

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fourth Session — Seventeenth Legislature
37th Day

Tuesday, March 26, 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 a pleasure to introduce to you and through you to all Members of this Assembly, 15 Grade Eight students from St. Francis School in Regina North West. They are seated in the west gallery with their teacher, Mr. Yano. We extend to them a warm welcome and we hope that their visit here to this Assembly will be pleasant and informative.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. H. H. P. Baker (Regina Wascana): — Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure as well to introduce 67 students from St. Andrew School, seated in the east gallery. They are accompanied by Mr. Phil Halter, their teacher. I must say that St. Andrew School is located in a very fine residential area of our city, Douglas Park, and we are pleased that so many are able to come this afternoon. I am sure they will gain much by visiting their democratic Legislative Assembly in this province and in this city, and I know that they will be able to use the information in their Social Studies.

I should also like to welcome a group of Air Cadets, in the Speaker's Gallery. They are here from Crystal City, Manitoba. There are I believe 17 cadets and they are accompanied by Capt. Gorrel, Lieut. McKittrick and Mr. Poirier. We do welcome them most sincerely. I had the privilege of greeting them at City Hall. This is their first visit here and they are touring many of our sites in our community. I should like, again, to welcome them to this Assembly as well as St. Andrew School.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. P. P. Mostoway (Hanley): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to welcome to this House a group of 66 Grade Five Students, accompanied by five adults and their teacher, Mr. Unrau from Clavet School. For your information, Mr. Speaker, Clavet School is a large rural school in the Saskatoon East School Unit, located roughly 13 or 14 miles east of Saskatoon. I understand that they were to have visited the RCMP Barracks and also the Museum of Natural History. I have no doubt that they probably saw many interesting things and learned many new things also. I hope, boys and girls, that you see the MLAs at their best this afternoon. I hope that you will learn something about the Parliamentary process in action. Also, I would hope that you have a good trip home and that you end up being able to say that it was a very successful day for you.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. K. R. MacLeod (Regina Albert Park): — Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure on behalf of my colleagues and myself to join with the Hon. Member from Regina Wascana in welcoming the Air Cadets who are with us today. I am not sure if I am the ranking officer in the House, but as one who has served in the forces I can assure the House that we appreciate, and I know that every Member appreciates, the discipline and the ability and training to work in teamwork, one with the other, that is produced by the cadets; and the officers are to be congratulated in bringing them to this city and they couldn't have picked a better place to come than Regina.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. F. Meakes (Touchwood): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to introduce a group of students on your behalf, from your constituency of Wadena, a group from the Quill Lake School, 25 children from Grade Six to Grade Nine. They are accompanied by their teachers Mr. Boyko, Mr. Aitken and Mrs. Engemoen. I know I pronounced that wrong and I apologize. I believe they are in the Speaker's Gallery. I know on your behalf and on behalf of all Members we wish them a safe journey home and enjoyable day while they are here.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. D. W. Cody (Watrous): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to join with the Member for Wascana in welcoming the students from the St. Andrew School. I think he mentioned a teacher and I am not sure that he is here, but I do know that their other teacher, John Stockmal who sits right above me, is here. Mr. Stockmal is a resident of the Glencairn area and we have become great friends, because our sons play hockey together. I certainly welcome him and the students here this afternoon.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

Sawdust on Ice of Copp Creek

Mr. T. M. Weatherald (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I wish to direct a question to the Minister of the Environment.

It has been brought to my attention, Mr. Speaker, that the Saskatchewan forest product saw mill at Sturgis has deposited a large quantity of sawdust on the ice of Copp Creek and Lilian River, approximately 500 yards from the Assiniboine River and the dam. Obviously, Mr. Speaker, when spring breakup occurs this will seriously deteriorate the oxygen levels and will substantially affect the town water supplies that will be taken from this river.

The question, Mr. Speaker, — and I have a picture of the situation that exists there — the question that I should like to ask the Minister is why has his Department not enforced regulations that exist as far as this deposit of sawdust is concerned?

Hon. N. E. Byers (Minister of the Environment): — Mr. Speaker, the Department of the Environment does make or requests other agencies of government to make inspections where any company, private, corporate or Crown is carrying on practices that are damaging to the environment. I am not able at this time to advise him whether or not we have investigated this particular situation. I am certainly willing to look into it. I would appreciate it if the Hon. Member would provide me with the details as to the precise location so that the matter can be investigated.

Mr. Weatherald: — Well I think that it is unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, that the Government's own Crown corporation apparently doesn't live up to their own regulations. I would suggest, very seriously, that the Minister look into it immediately before the ice breaks up because it could cause an extremely serious problem.

Audit of Saskatchewan Metis Society

Mr. J. C. McIsaac (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Culture and Youth.

A few days ago in the Legislature here in discussing his Estimates, there were some questions raised by myself and the Leader of the Opposition with respect to an audit of the books of the Saskatchewan Metis Society and some requests that we have had dealing with that. Since that time I have had several other requests since it was aired in the House. At the time the discussion was not recorded, as I understand it. The Minister told the Assembly that the Federal Government was conducting an audit, I believe. That he and his Department were a part of that and going to be their contribution and their funding of the Metis Society would also be audited by that Federal audit. As a result no provincial audit was required.

Is this the essence of what the Minister said at that time?

Hon. E. L. Tchorzewski (Minister of Culture and Youth): — No, I don't believe I said that the funding that would be provided by a provincial department was necessarily being audited by the Federal Department auditors.

I doubt very much whether that in fact is the case.

Mr. McIsaac: — Mr. Speaker, that is very interesting. My understanding was in that particular study in Committee, that the Minister did say the province felt no need to conduct any audit for the simple reason that the Federal Government was going to be doing all the auditing. Now he tells us a little bit differently and I am not too sure why. I want to read a telegram received by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, this morning:

As per your telephone conversation earlier today.

And this is from the Special Assistant to the Secretary of State.

Audit of Metis Society of Saskatchewan by the Department

of Supply and Services scheduled to begin April 15th.

Now the Minister told us the other day this it was already underway.

Target date for completion, June 7th. Federal audit to cover only core funding money by Secretary of State and will not cover any moneys granted by the Provincial Government.

And yet the Minister came into this House during Estimates and blithely assured us that the Federal Government was going to do the auditing. The question is very simple: when can we believe this Government opposite when it comes to spending money and the misspending of money?

He has assured us that they are going to be looking after it, obviously they haven't. Is he now going to change his story of the other night and take some action?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Speaker, if in fact there was a question asked I should like to reply to it. I think that Members opposite can believe the Government when we have given a reply by simply listening to what the answers are that are being given.

I did not say, under consideration of the Estimates of the Provincial Secretary's Department, that the federal audit was being done of provincial funding. I made it very clear that it was being done of funding that was provided by the Secretary of State's Department from Ottawa. Not only did I state that clearly, Mr. Speaker, I did it three or four times because the Members opposite pursued that question.

Mr. Speaker: — I should like to say that on these types of questions, it is quite plain in the rules that telegrams should not be read and then base a question on them because they lead to dispute and arguments. Questions should be concise and if the answers are not what the Members want then they should place a question on the Order Paper.

Leases Granted by Lands Branch

Mr. E. C. Malone (Regina Lakeview): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I have a question of the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, you will recall that several days ago my deskmate the Member for Morse (Mr. Wiebe) made what I consider to be very serious allegations of direct political interference by the Minister of Agriculture in connection with leases granted by the Lands Branch of his Department. Now the Minister was on other business the night these allegations were made and, of course, did not have a chance to reply to them at that time. But he has been on his feet on several occasions after that, and has made no explanation whatsoever of these allegations.

I would remind you, Mr. Speaker, that these allegations were confirmed in a court hearing before a Queen's Bench judge . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! I think the Hon. Member may or may not

have been in the House when this question was raised earlier. This was a statement made in a debate and I don't think that statements made in a debate, they may or may not be factual, the Chair doesn't have to decide that. But a statement made in debate should be answered in the debate and if not answered in the debate then a written question should be put on the Order Paper. It should not be brought about upon the Orders of the Day.

Mr. Malone: — On a Point of Order, I understand that these questions are to find answers to things that are of very public concern and interest. And my question to the Minister will merely be whether he is prepared to give an explanation of his actions at this time or at some time in the future.

Mr. Speaker: — I think questions like that while it pertains to or arises from statements in debate should be put on the Order Paper in a matter of a Resolution rather than ask a question and then it could be debated. You cannot debate them on the questions on Orders of the Day.

Mr. MacDonald (Milestone): — On a Point of Order. How would you word that question? Will the Minister please defend his actions, is that the way?

Mr. Speaker: — It is not up to the Speaker to tell the Members how they should word their questions, but I think that the House will realize that if every statement made in debate became questions on the Orders of the Day, we should go around and around the same circle.

Mr. McIsaac: — Just on the Point of Order, Mr. Speaker. Here the question arises not necessarily from a debate but from court findings and court records which the Member has in his possession. So it is not out of debate that this question arises for some investigation or for some justification of the Minister's action.

Hon. J. R. Messer (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order. I should like to say and bring to the attention of the Hon. Members to your left that Estimates will be coming up for the Department of Agriculture, the subvote Land Bank will be sure to be debated and scrutinized with some diligence by all Members of this Legislature and I think that would be the most appropriate time for myself to bring forward any defence, if I have any defence to bring forward, and I assure you that I will.

Regina Pats Hockey Club

Mr. K. R. MacLeod: — Mr. Speaker, then I wonder if I might be permitted to ask a question of the Minister.

I realize that the Minister of Agriculture is acting Minister only at the present time, but it is a matter of some importance and I wonder if I could present it to the House and to him, having regard to the fact that the Regina Pats Hockey Club is on the verge of moving to some other centre, possibly Spokane,

Washington, thus leaving Regina without a major junior hockey club at all. This, Mr. Speaker, is a major sporting thing for Regina. The Regina Pats are the most complete junior hockey system as such in Canada and I wonder if the Hon. Minister . . .

Mr. Kramer: — Mr. Speaker, the rules of this House are being continually broken with speeches rather than questions and I suggest to you that this certainly should not go on.

Mr. Speaker: — I ask Members who ask a question not to preface it with a speech and I wish they would try to get their requests as questions rather than as speeches.

Mr. MacLeod: — Mr. Speaker, I was hoping merely to give a little background to the Minister because he has a problem and I am sure that he doesn't know all about his Department.

My question to the Minister is this: Would he give some consideration, as quickly as possible, to assisting either the city of Regina or the Regina Exhibition Board to create the kind of a facility in Regina which would allow us on behalf of the city, to make whatever representations are necessary to keep the Regina Pat Hockey Club here? I should like to encourage him on behalf of our side of the House, and I am sure the Member for Regina Wascana (Mr. Baker) would be anxious to get a favorable reply too, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Messer: — I am not aware of any direct discussions between the Regina Pats Hockey Club and the Department of Municipal Affairs or presentations being made on their behalf in relation to whether or not more adequate facilities would retain the Club here in Regina rather than locate at some other point. The point suggested, Spokane, Washington, has been mentioned by the Member for Regina Albert Park. But I do want to assure this House that if there are representations being made that certainly the Department of Municipal Affairs and this Government will consider them very carefully. Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I will say that for the first time ever there is a good deal of money being made available in an unconditional grant from the Community Capital Fund to the city of Regina to a maximum of \$75 over a five-year period of time on the basis of the per capita population of the city. And if the city so chooses in their wisdom to budget some of that sum towards an agri-dome or to some other facility which will provide better conditions for that Club to play hockey in, then certainly the Government has contributed in a major way to have that Club retain its activities here in the city of Regina.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacLeod: — A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. It's difficult to ask a question in this House because we are constantly interrupted. Now we won't mind being interrupted by Mr. Speaker, but constant interruptions by the Minister is something that I hope you can control, Mr. Speaker.

Maybe I could ask then if the Hon. Minister hasn't heard about it, it's possible that somebody has gone to the Minister of Culture and Youth, perhaps he could answer. The only problem

that we are faced with, Mr. Speaker, is that this unconditional grant is now being spent in about 14 different ways by the Hon. Minister opposite and quite frankly I was hoping we could get a nonpartisan discussion on this point. Obviously we can't. Now the question is: Has the Minister of Culture and Youth received any requests from the city of Regina, because if he has then I should like to hear about it and what action can be taken right away?

Mr. Speaker: — We are getting out of order on these questions. Questions if you check the rule book, it is quite plain should not be asked on future policy but what is a fact at the present time. Questions are being put to ask Ministers to make a decision on future policy before it has come to government. I think that type of question would be better taken up privately or dealt with otherwise because they don't qualify under the rules as questions.

Mr. MacLeod: — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order, the only problem we face over here is that this must be the worst Question Period in Canada because we can never get a question without being constantly interrupted by the Government Benches.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — Order! If the Question Period in this Legislature doesn't suit the Members it is within the powers of this House to lay down rules and regulations which they wish to govern. If the present standing rules are not satisfactory they can be changed by the Members concerned.

SPEAKER'S RULING

Questions Put by Members — No. 202

Mr. Speaker: — In calling Questions put by Members I wish to say that appearing on the Orders of the Day is question No. 202 which pertains to the Legislative Assembly Office which falls under the jurisdiction of the Speaker. I refer all Hon. Members to Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, Fourth Edition, Citation 184, page 155, which is in part as follows:

Standing Order 39 does not allow Questions addressed to the Speaker. If, however, Members write to the Speaker and inquire about measures placed under his control he is bound to give the information required. The House of Commons of which he is the head is like one of Government's departments with a staff of several hundred officers, clerks and employees. The annual expenditure including Members' indemnity is under his supervision as well as the Library of Parliament and the Parliamentary restaurant controlled by joint committees of both Houses of which there is a joint chairman with a Speaker of the Senate. His prestige would suffer if his name appeared frequently on the Order Paper or in Votes and Proceedings in connection with questions relating to appointments or sessional employees, meals in the restaurant or books received in the Library. His position is not only administrative but it's

quasijudicial. Being the presiding officer he cannot be drawn into any discussion on the floor of the House.

So for the above given reason I rule that question 202 is out of Order.

Mr. J. C. McIsaac (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, with respect to your ruling does this mean, going back to the beginning of the quotation from Beauchesne, a letter outlining a similar request directed to you would receive your consideration?

Mr. Speaker: — That is correct. Jurisdiction under the Speaker's office, a letter directed to the Speaker, the Speaker will get the information but it does not go through the floor of the House.

RESOLUTIONS

Resolution No. 13 — Nationalization of the Provincial Oil and Gas Industry

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

That this Assembly urgently calls upon the Saskatchewan Government to consider nationalization of the provincial oil and gas industry.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I imagine the Members of the House have been waiting with bated breath for this debate, with eager anticipation in order to be able to delve once again into obviously the most crucial issue which has been before this House this Session. As some of you may have read reports in the Leader-Post in the previous Saturday edition, you will realize that there have been some slight complications and hang-ups and some slight reluctance on the part of some Members to undertake this debate.

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, we have arrived at this occasion and I don't apologize for raising the issue once again given its importance and primacy, nor do I intend to go over once again the classic arguments about refinery closures, profit rip-offs, about low royalties. My basic purpose today in moving a motion which I shall move at the conclusion of this debate, calling upon the Saskatchewan Government to consider nationalization of the provincial oil and gas industry, my major purpose in raising the debate today is to introduce some new calculations with respect to profitability of the Saskatchewan oil and gas industry. Secondly, to discuss the question of the wasting of this resource and the need for an immediate new policy with respect to exports.

Mr. Speaker, with the indulgence of the House I have prepared a summary of the oil industry in Saskatchewan in 1973; these figures are also contained in the tabloid which I have just distributed to Members and I should like to go over them — a summary until we get into the more complicated calculations. Mr. Speaker, in talking about the total cost figures of \$1.60 per barrel, these figures include pro-rated exploration costs . . .

Mr. Speaker: — I think the Hon. Member is preventing his mike from

picking up the recording for the recording staff.

Mr. Richards: — Excuse me, Mr. Speaker. We would not want to be losing this for posterity.

Mr. Speaker, total costs included in this table, drawn from the Canadian Petroleum Association involves exploration costs pro-rated per barrel. Exploration costs have been in the order of 1.2 billion cumulatively since 1947 for a per barrel of approximately 63 cents given the discovery in the province of approximately 2 billion barrels of oil. The producing costs which cover all costs of lifting the oil and facilities associated with lifting, amount to 62 cents and using 1973 figures of provincial taxation of 35 cents, we have a total cost figure, according to the Canadian Petroleum Association, of \$1.60 per barrel of Saskatchewan produced oil.

Mr. Speaker, again according to the Canadian Petroleum Association, the figure for the average price received in 1973 is \$3. The debate last December used the figure of \$3.08. There is a slight disagreement and I am quite willing to use the lower figure for the sake of the argument. Either way you cut it, \$1.40 is the profit per barrel at this juncture. Now, for reference, \$3.38 is the frozen price as of September, 1973 for oil.

Now, Mr. Speaker, these figures are summary figures per barrel in 1973. We are going to have to introduce some more sophistication into this before we finish but let me even at this juncture entertain some qualifications. The capital cost figures of 63 cents per barrel are based upon proved reserves as published by the Department of Mineral Resources. The Department of Mineral Resources assumes 30 per cent recovery ratio. Actually known to be in the ground is approximately 7 billion to 8 billion barrels that have been discovered and given the higher prices which are currently being earned for oil you can certainly expect better recovery techniques in the future which may well be considerably above 2 billion which are actually listed in current figures supplied by the Department of Mineral Resources.

Now these figures, Mr. Speaker, jar considerably with what has been put forward by various industry spokesmen in the last few months who have been complaining bitterly about the imposition of Bill 42.

I should like to draw several arguments from this. This first argument is to compare the situation of the small independent producers to that of somebody farming land which is so poor that it would require \$10 per bushel wheat before he could earn a living. There are small operators in Saskatchewan on marginal fields requiring heavy recovery technique expenditures who would not make money unless oil prices could continue their inflationary spiral above the \$3.38 frozen level as of last September.

A second problem, is that in an industry which has been used to an excessively high rate of return and a rate of return in other provinces which is even higher than in Saskatchewan, the rate of return in the United States which is higher than in Saskatchewan, given the various subsidies and incentives, why should the industry stay in Saskatchewan? The argument is that you can earn a 50 per cent rate of return somewhere else, why

Content yourself with a measly 20 per cent in Saskatchewan? But admittedly, as Members here on this side of the House have stated, exploration has decreased. To quote accumulative figures according to the latest I've got to the March 9th, 1974, exploration in Saskatchewan, total footage drilled, 96,000. That compares with 205,000 feet drilled in this same period in 1973. There are five drilling rigs in operation in Saskatchewan in 1974 at this point, compared with 12 in operation at the same time last year.

But now, Mr. Speaker, there is a final point to be made. Surely the Government must have understood and recognized when it introduced Bill 42 that the oil industry would retaliate in various methods that it had and one of them would be to try and disrupt the domestic Saskatchewan oil and gas industry as it exists. And that surely was the reason for the introduction 12 months ago of the Saskatchewan Oil and Gas Corporation enabling legislation. But clearly in that piece of legislation which at the time of introduction the Minister of Mineral Resources at the time (Mr. Thorson) stated it to be urgently needed and that it quickly would be set up — 12 months later there is no exploration activity being undertaken by the Saskatchewan Oil and Gas Corporation. When you phone up their office you get given a phone number of a professor's office on the Regina Campus. The Minister in charge now says, "Hopefully staff will be in place in April," heaven knows when actually operations will begin.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to give some more detailed discussion. Before I do, however, I think Members might be interested just to have some appreciation of what has happened in the ensuing 12 months in 1973. For the total western Canadian oil and gas operation one has got a doubling of the surplus reported by the Canadian Petroleum Association, a doubling from \$476 million in 1972 to a profit earned in western Canada of over one billion — \$1,021 billion. And it should be noted, Mr. Speaker, that those figures of \$476 million and \$1.02 billion, those figures include the expenditure on Arctic exploration which for 1973 was \$265 million. In other words \$1.02 billion is after all the exploration activity undertaken by the oil industry in the Arctic. So obviously the idea and the argument that the expense of Arctic exploration is such as to take away and diminish any of the profits earned in southern Canada is nonsense and rubbish. It should be seen precisely for what it is.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in this draft we have accumulative experience in Saskatchewan of expenditures by the oil and gas industry. As one can see starting from 1947 it is a very low level, there was a peak in the late 1950s, decline in the early 1960s, peaking in 1965 and roughly stagnating since then. Mr. Speaker, the black line at the bottom represents total capital expenditures on exploration and development. To the last year recorded here, 1973, these expenditures amounted to \$45 million. Of that \$45 million only \$9 million was accounted for by actual exploration on new wells. The remaining \$36 million involved development wells and did not involve exploratory activity. The difference between the black and the red line, Mr. Speaker, between 45 and 99 that covers operating expenditures such that in 1973 the cumulative expenditures on capital and operating expenses were \$99 million. If you add to that the blue, we have a total of \$130 million having been spent in 1973 for capital expenditures up to the black line, operating expenditures up to the red and the blue gives the figures for provincial taxation paid.

It should be noted, Mr. Speaker, at this juncture that the provincial taxation had actually declined as a proportion of total oil and gas revenues. Going back to the year 1966, in that year, there was a \$218 million total oil and gas revenues in the industry and 37 million was taken into the provincial treasury in the form of royalties, bonus bids, etc. That was a percentage of 17 per cent.

By 1970 when the Liberals left, the last complete year the Liberals were in power, that figure declined to 13 per cent. But unfortunately since the NDP came to office this figure has continued to decline, such that it is now in 1973 a mere 11 per cent of total revenues. If we turn over the overlay we get the figure on the overlay of the increase which is certainly quite phenomenal in the last year, but has obviously been cumulative over the period '47 to '73. This gives the picture of total revenues received by the industry.

Up to the period 1957 we had an annual situation in which expenditures were higher than revenue. Since 1957 you've got a situation in which revenues have in each year exceeded expenditures such that in the last year of operation, 1973, one has total revenues of \$266 million compared with \$130 million in the form of expenditures. Approximately 50 per cent in that year of revenue was surplus or profit.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what is of considerable interest from the point of view of economics is to try and assess what has been the average rate of return of this industry over its lifetime. Obviously, merely to take the last year of operation with its phenomenally high oil prices, is not a fair figure. That's the first table which I gave here, although accurate for experiences in 1973, it does not give the cumulative experience of this industry over its lifetime in the province.

Now, in formal economics what is required is to construct an internal rate of return analysis. And what is meant by that is quite simply to try and arrive at a figure which represents what would have been the rate of interest earned had the corporation invested its capital in some safe asset as opposed to investing it in an actual ongoing corporate entity.

If I might give an absurdly simple example, if in 1973 a businessman invests in a factory \$100 and in 1974 he earns a revenue from that factory of \$250 of which \$50 goes in the form of taxes and \$50 in the form of wages he then has left over in 1974 \$150 on an investment in 1973 of 100 and taking this absurdly simple example if everything is squared off at the end of this 1974 period, there's no factory left, there's no scrap value left, there's no capital assets to consider, the rate of return is obviously \$150, relative to an initial expenditure of \$100 in a one year period, the rate of return is 50 per cent in one year.

Now, obviously that is a gross simplification, because what we have in this situation are expenditures spreading over a 27 year period and revenues spread over a 27 year period. Also the matter is complicated by the fact that at the end of 1973 what is not used up, all the oil discovered as in my simple example about the factory which presumably disappears in a puff of smoke at the end of one year, we have left 800 million barrels in the ground which the oil companies can still take out.

