

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
First Session — Eighteenth Legislature
35th Day

Tuesday, January 13, 1976.

The Assembly met at 10:00 o'clock a.m.

On the Orders of the Day.

QUESTIONS

ABSENTEE MLA'S

Mr. R.H. Bailey (Rosetown-Elrose): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to direct a question to the Premier.

Following a recent article in the Regina Leader-Post in regard to absentee MLAs, was the Premier aware prior to the June 11th election that some of his candidates would not attend the Session even if they were elected?

Hon. A.E. Blakeney (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, the Premier doesn't have candidates.

Mr. Bailey: — Mr. Speaker, then in view of the answer given by the Premier I wonder as supplementary here, noting the absence of some candidates on a continuous basis, in any way were these candidates in the last provincial election given any indication that prior to the election that should they be elected that they would, in fact, be receiving an increase in salary?

Mr. Blakeney: — That is not within the knowledge of the Government. If you are asking whether the Government gave anybody any indication that there would be an increase in salary, the answer is, No.

Mr. Bailey: — A second supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Even with the majority on the Government side of the House, does the Premier feel that whether the MLAs be on that side of the House or on this side of the House, that they can in fact properly represent the views of their constituents and still remain for a long period of time absent from this Assembly?

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I think that my views on that area are of no greater or lesser value than those of the Member for Rosetown-Elrose.

I think that Members who are elected in this House are responsible not to me, or not to the Member for Rosetown-Elrose, but to their constituents and I am sure they will answer to their constituents and they will, in the appropriate way, indicate to their constituents or alternatively their constituents will indicate to them whether their conduct is becoming.

FINANCIAL STATEMENTS FROM POTASH COMPANIES

Mr. S.J. Cameron (Regina South): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the

Provincial Secretary (Mr. Cowley).

The Government has made much of the lack of financial information, information which has not been forthcoming from the potash companies. Our information is that Alwinsal Potash Company gave to you its audited financial statements for the years 1969 to 1973, inclusive, and I would like to know whether or not that is correct?

Hon. E. Cowley (Provincial Secretary): — Mr. Speaker, the jurisdiction of that would fall under the Minister of Mineral Resources. I am not sure of the years in responding to the Member, but I believe that sometime ago that particular company did file its financial statements. I believe that there are two companies which have filed their financial statements, and only two, and I think that has been indicated for some time by the Minister of Mineral Resources.

Mr. Cameron: — I don't think that it has been indicated, Mr. Provincial Secretary, that Alwinsal had in fact filed that kind of financial information.

I am also told that Alwinsal filed, in addition to its audited balance sheets and profit and loss statements for those years, some additional financial information which would mean in total, if I am correct, and I should like to ask you whether I am correct, that in total you have received more financial information from that potash company than has the Federal Income Tax Department. Is that correct?

Mr. Cowley: — I have no knowledge what information the Federal Income Tax Department has received and therefore I can't comment on your question.

Mr. Cameron: — It is an interesting admission in view of the statements we hear coming from the other side about the financial information which is filed with the Federal Government, but is not filed with the Provincial Government, which is the charge that you often make.

I have one last question. I am also told that in February of 1974, Alwinsal wrote your Government a letter indicating that it was prepared to give you whatever other financial information required in addition to the bulk of information which it had already given you, that you did not respond to that letter of February, 1974, and I should like to know whether or not that is correct?

Mr. Cowley: — Well, first of all with respect to your remarks before you started, I am aware of the kind of information that the Federal Government request depending on the differing tax positions and differing things that people are involved in. I am not aware of what information Alwinsal has provided to the Federal Government or any other company for that matter.

With respect to the question on the letter of February 1974, which I am supposed to have received from Alwinsal, I don't recall that, but I will check my files as to whether or

not I did receive in February, 1974, a letter from Alwinsal.

TEACHERS' CONTRACT

Mr. W.H. Stodalka (Maple Creek): — Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Education, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Smishek).

Negotiations with Saskatchewan's 10,000 plus teachers has been going on since last September. The contract has expired. I think the people of Saskatchewan have some right to know what the state of negotiations are at this particular time and I should like the Minister to comment on those areas in which agreements have been reached and, secondly, those areas in which the negotiating team is having difficulty.

Hon. W.E. Smishek (Minister of Finance): — Mr. Speaker, as the Hon. Member is perhaps aware the negotiations are conducted between the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation as well as representatives from the school trustees and the Department. I am aware that negotiations have been going on for a period of time and that negotiations are still in progress and the parties are making progress, on a gradual basis. I am not able to tell the Hon. Member where precisely the negotiations are at the moment and what are the areas where there have been resolutions and what areas are outstanding. I shall be glad to check and will be glad to provide any further information.

Mr. Stodalka: — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. I noticed in the report in the newspaper last Saturday that the doctors of Saskatchewan settled within the \$2,400 guideline established by the Federal Government. Is it the Government Trustee Committee's intention to try and settle the teacher contracts within the \$2,400 guideline?

Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Speaker, this is one of the problem areas in these negotiations. The federal guidelines, as the Hon. Member is aware have been set. We are still studying the federal guidelines, particularly the regulations. In fact I am aware that a further meeting of officials is to take place this week, because there are some problems with interpretations. Certainly the \$2,400 ceiling is one of the areas the Government is considering, but no formal decision has been made on that issue.

Mr. Stodalka: — Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary question. I understand that civic officials are having difficulties in negotiating with their own employees because of the lack of guidelines. Is the Minister prepared at this time to announce when Saskatchewan's guidelines will be presented?

Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Speaker, if the civic officials or any other group are having difficulties, we, too, are having some difficulties and it is because of the difficulties created by the very complicated and complex regulations as well as the Act. For the information of the Hon. Member, to the best of my knowledge, outside of the Province of Manitoba having announced its

position no other province has entered into agreement. To the best of my knowledge the whole of the nation is in precisely the same kind of position as Saskatchewan.

As to the confusion that has been created by the guidelines and by the regulations, we are trying to get clarification and as soon as we get that information we will be setting out our position publicly.

ROUTINE ENQUIRIES FROM MLA'S

Mr. W.C. Thatcher (Thunder Creek): — Mr. Speaker, I have been waiting for, I think this is the third day that I have waited to catch the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kaeding) in the Assembly. If he is ill my condolences to him, if he is not I am very curious to know where he is. I am afraid that I can't hold this question any longer and I don't know who accepts questions when the Minister of Agriculture is not in his chair and I will watch, with interest.

I should like to inquire as to why a directive has been issued from the Minister of Agriculture's office to senior members of the agricultural staff, senior civil servants, indicating that routine enquiries from MLAs must either be referred to his office or cleared through his office.

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I doubt whether any Member of the Government would be familiar with whether or not such a directive has gone out from the Minister's office and therefore I am not able to answer the question, the Government is not able to answer the question. We will take it under advisement.

To answer the preliminary question, the Minister of Agriculture is in Washington as part of a Canadian delegation of agricultural people, discussing agricultural matters with the Government of the United States. He is on government business and I think appropriately on government business.

Mr. Thatcher: — A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — The question was not answered therefore a supplementary is not allowed.

Mr. E.F.A. Merchant (Regina Wascana): — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order. It would seem to me that the Premier said that he would take notice of part of the question. He answered part of the question and that part of the question was: where is the Minister? He answered that and he answered that quite clearly and at some length. It seems to me that it might well be appropriate for a supplementary to be asked, that it would not be appropriate for you, Mr. Speaker, to lay down the policy that a Minister could get up and say, I will take notice of a small portion and then answer at length and deprive the Opposition of the opportunity to ask a supplementary at that time.

Mr. Speaker: — I think if the Member checks the record he will see that I am in order in stating that the Minister did not answer the

question. He answered an aside.

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION

Hon. R. Romanow (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Member for Wascana (Mr. Merchant) asked a specific question about whether or not the Human Rights Commission had ordered hospitals to eliminate the request for religion from their admittance forms and I undertook to inquire of the Human Rights Commission to provide to the Member and, as he requested, to all Member of the House, my information.

I am advised as of this morning, Mr. Speaker, that the Human Rights Commission has not considered this issue either as a matter of policy at a general Commission meeting or as an issue in any board of inquiry. I am advised that the staff of the Regina office has dealt only with application forms for employment under Section 7 of The Fair Employment Practices Act, in their discussions with hospitals in Regina. The Commission has apparently checked specifically with the hospitals that were alluded to, purposefully by the Member for Wascana, namely, the Regina General and Pasqua, who also confirmed to the Commission that they received no directives or orders of any kind prior to changing, if, indeed, there has been a change in any policy in this regard. So the Commission has not done anything as was implied by the Member yesterday.

Mr. Merchant: — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Hon. Attorney General would either check further or confirm that my information is correct. I am informed that the Human Rights Commission, although not having made an order, I was so informed after the question was posed in the House, but they don't deny an involvement with the hospitals and don't deny having taken some part. In other words they haven't been specific, but as the Minister implied yesterday, they may well not have made an order but given an impression. And if that is the case would the Hon. Attorney General indicate to the House that there is no requirement by the hospitals to not take the religion down in the forms, because the hospitals appear to be of that impression and the Hon. Attorney General may know, and I ask him if he knows, that the Chaplains in the religious groups in Regina are very concerned about this change in policy, which they believe flows from a directive from the Human Rights Commission.

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, if I may say so, I want to preface my remarks by saying that I have some respect in regard to the Hon. Member for Wascana but he is clearly shaken by this type of a question. Which would the Attorney General, he says, acknowledge that there has been some involvement of some kind, indirectly. I have told the Hon. Member in response directly to his question and I don't know how clear in English I could, on the information that is submitted to me, that there has been no involvement by the Human Rights Commission whatsoever.

Now that is not to say that the Human Rights Association or some other organization, for that matter, may or may not have been involved with the hospitals in the discussions as to the change, if any, of the practices. But that is between two private institutions, between the hospitals and the Human Rights Association or anybody else as a result of the policies. But please don't say to us or to the Government, or to the Human

Rights Commission, as an agency of government, that somehow we are the bearers of the responsibility for that decision. Because on the basis of the information, as I have told the Hon. Member quite clearly, we are not — unless I have been misinformed and I have no reason to doubt otherwise. So there is no use in saying to me that somehow we are indirectly, or somehow this, or somehow that, I have given you a specific answer. If there is a complaint, that is a matter that has to be straightened out as between the hospitals and the clergy and what motivated or prompted the hospitals to make the decision.

I repeat, in conclusion, that the Member was totally wrong in his statements in this matter yesterday and I would ask him to acknowledge that on the basis of the statement that I have made here today.

Mr. Merchant: — Mr. Speaker, I, frankly wasn't going to say anything further until the Hon. Member asked me to acknowledge and if a question is being directed at me let me only very briefly say that as far as I can tell, though the Human Rights Commission say they haven't made an order, they won't deny some involvement. And that from other conversations and not conversations which the Hon. Member has had.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! The Member must get to the point of his supplementary.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF NEW AGENCY FOR WOMEN EMPLOYED IN THE PUBLIC SERVICE

Hon. W.E. Smishek (Minister of Finance): — Mr. Speaker, I want to announce the establishment of a new agency to promote greater opportunity for women employed in the Public Service and in Crown corporations.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — The establishment of such an agency was promised in the Throne Speech at the opening of the current Session of the Legislature and I may refer the Hon. Members to the Throne Speech which reads this way:

In the past years my Government has taken a number of steps to establish equal rights for women in employment. In this Session you will be asked to approve measures designed to translate those rights into affirmative action. A new agency will undertake to open up new opportunities to women at all levels in the Public Service and to promote greater opportunities for women, who work in the community at large.

