this proposed subamendment seeks to amend the main motion. It does not deal with the amendment which is on our paper, so I have to rule the subamendment out of order.

The amendment agreed to.

The debate continues on the motion as amended.

HON. J. R. MESSER: (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to introduce a second amendment to the motion.

That al the words after the word "showing" be deleted and the following substituted therefore:

All payments made for the fiscal years 1971-72, 1972-73, 1973-74 to date, for advertisements by the Government or any of its agencies or Crown Corporations to: (a) each Saskatchewan newspaper having greater than 10,000 circulation; (b) all other newspapers with a circulation of 10,000 or less.

I so move, seconded by Mr. Bowerman.

MR. MacDONALD: (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, I want to just make a comment and bring something to the attention of the House and the Attorney General in particular as Minister in charge of SGIO, to indicate how insidious the Commonwealth is in its influence on political

patronage in the Province of Saskatchewan.

The Commonwealth, each year, writes a letter to all SGIO agents and my colleague the Member for Meadow Lake (Mr. Coupland) is an SGIO agent; Mr. Whelan has received this kind of letter, I presume, when he was an SGIO agent. I would be glad to submit the letter but I don't have it with me this evening, to the Attorney General. It was given to me by an SGIO agent in the Province of Saskatchewan.]

He said I am afraid not to take an advertisement in the Commonwealth because at the will of the NDP, which owns the Commonwealth, my livelihood and my agency can be cancelled.

Mr. Speaker, therefore this particular SGIO agent sent an advertisement to the Commonwealth against his will, against his political philosophy; it cost him money to support something because he was afraid of me political implications if he did not do so. This is another example. Here we have the Government of Saskatchewan advertising in the Commonwealth, their own political newspaper, out of the taxpayers' funds. I gave you another example of blackmail of the Commonwealth of people who have agencies and who make their living because of the wishes or the power of the decision of the Government of Saskatchewan.

I just point this out and I would hope, once again, that backbencher Members, if the Cabinet won't do it, will point out to the Government that this is a conflict of interest and a very serious conflict of interest. In fact it smells of corruption and that they will urge the Government and the Treasury benches, the Premier and the Attorney General, who is the dispenser of justice in the Province of Saskatchewan, that this is a foul practice and ask that the Attorney General and the Treasury benches prevent the Government of Saskatchewan placing advertisements in their own political newspaper for their own political benefit.

HON. R. ROMANOW: (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, we have heard today many funny statements during the course of the debates on these Motions for Returns but I must frankly say that one of the silliest was the statement from the Member from Milestone (Mr. MacDonald).

The business of agents being cancelled because of political operations of this nature, I am afraid that he is thinking of the good old days when the Liberal Members were in power. I don't think that the Member seriously suggests this. I would certainly be pleased to receive any evidence that the agent refused to advertise in the Commonwealth. I should like, for example, to ask when the Member for Meadow Lake advertised in the Commonwealth and it is my belief that he still has his agency.

I can tell you one thing, that between 1964 and 1971, you talk about conflict, you talk about corruption in the highest places, I could name you at least one or two agents right in this room who were cancelled summarily without any reason by you in the present Opposition. They weren't even asked to advertise in the Liberal paper.

I really say to you that this is one of these difficult operations to get into. The Hon. Member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt)

in another debate referred to the question of politicians and the image of politicians and I agree with the comments that he made. But you know, to suggest that because the Commonwealth writes a letter of invitation to agents and he refused to advertise in the Commonwealth that his agency is going to be cancelled is absolute nonsense. Well, it's absolute nonsense because the facts simply belie that. All that I say is that I even hate getting dragged into the debate, because I can show you memo after memo during your administration when you cancelled agents/period. You didn't even give them a chance to advertise in the magazine "The Liberal". If they had had a chance to advertise in "The Liberal" maybe they would have done that to save their livelihood. We didn't raise this issue of cancellation of agencies, and for you now to raise the red herring in this debate, I say it does not really behoove the Hon. Member who I think generally has a solid contribution to make to the House. On this one, he is way off base.