Now, what I would like to do at this juncture is to bring forth the following table which gives the internal rate of return on assets invested in the Saskatchewan oil and gas industry, using various assumptions. So the first table gives a rate of return in 1947 to 1973 assuming Canadian Petroleum Association figures with respect both to expenditure and revenue. It also assumes that the oil companies will receive no further revenue in any way, shape or form. The first figure of 11 per cent would mean that if the oil and gas industry were nationalized tomorrow with no compensation paid for oil in the ground, for oil facilities such as feeder pipelines and this, I must make this perfectly clear, I'm talking about crude oil production, we're not talking about refineries or retail operation. This is referring to production end of the business. This is what the industry has earned to date, taking no account of what assets it still has.

Now, Mr. Speaker, making those assumptions the Saskatchewan oil and gas industry has earned an 11 per cent rate of return on its assets. To put that in perspective that should be compared with the blue figures which give an average for 1966 to '70 of all non-financial corporations, their rate of return on assets. And we see that the Saskatchewan oil and gas industry has already a rate of return twice the average of non-financial corporations in Canada. However, obviously the assumption involved in the first calculation of 11 per cent, namely that there would be no further revenue earned, is totally misleading. Let us assume that the oil industry in Saskatchewan uses up the 800 million barrels which are still in place and remember these are 800 million barrels calculated on the present recovery techniques. A reservation is that it may be decidedly too low, given that higher prices justify better recovery techniques, but assuming the 800 million barrels, assuming a 5 per cent annual reduction in production as the Department of Mineral Resources predicted would be the case if there were steady exploitation of the oil in the ground, further assuming there to be no increase in the price of oil above the current frozen level, the level frozen jointly by the Federal Government and the Provincial Government under the provisions of Bill 42, and assuming that costs remain constant which is a reasonable assumption because Bill 42 allows that the \$3.38 ceiling will increase with increases in operating costs, that is provided for in the Bill assuming that there would be a 15 per cent rate of return on the Saskatchewan oil and gas industry by the time it had exhausted current, proved reserves. In other words a realistic assessment of what will be the rate of return of the private oil industry on the investment it has made to date, is three times what has been the average for non-financial corporations in Canada.

At this juncture it might be appropriate to read a quotation from Mr. Wilson, Vice-President of Shell Oil of Canada, talking in Louisiana, and I quote:

We have chosen 9 per cent as representing a reasonable rate of return we like to expect on future invested capital for the exploration and production business.

In other words we have a senior official of the private oil industry publicly stating what he considers to be a reasonable rate of return on assets, and that's what these figures are giving, 9 per cent. We've got a figure of 11 per cent already which will amount to 15 per cent by the time, after 11 years all the current oil would be depleted, assuming no further investment, no discoveries.

Mr. Speaker, this was a third figure here, pardon me, the final figure, 1974 to '84 is an attempt to calculate what will be the rate of return from there on in. If we call it quits on the 11 per cent from 1947 to '73 and we ask ourselves what is going to be the rate of return which the oil industry earns on those 800 million barrels in place, known to be proved reserves, assuming the \$3.38 price which is contained in Bill 42, assuming the costs figures remaining constant as was outlined on the first graph, making those assumptions, then for the period 1974 to '84 during the 11 years for which oil could still be continued to be extracted from Saskatchewan, there would be a phenomenal 37 to 66 per cent rate of return on the Saskatchewan oil and gas industry in the province. That, Mr. Speaker, by any standards is excessive, exorbitant and should be stopped. In other words, the provisions as provided by Bill 42 far from being repressive allow, depending upon assumptions which are as wide as the range, give a range of 37 to 66 per cent rate of return on the oil in place, in Saskatchewan, evaluated at historical costs of discovery.

Mr. Speaker, I challenge both the Canadian Petroleum Association and the Provincial Government to dispute those figures. I think they have been adequately calculated based upon proper rate of internal return analysis, using a computer, and I think they will stand up under the queries that either the Minister of Mineral Resources or members of the Canadian Petroleum Association would like to direct towards them.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, you may recall that I put a question on the Order Paper a short time ago to this effect: Has the Government undertaken any studies of the rate of return earned in the Saskatchewan oil and gas industry? The answer I got back was, yes, the study is under way. And then a note was appended. The note states, even after these studies are complete confidentiality must be maintained under the provisions of The Saskatchewan Statistics Act, which prevents disclosure of information obtained from companies under the authority of The Statistics Act.

Mr. Speaker, I should like Members of the House to consider that response. A simple question, has the Government undertaken any studies of rates of return? Yes, a study is under way. Nearly three years after coming to power, with the oil and gas industry a central focus of resource policy and of provincial policy in the intervening three years, we learn that finally in March, 1974, the Government has launched a study to discover whether, yes or no, there is a high rate of return in the industry. In other words, for the intervening period the Government has gone by the seat of its pants without undertaking the elementary economics which are required to formulate new policy. I think that is shocking.

But furthermore to compound the injury, the note is appended which implies that The Statistics Act would prohibit the publication of information. If the Members are willing to look up The Statistics Act back to the 1972 session, they'll discover that under Section 11 (1) indeed there are restrictions on what the Director can publish, there are restrictions such that no individual identifiable person, business or organization can be identified from these results. However, The Statistics Act also explicitly states in Section 4 that under the authority of the Minister, the Director can publish statistical information relating to the commercial, industrial, financial, social, economic and general activities and conditions of the province. The Statistics Act in no way prohibits the Government from publishing

an assessment of what is the industry wide rate of return. The Statistics Act merely restricts the Government from publishing information relative to one particular corporation.

We have once again, the Government hiding behind a piece of legislation in order not to engage in disclosure of corporate, relevant corporate statistics in order that we can have an intelligent public debate about this industry.

Mr. Speaker, these figures have been produced, admittedly on spare time and part-time work and have been labored over and doubtless there could be additional refinements added, were there the staff of a government behind it. However, I repeat the challenge, I challenge the Government, I challenge the Canadian Petroleum Association to deny that cumulatively the experience will be 15 per cent on the investment already made and that from here on in there will be an outrageous 37 to 66 per cent rate of return if the oil industry is left to its own devices.

Mr. Speaker, time is running out. Oil is a wasting asset. We need to act now if we are going to preserve this asset for the better use of the people of Saskatchewan, if we are to assure that returns on this asset do in fact flow to the people of Saskatchewan. I used here an 11 year pay-out period, however, assuming some rate of growth it could be as short as 9 years. The life index of the conventional crude discoveries in Saskatchewan, if there are no new large discoveries. I was pleased to note when the Premier spoke in the debate in reply to the Speech from the Throne, that he discussed the problem of rapidly diminishing reserves and I quote:

We must act to reduce the amount of oil leaving this province. We believe it is better to have more of our oil safe for use in Saskatchewan in the 1980s and 1990s than to have it shipped off to Chicago and Minneapolis to be used in the 1970s.

Mr. Speaker, that was a quotation from the Premier in the Throne Speech debate back in December. I can totally agree with his sentiments. In 1972 and 1973 we exported fully 50 per cent of our Saskatchewan oil production to the United States. One would have expected that following those statements of general policy there would have been attempts to reduce oil exports to the United States. However, come up to March and we have a release from the Minister of Mineral Resources, Mineral Resources Minister Elwood Cowley, today announced the National Energy Board has granted an additional allocation of 45,000 barrels daily of Saskatchewan crude for export to the United States. Mr. Cowley went on to say and I quote:

He was pleased to hear of the National Energy Board's decision.

On the one hand we have the Premier talking about the problems of preservation of Canadian oil, Saskatchewan oil, on the other hand we have the Minister of Mineral Resources talking about the need to step up exports. In reply to a question in the House, the Minister of Mineral Resources stated it is with a view to increasing the production particularly of the sour crude. But what I might call an extraordinary allocation of Saskatchewan crude made basically to the American west. The Minister was there discussing in the House the National Energy Board decision to increase by 45,000 barrels daily, the

allocations.

A clear contradiction. On the one hand the Premier stating the necessity to conserve, on the other hand the Minister of Mineral Resources and the Department of Mineral Resources proceeding along with the ideology and the blinkers of years gone by of continental integration of resource policy of doing what ever the oil companies want, a mirage that seems to affect bureaucrats both on the National Energy Board and here.

The question obviously arises who is to be believed. The Premier back in December or the Minister in March? I would argue the situation is not really a question of Saskatchewan crude oil, for after all Saskatchewan is only in the order of 10 per cent of Canada's conventional crude. The situation nationally is serious.

Here on this final simple graph taken from the Canadian Petroleum Association data and for that reason it may be suspect but we can question the figures. The black line gives estimated projected crude oil production in Canada. And according to the Canadian Petroleum Association there is going to be a levelling off this year and a decline here on in from conventional oil, that Canada as a whole is going to be facing the same situation as Saskatchewan and we are going to be approaching the end of our conventional oil reserves.

In order to supplement conventional oil, it becomes logical, and I don't question that logic, to proceed with some development of tar sands oil. The blue line gives an indication of projections with respect to tar sands development. Up to 1973 the only plant on stream is the GCOS, Great Canadian Oil Sands, producing at 50,000 barrels a day. The jagged lines indicate the size involved in any new production. Each of those jags indicates coming on stream in 1970, 1980, 1982 of one large tar sands operation. Each costing \$1 billion. Each producing 100,000 barrels a day. Syncrude in 1978, Shell in 1980, Petrofina in 1982 are the tar sands projects currently under way at various levels of development.

But even assuming that kind of development one is still faced with this distinct possibility that total oil production combining conventional and synthetic crude is going to decline. And the assumptions involved in this rate of expansion of Athabasca Tar Sands with three plants on stream by 1982, assumes incalculable environmental damage to northern Alberta, problems which have not been resolved and problems which very likely will not be resolved.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the red line gives an extrapolation of current Canadian demand for Canadian oil. In other words it separates out imported oil east of the Ottawa valley line.

If we do a simple extrapolation of the rate of increase experienced during the 1960s we find that demand equal to conventional crude production by 1983. But, Mr. Speaker, the Canadian oil industry has not been developed primarily for the use of Canadians. The Canadian oil industry has been developed as an integrated item with the continental mid-west American demands. This figure, this blue-purple line gives to 1973 the level of exports of Canadian oil which have doubled in the last three or four years, have increased from something in the order of 200,000 barrels in 1961 to 1.1 million in 1973. Clearly,

if that kind of continued extrapolated growth went on, we'd be in trouble a lot sooner than 1983.

I think the argument can clearly be made and that is the assumption involved in the dotted lines we should be phasing out exports to the United States of all Canadian petroleum. We have only in the last two years achieved a situation in which Canada produces more than it consumes. But we have produced into such a situation that we are entirely dependent upon the United States market. We have constructed an irrational system whereby we cannot transport western Canadian oil to eastern Canada and we have locked ourselves in such a way as the Americans expect us to continue exporting our rapidly diminishing conventional crude reserves to them. It is one small example of the dependent mentality which exists in Canadian governments at the provincial and federal level that the Minister of Mineral Resources says that he is pleased in 1974, to have a 45,000 barrel per day increase in export allocations. I think any sane socialist ecologically oriented person who looks at the Canadian oil and gas situation cannot help but be alarmed at what are the projections into the next decade. Perhaps not coincidentally one decade away will be 1984.

Mr. Speaker, in concluding my remarks, I hope that I have added some new information to this debate; information about objective calculations on what in fact has gone on in terms of dollars and cents and profit and losses and rates of return in the oil industry in this province. I would admit that the data involved in much of this is dubious inasmuch as it comes from the Canadian Petroleum Association and not from independent authorities. I think a case can well be made that we should have a great deal more concern than we currently do about continuing to export both from Saskatchewan and Alberta at the level that we are. What that means by the end of the decade is that either a large net importing of off-shore oil or developing the Athabasca Tar Sands in an unseemly haste with incredible damage to the environment to northern Alberta.

Before I take my seat and formally move this Resolution I should like to take the opportunity to express a personal word to the seconder, Mr. Lange. Mr. Lange has agreed to second this Resolution, despite considerable misgivings about the decorum and propriety of seconding a motion from a person sitting on the other side of the House. I should like to congratulate, personally, Mr. Lange for his step. I think that this is a debate which should have gone on within the New Democratic Party, the debate that I would have liked to have led as a Member on that side of the House, but exactly the same experience as I have experienced this year in trying to bring before the House this debate, I experienced last year when I tried to initiate a debate on potash policy when the Hon. Member for Albert Park was forced to second that resolution in order that we could debate potash policy. In other words the Government which claims to be interested in ending the resource rip-off is not even prepared to debate the issue in the Legislature.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Richards: — Why, Mr. Speaker? Why, if this is the most crucial issue facing Canadian people about ending its resource rip-offs, potash and oil and forests, and water across the country, why,

are Members opposite not prepared to have this debate? Why does it have to be myself who introduces this motion as an Opposition Member? Why is the Government opposite not prepared to take the lead in establishing a precedent for a sane national energy policy by nationalizing the provincial energy policy? Such a policy has been adopted by the NDP in conventions since 1971, it has been stated publicly by the Premier of British Columbia, it has been stated publicly by David Lewis, the Federal Leader of the NDP and even, on occasion, it has been stated by Premier Blakeney. When it comes to actually engaging in the guts of the debate providing the facts and the figures so that the people of Saskatchewan can decide rationally on this issue, at that time, Mr. Speaker, this fear about embarrassment, this fear about what that means in terms of the private negotiation with the Canadian Petroleum Association. In other words, there is an abandonment of the responsibility which a socialist movement or party has in 1974 to give the people the information so that they can decide to lead on this issue so that we can consider it possible in the 1970s to have an independent socialist Canada.

With that Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Lange Resolution No. 13.

Mr. L. Larson (Pelly): — Mr. Speaker, I want first of all to compliment the Member for Saskatoon University for the amount of work that he has obviously done in preparation of his presentation.

I will agree with him that it is a very important subject. I will agree with him that his presentation as he has presented it probably sounds very logical. I would have been inclined to have gone along much further with what he is saying had he refrained in his closing remarks from attacking the Government, attacking the courage, attacking the principle, and attacking a lot of the general philosophy that he spoke of.

I would remind him that this energy policy and energy crisis is a very important one that it has some very, very far reaching and important implications, not only for this Government but for the Government of Canada.

He knows very well that the position of Saskatchewan is a very minor one in total production being not very much more than approximately 5 per cent. He is well aware that we have established Saskoil, that it has been fairly well accepted, that it needs considerable development to be workable. He knows very well that Bill 42 has been passed and again it has achieved remarkable acceptance. He knows very well that the Premier of this province attended the energy conference and made us all rather proud of the presentation that he made.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Larson: — And he knows even better that at this very moment the Premier is again in consultation with the rest of Canada, not Saskatchewan alone, insofar as trying to work out and resolve something by way of a suitable energy policy for the future. Now that this problem is with us and that it needs resolving, I don't think anyone on this side of the House will deny that the Resolution suggested by the Member for Saskatoon University is one way to resolve it. But I am not in position to reply and to adequately cover all the points the Member raised. This will require considerable research on my part to be objective. I, however, feel that it

deserves objective research for reply, so I would at this point Mr. Speaker, beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

Mr. Richards: — Mr. Speaker, before adjourning debate would the Hon. Member permit a question. The question, Mr. Speaker, is, will the Member allow this motion to be debated at a later time. We have the unfortunate precedent with respect to potash last year that the debate was adjourned and . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! Once a Member moves a motion it is then the property of the House and the House must decide and the Member cannot press for special preference on any motion once he has moved it. It is now the property of the House, the House will decide.

Resolution No. 15 — Control of Wild Oats on Prairie Grain Farms

Mr. E. F. Gardner (Moosomin) moved, seconded by Mr. Weatherald (Cannington):

That this Assembly urges the Government of Saskatchewan and the Government of Canada to properly recognize the serious problem of wild oats on prairie grain farms, and to consider methods of control and eradication.

He said: Mr. Speaker, my main reason for introducing this Resolution today, is to draw attention to the magnitude of the wild oats problem on the western prairies. It is a problem of staggering proportion for all farmers, particularly Saskatchewan farmers. It is perhaps so common, so persistent that we have come to accept the wild oats problem as a fact of life on our farms. Unfortunately we have seemed to resign ourselves to accept the problem. It is something like the weather, there is a feeling in rural Saskatchewan that there is very little we can do about it.

You will note, Mr. Speaker, that about 85 per cent of the cultivated acreage on the prairies is infested to some extent by wild oats. Almost no area of the western prairies is now immune from this problem. It has spread throughout the prairie provinces and now covers almost the complete area. It is by far our most costly weed. Infestations range from very mild in some cases with little effect on yield to so severe that crop loss can approach 100 per cent.

Oil seed crops which have become very important in our province in the last decade are specially susceptible, even a minor infestation may be responsible for substantial losses.

The annual cost to farmers due to wild oats is difficult to estimate. Research has been spotty and inconclusive. There have been various experts who have suggested that wild oats have been costing farmers over \$100 million per year. However, these figures generally have been two or three years old. They are based on \$2 wheat, \$1 barley, and \$4 flax. The chief cost of course of wild oats is a reduction of grain yield. At today's prices, wild oats could well be costing our farmers \$300 million per year in yield loss alone. Mr. Speaker, this is only part

of the loss.

Grain delivered to elevators in Saskatchewan averages about 2.5 per cent dockage, in most cases the largest percentage of this is wild oats, about 500,000 tons of dockage are delivered to the Lakehead and Pacific Coast terminals each year. This amounts to something like 10,000 carloads of dockage that has to be transported to our terminals.

This would be serious at any time but when grain transportation is in its present critical stage it is a disaster. Cost of cleaning infested grain is borne by all farmers — those with dirty grain as well as those with clean grain. The cost of cleaning comes out of the Wheat Board funds and this is simply reducing the final payment that is made to farmers.

There has been a reluctance in this country to penalize farmers whose grain contains a high percentage of dockage. This has been done in some areas but there is reluctance to do it here.

I mention these points to give you an indication of the magnitude of the wild oats problem. We should ask ourselves: what is being done about it? The answer, Mr. Speaker, is very little in relation to the size of the problem. I don't want to belittle the efforts of those who are concerned with the problem. There are some university people and some organizations who certainly recognize the problem. Regional meetings have been held around the province by the Wild Oats Action Committee and I understand a final symposium on wild oats is to be held in Saskatoon on April 5th. I congratulate the Department of Agriculture for supporting these meetings. But in relation to the size of the problem, efforts to date have been woefully inadequate. When I speak of inadequate I am thinking of governments at all levels, farm organizations, grain companies, researchers and all people involved. There is no indication at the moment that the wild oats infestation is decreasing.

Because of erratic results, farmers have little faith in chemical control. This may be partly due to a lack of proper instruction or education in the use of the chemicals. But chemicals for wild oats control are expensive and a farmer wants some assurance of success before he invests heavily in them.

Mr. Speaker, perennially we have debates in this Legislature about the Port of Churchill, grain transportation, feed grain marketing, movement of wheat, boxcars, terminals and other farm problems over which we basically have little control. We discuss the Bertha Army Worms, or the plight of farmers hit by floods or crops being left under the snow. These problems come and go but across the prairies every year production losses due to wild oats are far greater than any of these.

Many methods of control have been tried and most are in part successful. A number of farms use delayed seeding. This has been done for years. There are cultural practices such as rod-weeding after seeding that has some beneficial effect. Some farmers have cut infested crops for forage. It is recommended, of course, that people should use wild oats free seed. It is also recommended that grain trucks should be covered to prevent scattering of wild oats, which blow off quite readily. Barley is grown and quick maturing crops to try and control the problem; crop rotation, summerfallow and, of course, now we have new chemicals on the market. But in spite of these so-called control

methods, strangely enough we are not winning the battle.

The main problem, as most farmers realize, is that wild oats will remain dormant in the ground for years and only a percentage of them will germinate each year to reinfest the land. It is quite possible that you may control wild oats on land for two, three, four or five years; you could summerfallow it completely; grow absolutely no wild oats or even seed it down to grass, and five years later disc it up and the wild oats would grow.

The question that we must ask then, is: what can be done? Obviously, I think, a bold new approach is needed. A few meetings around the country or a few thousand more dollars for research doesn't seem to be the answer. Governments should co-operate in a massive campaign to eradicate this prairie scourge.

Greatly extended research should evaluate and co-ordinate present control methods. I believe that what we need is some imaginative research to look into new and exotic means of solving the problem. I would suggest, for example, that could wild oats be somehow sterilized so that the seed would never grow or perhaps just as valuable, could the germination of the wild oats be so encouraged or enhanced that all the seeds would grow in one year. In either case we would have the problem pretty well solved.

I may also ask if wild oats could be crossed with domestic oats to produce characteristics which would make them easier to control. We may even ask, could such a crossing procedure produce a product which would have some value as grain rather than the useless product which is now produced. Or perhaps there is yet some undiscovered chemical which would give complete eradication and be relatively simple to use. At the moment there doesn't seem to be any of these on the market.

In a world where many people are hungry, can we afford to lose millions of bushels of cereal production to wild oats every year? This problem must be given top priority by governments, grain officials and everyone concerned if there is any hope of success.

Mr. Speaker, I suppose as is usual in Resolutions, someone will propose an amendment to commend someone for their efforts in wild oats control. I should like to remind you that we have in Saskatchewan, the world's finest agricultural land and a very large acreage of it. But almost every acre of this land is visible evidence that wild oats control efforts until now have been ineffective. Perhaps a concentrated effort in a designated area of this province could serve as a pilot project to see if success is possible. At the present world demand for grain I don't believe that we can afford to wait any longer. Some action must be taken immediately.

Mr. Speaker, with this in mind I should like to move Resolution No. 15, seconded by my colleague from Cannington (Mr. Weatherald).

Mr. I. W. Carlson (Yorkton): — Mr. Speaker, I should just like to make a few comments about this very serious problem that is being brought to the attention of this Assembly. I am sure that any rural Member will be concerned about the problem. One of the Members next to me, the Member for Watrous (Mr. Cody) said that he is concerned about

the problem but he doesn't know very much about it. The only wild oat problem he knows about is the one he sows on Saturday night.

Mr. McIsaac: — That's a perennial problem.

Mr. Carlson: — The Member for Wilkie says that is a perennial problem and I am sure that it is for some of the Members.

I wish the Member who initiated the debate had remained as I wanted to make a few comments on his suggestions. Maybe the Member for Milestone will take notes and pass them on to him. He says that the farmers tend to take the wild oats problem as something very little can be done about and just accept it and carry on. Then he went on and spent 10 or 15 minutes listing the various chemicals that are available and the cultural practices that are used throughout the province and indicated that they are, in fact, serious about this problem and are attempting to do what they can.

He also mentioned the seminars that are sponsored jointly by the federal and provincial governments and the chemical companies, that are being conducted this year in an attempt to familiarize farmers with cultivating practices and chemical control methods that can be used. I think the problem probably is not so much the lack of a solution as it is with getting it implemented, making the farmers familiar with the various kinds of chemicals that can be used on different crops. I think that if you go through the list of chemicals you will see that there is a chemical suitable to kill wild oats in almost every crop. Most of your oil seed crops can be sprayed, wheat can be sprayed. I think the only two that you cannot spray is oats and barley. I fully agree that there are problems but I don't believe they are so much at the researchers' end. I think the researchers have done a fairly good job on this and I am not suggesting that we should back off or not continue to push hard in this field. Maybe what the Member was getting at is that we need more civil servants, maybe we should include one wild oat patrol officer in each agricultural representative district. I am not too sure that something like this is not well worth looking at.