Mr. Speaker, the new agency has been named the Career Development Office, will have as its main function the improvement of the status of women employed in the public sector.

Women constitute a large percentage of the total workforce, it is just good social and economic sense to make the best

possible use of the skills they possess.

Mr. Speaker, the director of this new agency is Mrs. Florence Wilkie. Mrs. Wilkie has been employed in the Saskatchewan Public Service in various capacities for the past 23 years. Mr. Speaker, I might also mention that further announcements concerning new initiatives on behalf of women in the work force will be made in future announcements.

Mr. Merchant: — Mr. Speaker, let me start by saying that we are very pleased and I don't want, in my brief comments, to take away in any way from the pleasure of the Opposition in this announcement. We think it is long overdue, indeed, the failure to lead as far as promotions for women, indeed, the bad example that the Government has been giving for the past few years and I shall be asking questions in that regard, the bad example may now be turned around and we say that we are very pleased.

I am concerned first, that it appears that this is not going to be a part of the Department of Labour, unless I'm misinformed. My feelings, and our feelings are that this properly belongs within an expanded and strengthened women's bureau within the Department of Labour. That's where it is in other jurisdictions where it has been tried and I only know of Ontario. It is now being planned in the federal jurisdiction, and that's where it belongs. I don't know why it is independent. I am concerned that it would be independent of the Department of Labour, although its operations should basically be independent.

I must say with respect to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Smishek), the Hon. Attorney General told us a couple of days ago that there was nothing new about this, that it had been operating for months and there was nothing particularly to announce. But I know that the Hon. Minister of Finance is very busy and can't always be in the House when the Hon. Attorney General announces these things.

Lastly, I wanted to say that we are if not concerned, worried about Florence Wilkie going into that job. Now let me say that with some care because I understand from people who know her well, including our Leader, that she is a very capable person in some ways. But she has been highly political. She left the Government service at a time when it wasn't even possible to get a pension, and went to work for Woodrow Lloyd. Went out of the Government service and into a political position. She clearly is an active member (I don't know whether she is active now, but she has been an active supporter of the New Democratic Party and I assume before that the CCF), she is a special assistant to the Premier now.

Mr. Smishek: — Anything wrong with that?

Mr. Merchant: — No there is nothing wrong with being an active member of the NDP, except somewhat misinformed, but the point is that it raises some concern that there may be political inroads and some political direction to those promotions. And I said that I don't want to oversell that, but I think that people should be conscious of that problem and I know that the Government, in setting up a new department, was careful and is no doubt as concerned as we are and I hope that they will see to it

that no political overtones slip into this new area. I wish you luck with the proposal and I think it's long overdue and we congratulate the Government on taking this step.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. L.W. Birkbeck (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, just to reply to the Minister's announcement of the new Government agency that Florence Wilkie will be heading. I should just like to give congratulations. We are definitely in favor of this and we will be watching with interest I'm sure to see what the effect of it will be. The most important thing is to see what the outcome will be, if we can involve more women in this Government service.

MOTION

PRIORITY OF DEBATE - PURCHASE OF POTASH MINES

Mr. S.J. Cameron: — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I rise under Rule 17 to beg leave under that rule to move a motion asking for Priority of Debate for the purpose of discussing a matter of urgent importance, and I state the subject to be as follows:

The urgent and compelling need for this Assembly to obtain immediately full and complete answers to the following questions:

- (a) How many potash mines are intended to be purchased or otherwise acquired in the immediate, intermediate and long term?
- (b) How much money is it likely to cost to procure each of the mines intended to be acquired?
- (c) How much cash is likely to be required for this purpose; where will it come from?
- (d) How much money will have to be borrowed; what are the likely sources of the borrowing; what interest will have to be paid on those borrowings?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cameron: —

in view of the continual meetings and discussions between the Government and various potash companies with respect to the Government taking over some, or all, of the potash mines of the province, and to this end the necessity, later this day, to convene the Standing Committee of Crown Corporations to seek answers to the foregoing questions by subpoenaing such papers and witnesses, including the Premier, the Provincial Secretary and the Minister of Finance, as may be necessary to obtain full answers to these questions.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — A notice regarding this particular matter was proposed for Priority of Debate and was received in the Clerk's

office at 9:35 p.m. last evening, for which I thank the Hon. Member.

I refer all Members to a ruling of the Chair on February 23, 1971 and quote a section of that ruling as follows:

The fundamental principle underlying Rule 17 was to provide an opportunity within a proper framework of parliamentary procedure where none otherwise existed, for the immediate discussion of any matter deemed to be of such urgency and importance that all of the normal or special business of the Assembly should be put to one side to provide complete right-of-way to a discussion of one specific particular subject.

I also refer all Members to Rule 17 (10) (c) which states:

The motion must not revive discussion on a matter which has been discussed in the same Session.

The subject matter for this debate has been discussed on second reading of Bill 1 and can be discussed on the clause-by-clause consideration of Bill 1 in the Committee of the Whole.

I, therefore, rule that this topic would revive a matter which has already been discussed and in fact can be discussed further in Committee of the Whole. For this reason I rule the motion out of order.