MR. D. W. MICHAYLUK: (Redberry): — Mr. Speaker, I haven't participated in any debate since we met here last month, but seeing that we are now on the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office agency I want to comment briefly. In respect to the Commonwealth writing letters to SGIO agents soliciting ads in the Commonwealth I want to say this. A number of years ago when I was sitting on the other side of the House and the Hon. Member, the then Minister of Highways who was in charge of the SGIO tabled the annual report for SGIO and the revenues for that fiscal year were the highest ever recorded by the Crown Corporation. I rose in the House to question the increase of the rates for fire. SGIO rates had been increased in all the small urban and rural communities. I was accused because I had a relative who was an agent that I was given wrong information. The Minister got up on the floor of this House and stated that the agency at Krydor was already cancelled as of that day. This is the treatment that we got.

The Minister, the Deputy Premier has just risen and asked the Member for Meadow Lake (Mr. Coupland) if he has ever put an ad in the Commonwealth. He hasn't. His agency has never been threatened. We've been the government since 1971. I mentioned what went on when the Hon. Members opposite were on this side of the House.

Just by association or by having a relative as an SGIO agent the agencies were cancelled. The then Minister of Highways did cancel SGIO agencies in this manner.

I don't think that the Member for Meadow Lake (Mr. Coupland) has been threatened because he didn't advertise in the Commonwealth.

MR. M. FEDUNIAK: (Turtleford): — Well, Mr. Speaker, I guess I must be pretty small and not seen. I tried quite a few times, finally got up here to be recognized. I wasn't going to say anything about this but when I listen to the Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) get up and tell us a bunch of bunk and untruths which he always does. I'm not a bit surprised. This is his theory. When he talks about conflict of interest I think I should relate that he should probably say conflict of truth would be more appropriate. But anyway when the Saskatchewan Government or the CCF Government brought in the Saskatchewan Government Insurance, it was away back in 1945. I believe I was the first person appointed,

or not the first but one of the first at that time, and I sold insurance for the Saskatchewan Government for years. About 10 — 12 years ago I sold my insurance business to my company, incorporated company in Glaslyn, and all these years, now that's 28 years of continuous service to the people in our community there, where I come from, where I live. I've never been asked by the Commonwealth to advertise, I've never advertised in the Commonwealth relating to the Saskatchewan Government Insurance for 28 years and the insurance has never been cancelled. I don't know, I think they couldn't see me, I'm so small and so quiet that they kind of by-passed me, there is a lot of bush around that north country and they never got that far.

However, I just thought that I would get up and put the Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) straight, because I think this House and the Members on this side should have an apology from the Member. If he has any integrity about his own conscience, he should get up and apologize for the untruths that he has been conducting and saying every time he gets up.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. A. MATSALLA: (Canora): — Mr. Speaker, after listening to the Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) indicating that there is a conflict of interest with respect to the Commonwealth asking Saskatchewan Government Insurance Agents to advertise I certainly can't see anything wrong with any newspaper asking anybody to advertise in their paper. There's absolutely nothing wrong with that and when he goes on to say that in the event that they don't advertise that there is a possibility of their agency being cancelled, I want to say this, that this is just imagination on the part of the Member for Milestone. This isn't the first time that his imagination has gone wild. When he talks about cancellation of agency contracts, I should like to relate to him that I have been an agent with the SGIO. I was appointed in 1956. In 1965 on May 2nd I went to the post office to get my mail. I pick up this mail and there's a registered letter and I've already thought to myself, well this must be it. The axe must be falling. I got back into the office, I opened this letter and my agency was cancelled, not the day I got the letter, but the day before that, on May 1st.

Now when you talk about cancellation of agency contracts you take a look at your record. It's very shameful.

This is the record of the people across the way and you certainly haven't got any room to speak about cancellation of agency contracts.

MR. D. BOLDT: (Rosthern): — I just wonder what the Member for Lakeview (Mr. Malone) will say after the debate for the last half hour, having made a comment about an hour ago that the debate had reached a high level here tonight, but I don't know what he would say to what has happened the last half hour.