A lot of farmers just don't have the time and ability possibly to understand all the ramifications of various chemical weed control programs and a real concentrated effort by the Department of Agriculture may well help in this program.

In dealing with chemicals I think another serious problem is simply the cost of the chemicals. A couple of years ago, when the prices of grain were half or less than half of what they are now, it was debatable whether it would pay to spray a crop for wild oats. I think that is changing but no doubt cost is certainly a real factor. Costs are increasing in all agricultural inputs, chemicals are no exception, fertilizer and all the rest of the inputs. Farmers are going to have to look very seriously at how much they spend on each of these inputs. Probably if their budgeting is done well in advance it may, in fact, prove that they can't afford not to fertilize or not to spray for wild oats. I think what we really need is more information in the hands of the farmers, and possibly a program to reduce the cost of many of these chemicals.

I think this is a serious Resolution, something that we do

need to do a little more work on and Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

MOTIONS FOR RETURN

Return No. 164

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. E. F. Gardner (Moosomin) for Return No. 164 showing:

With respect to Land Bank Commission Lease allocations or Appeal Board allocations: (a) whether any leases have been granted to persons who did not have the greatest number of points under the lease allocation program; (b) If so, the names of persons who received the leases and the description of the land involved.

Hon. R. Romanow (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment to propose with respect to this proposed Motion and I shall send a copy over to the deskmate of the Member for Moosomin.

The amendment really, I think, will provide the information that the Hon. Member seeks except the one problem that the Government has. It has to do with the names of persons who received the leases. We get ourselves into this traditional argument or discussion of what is confidential or what isn't confidential and I would argue that it would be unfair to those who did receive and to those who did not receive, to publish the names. Accordingly, what I will be proposing to do is that we amend Return No. 164:

By striking out everything after sub (b) and substitute the following:

(b) (i) the total number of allocations made under competition; and (b) (ii) in each case where a lease was not granted to the person receiving the greatest number of points, what was the reason.

So if the amendment goes through, as recommended, what we will have on this item No. 3, Return No. 164, is an answer which will answer the question (a) whether any leases have been granted to persons who did not have the greatest number of points under the lease allocation program; and then (b) (i) the total number of allocations made; and (b) (ii) the reason why the allocation was not made to the person involved with the greatest number of points.

This will allow the Government to protect the names of people who are really innocent in this operation. After all the Members want to know if there have been allocations made favoring people and their names who don't have the highest number of points and this information will be granted to them by this amendment.

I will move this, Mr. Speaker, seconded by my colleague the Minister of Education (Mr. MacMurchy).

Mr. J. C. McIsaac (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, I must say I don't quite follow the arguments of the Attorney General. It is a little bit better provision, if you like, than the Government was prepared to make the last time this particular issue was debated, when the Minister of Agriculture I believe, indicated he was going to turn down or invite the House to turn down the entire Motion.

The question now will ask, with respect to Land Bank lease allocations or Appeal Board allocations, firstly, whether any leases have been granted to persons who did not have the greatest number of points. And if so, the names of those persons who received the leases and the description of the land involved. I appreciate the Government's situation with respect to respecting the confidentiality of people involved in these and other Government business.

The fact remains, however, Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Attorney General, there will be no instances here in my opinion where the names of these persons are not already known to other people in the area and in the district. Presumably the great majority of these, if not all of them, would have been appealed. There may have been some of them that didn't result in an appeal but if, indeed, leases were awarded and we can presume there were some, the people in the area where the people who had applied, the other applicants, are certainly well aware of who got it, well aware of the fact that they perhaps qualified to a higher degree on the point scale. And what we are looking for here is to find out how many of these instances did take place. And may I suggest that to allow the Motion as it originally stands is not to reveal any confidentiality, because I am convinced that all of those parties involved are well aware of the names. What we are concerned about here is to get some specific instances as a result of asking this question and then proceed from there.

So I don't think, Mr. Speaker, that the comments offered by the Attorney General with respect to government confidentiality and I respect that must be maintained to a degree in certain cases, to a complete degree in other cases, but certainly not in this particular instance. It just doesn't apply here at all. I think they are still trying to dodge the issue, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the Land Bank. We have seen it so many times that any Motion dealing with the Land Bank is for one the Government Members automatically to try to amend or water down and just don't want to provide the kind of basic information that we need, and that the farmers of Saskatchewan need, before they are able to assess the value of this program that the Members opposite continue to talk about.

We have yet to see that value, we have yet to see for sure that it is being operated fairly. We are trying to get information to determine that and here the Government proposes an amendment that will prevent us from getting the kind of information I suggest, that this House and the farmers of Saskatchewan, really need.

So I am going to oppose the amendment, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. T. M. Weatherald (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, the other day the Minister of Agriculture rapidly told us that he would provide no information whatsoever and we observed that the Attorney General very rapidly adjourned

debate. His discretion was a little better than the Minister of Agriculture. But once we have received the amendment we find out that his discretion wasn't even as good as the Minister of Agriculture's, because simply by this amendment he isn't telling us anything.

For example, (b) (i) of the amendment, it says the total number of allocations made under competition. We can count, Mr. Speaker, in the annual report the total number of allocations made under competition, the annual report which presumably will be due after the 31st and all those pieces of land that are leased will be listed there so that information is already available.

Now let's look at the second part of the amendment he moved. "In each case when a lease was not granted to the person receiving the greatest number of points, what was the reason", Mr. Speaker. Well, this is slightly helpful but once again it does not provide the name of the individual or the situation that we have been referring to.

I think that the Attorney General doesn't want us really to be able to check out and find out whether the facts that he has given us are correct or not.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Weatherald: — This is very obvious. If he had really a valid reason for being able to come and tell us in this Assembly a case where the point system, a person say getting 100 points did not get the lease and someone getting 85 points got the lease, then if he really and honestly believed that the lease had been given in fairness he could give us the reason, he could give us the name. We would check out the information and we would find out if what he is telling us is correct. But, obviously, he is hiding something because the above procedure would be extremely easy to do and he has chosen not to.

I think that this is the type of thing that people in Saskatchewan involved with the Land Bank are extremely concerned about. I think that until the Government opposite is willing to come clean and provide the number of points that each applicant has received, the person being awarded the lease and they give a very valid reason why the person who had the most points does not get the land, a reason that will stand up in the public's eye, the suspicion will always be there and will have good reason to be there. There is some hanky panky goings on in the Government in the leasing of land.

Now it is obvious that there is some goings on because there have been far too many discrepancies coming to the Opposition's attention where individuals receiving the land, who did not have the most points, that there isn't a very good reason why the person with the most points, that there isn't a very good reason why the person with the most points didn't receive it. I think that if we were able — as the Attorney General well knows — if the Opposition was able to go out and investigate these things that they would be able to go out and investigate these things that they would be able to come back to the Assembly and say without doubt that some of the allocations being made are certainly not in accord with the fairness the Land Bank system would have to have in order to operate.

I think that it is obvious, Mr. Speaker, that the amendment

as presented to us does not satisfy the requirements of being able to determine if leases are totally fair or not, and, therefore I would beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

RESOLUTIONS

Resolution No 16 — International Development Programs

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution by Mr. D. L. Faris (Arm River):

That this Assembly recommends to the consideration of the Government of Saskatchewan that: (1) the Government of Saskatchewan should match annually dollar for dollar the money raised for international development purposes by non-governmental agencies in Saskatchewan; (2) part of this money should be spent in international development education in the Province of Saskatchewan; (3) there be on-going consultation between the Government of Saskatchewan and the non-governmental agencies as to these international development programs.

Mr. H. H. Rolfes (Saskatoon Nutana South): — Mr. Speaker, the other day before I adjourned debate on this Resolution I had made a few comments in regard to the present situation and what I thought ought to be done in regard to the world situation when we compare the rich nations to the poor nations.

One of the comments that I made was that we are not really that concerned about financial assistance that would be raised by this Resolution, but that we are more concerned about the re-education of not only our adults but also our young people. I had mentioned at that time, Mr. Speaker, that there were a number of reasons as to why there were shortages in the world. Some of the reasons for the shortages we, as human beings, have no control over situations and I refer to such things as drought and floods. But, Mr. Speaker, there are certain things that human beings do have control over and I think these are the things that we would really like to have discussed.

First, the sheer gluttony of the rich nations. We produce and keep on producing for the sake of having more and more. Mr. Speaker, it is this kind of selfishness, I think, that we will have to attempt to overcome if we want to salvage at all the poor nations in the world.

I mentioned the other day also, Mr. Speaker, that I thought that it was very, very important that we re-educate and I referred to such things as the discrepancies that exist in the world today between the rich and the poor. We must, I believe, make our own people more conscious that this is a global village and that we in Saskatchewan cannot just look at our own situation, but that we have obligations and duties, moral duties, to the people who live in South America, in China, in India and the other parts of the Third World.

This is a global village and I think our schools must do something about making our young people more aware that they have these obligations.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, I think students should seek answers to certain questions. It is now that I wish to dwell on these questions.

Students should ask themselves why do we continue to pay inadequate prices and allow exorbitant prices for basic agricultural commodities, such as, coffee, cocoa, rice and sugar, while millions of workers and their families in the Third World suffer hunger, illiteracy and disease. We, in the rich nations, profit at the expense of those who are poor.

Another question, Mr. Speaker, our students should ask themselves is: why does one quarter of the world's population, including affluent Canadians, control and consume three quarters of the earth's resources and services? Are we prepared to do with less so that others can have more, Mr. Speaker?

Another question that our young people should ask themselves is: why isn't Canada more vocal within the councils of the rich nations? Shouldn't Canada's position be to share decision-making power in trade, in tariff, in monetary reform, with developing nations?

In 1972, when UNCTAD III or United Nations Conference on Trade and Development took place, it is my understanding that Canada was one of the toughest nations to negotiate with the Third World. Any time that a question came up Canada was always asking, 'What is in it for us?' rather than looking at the other side of the coin, 'What is in it for the poor nations?'

Another question, Mr. Speaker, that I think we should ask ourselves, and students should ask themselves is: why do we allocate only 0.5 per cent of Canada's gross national product to foreign aid? Hopefully, Mr. Speaker, in this regard we do not follow the example of the United States as suggested by the Member for Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod) because the United States in 1970, according to Mr. McNamara, the President of The World Bank, allocated only 0.34 per cent and he stated that if that would continue that by 1975, in his estimation, it would drop to 0.24 per cent.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that we have to reverse the trend. It has to go in the other direction. It is not what is given per capita but the percentage of gross national product.

Another question, Mr. Speaker, that we should ask ourselves is: why do the rich get richer while the poor grow relatively poorer and more desperate?

Studies made by The World Bank showed that in 10 countries with per capita income averaging \$145, the poorest 40 per cent of the population received a per capita income of only \$50. On the Indian subcontinent alone some 200 million people subsist on incomes which average less than \$40 per year. At India's rate of economic growth, it would take more than 30 years before the poorest one-third of the population could even afford an adequate diet. Third World countries are growing in gross economic terms, that is a fact, but their individual lives are stagnating in human terms.

Mr. Speaker, another question that we should ask ourselves is: have we ever seriously contemplated the effect of raising the price of wheat from \$2 to cover \$5 on the international market. What effect does this have on the Third World countries? What about the increase in the price of uranium, of oil, of meat and other exports needed by developing countries? Yes, increases in the prices of our exports is good for our country, and no one will argue with that, but it means that literally millions of people in Third World countries will starve and live in utter desperation. They simply cannot afford to pay these prices and must go without. This, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, is nothing more than international blackmail by the rich developed countries.

Mr. Speaker, there are many prominent people who have pointed out the injustice of a situation whereby 25 per cent of the people own and use more than 80 per cent of the non-renewable resources. These same people have warned us on the impending dangers and unless society grants greater justice to the poor their resentment will explode into revolution.

Mr. Speaker, we don't have to go very far to see that some of these predictions have already come to pass.

Let me just refer to a few of these prominent people — Mahatma Gandhi warned us that, and I quote:

A violent and bloody revolution is a certainty one day unless there is voluntary abdication of riches, sharing them for common good.

The Archbishop of Hyderabad, India, stated in the summer of 1973:

The long ages of resigned fatalism and passive acceptance of poverty have ended. The poor are rapidly becoming intolerant and are already in rebellion. If they do not succeed in securing a change that leads towards justice, then that rebellion will become an explosion.

Mr. Speaker, permit me to quote one more international figure, the Archbishop Camara of Recife, Brazil. He described very aptly the present situation when he said:

Today 85 per cent of the people rot in misery to make it possible for 15 per cent to live in comfort.

Mr. Speaker, this is what this Resolution is all about, to make our people more aware of the global situation, that we have an obligation, a responsibility to change the things as they are. They need not be this way for we have sufficient for all.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, unless we heed these warnings and share more generously from our over-abundance, there will be more revolutions, more explosions and much more bloodshed. The poor have everything to gain by being vocal and revolutionary and they have nothing to lose, because they have so little. In the meantime the tables of the rich have been loading up with new wealth but very few crumbs have fallen to the needy. In our pursuit of the good life, affluent Canadians have paid more to consume more, which has driven up costs for such basic necessities as food, clothing and housing. We have paid little regard to what effect this has on the budget of the Third World.

This is just one more depressing characteristic of a nation dedicated first to economic growth and only, secondly, to social justice.

This trend to consume and to accumulate more must be reversed. We must become more conscious of our obligations to the poor. We, the elected Members in this House, have an opportunity to show our concern in a real tangible way by supporting the motion moved by the Member for Arm River.

Again, Mr. Speaker, it is not the money raised by the Resolution that is important because it is a pittance to what is really needed, but it may make more people aware of the discrepancies that exist in the world, and the need for all of us to cut back in the over-use of a limited amount of non-renewable resources. There is no reason why every person in this world could not have an adequate diet, but it will mean that governments of affluent countries must set aside a certain percentage of their budget for the needy.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I hope that this Resolution, if passed, will eventually lead to our Canadian Government advocating in the world councils and working towards a 1 per cent world income tax which could be used for people in the Third World.

Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to support the second the motion as moved by the Member for Arm River.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. C. P. MacDonald (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, I just want to add a few comments to the Resolution of the Member for Arm River (Mr. Faris).

First of all I say very simply that no one in this Assembly or I suppose no one in the Dominion of Canada or in Saskatchewan particularly, would question the desirability of the sentiments expressed by both Members in moving and seconding this motion.

This morning I picked up the newspaper and read once again about the great danger of the increasing spread of famine in Ethiopia. The problem is no longer under control and that the danger seems to be becoming more and more apparent. Every day we pick up the newspaper and we find that the world is no longer a national world but it is an international community. Of course we all agree with the sentiment that if we are going to solve these problems certainly we in the rich communities or rich countries of the world are going to have to recognize an international responsibility and recognize it very quickly.

Traditionally, this has been considered a federal responsibility. Under the British North America Act, the Federal Government has been given the responsibility for international affairs or foreign affairs and therefore, most Canadians have looked to the national government as that agency or that jurisdiction that has the responsibility of passing on foreign aid to countries outside of the Dominion of Canada. However, perhaps this Resolution can emphasize to Canadians and perhaps to all jurisdictions that we can all do at least a little part and a little parcel in assisting in this particular area. I don't see anything wrong with the Provincial Government or the Government of Saskatchewan making contributions, particularly with the

wording of the Resolution in relation to educating the people of Saskatchewan about the responsibilities perhaps of the richer portions of the world towards the poorer nations of the world.

I should like to emphasize that perhaps before we start looking abroad, look here at home. In Canada today, and in the Province of Saskatchewan, I suggest we should look in our own backyard. Before we start talking about looking beyond the borders of Saskatchewan, that perhaps a Resolution of this kind can turn our own eyes, our own minds and our own thoughts inward. We only have to go to a few of the reservations, a very few miles from the capital city, Regina, we have only to go into northern Saskatchewan to see the poverty, to see the poor housing conditions, to see perhaps the lack of educational opportunities or economic opportunity of citizens that belong right here in the Province of Saskatchewan.

I think of the problems of drug abuse. How little we as Canadians and we as a government of Saskatchewan have contributed toward this very serious problem.

I think of alcoholism. Certainly the greatest drug problem in Canada is right here with us in Regina, it's in Saskatchewan, and we, with the Provincial Government that takes in millions and millions of dollars each year, refuse to give very little or nothing toward the rehabilitation and the control of this serious problem.

We can think of crime, rehabilitation, and all the other problems that are at home with us. It makes us realize that not only do we have to sacrifice for those nations abroad but perhaps we have to make sacrifices right here at home.

The spirit of this Resolution is charity. Charity is of course the number one quality or virtue in man. Certainly, I think all of us will support the concept, the philosophy and the spirit of the Resolution. I want to tell the Member for Arm River that I will be most happy to render my support.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. W. E. Smishek (Minister of Public Health): — Mr. Speaker, I'm glad to see this Resolution introduced in this Legislature for debate.

Too often perhaps too much, in fact, daily we are preoccupied with our own immediate concerns. Preoccupied with our wealth and how we can become more affluent without looking beyond our noses, without looking at the poverty, disease, starvation of the emerging nations.

While I agree with the Hon. Member for Milestone that we still have pockets of poverty right here at home, compare that with the poverty and starvation of the underdeveloped countries and there is no comparison.

As a citizen of this country and of this world, I have always had a deep concern about the need for us as a wealthy nation to share our wealth and the need for us to help our neighbor.

Mr. Speaker, while the main thrust of this Resolution is designed to provide funds for international development programs,

and I wholeheartedly support this effort, I feel that the second part of the Resolution is in fact even more important.

There will be a limit to the financial aid that we can offer to underdeveloped countries. But there is practically no limit to the human effort we can put forward on their behalf. Sending money is important but it is not enough, we must do more. I feel we must make a moral commitment to insure that our citizens realize and understand the plight of the vast numbers of the world's population.

Many things are occurring on this planet of which we may know very little about. For example, the Hon. Member for Milestone made a passing reference to a situation in Ethiopia, it is thought that over 100,000 people died from starvation in that country before the government moved to meet this crisis. In Venezuela, oil resources are expected to run out in 25 years, yet 90 per cent of the population is not benefiting from the riches gained during the oil exploitation and exploration.

The elaborate scale of food consumed in the rich countries of the world appears to be at the expense of the poor. If the Peruvian fish catch were used as food for Latin Americans, instead of food for animals in the United States, the catch would meet one-half of the annual protein deficiency of Latin Americans. In India thousands of people die annually from starvation with little or no knowledge of this tragedy relayed to the outside world.

If we are to help solve the problems of the world's poor, these conditions must be made known to the people. An education program must be developed which outlines the depth of the problems facing the people of the emerging nations. Through such a program could be created a growing consciousness among our people of the plight of the poor which would help to mobilize full support for programs to aid the world's poor. Such a program could be handled through our own Departments of Education, and Continuing Education. I know, Mr. Speaker, that the Department of Education staff are looking at the text books and curriculum now being used in our schools. Perhaps a program on world development could be included in the school curriculum. The Department of Continuing Education through the Extension Department of the University could make lectures and films available on these subjects.

Mr. Speaker, we are our 'brothers' keepers'. While we live in a land of plenty, there are nations of people who daily face starvation. Many of the services we take for granted, such as medical care and education, are not available to much of the world's population. Living in a country such as Canada with wealth and convenience all around us, we can quite easily become blind to the problems facing so much of the world's population.

In our schools we study countries such as Britain, France and United States, countries that are industrialized and which have realized high standards of living. We spend very little time studying the poorer nations of the world, such as Ethiopia, Kenya and India, to name but a few. In our homes we often may watch television programs which depict life as essentially rosy, occasionally troubled by a few minor problems which are usually resolved to everyone's satisfaction with a concluding reassuring laugh, Mr. Speaker.

Life is not that simple for most of the world's population. We cannot gloss over the fact that many people die lacking even

the bare necessities for sustaining life. As a nation we are isolated from the world's poverty. We see it only briefly, as news items on television or a grim picture in a magazine or newspaper. We simply do not know enough about world poverty.

The Resolution rightly speaks to the need for an education program to bring all of us an awareness of the depth of the world poverty.

Mr. Speaker, there are concrete steps which can be taken to help them improve the standards of living for the world poor. One step is to provide development funds such as is being suggested here today. I feel that as well as providing such funds, we should strive to ensure that these funds are used to build labor intensive industries in developing countries. These industries should be structured on a co-operative basis to ensure that the maximum benefits can be achieved for the maximum number of people. Most nations which need aid have a large supply of labor, Mr. Speaker. The solution to many of their problems lies in full utilization of the labor forces.

Now, Mr. Speaker, a recent Ottawa project pushed on Tanzania, for instance, is a million dollar automated bakery which will destroy existing small bakeries in that country and do nothing for the overall welfare of the people of that country. This is the kind of a contribution that we are making. Canadians are quite capable of providing such needed expertise in many fields. In medicine, in agriculture and education to name a few. But I doubt whether this is the type of help, such as an automated bakery was a priority item.

While I agree that we should provide such expertise we should also realize that our end objectives should be the self determination of the countries we are trying to assist.

In the field of medical training we are witnessing some of the results of poorly defined objectives on the part of our country. Many medical students come to Canada from developing countries each year to finish their medical training. We provide the training facilities and expertise to upgrade their training. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, according to some spokesmen for the Canadian Medical Association what too often happens is the foreign students never return to their native lands to practise medicine. Many become enamored of the Canadian way of life and feel that they cannot face the poverty and the backwardness of their own country. In other cases the student returns home after his training has been completed only to find that his Canadian training really doesn't equip him to practise medicine in a country where the latest medical technology is not available. It may well be asked whether this kind of assistance has helped or hindered developing nations.

We seem to be operating a brain drain in the reverse, Mr. Speaker, taking some of the most skilled medical manpower from developing countries for Canadian needs. In fact, a brief from the Canadian Medical Association to the Canada Immigration and Population study made the following recommendation, let me quote:

That foreign undergraduate medical students and foreign physicians in residency programs undertaking such training on a student visa not have the option of applying for landed immigrant status in Canada, thus depriving

their country of origin of manpower, the education of which may have been borne by the mother country.

We must not allow our expertise and affluence to rob the people we are really attempting to help.

Mr. Speaker, may I suggest as I have suggested before that we should be providing funds to develop their own medical schools, their own teaching hospitals. To provide their own medical technology and yes, we can provide some of the expertise to get them started. What is found to be true is also that after they return to the countries of their origin we have really not equipped them to treat the diseases caused from malnutrition, tropical diseases, diseases of the environment of those nations. Therefore, I think it would be better if we provided the kind of support necessary to train them on the scene in their own countries.

Mr. Speaker, we in Saskatchewan have a long tradition of helping our neighbor, of co-operation between groups and individuals. I recall that in the '50s and early '60s we had a student exchange program with underdeveloped countries. In fact, Mr. Speaker, that program was introduced, as many of you may recall by the late Woodrow Lloyd, the former Premier of this province. He himself was a person dedicated to the proposition that we as Canadians ought to do more to help the underdeveloped countries.

All of us do recall that he was a man deeply committed to help the underprivileged and in fact, died in the service of the United Nations helping to upgrade and helping to resolve problems and assist the underdeveloped countries.

Two Saskatchewan students were given grants to work and live in a developing country for a year while two foreign students came to live and work in Saskatchewan. Perhaps this program should be reinstituted again.

That program that was introduced at that time was a modest project but it exemplified the kind of program we need to increase our awareness of what is happening in the developing countries. We must strive to build human bridges between ourselves and the nations we seek to help. Surely, there can be no greater challenge to the co-operative ethic than working to assist our brothers and sisters in other lands who are less fortunate than ourselves.