Mr. Cameron: — Mr. Speaker, may I please have leave briefly to comment upon your ruling and ask you if you might reconsider in terms of the public importance and the urgent public importance of this.

Mr. Speaker: — I should like to know under what procedure the Member is proceeding?

Mr. Cameron: — I wanted, Mr. Speaker, to make a point to you very briefly and ask you to consider it in terms of the urgency in view of the circumstances of the matter that I now put before you.

Mr. Speaker: — I think the Member is acquainted with the procedure for Priority of Debate. Once the Speaker has made the ruling under Section 17 (6), and, if, in fact he has found it to be not in order and not of urgent public importance, that is the end of it. If, in fact, the Speaker has ruled that it is in order and is of urgent public importance, then (7) and (8) determine in which manner it will be dealt with. However, I have ruled that it is not of that nature, and consequently the matter ends at that point.

Mr. Cameron: — I understand, Mr. Speaker, I am within the rules in commenting briefly upon Mr. Speaker's decision.

Mr. Speaker: — I am attempting to determine from the Member under what procedure or rule you are commenting. I am not aware of it.

Mr. Cameron: — Mr. Speaker, correct me if I am wrong on this. It was my understanding of the rules that once you have made a decision on a matter such as this, that I am not out of order in rising and commenting upon Mr. Speaker's ruling - briefly.

Mr. Speaker: — I think that in the past there may be some confusion with regard to this. Members have taken an opportunity they saw to rise and discuss the matter, but the discussion has not been in order. It was not in order before and is not in order at this time. So consequently I really can't permit it at this time.

Mr. Cameron: — I rise on a Point of Order, Mr. Speaker. The hour in respect to the potash takeover is late. Bill 1 is in Committee of the Whole and passage is imminent. There is talk about this Session rising . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! What is the Point of Order? The Member has failed to state what the Point of Order is.

Mr. Cameron: — My point is: The hour is late with respect to Bill 1. We have no other ways at our disposal to get this basic kind of information which we have a right to have.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cameron: — That's why we asked for Crown Corporations to be convened immediately and give us . . .

Mr. Speaker: — I think the Member will have to agree with me that that is not a Point of Order.

RESOLUTIONS

RESOLUTION NO. 35 - CONTROLS NEEDED BEYOND THE STATUTORY LIMITATION ON A PERMANENT BASIS TO FIGHT INFLATION

Mr. R.L. Collver (Nipawin) moved, seconded by Mr. Bailey (Rosetown-Elrose):

That this Assembly deplores and denounces the announced declaration of the Prime Minister of Canada that centralized controls, regimentation and regulation, necessitated in the short term by the need to fight inflation, are going to be required even beyond the statutory limitation on a permanent basis, thereby creating a so-called "New Society"; and

Further deplores and denounces the obviously permanent movement by the Prime Minister of Canada and his Cabinet away from the fundamental principles of his Party as they relate to a free market society.

He said: Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of my remarks I intend to move a motion that I am certain both the Members

opposite and the Members to my right will want, no they will be eager to support. Mr. Speaker, the Members opposite will be eager to support this Resolution because although I realize that they will support the new direction of the New Society and that they will support the increased use of regulations, regimentation and bureaucracy to control the day to day lives of the citizens of Canada and of Saskatchewan, that they do not support the Leader of a party in Canada espousing on the one hand the principles of a free market society but leading his party and leading the country in quite another direction. In other words, if you will, to be two-faced. I am certain the Members opposite do not wish that to happen and I am certain they will want to support this Resolution for that reason.

The Members to my right I am certain will want to support this Resolution because for the last month and a half or two months we have been hearing on a daily basis and, in fact, on an hourly basis, how much they stand for the free market society, how much they support the aims and objectives and, in fact, the principles of a free market society. And the Leader of their party federally who only recently, within the last few months, received 80 per cent support of his party for his principles and for his policies that he has espoused for some considerable length of time or something of that nature. But certainly the Members to my right will want to express to their Leader in Ottawa, will want to express to their Leader philosophically and will want to express to him clearly and concisely that they do not support the directions of the New Society, because of their espousal of the free market society and that they will want to be certain that their Prime Minister and their Leader clearly understands their position that they have made in this House repeatedly and continuously over the last couple of months.

Now what exactly did the Prime Minister say — I can wait as long as you people can. Mr. Speaker, quoting from a document, View from Ottawa, this is perhaps not in total detail but is a rather reputable source and does make accurate quotations from statements:

The state is important, the Government is important (he says). It means in explanation of his New Society principle that there is going to be not less authority in our lives but perhaps more. He called for a different society, a New Society, one where net human benefit would be the important thing rather than gross national product, where the good life would replace the life of more, where the value of people would be judged not by what they own but what they are and what they do.

Now that's a pretty great statement. There are just a few questions that one might ask about that particular statement. First of all, how do you measure net human benefit, who sets the criteria for net human benefit, what is the gross sales if you want under net human benefit and what are the expenses that are entailed in calculating net human benefit, what are the taxes that have to be calculated in terms of net human benefit? In other words, what criteria are you going to use to establish net human benefit. Furthermore, the economists have developed over the last number of years a reasonable calculation of what the gross national product is and this is a reasonable, measurable quantity, but net human benefit, who is to say "where the good life would replace the life of more."

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Collver: — Mr. Speaker, in due course I will get to the Members opposite and they'll be happy, in due course I will get there and then they'll be enjoying this as well.

Mr. Speaker, one of the Members has asked whether it is hymn singing time and it might be more pleasant than some mornings and afternoons that we have spent in this particular Legislative Assembly in the last while and perhaps less pleasant for some of them today.