I will admit that agents were cancelled when I was in charge of SGIO. There was nobody cancelled because I wanted them cancelled, the local people wanted them cancelled.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

March 5, 1974

MR. BOLDT: — Incompetent. I didn't know that seller from Adam. I didn't know whether he was a Liberal or who he was.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BOLDT: — I ask no pardons, but I want to tell you one thing that you overlooked. We gave an agency to the now deceased Ross Brown after we were the government. He asked for it and we gave it to him. And we all know who Ross Brown was. He is not here to defend himself so I won't comment.

The other thing that I should like to point out, is that during the election campaign you were trying to convince the people that they should vote for you, the Premier went on record that there would be nobody losing his job. Well, that hasn't panned out the way the Premier said it would.

Let's take a look at the former Ross Thatcher. When Mr. Lewry, Moose Jaw, was defeated as the Mayor of Moose Jaw, I believe the Premier phoned him and offered him a job and he gave him a job and he was a political enemy, not a personal enemy, but a political enemy. I am certainly not going to stand up here and say that I didn't cancel out any agents, I sure did. I'm going to be honest about it. Every one that was cancelled, they were asked for by the local people in that area.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BOLDT: — Sure they were Liberals. I don't think the NDP bothered me half as much as the Liberals did.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BOLDT: — Sure, and I'm going to tell you that the Liberals aren't bothering you half as much, Mr. Romanow, as the NDP are.

I'm telling you who is bothering the Minister of Highways. They are not Liberals. They are the NDP. The former Minister, Mr. Willis told me personally in this House that, well, we never have any trouble from the Liberals. The ones who are really pressuring us are the NDP. Where is the Minister of Highways (Mr. Kramer) today and I'd like to tell him I know politics. The Liberals don't bother you; it's your friends that are bothering you. That's a fact of life and if a back-bencher hasn't been a Minister of the Crown, he'll find that out very very soon if he should move to the front benches.

This is not the argument. I have never denied that I haven't cancelled out agencies. I took the position that you are either for or against and if you're against, by gosh it will be a little tough.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BOLDT: — I make no apologies for it.

I got my criticism for it, I took that action, I stuck my neck out and I accepted criticism for it.

MR. J. E. BROCKELBANK: (Minister of Government Services): — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order. The Member who is speaking has not related one word to the item that's before us at this time and I wonder if you could just bring him back to order.

MR. BOLDT: — Mr. Speaker, we have roamed all over SGIO and I'm sure that I'm out of order, so were others, so I'll just sit down.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, near!

HON. J. R. MESSER: (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, it's nice to see one Member who sits to your left at least attempting to be honest.

MR. SPEAKER: — The Hon. Member moved this amendment. He cannot speak again.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order, Mr. Speaker, I believe I moved an amendment to the amended motion and I did not at that time exercise my privilege to speak and I'm wondering whether or not because of moving that motion to the amended motion whether I do not retain the right to speak in the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: — My records show that it was the Minister of Government Services (Mr. Brockelbank) who moved the amendment to a motion when there was already an amendment there and he was out of order. But the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) seconded by the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan (Mr. Bowerman) moved the amendment which is now my hand. The Minister spoke at that time so he has exercised his right to speak on this motion.

MR. E. F. GARDNER: (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, it, appears that the Cabinet Ministers opposite are going to have to get some help. They may have to bring back some of the Members who are touring Canada or where ever they are touring. They seem to be pretty badly disorganized tonight.

We have been getting away from the question, the actual question that we have here is, did the Commonwealth send a letter to insurance agents asking them to advertise in the Commonwealth?

MR. SPEAKER: — The question before the House is for Order for Return No. 70 as amended. It's not the question of insurance agents. That was a matter brought in by the Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald). The matter before us is Motion for Return No. 70.

MR. GARDNER: — The question is, Mr. Speaker, why didn't they write to grocery stores, or cafes, or garages, or some other people rather than writing only to the people that are completely under their control. It is an obvious case of pressure and coercion

March 5, 1974

on a group of people that they have control over. They didn't bother writing to the garages in the province, or the cafes, the grocery stores or other people. They wrote to the SGIO agents who they were sure would be afraid to not support the NDP. This is the question we are asking, if they did send the letter. Nobody has denied that the letter has been sent out and this is really what we are concerned with.