Mr. Speaker, three years ago the United Nations called on the developing nations of the world to set aside 1 per cent of their gross national product as aid to the developing countries. Since that time only two nations, Sweden and Holland have matched or exceeded this percentage. Canada spends approximately one-half of one per cent of our GNP on foreign aid, but most of this is tied aid. 'Tied Aid' implies that the receiving countries are not free to use the aid money to shop around for goods and services, rather they must spend their aid money in Canada. They are tied by the conditions of the grants and in some cases, to loans, to purchase what they need in the Canadian marketplace at Canadian prices.

Canadian aid should be given free of conditions which tie receiving countries to our economics. They should be allowed the freedom to use these funds for the betterment of their

March 26, 1974

society, not for the benefit of the Canadian economy. While the spending of foreign aid should be supervised, these countries should not be forced to deal only with us. They should be allowed to purchase their goods wherever the price is most advantageous and where the goods will be the most valuable to them.

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately the Federal Government in Ottawa seems to attach a high priority to the defence spending rather than to foreign aid. According to the National Defence Report of 1973, the Defence budget will increase at the rate of 7 per cent per year over the next five years, starting from a base of \$2,133 million in the fiscal years 1973-74.

The Defence Department's Estimates for the '74-75 fiscal year is to be increased to \$2.4 billion, this is as I understand using the last year's constant dollar. Mr. Speaker, I cannot understand the rationale for such spending on defence at a time when defence equipment can and does become obsolete, almost overnight. There is no known defence against the consequences of nuclear war. Regardless of how much money is spent on equipment like the Bonaventure or the Avro Arrow. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, Canada should follow Sweden's lead by refusing to compete in the arms race. We could appoint a Minister of Disarmament, rather than a Minister of Defence as Sweden has done.

The \$2.4 billion say in '74-75 along would more than meet our commitment to the developing nations, in fact, Mr. Speaker, it would be almost three-fold of what was proposed by the United Nations.

You know the Federal New Democratic Party has committed itself to the one per cent allotment of the gross national product to the developing nations as called for in the United Nations. This means that the Federal NDP feel that at least \$900 millions of dollars should be given annually as aid to the developing world. This, Mr. Speaker, shows once again the commitment of the New Democrats towards building a better life for all of the earth's people.

We, in the NDP, believe in support for the needy, not for the greedy. It has been said that we have two alternatives. We can help to feed the world's hungry or we can prepare to fight them. Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt which course we must follow. I want and believe in a commitment to feed the hungry people of the world.

Mr. Speaker, finally we as Canadians consider ourselves enlightened in the field of international development; well thought of in the eyes of the world. This is a myth which should not be encouraged. Under the guise of international aid some Canadian corporations are exploiting the labor and resources of emerging nations. Mr. Speaker, I want to read from The Financial Times, dated March 18, 1974, just a few days ago. It reads this way, the headline is "Asia Attracts Canadian Firms."

The head of CIDA's business and industry division Dominic Sarsfield says Canadian firms are often interested in investing in Asia because they want to project and extend export markets or ensure sources of supply for vital raw materials.

Mr. Speaker, this is the same approach which, when practised by United States companies and Canada, is denounced as economic

imperialism. Even the Conservative Party has adopted a policy to buy back Canadian resources. Yet some Canadian companies practise similar exploitation in developing nations under the umbrella of international aid. I suspect that people in developing nations do not distinguish between Canada and Canadian companies. Surely one of our priorities must be the eradication of poverty in developing countries. It is therefore important that Canadian companies contribute to this priority, not undermine it.

The Canadian Government should influence the kinds of investments Canadian companies make. Denmark, for instance, does this with its industrialization fund for developing countries. It has a government institution that will jointly invest with Danish corporations overseas if the project meets certain established criteria such as providing extension of rural employment.

Ottawa should stress the effect a project will have on the real poor in developing countries before allowing Canadian capital to be poured into these countries. Canada should also monitor the operations of existing Canadian companies abroad. We should assure ourselves that these companies are operating for the good of the people, rather than merely exploiting their labor and their resources. Co-operation should be extended by Ottawa to the joint supervision of some Canadian companies to see that they don't transfer profits made in international aid projects to tax-havens like the Bermuda s, thus, escaping the tax payments to both Ottawa and the developing countries.

These are some of the steps which I feel should be taken, if we are serious about helping developing countries, Mr. Speaker. Yes, as a province, we must make a financial commitment as recommended in this Resolution. As a nation we must make even a larger commitment for providing funds, providing food, providing health services, yes, and the technical expertise that we have and we can share. At the same time, Mr. Speaker, we must place a greater priority on education of our people respecting international aid as well. We must strive to control the actions of Canadian capital in developing nations so as to allow the people of these nations a chance for self-determination.

As long as we allow our companies to exploit the peoples of the world without restraint by our Canadian Government, there will be little chance for a real development in the countries we are trying to help.

Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly support this Resolution.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. D. Boldt (Rosthern): — Mr. Speaker, I certainly am not at odds with the Resolution as proposed on the Order Paper. I certainly don't agree with some of the material that has been brought into the debate, particularly by the Minister of Health and some of the comments made by the Member for Nutana South (Mr. Rolfes).

I think the real crux of our situation today is not how much shall, will or can the Government do. I would like the Member for Nutana South and the Minister of Health pose the question to themselves: How much can you, how much can I do? And talking about exploitation by the United States Government and by the Canadian Government, the Federal Government, today

our Premier is sitting in Ottawa trying to wangle every dollar for the oil and gas that the country can bear. It will be sold to the poor people for our benefit. Then you criticize the Americans, you criticize the Federal Government. What does the Saskatchewan Government do?

I can remember the day when we had our first session and the first item was: How can we increase our salaries? That was top priority. And then talk about the Government. I am telling you that the Government is not going to look after the poor people in other countries, it is whether you or I will look after the poor. There is no reason in the world why you shouldn't contribute something from your own income rather than always run to the Government, because the governments have shown to us that they do a very poor job.

Now in criticizing the United States, I believe that Gordon Sinclair, wrote an editorial, and I believe it is now on a record in the United States, where he mentions some of the things that the United States has done. How many socialistic countries in Europe, Sweden, Denmark, Norway — how many plane loads of medicine went over to Peru when they had the earthquake? How many plane loads of medicine and doctors did the United States, a capitalistic country that you condemn almost every time you get up, and yet they have done more for the world than any other nation that I know of.

The Member for Nutana South said that Canada is a real hard nation at the bargaining table. That might be, but I don't think they are half as hard as the Government of Saskatchewan is, when it comes particularly to the question of oil. We are one of the exporting provinces in oil.

The Minister of Health said that the Federal NDP have committed themselves to one per cent of the gross national product to world relief. They haven't done anything yet. They have never been the government and I hope they never will be. They will never be called upon to fulfil this pledge.

Then you talk about industrializing the other nations and I am sure that you would be the first if Canada went to India and wanted to develop an irrigation dam, then you people, the socialists, would be the first people to stand up and say, Oh, you are spoiling the environment. Just like at the Churchill River.

The former Liberal Government, I believe, would have gone ahead with the power development at Churchill, they would have gone ahead with the development of the second pulp mill, but what did the socialists say, when we tried to help a lot of the poor natives in this country? Oh, don't you do that over there because you are going to spoil the environment.

The Mackenzie pipe line that is suggested now by the Americans and the Canadians, the NDP Leader Mr. Lewis says that he is opposed to it because he doesn't think that a deer will jump over a pipe line; they would not stay within a thousand miles; he doesn't think that the birds will fly over the pipe line and he suggests it would spoil the environment. And the fact now will be, perhaps that we have thousands and thousands of barrels of gas, natural gas and fluid gas, in the North, but there is no way to bring that gas into the United States or if there was a real surplus that we could help the other underdeveloped countries

get fuel — because we are going to spoil the environment.

When we look at what you are preaching here in Saskatchewan we shouldn't do anything for the people of India, or China, because we are going to spoil the environment. That is wrong! I think there are many, many areas, including the Protestant churches, Catholic churches as they have programs to help the underdeveloped.

I suggest to the Members opposite and to Members on this side if you look at your church programs they are all for development. They will help these countries. You are always running to the Government and I am telling you that the Government won't do it all. Don't look at Ottawa for solving the problems of the poor; don't look at the United States for solving the problems of the poor.

I want to agree with the Member for Milestone that what you want to do first is to look whether you can solve the problem of the poor, of your neighbor. Don't let the government do everything. Don't take the cosy attitude that while I am paying income tax, I have no responsibility to the poor. I have no responsibility to the poor. I have no responsibility for the old, I have no responsibility whatsoever, let the Government look after them. Government, government, that is all you know is government.

An Hon. Member: — . . . here for.

Mr. Boldt: — Yes, you are here to run some responsibilities that the Government has but there are certain responsibilities that you, as a citizen, have too. We are always running to the Government. At every corner we are running to the Government and we know that is an easy way out because we are paying taxes, we feel quite cosy about it. We are paying our taxes and we leave it up to the Government. And all the Government does, like the Minister of Health, he criticized the Federal Government and criticized the United States Government. And if there was some other government that he knew a little more about he would criticize them as well.

I think the top priority that we have to consider as private citizens is: What can I do to help the situation? Let's not always run to the Government. And there are many, many things that we can do as individuals.

I shall support the Motion for its general intent. I certainly don't agree with the arguments that were brought in the debate. I am not critical of the United States; I am not critical of Canada. And for us to say that we should have no initiative, I am glad that we have initiative; I am glad that we are a rich nation. In many of these areas that we are talking about the poor people, those countries are perhaps richer than Canada and the United States only the wealth is in a few hands. Most of the times these are socialistic countries, very socialistic countries. Russia, for instance, is one of the richest countries in the world and some of their politicians when they go to the United States and the United Nations they rent two or three floors at the Waldorf Hotel. They have the best services.

An Hon. Member: — . . . about the Watergate hotel.

Mr. Boldt: — I don't know whether there is a Watergate hotel or not.

Maybe the Minister knows. But I think that there are many areas where the private citizen can assist the let's not always run for Government help. We see the poor from our own back door. We see this in the city of Regina; we see it in our province, that the situation in many cases can be solved by individuals or local organizations. My argument is, let's not always run to the Government. There are many areas where we as groups of people, individuals, can help and it will be much more effective and we will receive a far greater blessing from it, rather than always go to the Government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. A. Taylor (Minister of Social Services): — Mr. Speaker, let me say at the outset that I intend to support the Resolution before the House. Let me say also, honestly, that I'm not sure of the mechanics that might be involved in the implementation of such a policy. I don't think that this should be our particular concern at this moment. I must say that some of the notes that I had made and to which I had intended to refer have become almost redundant at this point, because the first thing I had written down was that I had hoped to know where every Member of this House stood on this question; know whether or not they supported the Government in taking action in this particular field, and that it would be done on a totally non-political basis. Because it seems to me that this is one of the issues that can come before a Legislative Assembly or a Parliament and on which we can express our own personal views, not just in terms of thinking about the question but also our views on the action that ought to be taken.

I think it was Marshall McLuhan who some years ago wrote of the world as being a "global village"; who wrote of the world as being so small today with its modern means of transportation and communication that we can no longer think of the people of Saskatchewan as being our neighbors or fellow citizens without also thinking of the people in Africa being in the same category.

We can look to the past and we can be very critical if we want to. We can criticize the Federal Government for inaction if that's what we want to do. We can talk about the fact that we spend about seven-tenths of one per cent of our gross national product on foreign aid in one sort or another. We could talk about the fact that if we were to double our present defence expenditures of approximately \$1.8 billion, it would only increase the total expenditure of the NATO countries by about one and a half per cent, but if we were to increase our net expenditures on foreign aid by the same \$1.8 billion it would increase the total net expenditures of the wealthy white countries in foreign aid to poor countries by 33 per cent, which would mean quite a difference.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the seven-tenths of one per cent that we now spend on foreign aid is a sad representation of our commitment. Recently, most Canadian political parties, major labor unions, the Canadian Chamber of Commerce, CUSO, and a vast array of church and voluntary organizations have favored a commitment equalling one per cent of our gross national product.

Mr. Speaker, I say that we could heap criticism for inaction in the past. Although I mention these things I don't enter this

debate to do so. Frequently governments reflect the views of those who have elected them. Maybe those who have been the electors in many cases, those of us who have been the electors, have not made our voices heard. There is no doubt, it seems to me, of the growing concern throughout our country at this point in history with the welfare of people overseas. One sees the indication of this in the growth of aid funds in charitable organizations and indeed in the churches. Even a few years ago when most of our farmers were suffering some hardships at least and economic distress, we saw the givings in the mission funds of the various churches continue to rise. They were expressing their concern. Many of the mission dollars were going strictly for development work.

In my own community, I remember on one occasion, the time when farm income was extremely low, just a few years ago, holding a special canvas to raise funds strictly for world development. More was given on that occasion than had ever been given at any other time, in spite of the fact that less funds were available as disposable income in the hands of our people.

So I think there is no doubt that people are concerned; concerned, not just about those who live close to home. The Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) pointed out that we have to look in our own backyard, and I agree with him. We do have to look close to home. There are many in our country and in our province who are not sharing in the growing economic wealth of our nation. In fact, the lowest percentage of our population find their share of our national income dropping steadily instead of increasing. So we do have to look close to home. But we cannot let our eyes stop close to home, and may I suggest that if this had been the case, in days gone by, we ourselves would never have had the chance to develop. We must always look beyond our own borders; beyond the people whose faces we recognize and know.

In spite of the poverty in this country I would remind the Members of the House that 77 of the countries served by CIDA average a per capita income of \$145 per year, which is far below even the poorest of our own people. The share of world trade by underdeveloped nations declined from 23 per cent in 1953 to 17 per cent in 1970. So we see that there is a real economic argument. One of the Members who spoke before me, emphasized the fact that if we do not provide the kind of assistance that is needed in today's world, the hungry of the world will eventually rise up and take the assistance themselves. And for this we cannot blame them. And this I think is probably very close to the truth. But I'd like to suggest that it is not for this reason alone that we ought to be providing assistance or aid to other nations. The economic argument of self-preservation is not the argument, which I at least, would use.

Someone has said something about being their brother's keeper. I ask those who are concerned about that question, ask it of themselves. Am I my brother's keeper? And to that I have to answer a resounding yes. For if one looks at the story where this comes from, one finds that this is the answer that is given. Who is my brother? In the story or parable told by Jesus, it is not the matter of who is my brother, but if you read it carefully it is to whom am I a brother? And there is an amazing difference. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the people of our province do want to participate in providing the kind of assistance that is most needed, where it's most needed.

Now the suggestion in this Resolution is that we use the non-profit or charitable organizations in order to carry out the intent. And it seems to me that this fulfils the statement made by the Member for Rosthern which was that we as individuals have a responsibility. Because a matching donation is only matching if there is something there to match in the first place. And so each of us has the opportunity, but the opportunity not only to give a dollar but to see that dollar doubled. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that in this way as a province, we are saying two things. We are saying to the people of the province that we want to work with you and reward you, in a sense, for your contribution and help your contribution to go further by doubling it. We are saying secondly, that by providing this doubling or matching contribution, "we encourage you to participate in world development and relief." And I say this very seriously because I think, as I said earlier, we could criticize Federal action or inaction, but I don't think that's enough.

I think it is time we decided our priorities. It is time, if we think more funds should be made available, that we start making some available from our own resources. I strongly believe in the validity of people to people aid, rather than government to government aid. It seems to me it carries with it a greater degree of commitment and a greater degree of good.

Probably it has already been mentioned that the costs of various programs, the costs of administration, for every dollar reaching the needy, the cost is as follows. I'm told through Federal distribution, \$3 in costs. Through voluntary charitable organizations, 27 cents and through our churches, 8 cents. Therefore, the distribution of income in this way would assist us to make sure that the greatest number of dollars gets to where it's most necessary.

But like the Minister of Health, I believe that just as important a part of the Resolution deals with education. Because somehow we have to help people to realize that those they see on their television screens, as we look at the horror of war or poverty or starvation, that those we see on the television screens are not actors, but are indeed human beings, our brothers, some place in the world.

It is very easy to become insensitive today as we watch; and this happened to most of us during the horror shows from the Vietnam War and how we looked at these things over and over again and finally most of us did become insensitive and thought of them only as other news stories. We almost thought of them as plays being acted out on our screen. Education must somehow help people to see that they are all part of this world in which we live, and that we must all somehow share in the resources that are in the world. And that people, even though they live thousands of miles away share our desires and our hopes for their children. A few years ago, through a world development and relief poster it was brought to my attention that ten thousand people died in the world every day from starvation. Most of them children. No one in this nation wants that to happen; and yet it's easy to read the poster, walk away and later forget it.

It seems to me, that if we are serious as individuals, we will express our opinion. If we think that people to people aid is the best, then we will support this Resolution because it reinforces that kind of aid. As I said, the mechanics I'm not sure of. And if we believe that this is the way that we ought

to be going as a country we will want to provide in our educational system and throughout our public life the opportunity which will help people to understand the needs that there are in the world.

There are times, as one Member mentioned, when one need may conflict with another. The need for development versus the need for ecological preservation. I don't know the answers to these. But the answers must be found, and it is only working together with those in other countries that we can find these answers. Not working through the bureaucrats here in Saskatchewan, or over in some other country; but working through the people who care here and the people who need, overseas.

So, Mr. Speaker, I will be supporting this Resolution. I would ask leave to adjourn the debate at this time.

Debate adjourned.

Resolution No. 5 — Construction of Additional Facilities for Grain-Handling

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution by Mr. J. K. Comer (Nipawin):

That this Assembly urges that the Federal Government take immediate steps to provide for: (a) construction of additional facilities for grain-handling; (b) the dredging of Churchill Harbour to a depth of 40 feet; (c) the provision of bulk loading facilities for sulphur, potash and ores; and (d) immediate construction of sheds and cranes for the import and export of general cargo, in particular containers.

And the proposed amendment thereto by Mr. Grant:

That the words "commends the Prime Minister of Canada for indicating willingness to upgrade the Port of Churchill and" be added after the word "Assembly" in the first line and the words "and further, that the Government of Saskatchewan and the Government of Manitoba be urged to lend every possible assistance to the development of Churchill as a first class Port" be added after the word "containers" in the last line.

Mr. E. F. Gardner (Moosomin): — It seems that each year we get a little chance to debate the problem of Churchill. We would of course, agree with the Motion that not enough is being done in the Churchill area. We know that Churchill has been plagued with problems over the years. Most recently it has been plagued with problems of transportation because of its location and it is certainly especially vulnerable to transportation problems.

Much of the 1973 problems at Churchill were due to the rail strike that we had in the late summer and because the season is relatively short, in fact very short at Churchill, there just isn't a chance to recover from these set-backs. We could have all of the improved facilities in the world at Churchill, we could have all of the things that have been suggested in the Resolution and by Members opposite, but it's not going to help us in a situation that we had last summer. The Port manager at Churchill and grain officials agree that the rail strike seriously

reduced the handling at Churchill. Now, those of you who will recall the rail strike of last summer, will remember that the union bosses promised that there would be no restriction in grain traffic. Mr. Atkinson of the National Farmers' Union promised that there would be no restriction in the grain traffic. And if you will recall also, Mr. Speaker, these promises were not kept. I think that if you will take a look at the Press reports from last summer, and I would like to quote for example, from the Free Press Weekly Report of Farming, August 25, 1973 an editorial and it says:

The most disturbing news on Monday for western Canada coming out of the series of rotating rail strikes was the announcement that grain supplies are running low at Churchill and the Lakehead as a result of the non-movement of grain trains.

And it goes on to quote the Port manager at Churchill saying the problems they are having. It says:

A meeting of railway unionists at the Pas on Monday rejected requests from rail officials that the grain train be moved. All of this is strangely at odds with the promise given by the unions before the strike started, that grain would be kept moving. Roy Atkinson, President of the National Farmers' Union said last July, that Dick Smith, Secretary of the Association of Non-operating Railway Unions had given him assurance that grain shipments would continue in event of a strike. Mr. Atkinson, called the decision most responsible and representing a major improvement in farmer-labor relations. Mr. Atkinson it seems was a trifle optimistic in his assessment of the railway unionists.

Further down it goes on to say:

The improvement in farmer-labor relations so hoped for by Mr. Atkinson, will be non-existent. The unionists will be blamed and rightly for the farmers' loss.

I just wanted to bring this to your attention, Mr. Speaker, because as I said, we get into an annual debate on Churchill, we talk about all of the improvements that should be made in the Port and rightly so, we agreed that not nearly enough is being done, but the Member for Nipawin (Mr. Comer) and others who have talked on this, if they are really sincere about the problem at Churchill should talk to some of their friends in the labor movement, the union bosses who are involved, and see that grain traffic will not again be tied up to the Port of Churchill. I think that this is one of the most useful things that could be done to encourage the use of Churchill and to guarantee that ships coming into that area will not have to wait again because of labor problems as they did last summer.

I should like also, Mr. Speaker, to remind the Members that the Hudson Bay Route Association convention is being held in Lloydminster on April 29 and 30th and I know there were a few of the Members from both sides who were there last year and I would hope that if it's possible that some of the Members again take advantage of the opportunity to attend the convention because we all realize that this is a very worthwhile project. It should also be pointed out, I believe, that most of the activities of the convention in the past have been directed at trying to

get the Federal Government to take more responsibility for improvement to Churchill. But we are well aware that with the buoyant economy in Saskatchewan and also in Manitoba that it is perhaps a good time for the provinces of Saskatchewan and Manitoba which have chiefly used this Port to accept a greater deal of responsibility as far as use of the Port and improvements at the Port are concerned and I would hope that the Province of Saskatchewan would give this some priority.

I just might comment in this regard, Mr. Speaker, that a few months ago our Premier was at Ottawa bargaining with the Federal Government at the Energy Conference and he is again down there now, I would hope that points such as the improvements at Churchill would come into the discussions. I feel that if we have concessions to make as far as energy and oil are concerned we are in a bargaining position where the rest of Canada wants something that we have, we should also put on the table such problems as the improvements at the Port of Churchill. And if this isn't being done, if in fact our Premier is going to Ottawa and is neglecting to point out to those people that in exchange for some of the advantages they are going to get we want improvements in transportation, we want better freight rates, we want improvement in facilities in places such as Churchill. If he is not doing this then he is not doing the job that he should be doing for this province.

The Resolution, that we are debating should originally have called on Saskatchewan and Manitoba to take some additional responsibilities and some action. The amendment has now included that, and I will support it.

The Assembly recessed from 5:30 until 7:00 p.m.

Hon. R. Romanow (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few words with respect to Resolution No. 5, the Resolution proposed by my colleague from Nipawin (Mr. Comer).

Before I get into the main thrust of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I must make one or two references to the statements made in the course of the debate this afternoon by the Member for Moosomin (Mr. Gardner). The Member for Moosomin I must say really didn't have his heart in the intent of the Resolution. In fact I rather suspect that the Members opposite don't have their hearts behind the intent of the Resolution for support of Churchill. Because, if you really analyze what the Member for Moosomin said, you'll note, Mr. Speaker, that he really made three points: (1) He referred to a strike that took place about a year ago if not more and somehow tried to tie this up to Churchill and even yet somehow tried to tie this up to the NDP. (2) He referred to the provincial responsibility. (3) He referred to the fact that the Premier should be using Churchill as a bargaining lever with respect to the talks that are now proceeding in Ottawa in the use of oil. That's a kind of an unusual position for the Member for Moosomin to be in because in order for the Government to have a bargaining lever, we had to pass Bill 42 which of course allows us the bargaining lever, it allows us to control the oil and allows us to say to the Government of Canada that we are going to be able to provide for the rest of Canada oil on certain terms and conditions, on a quid pro quo basis. That's the bargaining lever. Now the Member for Moosomin, if I understand the Opposition's on Bill 42 is very confusing and almost contradictory,

if I understand his position, he argues, nevertheless, that we should be using Churchill as part of the quid pro quo, to use the jargon of today, with respect to oil.