Who decides what the good life shall be? Is it to be the individual or is it to be the state or, as a Member in his catcall just remarked, is it to be Pierre, or is it to be Allan, or is it to be anyone else who happens to be in charge of the state? What is the good life? That is one of the questions that we think have to be asked and asked furiously about the Prime Minister's comments.

Where the value of people would be judged, judged by whom, judged on what criteria? Judged in what area? Well it seems to us that what the Prime Minister is attempting to do is to set himself up as the judge and the jury of everyone's life and of everyone's lifestyle, and to suggest to them precisely how they should live and what they should do and how they should move and where they should move. Mr. Speaker, that has a relatively similar sounding nature to the same kinds of thought process and the same kinds of sounds that we have been hearing from the Government benches opposite, over the last number of months.

We know best for you, they say. We can do better for you on an individual basis, they say. We understand more about what makes your life tick than you do yourself and, therefore, we can tell you, describe to you, precisely how you shall live and that is how you shall live.

Mr. Speaker, sometimes it is necessary to look at not only what people say, but also what they do. During the ten years, if anyone is to be a judge in Canada and I am sure that all of us have witnessed over the last number of years the increased power and increased centralization of the state in Ottawa. The increase of the power in the Unemployment Insurance Commission; the increase in power of bureaucratic agencies, centralized in Ottawa. Oh, the odd time, with a decentralized sock to them, they put an office in Thunder Bay that reports directly to Ottawa, that takes its orders directly from Ottawa and we will call that decentralization. We will say to the people of Canada, that's decentralization. Those people are your people except that they have to report to the people in Ottawa.

Now the Members to my right might say, well, look we are not responsible for what our Leader in Ottawa says, we are not responsible for his actions. My goodness that great perpetrator of western Canadian sovereignty who invented the LIFT Program, that great standard bearer for justice and truth for western Canada, who suggested that the Crow's Nest rates be eliminated and who suggested that many rail lines be abandoned and said, in answer to response to Mr. Trudeau's comments, but he is really not speaking for the West, he is only speaking for the East. In the West we don't think that way.

An Hon. Member: — When did he say that?

Mr. Collver: — Well, that is what I heard him say. The western Canadians thought differently than that.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order has been called and I think it is well for the Members to keep in mind that debates proceed progressively and the Members should not interrupt unduly, if at all. I think the Member should proceed and we should have some order.

Mr. Collver: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I might reply to one of the catcalls, however, to suggest that Mr. Lang, calling the kettle black, I think, about the time that he told western farmers to sell their own grain, is when he said that.

Mr. Speaker, is the Prime Minister of Canada a centralist? Well, his actions would lead us to believe that he was. He has centralized more power in the Federal Government in Ottawa in the last ten years than has been centralized in Ottawa even during wartime when it was needed to fight a common enemy. He has centralized more power in the last six months in Ottawa than has been centralized in Ottawa in the last 50 years. This particular Prime Minister, Mr. Speaker, is an enigma. His mysterious behavior to Canadians over the last number of years has led many to comment and many to wonder, what really is his philosophy, where is he really leading the people of Canada.

Well, Mr. Speaker, with regard to his abilities as a politician no one will question. When he calls himself a pragmatist, he calls himself not a socialist, not a centralist, not even a Liberal, he calls himself a pragmatist. Where is he pragmatic, Mr. Speaker? He is pragmatic in winning elections, that is where he is pragmatic. He is pragmatic in presenting one face in July of 1974 and quite another face in June of 1975.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Collver: — And a completely different face in October of 1975 and a different face again in December of 1975 and January of 1976. He presents many faces. There should be a movie, "The Many Faces of Pierre". Certainly that is his pragmatism, it is his ability to win votes; his ability to convince Canadians that somehow, today, he is different than he was yesterday and yesterday he is different than he is going to be tomorrow, and tomorrow he is different than he will be one year from tomorrow. That is a marvellous way to act, Mr. Speaker, but not very reasonable when it comes to presenting to the people, where you really stand on issues, on issues, Mr. Speaker,. I would say to the Attorney General that he continues to use the words free enterprise, which continue to be misunderstood by the Canadian people. At the conclusion of my remarks I intend to say what I believe free market societies are all about and that is what I stand for that is what the Conservative Party stands for, a free market society. We are not ashamed to say that; we are not afraid to say that, not a New Society, not a Just Society, not a nationalized society, just a free market society.

Mr. Speaker, is the Prime Minister of Canada a centralist? Members to my right who have supported the Prime Minister for

some considerable time as the Leader of their party, as the Leader who received 80 per cent of the vote of his party, I am certain, have read this book. It was put out, "Pierre Elliott Trudeau, Federalism in the French Canadians", and it is an accumulation of essays that he wrote during the course of his earlier years, say from the age of 45 through 50 . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Collver: — . . . during his adolescence. I will just quote a few statements from this:

The basis of a socialist program is to state what minimum standards of the good life . . .

The good life, you remember this article was written in the University of Toronto Monthly, in 1961, entitled "Social Purpose for Canada," but keep in mind, Mr. Speaker, the basis of a socialist program is to state what minimum standards of the good life must come from that set of values. And to demand that those standards be made available to all. You know this is "the good life" mentioned in December of 1975 and also mentioned in 1961, in the same context, by the way.

The basis of a socialist critique is to state clearly what the provincial governments can do and fail to do.

I ask the Members opposite and the Members to my right, how clearly has the Prime Minister of this country stated in the last few years what the provincial governments can do and can't do? What have we seen? We have seen federal-provincial confrontation that is what we have seen. We have seen no clear statement from Ottawa as to what the provincial governments can or cannot do. But back in 1961 he says that is what should happen. Finally:

The basis of a socialist action is to define the various ways of striving towards socialist goals under a federal constitution and to lead each community towards such goals as it can hope to attain.