MR. SPEAKER: — The chair does not ask for that.

MR. BROCKELBANK: — Since my amendment was out of order I assume that I am in order now to be able to speak on the present amendment. Assuming that I am in order, Mr. Speaker, I will say something about the amended motion that is before us which gives, not only the information that the Member sought, but more information. I think that everybody should be perfectly clear that all newspapers charge a rate for advertising that is based on their circulation. Therefore, any money that is paid to any newspaper in Saskatchewan for advertising purposes, whether they are declared Liberal newspaper or whether some other newspaper, is based on the rate of value received, that is, related directly to their circulation. The information that will be given here will show that the advertising that is paid for is related, in one newspaper, the same as it is in any other newspaper. It is for value received for the advertising that was done by that newspaper. I see nothing wrong with it, since it is based on circulation and henceforth the province gets the value, if the readers read it, regardless of what newspaper it is in, whether it is the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix, which declares itself to have a Liberal Editorial page, hence a Liberal paper or the Regina Leader-Post which is owned by the same company and declares itself to be a Liberal newspaper. Therefore the information will be provided and I think it's false for the Members to attempt to judge at this time, what the figures will show, until the figures are before them.

MR. D. F. Mac DONALD: (Moose Jaw North): — I just like to say that I, well, I think that would likely be in order, another amendment would likely be in order, but I'll leave that up to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer).

I don't know about the discussions made as to whether threats were made to or letters sent out in order to get advertising, that this somehow made a threat. I don't know about this. I just wonder. In Moose Jaw I know that there was only one new agency or a transfer of agency made and that happened to be by the NDP defeated candidate, Mr. Gifco. As I understand, this is the only new agency given out in Moose Jaw and I'm sure this has got nothing to do with the political party.

But the reason for the question being on the Order Paper is that I think we have a right to know just how much the Government is subsidizing the NDP paper. Now the point is that when the NDP makes their paper the Commonwealth they have certain expenses to be met to print this paper and it appears to us on this side of the House that they decide how much the expenses are going to be, then they divide this up amongst the different departments of government, whether it is the Department of Municipal Affairs, Natural Resources or Crown Corporations,

they decide how much money they are going to need to put out their Commonwealth paper. They just tap the Minister responsible for the different Crown Corporations and so on, they tap him on the shoulder and say, we would just like to have a little advertisement to help defray the costs of the Commonwealth.

We on this side of the House want to know how much in one year the Commonwealth is subsidized by the Government in power. This is important to us. We have no desire whatever to know about how much money is going to the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix, the Leader-Post . . .

MR. ROMANOW: — . . . the Moose Jaw . . .

MR. MacDONALD: — Well, this is a different question all together. We are asking how much the Government is subsidizing the NDP. The Commonwealth, a paper set up as a business, it is set up for political propaganda. We want to know how much the people of Saskatchewan are paying to keep political propaganda going out. The Crown Corporations of Saskatchewan, the departments of government are subsidizing political propaganda. This is what we want to know. We don't want to know how much honest advertising is going out to the Leader-Post, the Times Herald, money that is based on good advertising principles. The rate is not based on circulation for the Commonwealth; it is based on how much is necessary to keep the Commonwealth going out. That is how the rate is determined. We have a right on this side of the House to know exactly how much the Government of Saskatchewan, the people of Saskatchewan are subsidizing the NDP. We have found out through Public Accounts how much the people of Saskatchewan are paying to the NDP through Service Printers. We have found this out and we will find out again. We are going to bring it to the attention of the Saskatchewan people, that this is a corrupt practice. It is just as corrupt a practice by sending advertisements to the Commonwealth. I would think that an amendment might be in order, if the Minister is so willing to give us all this extra information, on just how much government advertising is going into the Liberal paper.

MR. ROMANOW: — . . . they won't take it because they don't publish regularly.

MR. Mac DONALD: — Oh, we publish regularly. Mr. Speaker, may I call it 9:30?

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 9:30 o'clock p.m.