Now, Mr. Speaker, those are the only three points that were made by the Member for Moosomin and I might say, with all respect to him, I thought they were very weak points indeed. When he talks about union strikes, for example, and their effect on the Port of Churchill somebody should tell the Member for Moosomin that the biggest possible negative impact on the lack of development on Churchill to date has been the actions of the railway companies. I think that, as much as strikes are disruptive and as much as strikes are not wanted by any of us, when one looks at the whole transportation system. If one looks at what's been done over the last three or four or five years by the railway companies, one will see readily, Mr. Speaker, that the impact of negative and destructive policies by the CPR and CNR have done far more to harm the development of the Port of Churchill than anything by way of a union dispute. I need not repeat at length that which has already been documented in support of my argument, documented by the National Farmers' Union and documented by the Wheat Pools and by pretty well every responsible farm organization in western Canada of the railways' refusal to buy boxcars, the railways' refusal to repair boxcars, the railways' refusal to maintain tracks, the railways' refusal to use the Port of Churchill as a shipping mechanism, refusals, absolute refusals to correct the transportation system. Now Members may not like that but those are the facts. And while I deplore strikes and while I wish that somehow I could find the mechanism around strikes, while I think that strikes are disruptive, to bring up a strike of over a year ago at least as evidence that this is a negative impact on the development of the Port of Churchill really boggles one's imagination. Only the Liberals opposite and only the Liberal from Moosomin and the Member for Moose Jaw could in their wildest anti-labor position adopt that type of a stance and somehow relate it to the Port of Churchill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, I want to make a comment if I may on the question of this business of using Churchill in the bargaining with respect to the talks on oil. Well, all I can say to the Members opposite, having been involved in one or two of the meetings, that there are a number of matters which the people of Saskatchewan are urging upon the Government of Canada in these current negotiations and talks with respect to the use of western Canadian oil. Freight rates, a proper national transportation policy, industrial development, a proper ports policy. I don't think that we can single out for example, the development of ports in isolation, when we are discussing the tools to revamp western Canadian opportunities.

We're not looking at something in total isolation. Ports after all have to be an integrated part of a new transportation scheme. It is very little good to the western Canadian farmer to have a good port in Churchill or in Vancouver if the grain gathering transportation system is allowed to be frittered away by neglect as it has been by the railway companies to date. We have to look at it as an integrated approach and the position the Government of Saskatchewan is taking and has taken with respect to the Port of Churchill, the Port of Vancouver and the Port of Prince Rupert, the entire transportation fabric is one

of a totality with a view to improving the situation for western Canada. I can tell the Hon. Member for Moosomin that the interests of the Port of Churchill are uppermost in the mind of this Government. I can tell the Member for Moosomin that probably there has been no Government in recent years that has had more concern for development of the Port of Churchill than the Government of Premier Blakeney and this Government that occupies the Treasury Benches now.

Well, I want to say as well, Mr. Speaker, that there is a third point that was made by the Liberal Member opposite. It's embodied not quite involved in terms that I can totally reject but the intent is there and it is repeated again by the Member for Moosomin that somehow the provinces of Manitoba and Saskatchewan should be involving themselves in financial assistance in the development of the Port of Churchill. The amendment does not say financial assistance. It is sort of cleverly worded and says that we should be making sure that we give assistance and I think that that is a very nebulous term. I would argue that assistance has been given and is being given but when the Members opposite rise to speak on this motion, everyone of them invariably says that the treasury of the province is now very bulging and we are very wealthy and that somehow we should be contributing to the financial development of the Port of Churchill.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would ask when was the last time that the Province of British Columbia helped Vancouver, for example, or better yet when was the last time that the Province of Quebec gave financial support to the development of the Port of Montreal? When was the last time that the Liberals in this House or the Liberals in the House in Quebec said they were going to or that they should be giving financial support for the development of the St. Lawrence Seaway or the Port of Montreal or the Port of Vancouver or the Port of Prince Rupert? Would the Members opposite seriously suggest that the federal responsibility of harbors and ports, a federal responsibility they have been up to now, unwilling to share even with us, even to talk about sharing with us, forgetting about financial sharing. I am talking about just some form of input, Mr. Speaker, up to now they have been absolutely reluctant to discuss this with us. Do the Members seriously suggest now that the Provinces of Saskatchewan and Manitoba should be putting in financial contributions to the development of the Port of Churchill? Do the Liberals say that the Province of Quebec has contributed a cent to Montreal or the St. Lawrence? Do the Liberals opposite suggest that the Social Credit Government has contributed a cent to the Port of Vancouver? Of course not. Why even the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) knows that the Member for Moosomin's proposition is totally ludicrous and certainly can't be accepted by the people of the Province of Saskatchewan. Anybody who realizes and understands the national transportation system and accepts that this is a federal responsibility would reject out of hand as I am sure the Member for Athabasca would, the suggestion made irresponsibly this afternoon by the Member for Moosomin about financial support for the development of the Port of Churchill.

Now, Mr. Speaker, all of these remarks that have been made this afternoon lead me to the conclusion that the Members opposite really don't have their hearts in this Resolution as tendered by the Member from Nipawin (Mr. Comer). They don't realize the hard work that it has taken up to now to get what small advances that have been gotten with respect to Churchill. I don't think that the advances that we have made at Churchill are all that great.

I think many more can be gotten. I tell the Member for Regina Lakeview (Mr. Malone) that at least we got \$12.5 million more after the Calgary Conference as a result of the actions of the three western provinces than we did before the Calgary Conference. And I can tell the Member for Regina Lakeview that the Liberal Government federally when you people were in power from 1964 to 1971 didn't even pay attention at all to the Premier of the day or the Liberal Government of the day.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — And so I am the first one to recognize and acknowledge that perhaps in the minds of the big spenders opposite that \$12.5 million that we were able to pressure out of the Federal Government, maybe that's not enough. Maybe it's not enough. Maybe it's inflation. Maybe we can sort of say in an inflated way to repeat that old famous Liberal slogan, "What's a million?" maybe we can sort of say, "What's \$12.5 million?" I guess that's the position that is taken by the Liberals opposite.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a word or two about the remarks made by my colleague and friend, the Member for Regina Whitmore Park (Mr. Grant). I must say that I am pleased to note what is apparently a Member's change in approach, or his attitude. He now indicates that he feels encouragement, I think that was the word he used in his remarks and not criticism, is the best approach to be taken if we are going to develop the Port of Churchill and similar operations. I must say that I would welcome this departure from past performance by the Liberals and we would look forward I suppose to some form of encouragement and praise rather than the total pressure tactics that the Opposition adopts in everything this Government does.

However, leaving that aside for the time being, I want to point out that in my view the product which this amendment that the Liberals have tendered really is misdirected. Mr. Speaker, you will recall that the Hon. Member for Regina Whitmore Park has described how in the 25 years intervening his own trips to Churchill and how despite endless talks by governments of all political stripes, very little if anything has been done to promote or expand the port facilities at Churchill. And you will recall, Sir, that the Hon. Member has suggested that in view of past inaction we should, to use his words, "butter up" the Prime Minister because of his statement at Calgary last July at WEOC.

Let's review that statement of the Prime Minister. I have the quotation here and if I may say Mr. Trudeau stated in answer to comments made by Premier Schreyer of Manitoba, the Prime Minister said this:

There is agreement to the extent that we don't want to see the port disappear. We have undertaken to ensure its continuance.

Mr. Speaker, permit me to say that that is hardly rhetoric that one would build a nation on or for that matter build a port on. The Prime Minister says that there is an agreement to the extent that we won't let the port disappear. He says that, "We have undertaken to ensure its continuance," Mr. Speaker, I would say and I am sure all the Members opposite agree that those are hardly the type of flaming words of commitment that one would build a nation on let alone a small little port like the Port of

Churchill. Surely this sort of concern by the Prime Minister, or lack of concern, should this be the type of willingness that the amendment calls us to co-operate on? Should this type of a stirring call to arms to protect our western Port of Churchill by the Liberal Prime Minister from Quebec, should this be the type of matter that is the proper subject of praise or the proper subject of 'buttering up', to use the words of the Member for Regina Whitmore Park? Mr. Speaker, let there be no mistake I am fully in favor of giving credit when it is due. We all say that as politicians we do give credit on occasion to each other and I have done so to the Liberals in the past when I think they are going in the directions that I think we should be going in transportation. Let me call to witness — well, of course, when I do something that you think is in your right direction you also will applaud presumably — and I applauded a few days ago the statements made by the Minister of Transport, Jean Marchand, Federal Minister, when he acknowledged the total failure of the present National Transportation Act. We applauded when Mr. Marchand said that there is a need for a new government policy in this area, a totally new government policy from top to bottom. And we applauded again his statement made the other night when he finally said about the Canadian Pacific Railway that there may be no other alternative but to nationalize the Canadian Pacific Railway. Now I think those are good transportation statements. I think those are excellent transportation statements and I want to tell the Members opposite that where credit is due, I am the first one prepared to give credit, and I give Mr. Marchand credit.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Now I would really be prepared to give credit if I felt that the Saskatchewan Liberals would be prepared to walk side by side with Mr. Marchand on the CPR nationalization. But I don't think that the CPR is the favorite target of the Liberals opposite and, therefore, I regret to advise, Mr. Speaker, that I can't give credit in this quarter. But I am afraid that I cannot accept from the Hon. Member for Regina Whitmore Park the quote that we should "butter them up," the old "butter them up" philosophy, which I see no different than giving the Federal Liberal Government a pat on the back. It is a philosophy of giving them a pat on the back, crossing your fingers and closing your eyes and hoping for the best. That is the Liberal policy when it comes to the amendment with respect to the Port of Churchill.

Well, fortunately, I can tell the Hon. Member for Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) and the Hon. Member for Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac) that the western provinces of Saskatchewan, Manitoba and Alberta have not adopted this attitude of "buttering them up." It appeared to us that Saskatchewan, Manitoba and Alberta agreed that the Federal Government had really no serious intentions towards development with respect to Churchill. In fact they had no intentions at all.

The \$12.5 million, while welcome, appeared to be ill thought out and not part of a comprehensive transportation program. In fact they have, as I said, no major or serious intentions. From the Federal point of view Churchill was like the weather. In fact I think it is the same attitude the Liberals opposite have. They said so in this debate, that Churchill is like the weather. Everybody, they say, in this House talks about it, but nothing is done about it.

It was apparent that the promotion of the port would have to be done on a provincial or regional basis. It was apparent that we couldn't adopt the good old fashioned "butter them up" policy, that we had to put the pressure where the pressure should be placed, on the Federal Government in order to develop the port that belongs to western Canada and western Canadian people.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — We had to do the job of some development in this area. Therefore, Saskatchewan and Manitoba with the assistance of the Province of Alberta, decided to utilize the Port of Churchill Development Board as a new agency to accomplish these objectives of development and port development promotion.

To this end, in the past year, Saskatchewan and Manitoba contributed each \$15,000 to the Development Board and Alberta provided another \$5,000. This has enabled the Board to hire an executive director and a very small staff, who have in turn been able to do something positive about the Port of Churchill and not just talk about it, as sometimes all politicians in this House are wont to do.

This Development Board, coupled with the continued efforts of provincial officials, have met regularly with federal officials, the National Harbours Board, with industrialists, met regularly following the Western Economic Opportunities Conference. They have made direct proposals to the Ministers from the prairie provinces and to the Federal Government. They have kept up continued pressure and not butter on the Federal Government with the view to developing the Port of Churchill.

Mr. Speaker, it was pressure, not butter, by the provinces, supported by research and promotion from the new Development Board that finally forced Mr. Marchand to publicly commit the Federal Government to making the Port of Churchill a port of Arctic resupply.

The Member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) said to me, "What have they done?" One thing that they have done is they had the Port of Churchill designated as the Arctic port of resupply. Some might say, some Liberals opposite might say, "What effect does that have?" Well, I will give you one example. People will know that there is a manufacturer in the Province of Saskatchewan called Nelson Homes, out of Yorkton. Up until now, in order to get prefabricated homes, up to the high Arctic, they had to ship them to Montreal, out of Montreal and around to the north. Through the designation of the Port of Churchill as a port of supply, there are lower freight rates and it enables businesses like Nelson Homes and others, to be much more competitive on the freight rate, to get their commodity to the port of resupply and then to the high Arctic. That is a positive accomplishment for the Port of Churchill which will develop and promote it.

One could go on and cite other examples similar to that. I can say this, Mr. Speaker. It was this pressure that got the Port of Churchill designated as the port of Arctic resupply. That was in late 1973, sometime after the Western Economic Opportunities Conference.

Mr. Speaker, I say to you that it was pressure, not butter, from Saskatchewan, Manitoba and Alberta and from the Development

Board, that literally squeezed a federal expenditure of \$12.5 million from the Federal Government to improve the Port of Churchill's facilities. The sum is much less than what was asked for, much less than is needed. But, in fact, it has been allocated by the Federal Government.

I criticize the \$12.5 million because it basically only provides for the maintenance of the port. It is certainly not sufficient to provide for the necessary expenditures which the Hon. Member for Nipawin (Mr. Comer) is referring to. It is a start, nevertheless, a start for which we must commend the Federal authorities.

Mr. Speaker, I say that it was pressure from the Provincial Ministers of Transport on Mr. Marchand in Winnipeg, December 1973, that forced the Federal Government to reduce the time for the expenditure of this \$12.5 million from five years down to three years, so that the impact is a little more immediate.

At present, provincial pressure is being applied to have the Federal Government alter the focus of the \$12.5 million expenditure. For example, to refit existing tugs rather than purchasing new tugs; to limit proposed work on the north end of the wharf; to that area above the water line, thereby reducing costs and not losing a season's operations as we would under the federal proposal.

The money saved through these changes could then be applied to construction of a 1,200 foot breakwater at the south end of the wharf, which would provide extra space for berthing and for storage. The extra money could also be supplied to some form of limited dredging in order to allow the deep port ships, the large containers, the large hulks, to come into the Port of Churchill.

This is what we are proposing to the Federal Government, how to use the \$12.5 million. I think those are positive suggestions not only in the interest of the Port of Churchill, but in the interests of all western Canadian people who are concerned about the development of this particular port.

As the Member for Regina Whitmore Park has stated, the best commitment that has ever been obtained from the Federal Government to this point are statements such as that of the Prime Minister and that of the Hon. Minister of Justice, Mr. Otto Lang, which the Hon. Member for Whitmore Park cited, and that is to show us that there is demand for Churchill and then there will be an expenditure.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that those types of statements are the old chicken and egg approach that we are used to hearing from the Liberal Government in Ottawa for all these years. Show us that there is a demand and there will be an expenditure! It's the old chicken and egg approach. It is almost the old shell game. Now you see a demand, now you don't see a demand. Maybe you will see \$12.5 million and maybe you won't.

I say that this type of an approach by the Federal Government is not in the best interests of western Canadians. Up until now we have not been able to get a demand. How can you get a demand when you don't have the boxcars, and you don't have the expenditure for the port, when you have the bureaucrats in Ottawa — at least some of them — determined to close the port? How can you

then say there is going to be a demand developed under those circumstances?

Mr. Speaker, if the Liberals opposite in the Province of Saskatchewan just accept those words by the Prime Minister and by the Minister of Justice, show us the demand and there will be an expenditure, I say to the people of the Province of Saskatchewan that the Liberals really are saying that the Port of Churchill has no future and that they are part and parcel in closing the Port of Churchill in the Province of Manitoba.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — I should like to tell the House that the executive director of the Port of Churchill Development Board has received a commitment, for example, on this matter of demand, has received a commitment from the sulphur industry in Alberta and Saskatchewan, but Alberta primarily, to ship 350,000 tons of sulphur via Churchill. This is a firm and positive commitment. But does the Port of Churchill have the facilities to provide it? That is the question.

We have the 350,000 tons, but we don't have the federal authorities committing the expenditure of funds in order to have the facilities to handle it. This is just the sort of demand that the Hon. Member for Saskatoon-Humboldt, the Minister of Justice, and other Members of the Federal Government have been asking for. I say that is what they have been looking for and we have given it to them. It is now time for them to honor their commitments to the people in western Canada.

The same facilities with the addition of covered storage bins can be readily utilized to export potash, to export coal, to export lumber products. This is an expenditure which now must be made by the Federal Government in view of industries showing willingness to ship via the Port of Churchill.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I think it is obvious that things are changing at Churchill and changing for the better. I think it is equally obvious, Mr. Speaker, that it is the provinces — the western Canadian provinces — which are making things happen in bringing about these changes. I want to say also that I think it is even more obvious that this is being done with political pressure, the proper political pressure, and not Liberal butter.

Mr. Speaker, because this amendment seeks nothing more than cheap political advantage to pat the Liberals on the back, federally, for nothing done on the Port of Churchill; because this amendment, if adopted, might be misinterpreted by the western Canadian farmer who wants yet to see much more development done, I can't accept it.

I urge all Members of the Legislature to reject it. I don't believe that the Members opposite really support the Member for Regina Whitmore Park in his statement that everything is done and everything is in readiness and happiness at the Port of Churchill.

I don't believe that the Member for Rosetown (Mr. Loken) who is concentrating on this problem with a great deal of seriousness, that he believes in that amendment. I don't for one moment believe that the Member for Regina Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod),

although he has no involvement in agriculture and the Port of Churchill, that he believes in the amendment. I am urging all Members of the Legislature to reject the amendment and to support clearly and in a united voice, the Resolution from the Member for Nipawin, so that we can get on with the great task of building western Canada's own port, the Port of Churchill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. C. P. MacDonald (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to take part in this debate, but after listening to the Attorney General I cannot resist making a few comments.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, he started off that discussion of his about totality of the system. And per usual he started off with the whipping boy, the railways. You know, Mr. Speaker, it is rather interesting that there is no question that in considering transportation problems the Attorney General is correct, we must look at the totality of the entire transportation system in Canada. But don't you think that it is about time that the Attorney General did look at the totality of the system? He certainly hasn't yet. He blames the railway, oh, that terrible CPR and perhaps even the CNR. But he never mentions the delivery system and the handling system in western Canada.

Why should we ask the railways in this country to spend hundreds of millions of dollars to modernize their system and then ask them to operate in a system that is built for the horse and buggy days, the delivery and handling system in western Canada? It is about time the Attorney General started to call upon the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool and the Alberta Wheat Pool and the Manitoba Wheat Pool and all the elevators to bring their handling systems up to a modern transportation system. It is time the Provincial Government started to promote inland terminals in western Canada, where we clean and put together solid or unit trains. We have trains in the transportation system that take a 21-day turnaround to go to Vancouver or to Thunder Bay because of the antiquated delivery and handling system in this country. Get off the railways and join in and start calling upon the delivery and handling system in western Canada to modernize, get out of the horse and buggy days, as well as the railways, and I agree with you about the railways.

Let me tell you also that I have absolutely no sympathy for the Federal Government's position on the Port of Churchill. Every year since I have been in this House, this Legislature has called on the Federal Government to take some action. I am going to tell you that I have a lot less sympathy for the Provincial NDP's position on the Port of Churchill than I have the Federal Government.

All that we have ever done since 1971, since you became the Government, for the Port of Churchill is stand in this House once a year and talk and talk and talk and do absolutely nothing else. It boggles the imagination, in the words of the Attorney General, to turn around and blame the railways and say that the railways have a responsibility for the Port of Churchill and the Province of Saskatchewan has none. Can you imagine that! The CPR has the responsibility for the Port of Churchill, but the Province of Saskatchewan has none!

The Province of Manitoba has none. Of course the Federal

Government has a responsibility for the Port of Churchill. We endorse and support any opportunity to get the Port of Churchill improved. The Attorney General said, "Why, we gave \$15,000 in grants." Oh, you know out of that slush fund. I figured out today what the Attorney General's costs to promote that subsidy to the AAIA program, on the news broadcast in the Province of Saskatchewan for one day, to promote and justify the Attorney General's action in the AAIA fund, is more than \$15,000 that he gave to help out the Port of Churchill.

You are selling out. You have done absolutely nothing Mr. Attorney General. Now let's be realistic. He said that they went to Calgary and the three western provinces pressured the Federal Government. I thought it was Prime Minister Trudeau who called the western conference. I thought it was Prime Minister Trudeau who announced in the Throne Speech that he was calling it. I thought it was Prime Minister Trudeau who went out and laid on the table some concrete proposals for the first time. I agree with Mr. Marchand that the CPR and the CNR — don't point your fingers at the CPR, it is about time that we got the CNR to pull up its own bootstraps, shine its own little boots. And don't talk about nationalizing the CPR until we can demonstrate in this country that a nationalized railway can do the job because I think the CNR is just as bad, or worse than the CPR and so will most farmers in this province tell you that.

So if you are going to talk about nationalizing the railways let's demonstrate that the one railway that we have in this country, the CNR, can operate an efficient transportation rail system in this country, before we start talking about putting another burden on government and spending millions and millions of dollars. Nobody is going to defend the fact that today the railways, both CNR and CPR, are getting out of their traditional responsibilities in Canada, in the idea of passenger service, in the idea of rail line abandonment, and so forth. No one denies that and it is time that all of us — but let's get off the back of the CPR, let's quit calling for the nationalization of the CPR until we demonstrate that the CNR, that one nationalized railway can do as good a job by cleaning up its own backyard.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about another subject. There is only one Premier whom this province has ever had that was really the friend of the Port of Churchill and his name was Ross Thatcher.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — You go and ask the Minister of Industry, the best year that the Port of Churchill ever had other than wheat, was in the years when Ross Thatcher was Premier. He appointed a man from the Department of Industry as a full time co-ordinator. He went to Volkswagen in Germany, he went to all kinds of European countries to bring and promote traffic and trade into the Port of Churchill. He worked day and night to promote it and that is the responsibility of the Provincial Government. You can give \$500,000 to a Hog Commission but you don't give five cents to promote trade. The Provincial Government has got all kinds of Crown corporations, you got 30 per cent of the Saskatchewan pulp mill, or the Prince Albert Pulp Mill. You have got the Saskatchewan Timber Board, you have got potash. You could be promoting potash out of the Port of Churchill. All your other Crown corporations including Sask Timber. All kinds of purchases. How

many purchases — Ross Thatcher, for goodness sake, demanded an accounting about the purchases that came in through the Port of Churchill. What has the NDP done? Nothing but talk, talk and whine to Ottawa and nothing but a resolution once in this House. It is about time that the NDP Government in this province took some real action for the Port of Churchill and gave some leadership by showing some example. But if we are going to get trade to go out of the Port of Churchill then the Government of Saskatchewan and the Government of Manitoba have got to show leadership.

When Ross Thatcher was the Premier of the province he said to the small car manufacturers if you bring the cars in through the Port of Churchill the Saskatchewan Government will buy some. Any equipment that SPC needed he said you have got to bring it in through the Port of Churchill. He went to Dalgleish, he went to the European manufacturer, he did everything to promote it. That is the kind of responsibility that the Provincial Government should take.

You can promote hogs, you can control the farm economy, you can do everything but you can't do anything for the Port of Churchill and you haven't done anything for three years.

Let's not kid ourselves. There are three problems with the Port of Churchill.