An Hon. Member: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Collver: — Yes, indeed, the Member opposite says, hear, hear, and I am sure that all of the Prime Minister's comments in that particular article, the Member opposite would say, hear, hear, to them. They believe in the Prime Minister's statements; they believe in the New Society; they believe in the aims of the New Society. Mr. Speaker, at least they have the courage — and I say this — they at least have the courage to belong to a party that also says its aims are in that particular direction. We don't happen to agree with that direction, but at least they have the courage of their convictions.

Members to my right, however, wish to belong to a party that says their Leader can say one thing, but it requires explanation, both from 1961 and 1965, in 1968, in 1972, and, again, in 1974. Each time the Prime Minister comes before the Canadian people he is a different cat. Each time he comes before the Canadian people he either has a flower or doesn't have a flower. He either has a businessman's suit or he doesn't have a businessman's suit. He either has a haircut or he doesn't have

a haircut. He is the master, Mr. Speaker, of the image politician. He is the master of preparing and submitting to the Canadian people what he thinks the Canadian people want to see, while at the same time enacting legislation, controlling the Government of Canada to the extent that he will centralize more and more power in the hands of the Federal Government. Mr. Speaker, to suggest that the Prime Minister of Canada, today, is two-faced is to understate the case.

Mr. Speaker, to conclude on whether or not the Prime Minister of Canada is a centralist and is a socialist, again, I suggest that a person's actions speak louder than his words. Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition will know the following two names, I am sure, Mr. Tansley and Mr. Johnson. The Leader of the Opposition told me just yesterday in this Assembly that he fired Mr. Tansley when he was in office in Saskatchewan because he was a socialist and yet the Prime Minister of this country appoints that same Mr. Tansley, who the Leader of the Opposition believe to be a socialist, appointed him into one of the most sensitive and responsible jobs under the New Wage and Price Control guidelines and one of the most powerful positions in the country today. That centralist and socialist, that wonder of the NDP, has now been appointed by a Liberal Prime Minister and the Liberal Party says, but he will explain away his talk on December of 1975.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Members to my right are going to raise differences of opinion in our party as they relate to our stand in Saskatchewan and as they relate to what we would stand for and what we believe. But there is a slight difference, Mr. Speaker, when they are going to relate, there is a slight difference between what a Member says — a private Member says — or what a provincial organization says, in one province compared to a provincial organization in another, as it compares to what the Leader of your party says federally and does federally and as it related to your stand as a provincial organization.

I am sure the Members to my right are going to attempt to get out of it, they are going to attempt to amend the motion.

Mr. Messer: — Maybe they will confess up to it.

Mr. Collver: — I hope you are right. The motion was submitted to give them an opportunity, to give us all an opportunity to speak out to our Prime Minister, to tell him that the new direction into which he is leading us is not acceptable to the people in the Province of Saskatchewan. If we were to send a unanimous vote on this motion, from this Assembly, maybe, just maybe, the Prime Minister might listen to such a unanimous vote.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of reasons why we should be extremely concerned about what the Prime Minister has to say. The first one is that when the Prime Minister speaks to the Canadian people, not just once but several times, about a New Society and then fails to define what that New Society should be, but suggests that it shall be long-term continuation of short-term controls; when he suggests that free enterprise has not served the people of Canada well and that, perhaps, it is not doing its job; when he suggests that somehow the society that has provided and the system that has provided more things

for more people than any other system in the history of the world, is not functioning then we must ask ourselves seriously, what does the Prime Minister know about our economy that he is not telling the people of Canada? What secret, for example, has he in his mind that says to him that in two years, or three years, the economy of Canada is going to have an infinitely larger collapse than the one we are presently experiencing. What secret trade agreements, for example, have been negotiated between the Prime Minister and other organizations; what trade agreements have been secretly given notice that they are going to be cancelled to the Prime Minister, and he knows about it.

For example, Mr. Speaker, on December 27, in the Leader-Post there was an article entitled "Canada and the ECM" and the lead paragraph reads as follows:

All that remains in the way of Canada entering the European Economic Community (EEC) is the elimination of Denmark's objection. Contractual links between Canada and EEC nations have become increasingly . . . Are those contractual links going to seriously and materially affect the economy of Canada?

We don't know about it and are not entitled to find out from the Prime Minister.

Mr. Speaker, it may be suggested by Members to my right that the Prime Minister in his conversation was only espousing his own view. And yet either the day before or the same day that the Prime Minister made his remarks initially, we saw the spectre of Mr. Chretien on television who espoused the wonderful and new philosophy that Canada's economic policies and philosophical bent should become more like Sweden. That great and wonderful example of modern technology and modern society that has been spoken of glowingly by Members opposite at least on two occasions in this Assembly when talking on the potash debate.

Sweden is the epitome of society. Sweden is the country which has established goals and established legislation that we should all subscribe to and work towards. And yet Mr. Chretien, that espouser of free market society, suggested at the same time the Prime Minister made his remarks that we should work towards. The same as the Members opposite, Mr. Chretien one of Mr. Trudeau's right hand henchmen.

Mr. Speaker, what does the Prime Minister know that he is not telling the people? Why would he bring out — what deals for example, Mr. Speaker, has the Prime Minister made at the recent monetary meetings? What special and secret deals has he made that Canadians should be aware of that are going to bring about far worse economic conditions than those that we are presently experiencing?

Mr. Speaker, at the same time that Mr. Trudeau brought out his suggestion of a New Society there was an article in the January 9th Leader-Post: "Economic Council Upstaged by Trudeau New Society". Is that the reason he brought in these remarks? Because the Economic Council suggested an entirely different approach for Canada's economy than what our Prime Minister did. As a matter of fact, exactly the reverse. Not more and increased use of bureaucratization, red tape controls but less after a period of controls. This report says:

Governments in Canada have doubled their share of GNP in the last 25 years. They now command nearly 40 per cent of it, compared with about 20 per cent in 1950. The effect of this growing intrusion has been largely negative, says the Economic Council. Last year total expenditures reached \$70 billion. The outlay has highlighted income distribution transfer payments and has served to dampen Canada's own ability to generate an increased productive investment in the national economy.

The Economic Council says that increasing government is not doing the job. And yet the Prime Minister suggests that even more increased government is in order for our country.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of comment by the Press about what the Prime Minister's comments — about what effects they will have, and the kinds of things that perhaps the Prime Minister is not telling us in the creation of the so-called New Society.

Here is a headline, "Palliser Told Free Enterprise may be Endangered." That is the understatement of the year. We had better hope the United States' money well doesn't go dry. Does the Prime Minister understand or know that the money well is going to go dry and therefore lower our standard of living?

Business leaders are hesitant to talk recovery for 1976. Yet the recovery in the United States is proceeding apace and at a far faster pace than our recovery in Canada. We will to a certain extent follow the United States economic upturn and we will have our own economic upturn but surely we should move, in a country like Canada, in a developing country like Canada we should move faster than the United States if we have effective leadership.

Mr. Speaker, the second reason that we should be very concerned about the Prime Minister's comments is that they are basically dishonest. In the last election just a year and a half ago, the Liberal Party in Canada and the Prime Minister of Canada said short-term controls are bad, they won't work. As a matter of fact, during the election campaign, Mr. Speaker, they said the only people to whom controls will apply and will be successful are the people on wages, that is what they said. They showed and indicated in their television campaign and their editorials, a picture of a secretary sitting behind blocks of ice. Very effective advertising, very effective. A secretary sitting behind a block of ice. The caption is, "Don't Let Bob Stanfield Freeze Your Wages, Vote Liberal."

Bob Stanfield suggested freezing wages for 90 days. The present government has suggested they are going to freeze wages forever, or at least control wages forever.

Mr. Speaker, it is unacceptable as far as we are concerned to present one thing to the electorate and then get into government and govern differently. The Members opposite might possibly remember this in what they have heard from the Members to my right pertaining to the potash issue. They have heard from Members to my right, "You have no mandate to nationalize potash." You have no mandate, you didn't mention it in the last provincial election, you didn't make it an issue. As a matter of fact for three years previous you had discussed it in caucus and had rejected it as an idea. In fact the Premier of

this province had rejected Mr. Richards' plea for the nationalization of potash many times — Mr. Speaker, if the Member has a Point of Order, I wish he would make it.

Mr. Kramer: — I wish to God I was asleep.

Mr. Collver: — Stay with it. I will keep talking and you will fall asleep.

Mr. Speaker, the Members opposite might well remember that the Members to my right have suggested, and ourselves have suggested, many times that you had no mandate to nationalize the potash. Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister of Canada had no mandate to institute controls, let alone long-term controls. No mandate whatsoever. The Prime Minister of Canada, if he believed after July of 1974 that controls were going to be necessary if he believed sincerely that somehow he had to change the direction of the economy because inflation was getting out of hand, since he and the Members to my right, and other Liberals in Canada, totally rejected controls in July of 1974, they should have had the courage and the decency, the same as the Members opposite, to have called an election and allowed the people to suggest that controls were in order to govern Canada and implement the controls. Because the Progressive Conservative Party was committed to and is committed to, temporary controls, as opposed to the permanent kinds of controls that the Prime Minister is going to ease us into in his words. Give us some breathing space, he says. But at the end of the breathing space probably there will be a lot of guys who maybe weren't playing ball. Then we will have to continue the controls.

Mr. Speaker, long-term controls will destroy the free market society. The combination of long-term controls and nationalization of industry, will destroy the free market society. The people of Canada have not been asked whether or not they want to destroy the free market society. We are convinced they do not. We are convinced that the people of Canada and the people of Saskatchewan believe, sincerely, that this society has provided more for more people — I would like to mention one section of a press report written by a Richard Gwyn, it was headlined, "Turner Lost Jobs, UIA Changes."

In 1975, according to Statistics Canada, three-quarters of all Canadian families had record players, and AM-FM receivers. More than half had color television and clothes dryers. Over 40 per cent had freezers and subscribed to cable television. One-third had tape recorders. One in five owned two or more automobiles. Fifteen per cent had dishwashers; one in ten had snowmobiles; and window type air-conditioners.

Mr. Speaker, this system in Canada has created more wealth for more people than any other system devised by man. The nationalized system, the socialized system expressed by Members opposite and expressed by our Prime Minister has not worked. C.M. Parkinson said that there hasn't been a new idea in socialism in 60 years, he said that ten years ago.