1. It needs improved facilities. No one denies that. That is a federal responsibility. I am glad to see the \$12.5 million being expended and I give the Calgary Conference full credit, not the NDP in the Province of Saskatchewan. Credit goes to Prime Minister Trudeau who for the first time called a regional conference to look after regional difficulties. I say it takes a lot more than \$12.5 million. The Liberal Party when they were the Government of Saskatchewan asked for far more than \$12.5 million and we will continue to support any resolution that demands millions or whatever expenditures are required.

2. The Port of Churchill requires a longer shipping season. You and I know that one of the major problems today is with the modern ships, modern icebreakers, that the Port of Churchill can be used for many, many months. It can have a much longer shipping season. One of the major problems is insurance rates. Maritime people get better Maritime insurance rates in order to have a longer season. A good shipping company will tell you that the Port of Churchill is only being used to 50 per cent of its capacity in the season itself. Because it can't get good insurance rates and that many of the Maritime insurance companies won't insure their ships if they come in beyond the limit of the present insurance rates.

I think SGIO and the Saskatchewan Government could take some leadership in this field. I think you could.

3. I think also we need some expanded cargo out of the Port of Churchill. I don't think the Port of Churchill will ever be a major port for western Canada if the major commodity that's being transported out of that Port of Churchill is wheat.

We have to work with the potash companies, with the pulp companies, with the timber resources in this province and western Canada. We have got to convince them that we can use that Port of Churchill to export the commodities that are produced in

western Canada.

We have got to convince people, suppliers in Europe and other parts of the world that supplies that are required in western Canada can be brought in through the Port of Churchill. And that is a major responsibility of the provincial NDP and this Government to go out and promote that — first of all to ship out of the Port of Churchill for commodities manufactured or produced in western Canada, and for supplies that come into western Canada from the European countries.

Mr. Speaker, I have a few other comments I wish to make on this Resolution, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

Resolution No. 9 — Policies and Operations of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan

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

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.

Mr. D. Cody (Minister of Co-operatives): — Mr. Speaker, Resolution No. 9 is one of the kinds of resolutions which I don't think merit very much debate. However there have been things said in this House previously that certainly brings one to his feet. And it is for that reason that I want to say a few things with regard to this Resolution.

I particularly want to say these things because of the fact that I think the Department of Northern Saskatchewan is doing the kind of job that the people of northern Saskatchewan want it to do.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cody: — Now I know that the Members across the way are totally against DNS. We know that. They are committed to any campaign at all which would bring down the Department even if it were given a chance.

I also realize with such a small group over there, thanks to the people of Saskatchewan, it is necessary to follow the leader, however, blind devotion to their leader's insincerity is truly regrettable.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cody: — Mr. Speaker, there is however one dim flicker of hope over there. And that is the new Member for Lakeview (Mr. Malone). I say to him — he is out politicking with the Leader of the Opposition, with the Member for Moosomin, with the Member for Lumsden who hasn't been here all day, they are all out politicking. But I say there is one dim flicker of hope for this Member. I should

like to tell him that he should start thinking on his own. Don't be swayed, Mr. Member for Lakeview, don't be swayed by your leader's lust for attention and don't be fooled by your leader's politicking.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cody: — Mr. Speaker, I issue this challenge because I think the people of Saskatchewan have a right to know the true motives of the Liberal Party.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cody: — I won't spend very much time this evening recalling their gaunt track record nor will I spend time recalling their disorganization and confusion when for expedient reasons they choose their Party's alignment on many of the important public issues which may have arisen during the legislative history of this province.

Mr. Speaker, it was obvious that after the Member for Prince Albert West, the Leader of the Opposition said he would destroy DNS, if given a chance, the remaining Members of the fearless 15 or fearless 14 or however many there are over there had to fall in line and react in the same dismal fashion. When the Liberals started criticizing DNS, I patiently awaited an alternative. But did they present one? Not a chance. Do they have a better approach, Mr. Speaker? Obviously not. I am convinced they are having considerable difficulty comprehending the magnitude and the comprehensive nature of DNS after comparing their northern record. I can understand why they are miffed about it. Little question about that. Day after day they file questions on the Order Paper in attempts to find out what the department is all about.

We won't oppose that and we haven't opposed that. In fact, we welcome their new found interest in the northern people. However their admitted lack of information about northern Saskatchewan shows they don't have one bit of backing in support for their call for an investigation.

Mr. Speaker, Members on this side of the House and the people of Saskatchewan recognize the fact that what the Liberal Party Opposition is really attempting to do is to disguise their politicking and window-dressing by all the frightening things that they have said about this department.

Members opposite can snicker and cat-call all they want, however, if they cast aside their political motivations and constructively assess the department, its program and policies, surely, Mr. Speaker, they will recognize the motives of their own leader in condemning DNS.

The Member for Pelly just recently said in this House, in fact, I think it was during one of the recent debates, he expressed his frustrations that arise from listening to some of the old tired Liberal speeches that he has heard in this Assembly for years. I too share that frustration.

Mr. Speaker, let us examine the crux of the matter. Admittedly there have been problems in setting up this new department.

There have been minor set backs and certain obstacles which the department has had to deal with. But it is not unusual that this would happen with a department such as this. Certainly no one, especially Liberals, would expect to embark on a new program and expect smooth sailing all the way. However, even with the realization by our Government of the pitfalls ahead this has in no way detracted from our commitment to bringing a new sense of economic and social justice to the people of northern Saskatchewan.

The New Democratic Government sitting on this side of the House plots its legislative course using economic and social needs as the barometer to follow. Liberals on the other hand use political expediency and corporate allegiance in determining their stance. We have seen this time and time again as the Liberal Opposition will spare no energy in defending such entities as the Winnipeg Commodity Exchange, Imperial Oil, Parsons and Whittemore, Simpson Timber, Canadian Pacific Railway and so on.

Mr. Speaker, I have committed my fullest support to this department because it will reinforce the confidence of this Government in the department and will be public witness to the department's many employees that we back and back strongly.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cody: — If there are sincere concerns, Mr. Speaker, and I repeat, sincere concerns, let's get them out into the open. But I hope that Members opposite will be honest with the public and honest with themselves when they enter into this debate. Certainly a lot more honest than the Leader of the Opposition was last week when he entered into this debate. The shell shock of the 1971 election apparently is still with them. I am sure that they won't forget it for a long time. And that is the kind of thing that we see in this Resolution.

Mr. Speaker, the problems in northern Saskatchewan are not few. They have been there for over 200 years. Governments of the past have either failed or ignored the major commitment which DNS represents.

Initially the Member for Prince Albert West plotted his Party's position with respect to DNS. He said he would like to see it abolished. But recently I detect just the slightest shift in Liberal thinking. Now they are telling us, slow down, you are moving too fast. Maybe I am over optimistic when I sense a minor degree of philosophical acceptance over this major program. But before this debate concludes I am confident my sense of anticipation will either be confirmed or discounted.

Mr. Speaker, I think we must consider the reasons behind the stand that the Liberals have taken. Predictably, they oppose our energy legislation because of their allegiance to our multinational oil corporations. Predictably they opposed our amendments to The Forest Act because of their allegiance to Parsons and Whittemore and Simpson Timber. Predictably they would not support our stand on the rapeseed issue because of their allegiance to the Winnipeg Commodity Exchange. But what corporate interest are they defending in opposing the Department of Northern Saskatchewan? For once there doesn't appear to be any corporate interest waiting in the wings pulling the strings for the Liberal Party but rather they are attempting to capitalize on the theme that this defence is a good offence.

That's right, Mr. Speaker. The Liberal caucus feels that by rumor, innuendo and vicious criticism they can distract attention from their northern economic and social programs when they sat on this side of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this Government and I particularly commend the Hon. Ted Bowerman . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cody: — . . . for the determination and leadership in the past few months in setting up this new department. In less than two years a new confidence has emerged in the North. And the credit must go to the many new programs which are being carried out at the department level under the capable leadership of the Hon. Ted Bowerman.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cody: — The Liberal Party is in no way impressed with his progress. Members on this side of the House and the people living in northern Saskatchewan are impressed. I am fully confident that in the years ahead confidence and pride will be reinforced many times. For the first time ever northern residents have an opportunity to be rewarded for their initiatives. In the past piecemeal programs have met with frustration and despair. Northerners had only the prospect of welfare cheques to look forward to but that is all changing now.

I am sure — the Member for Meadow Lake — he snickers and laughs. Why would he laugh? Why would the Member for Athabasca want to laugh? They are too afraid to stick around their own constituency to try and change anything. Mr. Speaker, I am sure we will all recall the excellent account given in this Legislature just a while ago by the Minister as he detailed many of the programs which he has undertaken. At that time, Mr. Speaker, it was very interesting to note the reactions of Members opposite. The Member for Prince Albert West couldn't take it as he left the Chamber. A few minutes later the Member for Athabasca left. I should say the Member for Athabasca-Rosthern left. He was followed by the Member for Meadow Lake. Not a one of them will sit here and listen to the great things that are being done for the people of northern Saskatchewan.

Now, Mr. Speaker, why did they leave? They left because they didn't want to face the music. They hated to hear of the progress being recorded in the North. And they choose rather to retire in their lounges where they probably continued their conversation on DNS without the benefits of the facts and the truth.

Mr. Speaker, let me say a few things about the programs which have been going on in the North. A five-year housing program during which time 625 housing units for northern residents will be constructed. Substandard housing in the past has been the order of the day. Very few families had adequate accommodation despite the glaring need. What did the Member for Athabasca do? Nothing. What did the Member for Meadow Lake do? Nothing. The Liberal record was spotty to say the least. I'm not suggesting that our program involving 125 housing starts annually for the next five years will satisfy the housing needs of northern people, however, it certainly contrasts the record

between 1964 and 1971 when the Liberals averaged only 35 housing starts per year. Mr. Speaker, that's what I call a dismal record.

Every person has a right to expect decent accommodation for himself and his family. This Government, through the Department of Northern Saskatchewan recognizes the right and is doing its best to honor that right.

Mr. Speaker, I also commend the Department for initiating sewer and water programs in four northern communities. Planning and design systems are being completed and construction will begin this year in the communities of Buffalo Narrows, Cumberland House, Weyakwyn and La Loche. In addition to this the village of La Ronge received a \$220,000 provincial grant towards a sewer and water system which is currently under construction. In addition to these programs, new wells have been completed at Jans Bay, Cole Bay, Beauval, Buffalo Narrows. Wells are being attempted at Green Lake and Sandy Bay.

Mr. Speaker, I can understand why the Liberals are upset. I can understand why they are upset that we are going so fast. They recognize the writing on the wall. And it's obviously on the wall for them, because already the Member for Athabasca has left. They know that because of the fact the Provincial Government has followed through on its word and kept its promise, that the people will readily support that Government in its efforts to improve the quality of life for northern residents.

In fact, the progress being recorded by DNS is so profound, Mr. Speaker, that already the two northern residents, or two northern MLAs as I said, have given up and are running to the southern ridings. As my colleague, my seatmate just said, they're running for the short grass country. They do not like the odds, Mr. Speaker, they don't like the odds of seeking re-election, because they know they do not have much of a chance in attempting to discredit and distort the operations of the department.

Mr. Speaker, our friends in the Opposition have also attempted to drag out the old Liberal bogey man. The old Liberal bogey man argument and claim that according to the Member for Prince Albert West the instances of a dictator. I asked him, has he ever, Mr. Speaker, has he ever in the history of this province seen such a degree of local authority and decision. Did his government afford northern people the right of self-determination and grass roots decision making? No they didn't. Never before has there been such an opportunity given to northern people, to have the power to effect changes based on decisions made at the local level.

And, Mr. Speaker, the election of a Northern Municipal Council, some months ago, supports the promise of local involvement which was made to the northern people prior to the establishment of this department. The election of the five-man council attracted a tremendous number of candidates. Thirty-one to be exact, twenty-eight of whom were natives. No wonder the Liberals don't want us to talk about decision making at the local level.

Mr. Speaker, following the demonstration by natives at the Legislature, last fall, several Members of the Opposition started pointing fingers at us and using the demonstration as all the proof which was needed to condemn what our Government is doing in the North. I can recall what the Member for Milestone said.

Mr. MacDonald: — What's that? What did I say?

Mr. Cody: — You said all the dirty, nasty things that you could about the Department of Northern Saskatchewan and about this Government for not listening to the northern people, that's what you said.

What they failed to understand, Mr. Speaker, either deliberately or otherwise, were the commitments of one of the leaders who viewed the demonstration slightly different. He said for the first time ever, northern people have the opportunity and have been given the right to bargain for their local rights. For the first time they have been given a decision making responsibility. He said they are for the first time pressing their demands without fear of retaliation. And, Mr. Speaker, this confidence represents a complete reversal from the Thatcher-Stewart days of government when northern people were given no chance. No chance at all to effect change at the local level. And I say to the Members opposite and to the Members of this Assembly thank goodness the days of heavy handed government, heavy handed rule in the North is over.

Mr. Speaker, I also commend the broadly based economic program which is being carried out in the North. Last fall the Minister spent close to half an hour outlining the many economic developments which were being carried out. The results to date have been gratifying in my mind, despite attempts by some of the Opposition to discredit this part of the northern program.

When the truth squad, the great truth squad from Cannington and I forget who else there was, Cannington I imagine, and Moosomin, the northern Members. When the truth squad went to the North, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Athabasca, condemned the department for not providing assistance to small businesses, already in operation. This, of course is ridiculous. Some employees, as an example, who have been overworked and underpaid for years in private tourist camps, now for the first time have the opportunity, through the Economic Development Fund to get started in their own business.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cody: — But what does the Member for Athabasca say? Does he like it? No, he doesn't like it, because for the first time some competition has been created for his Liberal camp owners. For the first time some competition for his Liberal camp owners and this reduces their source of camp labor and cheap labor.

They say there is no economic development in the North. Why didn't the truth squad visit Beauval? The reason is obvious and it was because they didn't like what they would see when they got there and they conveniently drove by. They conveniently drove by, Mr. Speaker.

Have they mentioned that this single post cutting operation, Mr. Speaker, employs more native people, more native northern people than the pulp mill at Prince Albert?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cody: — Yes, Mr. Speaker, the Economic Development Program

is effecting positive change and the Budget is further evidence which will improve the economic outlook for the people of northern Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note that by even selecting a very narrow cross section of northern Saskatchewan the Liberal tour was unable to uncover their allegations that welfare is rampant in the North. They weren't able to uncover that either. They chose rather to blame civil servants who according to the Liberals didn't co-operate and refused to provide them with information. I'm sure they were most disappointed when they couldn't get their fingers onto some of the information.

Have they forgotten we are using the computer in Regina? I guess not. They probably don't know we've got one. The same only to be used while in Government to tabulate and calculate all costs of social assistance, but no, not much more news worthy is it to blame unco-operative civil servants. I think what ranks the worst of their tour is to say that the civil servants in the North wouldn't give them any information when they could have just slipped down to the computer room and got every bit of information they wanted.

An Hon. Member: — Who would be over there?

Mr. Cody: — There are a few computers around, there are a few civil servants around, thousands by your numbers and I'm sure you would have got the information by just asking. You wouldn't have had to rampage all around the North, tramping the bush and finding nothing.

Then, of course, the Member for Moosomin (Mr. Gardner), the great expert from the North, said there are many jobs, but because of the fact that welfare is so easy to get, employers can't find workers. Mr. Speaker, again that is rubbish. And I back . . .

An Hon. Member: — Somebody wrote his speech.

Mr. Cody: — Mr. Speaker, you know something funny just occurred to me that I was going to say about the Member for Athabasca, but I decided I better not.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cody: — Mr. Speaker, the rubbish I speak of, I was going to say, I back it up by quoting from a press release which four civil servants and social workers in the North, in northern Saskatchewan released following the Liberal romp in the North. Let me quote:

The recent tour suggested that employers could not find employees due to welfare. Here are some hard, cold facts. Due to miserably low wages being paid by the hospitals, missions, stores and other employers, 222 people must have their earnings supplemented so that they have as much income as they could get on welfare.

It's certainly obvious, Mr. Speaker, that what they are trying to tell us about welfare is absolutely incorrect. I

certainly wouldn't want to call them liars, but I'd call them strangers to the truth.

Mr. Speaker, as of November 1, 1973, 85 people who can work were receiving assistance, while looking for work and 41 were undergoing retraining. This is out of approximately 1,500 employable people in the area or 5.6 per cent unemployment rate. Not a bad record. What was the record when the Liberals were there? Would you believe ten times as high? If anyone will come to the Social Services offices, any time you want, outline a job at even minimum wage, we will always notify people of it and attempt to bring those looking, all those seeking, together.

In summation, there is a lot remaining to be done, however, we challenge anyone to show a better track record over twice the period of time, Mr. Speaker. We challenge you to print these facts and to refute them if you think you can. And 'm sure the Member for Athabasca will try, but I'm sue he can't. We submit that if some groups would quit wasting our time with their petty political games, Mr. Speaker, we could achieve much more and we could achieve much more of the things which they are talking about.

Mr. Speaker, things are not bad in northern Saskatchewan. People are certainly not crying out for help. They do not find DNS overbearing. They are not being exposed to dictatorship. DNS is not employing radicals who are opposed to the church and the RCMP. There certainly is not mismanagement within the Department of Northern Saskatchewan. People are certainly not refusing to work. DNS employees are not unco-operative. DNS secretaries do not all drive government cars, as is indicated by the Member for Moosomin and Cannington. DNS is deliberately destroying existing tourist camps according to the Members. That is certainly not the case.

Mr. Speaker, how can any serious person even take the Liberals seriously any more when they are trying to peddle such tripe in this Legislature? There is no basis to the allegations and innuendo as the Members opposite are trying to peddle to us. The Department of Northern Saskatchewan is providing new hope for the people of the North. It is making progress and the majority of the people in the North are happy with the Department of Northern Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, just recently I was at a convention in Prince Albert, at the Co-operative Fisheries Convention and I spoke to a lot of northern people and everyone of the northern people whom I spoke to was satisfied with the Department of Northern Saskatchewan. It was not an NDP convention, it was a Co-operative Fisheries Convention and I can tell you, Mr. Member for North Battleford or close to North Battleford, that one of your very close friends was there as the Chairman and he is not a supporter of ours.

Mr. Speaker, I spoke to people like Father McGrette of Wollaston Lake. I spoke to people like Ray McKenzie of Stanley Million, I spoke to people like Oscar Beatty of La Ronge, and I spoke to people like Freddy Thompson from Buffalo Narrows and all of these people, including dozens more, said that Ted Bowerman was doing the kind of job that the northern people wanted him to do.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cody: — And, Mr. Speaker, because of the things that the people told me, when I was up there and because of the kind of people that I saw when I was up there and because of the kind of job that I think Ted Bowerman is doing with the Department of Northern Saskatchewan I just can see no reason why we should be any where near supporting Resolution No. 9 and I ask everyone in this House to defeat it and defeat it soundly.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. H. E. Coupland (Meadow Lake): — Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this Resolution.

You know it is always amazing to listen to the fellows over there accuse the Member for Athabasca for running out of the North and the Member for Meadow Lake leaving the North and it's strange because you know, I still live in Meadow Lake, I still intend to run in Meadow Lake, but for the last three elections you people have tried to beat me in elections in the North, but so far you haven't been able to do it. You know I made a prediction, after the election in '71. I said to my wife, I'll bet you that I don't get a chance to run in this seat in the way the boundaries are now. And sure enough it wasn't long, either the first session or the second one that you people legislated me out of the seat, or at least you took off the north part of the seat.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Coupland: — I'm still running in Meadow Lake but instead of having the north and I can tell you that I'd be happy and proud to serve them. I would be elected again if I had the same boundaries I had before.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Coupland: — You may not know what the situation is in the North, you've never been up there. But you know the people in the North don't trust the NDP because they've had a record of being swindled by the former CCF. You fellows had twenty years up there, before we went in for seven years. It was a pretty sad situation up there in those twenty years.

And how did you use those people. Well, my experience in 1960, the first time I ran, the Government would if there was a place that might vote Liberal, open a lake 20 or 30 miles away where the fishermen all had to go and fish. If you know what commercial fishing is, where there is a 100,000 pound limit, the fishermen have to be out there when the season opens in order to get their share. So that come the day of the election, the men are all away from the settlement. In 1960 I had fellows come to me after the election who said, "Mr. Coupland, if the wind had gone down for two hours we would have had 100 votes across for you." This is how the CCF beat me in 1960 up there, and the people know this and they don't trust you fellows to take over in these places in the North.

You know he talks about us not stopping in Beauval. We stopped in Beauval and it was funny to hear the fellows laughing because just as we came into Beauval the Minister was taking off

with the Government aircraft. He dropped off there to pick up a plaque, he was afraid to go up for the opening, they invited him but he never showed up for the opening. He comes in a couple of weeks later to pick up a trophy. So don't tell us about not going into Beauval.

I want to say a word of praise for those fellows in Beauval for setting up an operation as they have. Just ten miles out, you go and see that nice place that's cleared for the pulp mill mostly by those fellows from Beauval. They would have had a lot more today had the Government not cancelled the pulp mill. They were willing to settle for second best and I compliment them on setting up that deal and making it operate the way it is. They are a good bunch of fellows.

Here is one of the reasons we need this Resolution and inquiry into DNS. Just last week I was home and when you hear rumors around Meadow Lake — such as, we were able to buy plywood at \$2 a sheet up there, it was shipped in by the DNS and somebody was picking it up. You hear rumors of fellows sitting in Buffalo Narrows waiting for orders and something to do. These are the kind of things going on. I'm not saying they're true. That's why we want this inquiry. I don't know whether the rumors are true but there shouldn't be those rumors and where there is smoke there is fire. That's why, if you people aren't afraid, set up that commission and go look into what is going on in the North. A lot of people are happy there, they are going up and making good money on some of the money the DNS is spending.

Mr. Romanow: — Hal, how far back do you want us to go?

Mr. Coupland: — Well, I don't care how far back you go. In fact go back to 1960 and the day of the election find out how many emergency orders were handed out in 1960, the day of the election. Go to some of the stores and find out how many emergency orders were handed out to try and win the vote. Don't tell me anything about the North. I tell you that I've had quite a few groups of Metis down from the North that want me to leave Meadow Lake and run there. But I live in Meadow Lake, why shouldn't I run in Meadow Lake. You call an election tomorrow and we'll see who will get beaten. I challenge you.

It is just for some of these reasons I have pointed out that the people in the North are going to be a long time trusting the NDP because they know they are tied to the former CCF. I wholeheartedly support this Resolution.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Would the Member permit a question? In your initial remarks you seemed to bewail the establishment of constituency boundaries by an Independent Boundaries Commission. Are you saying Mr. Member that you oppose the recommendations of the Independent Boundaries Commission?

Mr. Coupland: — All I am saying is that you legislated half my seat away, the people I am representing. It wasn't me moving out of a constituency it was your Government that took that away from me. I would be happy to have it.

Mr. T. M. Weatherald (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, I think since he is the Cabinet Minister it would be better if he caught up on a little of the news. It was the Attorney General who drew that line not the Boundary Commission. Everybody up there knows that and the Member for Meadow Lake would like to inform you that he lives in Meadow Lake and he has always lived in Meadow Lake and that has nothing to do with the new constituency. He'll be running where he lives — I'm not too sure where it is, is it Qu'Appelle or Watrous? Well it won't be anywhere for another year or so, so it hardly makes any difference.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it was a real pleasure when I went up North with the Member for Meadow Lake. In fact when we came back I said to the Member for Meadow Lake, you are so popular up here that you should start a bank because he could lend so much money . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Weatherald: — . . . from the time I was there he could have lent so much money to so many people that I think he should go into business up there. It was a real pleasure for me to be there with him.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Did you say lend or give money?

Mr. Weatherald: — Either way. You can give it away or you can lend it, whichever. If I was on your salary I'd give it away.

Mr. Speaker, in any event I do want to say a few words on this Resolution because since we made our trip to the North and I might say that I wish the Minister of Natural Resources were here because that was the latest of many trips I've made over the last 20 years to northern Saskatchewan and northern Manitoba and it may sound strange to some Members opposite, but the two are extremely alike. Whether you go into northern Saskatchewan or northern Manitoba, the country is similar and the people are similar. So much for the accusation which I never considered worth answering, that of being a southern expert. We didn't feel that it was much worth answering because it shows a man is pretty bankrupt of any ideas of his own to have to give that type of answer. In fact I was quite interested in Jim Sinclair's view when he said of Mr. Bowerman only about two weeks ago, that it would have been very good if they had had a Minister who did not think that he knew all the answers of the North. This is one of the types of accusations made against the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan. Simply because he worked as a conservation officer and a few other jobs and I might say that he never distinguished himself too greatly in the department to any great extent, I don't think he became an outstanding member of the staff. But apparently he left with the great convincing thoughts that he knew just about all the cures for everything and this, of course, is what is of grave concern to the people of northern Saskatchewan. All of a sudden when you become a general, you know everything, even if the advancement from lieutenant was rather rapid.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to review again some of the things that we said at that time which I think are still valid. First of all I want to say that the Government has been guilty of some very poor hiring practices in northern Saskatchewan. This is

obvious. We have had denunciations coming from civil servants, we have had retirements, we have had firings, we have had total upheaval in the civil service ever since this Department started. And the reason is obvious. The government has hired many social activists to go into northern Saskatchewan and I think this has been extremely unfortunate. If you look at some of the Press releases and I'm not going to go over them all tonight. I could but the Member for Athabasca has read them to the Assembly already. Some of the statements made by the social activists, hired by this Government, hired by the people opposite, the Cabinet Benches. You can't blame that on to somebody else, you can't blame that on the Opposition. Mr. Speaker, those people had been hired by this Government, that Minister of Northern Saskatchewan did the hiring and he takes the responsibility for the people he hired and sent them to northern Saskatchewan. Many of the people he has been sending to northern Saskatchewan have been the cause of many of the problems that exist there today.

We illustrated when we came back, Mr. Speaker, some of the situations that we found in the time we were there. The firing of all of the teachers or at least if it wasn't firing it was the telling of them to leave, more or less, at a public meeting in Ile-a-la-Crosse, despite the fact that they were legally there. They were awaiting the legal election of a school board which I, as a matter of fact, support. But nevertheless it was this type of social activist that caused the creation of the difficulty that existed in that area. And, as I already said, if you read the Press releases of the hirings and the firings of many of the people in the last year that have been in northern Saskatchewan, it is not hard to understand that only the surface of the iceberg has been shown in the news media and has been presented by the Opposition here in this Legislature.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Weatherald: — So that is the first instance, Mr. Speaker, where I say the Government has been an utter and total failure. It has been in its hiring practices of personnel and sending them to northern Saskatchewan.

Northern Saskatchewan is a remote, isolated area. It is inhabited by many people who are not familiar with so-called sophisticated ways. I say so-called because that is a relative term. They are people who do not have in many instances a great deal of education. They are people who can be manipulated by people who are social activists. I call them social activists because many of them are of a very strong left wing bent. Mr. Speaker, this has been a great social experiment for people wanting to go into northern Saskatchewan. There is probably nowhere else in North America that you can carry on this type of experimentation on a group of people who have not much education and do not have much access to the news media at any one particular time.

Let's take up some of those areas like Ile-a-la-Crosse and Buffalo Narrows — 200 miles, Mr. Speaker, by a gravel road from Meadow Lake. No television, one radio station. Mr. Speaker, obviously a place if you are a social activist you can get away with a lot of things that you couldn't anywhere else in North America. This has been a perfect opportunity and the Government opposite has deliberately allowed many of these people to go there to use their experimentation. I think this is one area in

which they can be soundly and roundly condemned and it is one area, Mr. Speaker, where the Government by firing people who already were there, they have pushed out many responsible, hard working people who tried to do a good job in that area. They were not white supremacists, they were people who did the best they could with the circumstances they had and for all intents and purposes did a fairly good job.

I want to talk for a few minutes about what the Government is doing. I listened to the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan and in fact asked him to tell us what they have done in an economic development way. Now we were in Beauval and we said, I believe, at our Press conference when we came back that this was a good and viable operation which I will say again now. And of course, this is the one that the Members opposite trot out before the Assembly and that's fine because it is an economically viable operation and it is one that has been worthwhile. But if you look further than that you will not see one single economic operation that has been developed by the people themselves, without the Government pouring in huge quantities of money. Essentially what the Government is saying in their Estimates Book this year is that if the people in southern Saskatchewan invest enough money in northern Saskatchewan we will get some people off social welfare. It is really a transfer of tax dollars. We have no objection to that, certainly it is a good idea and a necessity that we develop water works, town halls, develop all of the auxiliary services. The key services cannot be of lasting benefit or an economic benefit to the area if we cannot provide long term, job creating enterprises for the people that live there. Because we can build houses and that will create jobs for this year. We can put in water sewage systems but the people who live in those houses near the water sewage system have to have a job next year. There is nowhere in this Department and nowhere in this Government's operation that those jobs are being created.

Let's take a look, for example, in the Estimates. On page 64. Grants for Economic Development out of a total budget of \$22.6 million are \$500,000, Mr. Speaker. Obviously most of the expenditures that are going into northern Saskatchewan are for housing, they are for water works, they are for schools, they are for hospitals, and all of those in themselves are worthwhile and they are good and they are obviously needed in the area. But we have to be doing something that provides jobs for the people that live there, rather than just the services that will make life better for them.

We have also said when we were there that a number of jobs were in existence and this was true. I could have got a job which would have not reflected education or skill or anything I think within the first two hours I was there. I would say that it would have not been a high paying job but I presume that it would have paid the minimum wage, presumably the minimum wage applies equally there and it would have brought me a level of living at least equal to or better than social welfare. There was apparently no effort whatsoever to channel people who were obviously available for work into this type of work. And I think that this was a disappointment.

The Member and the Minister of Co-operatives says we should have gone to the Department of Co-operation. Well, Mr. Speaker, I have yet in my constituency or anywhere here in the city of Regina to go in and receive the type of treatment we received from

civil service workers in northern Saskatchewan. We walked in, we shook hands with them and we asked them a simple question like, what was the level of payments on social welfare? We got the answer he didn't know and he had been there for six months, Mr. Speaker. We got an answer when we asked if the sawmill was working in that town from a man who lived there for six months and he said, he didn't know. And the sawmill was operating 200 or 300 yards across the street. Well, Mr. Speaker, obviously the civil servants who are being hired in that particular area are not very well qualified for the job or they are obviously so politically scared and I suspect that they had received a phone call from right here in the Head Office in Regina. Because the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan had heard that someone was going up there for information and I rather suspect that everybody had been put on alert and told don't talk to anybody who appears at the office.

Well, my understanding is that all have access to civil servants and I think that such fundamental questions as what is the level of social welfare should be answered by any civil servant and I don't think this is expecting too much.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that besides the lack of any co-ordination of jobs and the fact that I think the hiring policies have been at the root of much of the trouble in northern Saskatchewan, that I think the Government itself has been attempting to do something which I think will be extremely difficult in the sense of co-ordinating departments. The Government itself, I think, if it had a streak of honesty or a sudden whim of honesty would be sure to admit that the co-ordination of all departments into one department such as Northern Saskatchewan is not exactly nearly as feasible as it seemed prior to the last election. I say this because it was obvious that many of the departments that were experiencing problems had to come back to Regina to be able to come up with solutions to problems. There is simply no way that the Department of Northern Saskatchewan can have all of the back-up personnel that can cope with problems of water works, problems of hospitals, and problems of schools, and this results in many of their requirements coming back here to Regina and simply without a fantastic civil service in La Ronge it is an impossibility.

We can take for example the situation we now have with the Department of Natural Resources and the Department of Northern Saskatchewan regarding fisheries. Now surely fisheries are something that can be handled with a co-ordinated effort and yet have two distinct jurisdictions in the Department of Northern Saskatchewan and the Department of Natural Resources. Personally, and I don't think anyone else that I have talked to who is acquainted with that type of a problem can see any necessity why we should separate fisheries in northern Saskatchewan and fisheries in southern Saskatchewan. Southern Saskatchewan, I use that just as the line of demarkation the Government has outlined for the division between northern and southern Saskatchewan. This is only one case of many. We are going to be using the same type of biologists, we are going to be using the same necessity for setting fishing limits, the same study of water problems and yet instead of having any co-ordination whatsoever, we are going to be doing away with it. And so on down the list. The same with many of the other aspects of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan.

I want to also mention the statistics on Social Welfare.

Again in the Estimates I notice that welfare payments are up in northern Saskatchewan. Which would seem to indicate that the treasurer certainly is not as optimistic about the level of social welfare in northern Saskatchewan decreasing as are many of the speeches we have heard. He has appropriated in the Department of Northern Saskatchewan for an increased amount of social welfare payments. The Saskatchewan Assistance Plan is up from \$3 million to \$3.5 million. In the first report of 1972-73 we notice the case load went in November from 995 to 1174 in March 1973. I would suspect that if it were not for the tremendous amount of Government spending that the welfare work load would be increasing even more.

I think one other aspect that the Government should be condemned for and that is that its policies or lack of them on industrial development are having a serious effect on northern Saskatchewan. The previous Liberal Government had various policies that did result in development such as the uranium mine which is coming on stream in about a year. It will have probably two to three hundred permanent employees.

The Liberal Government had an incentive program for looking for mines and minerals in northern Saskatchewan. This was the type of economic activity, if it is bolstered by government money into housing and government money into welfare, I don't mean social welfare, I mean welfare programs that will assist in public health, schools, hospitals, this type of spending that the Government is putting in, which I congratulate them for. I give them full credit for putting money into public housing and into schools and hospitals. But unfortunately this will not count for much unless their industrial development policy changes in northern Saskatchewan simply because the Government itself is not creating permanent jobs and their policies in industry all over Saskatchewan, particularly northern Saskatchewan are disastrous. We are not creating jobs in manufacturing anywhere in our province.

I think that generally speaking, while the Government opposite is going to attempt to bail themselves out by spending sufficient money to make northern Saskatchewan look somewhat prosperous that the people of Saskatchewan are not going to get very much for a lot of that money. There are two or three things the Government I would say are doing right. I would say that the development of a Northern Advisory Council is a good step. I think the election of such people and more say in their own affairs is certainly a good move in the right direction but I do think that many of the things they have done there we will live to regret. I think that many of the people in Saskatchewan are regretting. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I don't doubt that the Minister of Co-operatives when he was in Prince Albert talking with a number of people there, that the ones he talked to patted him on the back.

If I was spending money and a Minister of that Government was spending money like he is, I would expect to get a lot of pats on the back. But not necessarily because I was doing a particularly good job. So I don't think it should be too much of a surprise to the Minister of Co-operatives that a number of people told him that he is doing a good job. With the kind of money he has to hand out he is apt to get quite a few congratulatory pats on the back which not necessarily are indicative of anything.

I just want to close, Mr. Speaker, by saying that I will be supporting our side's contention and this Resolution. I hope that the Government does not continue its high minded manner and I hope that will be so particularly for the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan because northern Saskatchewan is one of the biggest geographic areas and has a great deal of potential. I think that if they are unwilling to show any type of change that many of the mistakes that they have made now will go on completely uncorrected and in fact will become much worse.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. C. P. MacDonald (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, I just want to add a few comments to this Resolution. First of all I want to ask the Members opposite a simple question. Why is everyone protesting to the degree they are with a very simple resolution that is asking for an inquiry, an investigation into the affairs of northern Saskatchewan? You people have tried an exciting new concept called the single agency concept in northern Saskatchewan. We have rejected that. Because we felt that one single department of Government which would have complete jurisdiction over every aspect of the citizens of northern Saskatchewan's life, whether it came to health, education, welfare, municipal government, local government whatever it was, that it was just too dictatorial and it had too much scope or regimentation of the same kind of regimentation and the attitude and the reputation of the old Department of Natural Resources in northern Saskatchewan.

Yet every single Member has stood up and attempted to justify the new department's existence. They have pointed to Members of the Opposition creating trouble. I am going to say just a few words and then I am going to ask leave to adjourn the debate because tomorrow there is a group of people from northern Saskatchewan coming down and these, Mr. Speaker, are not Members of the Liberal Opposition, these are not Members of the Liberal Party. I don't even know who these people are. These people are people coming from northern Saskatchewan to hold public meetings in southern Saskatchewan to tell the people of southern Saskatchewan what is going on in the North. What some of the problems are.

Mr. Faris: — They are Wafflers.

Mr. MacDonald: — I don't care if they are Wafflers as long as they are people from the North. They are coming here to point out to people of the South that there are problems in northern Saskatchewan. And yet you people want to whitewash this. My colleague the Member for Moosomin who was up in northern Saskatchewan on that tour of the MLAs has some comments that he wants to make. We had some specific observations. The Liberal Opposition wants to hear what the people of northern Saskatchewan have to say and not the political hacks and not the Minister standing up to defend government policy. We want to hear an independent observation of northern Saskatchewan. We want to give the people of southern Saskatchewan an opportunity to hear what is going on from people outside the Legislature before we make our interpretation. I am going to ask the people opposite to re-examine their position on this. If they have nothing to hide, if Ted Bowerman is doing such a great job, if Wilf Churchman is doing such a great job, if the Department of Northern Saskatchewan is revolutionizing the North, revolutionizing the standard of living, the educational

opportunities, the economic opportunities, why for goodness sake are you afraid to make this public to a public independent inquiry which will report to the people of Saskatchewan, will report on the single agency concept, report on the progress, report on the attitude of the people of the North, it will justify the position you have taken.

So, Mr. Speaker, I have a few other things to say, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Mr. Kramer: — Mr. Speaker, there was a Member on his feet here before and I am sure that if the Member was going to adjourn the debate he should have had the courtesy to let him speak first.

Mr. Speaker: — The motion will still be before the House.

Debate adjourned.

Resolution No. 10 — Upgrading of Beef Industry

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution by Mr. J. C. McIsaac (Wilkie):

That this Assembly urges the Government of Saskatchewan to consider immediately the improvement and expansion of The Guaranteed Livestock Loan Act and the implementation of a program of assistance to expand the use of artificial insemination as a means of upgrading the beef industry and ensuring the continued growth and expansion of this very important sector of provincial agriculture.

And the proposed amendment thereto by Mr. Carlson:

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

commends the Government of Saskatchewan for introducing the FarmStart program to expand the livestock industry and further commends the Government for having appointed an artificial insemination advisory council in December 1972 which is to make recommendations for a program that will encourage the use of artificial insemination and thus upgrade the quality of livestock in the Province and ensure the continued growth and expansion of this very important sector of the provincial economy.

Mr. J. C. McIsaac (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, just a few comments on closing the debate on this particular motion. I want to comment briefly on a couple of the opening remarks made by the Member for Yorkton in his reply on behalf of the Government to this motion.

I pointed out in my own remarks that the FarmStart program was not large enough to allow all of the farmers and all of the livestock people in the province to participate in it and it was for that reason that I put forward the suggestion that we expand and improve the opportunities available under The Guaranteed Livestock Loan Act. And had the Government seen fit to or should they in the future expand the FarmStart program to make at

least some of the advantages perhaps not the grants and so on, but some of the advantages of that agency available to all farmers, we could certainly do without The Guaranteed Livestock Loan Act. That much I certainly agree with. The suggestion in that sense was certainly not out of date. It was a very timely one because of the limitations of the FarmStart program. FarmStart concept is a good one. And I only regret that it is not available to all of the farmers of the province rather than just a few.

I regret, Mr. Speaker, the direction that I believe the Government will be taking, certainly if we can take the remarks of the Member for Yorkton as he made them to us speaking on this Resolution.

There is a good deal that can be done to facilitate the use of artificial insemination in the province particularly to upgrade the beef industry. I might point out I spoke only about the beef industry because I wasn't concerned in this Resolution about dealing with the swine industry or the dairy industry or any other aspect. The largest sector by far of the livestock industry in the province is the beef industry and it was that industry that I wanted to talk about and that was the reason it was put that way.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that if again we can interpret the remarks of the Member for Yorkton as being generally indicative of the direction the Government intends to go in this regard, he is going to once again step in with the Government and the Government agencies entirely and allow no opportunity, allow no room for the good work that is now going on by some of the private semen operations and some of the co-operative semen organizations that are in the province and that might well be encouraged to come into the province and instead step in with a government agency, a major government program and as I say, I think, the work could be done. Much of what they spoke about could well be done by some assistance, it need not be very great assistance and some guidelines so that some of the progeny testing that is now going on could be expanded, it could be upgraded, it could be made available to all of the livestock men in the province.

As usual, Mr. Speaker, the NDP drag out the old bogey and the biggest argument that he put forward for stepping in with a big government agency is because of some report in Quebec or Ontario where by fraud or by mistake or otherwise somebody wound up finding that they didn't have cattle bred to the bull that they thought they were in one instance. He cited no instances from the Province of Saskatchewan. There is no question that care must be taken in this regard but it is certainly a mistake and very unfair of the Member to try and leave the impression that this happens and is much more liable to happen to private organizations than under a government scheme. That certainly isn't the case. I think the Member well knows that. I think it is also fair to say that there have been very few situations of that kind in the province here. I think it is also going to be very difficult for the Government to ensure that there is no trading or exchanges or handling of any kind of semen in the province other than completely under the thumb and the jurisdiction of the Government or of a government agency that is going to be almost impossible to police.

He made the point that the semen might be shipped or sent to a livestock man, he might in turn next spring sell some of

that to a neighbor and make \$5. Here again, an awful thing as far as the NDP are concerned if somebody should make a dollar. If somebody else should feel that the demand for that semen was such that he could well afford to pay a little more for it.

Mr. Speaker, I again would urge the Government to take what steps they can to establish more districts if you like, to set them up co-operatively, that is fine and to assist the technicians for rendering the services to the farmers. In many of these areas, the Member for Yorkton made a point and it is a very good one, that up 'til now we have seen a good deal of the development in the more heavily concentrated areas, and I suppose that is only natural. These services should be made available to the sparsely, the less concentrated areas of livestock in the province. I think that is a government responsibility, and one that I hope any new policy will accomplish, to make the services of utilization of AI available more generally across the province.

Mr. Speaker, once again I regret that the amendment was put forward, I will however in the interests of the industry and the furthering of it, support the amendment because it still seeks to promote greater use of AI for the cattle industry of Saskatchewan.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Final Report of the Special Committee on Welfare

Mr. P. P. Mostoway (Hanley) moved, seconded by Mr. Rolfes (Saskatoon Nutana South) that the Final Report of the Special Committee on Welfare be now concurred in.

He said: Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to lead of discussion on the Final Report of the Special Committee on Welfare.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Mostoway: — It gives me much pleasure because I have to say in all sincerity that it is a good Report. It is the result of much hard work by Committee members and of even probably harder work by the various people attached to the Committee. It is the result of many excellent suggestions put to the Committee by numerous individuals and organizations of Saskatchewan through briefs, letters and public and private oral presentations.

Mr. Speaker, over 160 formal briefs were presented to the Committee and at least another 100 informal ones. Many letters were received; much information was presented, along with numerous reports from various agencies. To me, this indicates that there was a need for such a committee as ours for we all know that social security change, whether it be good or bad, is one of the chief characteristics of this day and age.

Mr. Speaker, let me say at this point that I have no intention of bringing politics into this debate. Members of the Committee did not politicize while on Committee business and for

this all members should be commended. I believe that the whole area of welfare or social services is too important to all citizens to be a victim of politics. Too many good ideas are lost, too many emotions come into play when social services are looked at closely through a political bias.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to inform you that very seldom did the Committee run into persons who allowed politics to influence their presentations to us. That is not to say that some did not openly admit to embracing some sort of political philosophy. Rather, almost all presentations were made with the view of pointing out to the Committee certain things whereby the one big idea was a desire to have a social security system that is just for all. Mr. Speaker, it was to this end that the Committee worked.

As Chairman of this Committee, I should like publicly to commend the various individuals who helped this Committee function smoothly. Mr. Gordon Barnhart, Ms. Merry Harbottle, Mrs. Joyce Rublee, Mrs. Rose Zerr and Mrs. Vivian Doan, deserve some good desk-thumping applause.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Mostoway: — I want also to commend Mr. Lorne Dunsmore, the Committee's research assistant from the Department of Social Services, for the good hard work he provided the Committee. Also to be commended is Mrs. Marj. Mickleborough, from the same Department, for her advice and assistance.

Mr. Speaker, it was always the Committee's intention to allow as many individuals and organizations, as possible, to submit their opinions and ideas to the Committee. Therefore, the Committee decided to visit a number of Saskatchewan communities in the south as well as the north. In most communities visited, the response was good; in some it was excellent; in others it was not so good. Relative to this, I should mention that, I think, the Committee was wise in visiting numerous northern communities for it is from this area that we had few briefs but many good oral presentations.

Mr. Speaker, in many of the communities visited, various Committee members went out to talk to citizens about welfare and related things. In some communities, certain members visited the recipients of social assistance in their homes. Mr. Speaker, we saw and talked to people from all rungs of the economic ladder. We visited homes that ranged from the modern, well-built to the log hut.

Mr. Speaker, one scene from a home I visited up north, I shall never forget. I believe it was at La Loche. I think two of us visited the home which was a log hut. It was small, much too small for the old woman, the young girl, the baby and the three middle-aged men it housed. It contained one little window and a small wood stove. Obviously it couldn't hold back winter's cold sting very well.

Through our able Metis Society interpreter we were able to find out that all six were related. The middle-aged men were socially and physically unemployable, and had been for a goodly number of years. The girl had no job for she had to look after her fatherless child. As for the grand old woman, she was

weather-beaten, frail, contorted and blind.

We questioned the old woman and with tears streaming down her cheeks, she told us that she had come from farther north nearly 70 years ago. She also told us that if we thought conditions were bad in that home then, we were wrong, because when she was a girl, they were much worse.

Mr. Speaker, the point I wish to make is this. One could almost smell the despair and the hopelessness that hung about the house. One could not help somehow coming to the conclusion that we are all, in varying degrees, responsible for our fellow men and obligated to help them reach their highest, based on their potentials.

Mr. Speaker, lest you think the Committee members always listened, questioned and visited in an air of sombreness, let me tell you about a gentleman who presented a brief to our Committee in the south. This fine gentleman had, I believe, two children whom he was bringing up himself. He lived on a large lot on the edge of a certain village, and of course, he was receiving social assistance. Well, as he related his story to us, one day he got to thinking about how he could better himself and possibly become completely or partially independent. Soon, he was able to scrape up enough money to buy a female goat, whose milk he used for his family. Well, he figured two goats would be better than one, so one day he took his female goat for a social visit, and, well, to make a long story short, soon he had two goats. This went on and on until it resulted in this man having quite a nice little herd of goats, partial financial independence and a well-earned feeling of accomplishment.

Mr. Speaker, in case anyone in this House is of the opinion that we met only with recipients let me dispel that notion right now. We met with businessmen, farmers, housewives, fishermen, clergymen, parents, societies, institutions as well as recipients. Although it is true most were middle aged, there were some elderly, and some young. We met those who thought there was too much social assistance given, and we met those who thought there was not enough. We met those who suggested that the names of recipients might be posted on public billboards; we met those who were more compassionate. In short, Mr. Speaker, we had so many opinions and ideas given the Committee, that it would boggle the mind.

And what is my reaction to this host of opinions and ideas? Well, Mr. Speaker, simply put, it is that in most matters related to welfare, there are few areas where there is unanimous agreement. In most areas there are numerous divergent opinions held by different people. I suppose this is exactly what one would expect in a democratic society such as ours.

Mr. Speaker, I suppose I should mention the one area in which there seems to be unanimous agreement — and that is that assistance should be given to those who need it. No one quarrels with this. No one quarrels with the physically handicapped getting assistance. No one quarrels with the deserted mother receiving it. No one quarrels with the aged getting it. There is, however, as is usually the case in such things, a grey area — an area where there is not unanimous opinion on whether or not certain people should be receiving assistance. And it is in this area that the Committee realizes there has been, is, and will probably continue to be much public discussion.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that certain members of the Committee, including myself, have certain reservations about this Report. I see nothing wrong with this. In fact, I see it as a healthy sign. I see it as a partial reflection of the many diverse views held by the people of this province.

Mr. Speaker, this Committee felt that what with all the various plans and schemes in this and other Canadian provinces, few people can honestly say they do not accept some form of assistance from public coffers. The aged avail themselves of assistance from the Federal Government through the old age pension the supplementary allowance and various other provincial programs. Parents accept family allowances to help feed and clothe their children. Many workers take training courses and allowances. Many unemployed receive unemployment benefits. Many businesses accept tax write-offs and grants. We all eat food, some of which is subsidized. Many students who attend universities are subsidized. Many businessmen owe much of their business to recipients of social assistance. Public transportation may be subsidized.

Mr. Speaker, what I really wish to say is that the people of western society have come to accept subsidization, or assistance, or whatever you wish to call it, as being desirable and normal. It is a fact. It is just that some have been subsidized for so long that we have come to accept it, very often under another name. It is just that some forms of assistance are so subtle as to be almost unknown to the general public.

Mr. Speaker, is the subsidization of a millionaire for the promotion of horse racing any worse than the assistance given the poor? Is the public subsidization of shysters who might, for example, be involved in a strawboard factory, any worse than assisting the handicapped? Mr. Speaker, let me tell this House that whether we like it or not, very few people can say they are not receiving some sort of assistance.

Mr. Speaker, it is my intention to comment on some of the recommendations of this Committee. I think this will be useful in that certain reasons will be given, some of which may not have appeared in the Report.

In the area of public relations and information, the Committee became very well aware of the lack of information or lack of accurate information in regard to programs offered and actual benefits given recipients. In this regard, I must say that a large number of the public at large would find it beneficial to be made more aware of programs offered. I am under the impression that many people are of the opinion that fantastic assistance payments are given some, which is not the case. I well recall at one meeting one lady thought that a small recipient family she knew was receiving approximately \$1,000 per month. When she was told it was closer to \$200 per month, she seemed to be more pensive for the remainder of the meeting.

Mr. Speaker, still on the same subject, I know people tend to harbor anxiety and suspicion about things they lack information on. This is only natural. And this is why the Committee has recommended more information and a better public relations program be directed to the public by the Department of Social Services. That is why I should like to publicly commend the present Minister of Social Services (Mr. Taylor) for the good start he has made in this direction. I am sure the public, and

particularly municipal councils, appreciate the good start already made.

Mr. Speaker, it is a well-known fact that there can never really be complete social justice unless there be economic justice. But can there be economic justice in our society? Can we really expect the worker who works with his hands to compete with the person who inherits a tidy sum? Can we really expect the docile, the meek, to compete with the domineering? Nobody expects the mentally, emotionally or physically handicapped to compete. No one expects the unemployed to compete.

What I say, Mr. Speaker, is that thanks to the wonder of science and good Christian values, our society contains many whom society must assist in order for them to survive.

Now I will be the first to admit that there are a host of programs to assist these needy persons. But I will also be the first to admit that very often these people do not get their share of the economic pie because of the low benefits, or both.

Mr. Speaker, any way one looks at it, the disadvantaged are almost doomed to be disadvantaged and to pass on this disadvantage to their children. It is with this in mind that the Committee recognized the hodge-podge of programs which are now being offered as being little more than stop-gap measures.

As a partial solution to this, the Committee certainly recognized the part that could be played by a guaranteed employment program. The Committee is well aware that lack of employment opportunities puts some people on social assistance. And in this regard the Committee feels that the unemployed but employable recipient wants to work, but he must be given the opportunity.

The Committee also feels that a guaranteed employment program should allow for cost-sharing by the Federal Government regardless of who initiates such a program. It seems difficult to comprehend how cost-sharing can be accepted for assistance, but not for programs to help people become self-sufficient through work. At any rate, Mr. Speaker, the Committee feels that the only way a fair degree of economic justice can be guaranteed people in general is to implement a guaranteed annual income program. There are a number of reasons why the Committee feels this should be so.

In the first place it would help guarantee a degree of economic justice, not the sort of justice which is now the case whereby in the last 20 years in Canada the top 20 per cent of income earners increased their share of total income from 41 to 43.3 per cent while the bottom 20 per cent dropped from 6 per cent of total income to 3.6 per cent. In the second place, although at the first glance the cost might be high, it would certainly help to generate economic activity throughout the country. In fact, a case could be made that every dollar spent through this plan would benefit a host of people, businesses and even governments. Mr. Speaker, it would help put money into circulation.

I have no doubt that all Members of this House will be paying close attention to the Guaranteed Annual Income experiment which will be taking place in Manitoba with the Federal and Manitoba Governments participating.

And, if a Guaranteed Annual Income were to be implemented, it could well result in a cutting back of the host of personnel now used to administer social services in the country. Supplementary to this, one can visualize that the social workers left could well use their time then for matters other than financial, which is now not the case.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make a few remarks in regard to a recent article on the Guaranteed Annual Income in yesterday's Leader-Post. A point made was that such a program makes sense. Another was that the price tag is manageable, but the real point is that the Guaranteed Annual Income is politically dangerous, especially to Federal politicians. The article then went on to point out an obvious truth. That truth is that under the present Canadian social security system, the point has already been reached where it may pay the breadwinner of an average sized family to cease working and receive welfare benefits that exceed his or her minimum wage income. Would the Guaranteed Annual Income dash to pieces the work ethic any more than the situation I have just mentioned? Mr. Speaker, I think not. In fact, I think less.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee felt, and I am sure that most Members of this House will agree, that if a universal Guaranteed Annual Income Plan cannot or will not be implemented at this time, with federal and provincial governments participating, the next best step would be to implement, as a start at this time, a Guaranteed Annual Income plan for a segment of society. Such a segment of society could very well be all one-parent families with dependent children as advocated in a Catholic women's League 1973 annual convention resolution. Mr. Speaker, the implementation of such a plan, or the start of one, would very much help, and here I wish to quote Pope Paul, "The poor to a better standard of living." It would, Mr. Speaker, help to eliminate poverty.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee embraced no illusion that the Guaranteed Annual Income would be implemented in the very near future. With this in mind the Committee set about making recommendations relative to the present system in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, while the Committee was working, it was announced that revisions were to be made to the family allowance program. The Committee felt that this program could have very well been used to help eliminate economic injustice and poverty. The Committee felt that family allowances should be related to the income of a family along with family size and age of children. However, this was not to be, and I am sure the Committee is disappointed.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee took note of the fact that very often one spouse would be eligible for old age security while the other spouse would not be. In the majority of these cases, it would be the wife who would not be eligible due to the fact that in our society men in a marriage tend to be older than their wives. In this regard, the Committee was made aware that very often the younger spouse would have to apply for social assistance to help the couple maintain even a minimum standard of living. The Committee felt that a reduction in the eligibility age for old age security from age 65 to 60 would do much to alleviate hardship at this age area for our senior citizens.

Mr. Speaker, at many of the numerous hearings held, great

concern was expressed in regard to youths receiving assistance. The Committee is well aware that many people are of the opinion that it is too easy for youths to receive this assistance, that some are almost induced to leave home and school in favor of independence from parents but with dependency on assistance. With this knowledge in mind, the Committee felt that all youths under 18 years of age should be legally regarded as children and as such should only be allowed to receive assistance under The Child Welfare Act. As well, the Committee felt that under this plan, more pressure would be put on parents in turn to put pressure on their children to remain at home and receive adequate training and education.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, the Committee was well aware that there are genuine cases where it is in the interests of society publicly to support those under the age of 18 who might live independent of their parents. In these cases, the Committee asks only that the youths concerned be engaged in some meaningful activity — not idleness.

Mr. Speaker, if one of the aims of the society in which we live is to allow individuals the right to develop socially, emotionally and economically to their highest potentials, then I am sure we would all agree that recipient adults and children are not always allowed to do so due to a shortage of money necessary to help develop these potentials. No one will deny that it is more difficult for a child of a recipient family to participate in hockey, dancing, summer camping or music than it is for a child of a non-recipient family. No one will deny that in terms of children, we may be denying a genius the opportunity to emerge in society. No one can deny that a night out for recipient parents is almost a must in this day and age if good mental health is to be enjoyed. And no one would deny the 55 year old woman who lives alone and is not able to engage in gainful employment, the opportunity to see the odd movie. Mr. Speaker, it is for this reason the Committee recommended that a social allowance be included as an item of basic need.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note that the newly announced Family Income Plan closely parallels one of the Committee's recommendations, and that is the removal of the extreme hardship clause whereby the working poor, in the past, found it very difficult to receive any sort of assistance while employed. To the Committee, it almost seemed that the hardship clause was in reality an incentive in some cases, for working parents to throw in the towel, as far as employment is concerned, and to go on complete assistance.

Mr. Speaker, I know the newly announced plan will really create an incentive to working parents to continue working and receive some degree of assistance at the same time. In other words, Mr. Speaker, the new plan has in it an incentive to work, and this is what we were told at our hearings there must be.

Mr. Speaker, it is the Committee's opinion that under the present set-up, many of our good social workers must put their energies to use in a host of activities, two of them being the processing and direct involvement with applications for assistance. The Committee feels that insofar as applications are concerned, the better method would be to use the self-declaration concept whereby actual applicants and applicant processors, only, would be involved. This in turn would free the higher paid social worker to be able to concentrate more fully on what he is

Really trained to do — to counsel and assist recipients on the road to independence if at all possible.

Mr. Speaker, at the various hearings held by the Committee, time and time again, the Committee was told that even though municipal councils have no desire to ever get back into direct involvement in the dispensing of social assistance, these same councils feel strongly that there should be more consultation between the Department of Social Services or its representatives and themselves. These same councils feel that formal meetings would better help them, as elected officials, to help the Department and recipients in such matters as local employment opportunities the exposition of abuse, and the detection of those who might well be in need. It is for this reason, Mr. Speaker, that the Committee felt that more dialogue, formal and informal, between municipal councils and department representatives is desirable.

Mr. Speaker, I must briefly touch on another Committee recommendation which recommends that a system of family courts be established. The Committee felt that far too often in this society, there is no institution to deal adequately with child welfare cases, separation of parents, deserted wives and the custody of juveniles. The Committee felt that the present court structure is too formal, too rigid, too non-understanding, too cold thinking to adequately deal with such problems. Then, too, the Committee also felt that the present court structure is such that it usually ends up as being a 'court of last resort'. Mr. Speaker, a family court system as envisaged by the Committee could well involve itself in these cases before the point of no return is reached. It could well help to preserve and strengthen families when the first cracks appear. Manned by personnel not legally oriented, it could very well do what we all wish the present court system could or should do, but can't.

Mr. Speaker, our Committee made a number of recommendations pertaining to housing in Saskatchewan, and well it should have for the housing of recipients and the working poor is in what I would term a sorry mess.

As I mentioned previously, many members of the Committee had occasion to see the housing that the working poor and recipients are forced to live in. I well recall one small slum housing compound in one northern community in which a number of recipients lived. Mr. Speaker, I can tell you that I was ashamed to know that this particular compound was hastily put together by an entrepreneur who was being vastly over-subsidized to provide living accommodation that would turn the hearts of even the coldest of individuals.

Mr. Speaker, much of the housing of the working poor, recipients and even those not in this category could be greatly improved if various pertinent regulations were enforced. And by enforcement, the Committee did not have in mind gentle prodding or innumerable reminders to owners that improvements are needed. In fact, Mr. Speaker, in the whole area of housing, there is even some suggestion that jail terms be considered in order to avoid such catastrophes in housing as we experience now and again in this province, sometimes with considerable loss of life.

On this last point I am sure all Members of this House will be following with interest a case in Ontario where Toronto city council has asked the Attorney General of that province to lay

March 26, 1974

charges of violations of the Criminal Code against an outfit that paid no attention to council's pleadings to upgrade safety in its numerous leased houses.

Mr. Speaker, one of the Committee's recommendations favors a provincially operated employment agency to involve itself in a program of job finding and creation. This, of course, should be done by cost sharing with the Federal Government as I mentioned earlier. It would also be closely attuned to the Department of Social Services.

You may well wonder why such a recommendation was made. Well, it was made because at most of our public hearings, people told us time and time again that Manpower is not doing the job it is supposed to do. We were told in no uncertain terms that it caters to employers first and foremost and not to potential employees. Mr. Speaker, I can verify that myself from personal experience and from experiences of people I know who have pounded the streets looking for work themselves knowing full well that Manpower is a sort of 'last resort' agency for people really seeking work.

Mr. Speaker, such an agency could very well serve to offer employable recipients as well as possibly others the opportunity to work and thus help in making Saskatchewan more productive. As well as being the agency charged with putting the guaranteed job concept in the realm of reality, numerous projects for the public good could materialize. Another reason for this recommendation, Mr. Speaker, is the Committee's belief that employable recipients and certain physically handicapped want to work. I think this was brought home by the Employment Support Program of last summer where the Provincial Government, alone, I might add, set aside money for work projects for recipients. I believe the program was a smashing success.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee was aware of the numerous work training programs offered people in all walks of life. Most such programs are greatly subsidized by various levels of government and with this the Committee certainly had no quarrel. However, it was made aware that very often, particularly as these programs affect recipients, training courses are offered without any in-depth study of future implications. To show what I mean, Mr. Speaker, I will give you an example of an employable recipient I know and ran into last year. It seems he had this opportunity to take a course through Manpower. Well, he was a big strapping man, the kind you see in the Saskatoon area. He was the outdoor type, too, and do you know what course he ended up taking? Well, it was gourmet cooking. And when I asked him how come, he told me in a matter-of-fact voice that it was better than doing nothing, and besides, he would be paid for doing it.

Well, Mr. Speaker, this may be an extreme case, but it should illustrate my point that far too often people take courses which they will not follow through with after completion.

Then, too, it seems that under the present set-up, when many of these people complete their courses, there isn't too much effort made on the part of any jurisdiction to help these persons find jobs for which they trained, sometimes for considerable lengths of time.

Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to condemn, completely, the whole job training and employment program, for I know only too

well that many have been helped by it, and many will be in the future. It's just that I voice the Committee's concern in some instances in the trainee-course match up and the lack of opportunity of employment for some on the completion of their courses.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee recommended a Day Care Program with the fee schedule based on income. I am pleased that such a program was recently announced by the Minister of Social Services. It will be of particular benefit to single parents and families where both parents must work to provide for the family.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee recommended that subsidized adoption be considered by the Department of Social Services. I think we all know of certain families where it would be most desirable to have children placed for adoption — desirable because the family is wholesome, and the parents especially considerate and good. But in many of these situations an adopted child would mean an initial financial strain — one that could not be borne without some sort of initial subsidization.

Then, too, I remember one case I ran into years ago. Disaster struck the family of five — the father, the mother and three children. The parents were killed in an automobile accident. Who would take the three children? You know who did, Mr. Speaker? No one, so the three little orphans were sent to three different places. Oh, they were each adopted all right, but they grew up never knowing each other. Now I ask you, Mr. Speaker, was that justice; was that a price to be paid in a so-called civilized land? Why should those children have been separated, never to know each other?

Mr. Speaker, on that particular case, I can't honestly say that subsidized adoption might have kept those three little children together, but then again it certainly might have.

Mr. Speaker, I want to spend just a few minutes on another recommendation which stresses the importance of having workers who appreciate and understand the culture and the language of our native people, working with native people. I know many non-native workers are doing a good job in working with native people, but we often were told that language and cultural barriers were almost too great so that much of the rapport which is needed for a good relationship between social worker and recipient is strained or in some cases, lost. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is this Committee's hope that in future, a higher percentage of native people be employed to deal with other native people in the context of social services.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words on the Committee's feeling in regard to adjustments and various allowances paid under the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan. I believe I am correct in saying that all members felt that far too often, in the past, various allowances were often far below the minimums actually needed for particular needs. In other words there is often a time lag in adjustments and particularly so when one considers the high rate of inflation past and present. Keeping in mind the real need experienced by many in the past, the Committee most certainly should agree that recent adjustments have certainly been in order. But to more or less guarantee that adjustments are made when they are actually needed and not before or after, the Committee recommended that once the various rates are found

to be just, they should be tied to some sort of index that adequately portrays the cost of living. Tied to such an index, these allowances would be less likely to cause hardships among those in need.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact the Minister of Education (Mr. MacMurchy) has a committee soliciting people's thoughts on family life education in our schools, I will make no comment on the Welfare Committee's recommendation that our schools offer a course on budgeting, money management and economical buying, other than to say that it is my hope that these three items will be three out of many more much needed items which will appear in a so-called Family Life Course offered to our schools.

Mr. Speaker, in case anyone is of the opinion the Committee thought of improving our social security system in terms of juster and better Government programs and department people, only, let me set the record straight. Committee members felt there is a much greater need for community involvement in the future than there has been in the past. All members felt that most communities want to play a greater and more direct role. Committee members felt most communities harbor a host of good people eager and willing to contribute time, energy and excellent ideas to make social services in this province acceptable and just to all.

Mr. Speaker, that is why, in numerous recommendations, we have called for more public involvement from individuals, from organizations and from institutions. The Committee believes they want to involve themselves more fully and the Department of Social Services should take advantage of this desire.

Mr. Speaker, that is why, in numerous recommendations, we have called for more public involvement from individuals, from organizations and from institutions. The Committee believes they want to involve themselves more fully and the Department of Social Services should take advantage of this desire.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to be a sad comment on our society, but the number of desertions by spouses is climbing yearly at an alarming rate. The Committee is well aware of the hardship, the suffering which usually ensues. The Committee is well aware that should a family breadwinner decide to desert, there is little the other spouse can do to receive maintenance. There seems, Mr. Speaker, to be no way to force the deserting breadwinner to meet his or her obligations to the deserted spouse and dependents. Oh, there seem to be various laws in the various provinces to ensure such support, but there seems to be no coordination of these varying provincial laws, so that all a deserting spouse has really to do is move around a lot, and if not within a province, then within the country.

Mr. Speaker, that is why this Committee advocates that the Federal Government assume responsibility for desertion legislation. Mr. Speaker, if the Federal Government has the power to dissolve marriages, surely it has the power to force deserters to fulfil maintenance obligations.

It is this Committee's suggestion that in the interim, the Provincial Attorney General's Department assume this responsibility of seeing that maintenance is provided by deserters. Surely the deserted have enough troubles arising from such situations. Surely they cannot in all sincerity be expected to expend their energies pursuing such matters. They have troubles enough just mustering energy to keep their families together.

Mr. Speaker, desertion is a blot in our society. It is an emotional crippler that inevitably saps our society, and it is society as a whole which must pay for it sooner or later. It is you and I who pay for it. I don't pretend to believe we can

stop it; however, I do think we can prevent it from wrecking the lives of those who are most affected by it.

Mr. Speaker, our Committee met with numerous native people throughout the province. The Committee believes that numerous bands are doing a good job of administering their own welfare programs.

The Committee also appreciates the fact that traditionally and otherwise, it is the responsibility of the Federal Government to provide for our native people. This the Committee would not like to see altered.

However, there is one area of concern in which the Committee would like to see more positive action, and that is child welfare on reserves. The Committee was made aware of the fact that there is not, on most reserves, any workable plan or personnel, for dealing with child welfare. Consequently, very often the Provincial Department of Social Services is asked to involve itself, often too late, and sometimes in a spirit of uncertainty. Relative to this I am sure most would agree that it would be far better were a good working agreement worked out to alleviate or solve reserve child welfare problems before they degenerate to the detriment of the children involved. And in this regard, Mr. Speaker, the Committee particularly had in mind such things as adoption and foster home placements. But I must also mention here that the feeling is that all means must first be exhausted to try and place these children with other native families. This feeling is a direct consequence of what we heard from local people whenever we held hearings where a goodly number of native people attended.

Mr. Speaker, I have only commented on some of the recommendations. It was not my intention to comment on all because this would be too time-consuming. However, I would not want anyone to get the impression that those I have missed are not important. I believe that Committee members feel that every recommendation is important, each in its own special way.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note that many of the Committee's recommendations are at this very moment being implemented, and I have no doubt that others will be in the near future. To me this indicates that, generally speaking, the numerous recommendations are realistic, desirable and certainly capable of promoting justice within our province. But, Mr. Speaker, I harbor no illusions that all the recommendations will be implemented. Rather, I see some of them becoming talking points of interest on the part of the general public. Out of this, new or altered recommendation will certainly emerge, and this is desirable in a changing society to keep pace with changing needs and trends.

Mr. Speaker, this Committee feels the task assigned it is completed. It was asked for recommendations, and it produced them, 80 in all. In formulating these recommendations, some with long term implications, others with short term, it at all times tried to keep the best public interest in mind, but this is a difficult thing to do in a free society because of diverse opinions held by people.

Mr. Speaker, at all times Committee members were well aware of a movement emerging in our society, and that is a backlash directed toward recipients of social security. Mr. Speaker, this backlash is real, but it is one we found wanes when the facts are

March 26, 1974

given — facts like those that show that only approximately 10 per cent of recipients are employable; that many recipients are those who are unemployable in an emotional, physical or mental sense; that many are deserted spouses who have families to bring up; that some find themselves dependent but not able to take advantage of programs such as compensation, The Canada Pension Plan or unemployment insurance; that some of those directly affected are children who will grow up and be caught up in a dependency cycle to the future detriment of themselves and, probably, society.

Mr. Speaker, this last general point leads me to another area on which I will spend just a few minutes.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Mostoway: — I will spend just a few minutes, and that is on abuse in our social services system. No one would be so naïve as to suggest there is no abuse in this system. Nor do I think anyone would not suggest that there will probably always be some abuse in any system or program in which humans are involved. Certainly abuse was a topic at many of our hearings, but for the most part specific details were difficult to come by. Mr. Speaker, in my estimation the Committee found little real evidence of abuse. However, given that some abuse probably does exist, I believe the Committee felt that to ferret out this abuse, to possibly police to a certain extent, would be very costly, and in terms of dollars and cents, cost the public more, much more, than what might be saved in the first place.

Mr. Speaker, I should like now to sound a last call to Members of this House for copies of this beautiful Welfare Report. A number of copies are still in the Clerk's Office. I know he would be only too happy to have them sent out to your constituents — the line forms to the right.

In closing, I want to go on record as congratulating each Committee member for his particular contribution, and I mean that in all sincerity. Rugged individualists they were, and it was a pleasure working with them. I said I wouldn't politick at this time, so I'll honor my word.

Mr. Speaker, I now move that this Report be concurred in.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Assembly adjourned at 9:45 o'clock p.m.