Mr. Speaker, we must concern ourselves about the Prime Minister and I sincerely hope that the Members to my right and the Members opposite will tell him in no uncertain terms that where he is leading us is not the place we want to go. This

dishonesty of the present Prime Minister is unacceptable to the Progressive Conservative Party of Saskatchewan, it is unacceptable to the Progressive Conservative Members of Parliament, it is unacceptable, in our opinion, to the people of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, the third reason that we should be infinitely concerned about these comments is, what is the real philosophy of the party which the Prime Minister of Canada heads? Is it the philosophy espoused by the Members to my right during the last two months? Or is it the philosophy spelled out by the Prime Minister of Canada in many articles and books, and in comments made in December of 1975? Is it the centralized philosophy of their Leader or do they really believe the free market society can function and should function? Mr. Speaker, it is time that the leadership of the parties in Canada and the leadership of the parties in Saskatchewan, have the courage of their own convictions and the courage of their parties' convictions and are prepared to state firmly what their philosophy is, where they are leading our people, and where we are going to end up. They have got to do so at a time when people have a chance to do something about it. Not six months after an election, but six months before an election. Because the people of this country and this province are fed up to the teeth with the two-faced attitude of the political leaders of this country. I will include, Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the Members to my right and the Members opposite, I will include members of my own party in this regard. The people of this country want to know where their politicians stand on some very basic questions. Do you intend to allow a free market society to function or not? Do you intend, for example, in Saskatchewan to bankrupt the landlords out of business in order to put the government into it or not? If not, then be prepared to say in black and white. Do you believe that in Canada the free market society can continue to function or not? If not, say so and let the people have their say as to whether or not you are able to stay in office.

Mr. Speaker, the real philosophy of the Members to my right seems to be that which holds on to power is best. Whatever pragmatic behavior we have to use is best. That certainly, Mr. Speaker, is the attitude of their Leader who received 80 per cent support of his party. Obviously the Members to my right were part of the 20 per cent of his own party who called for a leadership review. Obviously. Because they, of course, have told us in the last two months that they do not support this new direction, and they do not support this New Society. We will certainly wait to see with eager anticipation what they have to say about where they really stand as it relates to centralization of power.

The fourth thing that we should concern ourselves with today, Mr. Speaker, is what effect will long-term controls, regimentation, bureaucratization of every single aspect of our lives have on the individual citizen. Why should we be opposed to centralization of power? Why should we? Members opposite I am certain will say that we shouldn't, there is nothing wrong with it. We can work better for the little people, than the little people can for themselves, they say. We can think better than they can. We have the tools at our disposal to think better, therefore we can better tell them where to go, how to direct their lives, why to direct their lives.

Mr. Speaker, the Members opposite and the Prime Minister

seem to think that everyone in this country is a bookkeeper. Everyone has the capacity and capability to understand forms. And that the more forms that you bring into effect into this country, the better off we are going to be. Because then you can find out what people are really like, then you can find out what people are really thinking. Then you can control them better, if you put them all and slot them into a form. During the last two or three months as a result of my leaving some of my business activities, I found myself in a position of having to go back and become a bookkeeper again, which I hadn't done for ten years. The increase in the number of forms and red tape required by both federal and provincial governments in terms of the Unemployment Insurance Commission and the Workers' Compensation Board, Statistics Canada, Labor Relations, I'm sorry I don't want to get that wrong now, the Occupation and Health Committees, the increase in the amount of red tape that was necessary to maintain a small business that I saw in the last two months over what I saw ten years ago was literally unbelievable. Unbelievable. There is a form that is to be prepared for each employee under the Unemployment Insurance Commission and I wish I had brought a copy of it with me today to show you. No matter if you are a trained administrator and a chartered accountant, mind you the lawyers would understand, but if you are a trained administrator or a chartered accountant or a little guy or a businessman, I defy you to understand that form. I defy you to figure it out as to what you are supposed to fill in, what dates you are supposed to fill in and why you are supposed to fill it in. All of that information for each employee when they leave employment.

The Member to my right has suggested that there's the same problem in Alberta and there's the same problem in Ontario. I agree with the Member to my right. Of course, there is increased bureaucratization and centralization of power in Alberta and Ontario. Of course there is. And we do not deny the use of it. We believe strongly that that should not be allowed to continue in this country. It certainly should not be allowed to continue in Saskatchewan and should have less and less effect on us federally as soon as the period of inflation has been brought reasonably into line with short-term controls.

What happens to people when they become regulated and regimented? Our Member for Souris-Cannington suggested yesterday that the centralization of power was like the mumps. Well I agreed with him because it does have a tendency to spread to those areas of the body which bring about the zest for life. When a centralized planning committee decides that they want to make a set of dishes, they are going to end up with a set of white or grey dishes. If each individual citizen can make his own set of dishes, one will make a red one, one will make a green one, because a red one turns him on and a green one turns the other one on. But the centralized planner will make grey or white. Why? Because red would offend one person, green would offend another, yellow would offend another and you don't want to offend people because, my goodness, once you have planned their lives you wouldn't want to offend them. So you give them something that is non-offensive. You give them something that you decide. Or even worse the centralized planner instead of deciding not to offend people may say rather, we'll give the citizens what I think he should have because I know best, because I know better.

Mr. Speaker, we find that unacceptable.

During the recent potash debate, Members to my right suggested that there were no individuals in the Province of Saskatchewan who were capable of operating the potash mines in our province.

An Hon. Member: — You're out of order.

Mr. Collver: — Well, I don't think it's out of order because I'm leading up to something that the Prime Minister has said.

But somehow they feel that the U.S. corporations have a monopoly on talent. Mr. Speaker, the establishment has no monopoly on brains or technical expertise. The 'ins' have no monopoly on the ability to operate things. There are many people who are just as capable. I'm not suggesting when we have already spelled out our position on the potash takeover and we object to it strongly, but to suggest that somehow there is a monopoly on brains, the Liberal Party has no monopoly on brains.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Collver: — The Prime Minister of Canada has no monopoly on brains. The Government of Saskatchewan has no monopoly on brains. The Progressive Conservatives have no monopoly on brains.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Collver: — And for that reason, Mr. Speaker, the government should not have increasing amounts of control over the day to day lives of the citizens. Because when they have these kinds of controls over the day to day lives of the citizens, they take away the inherent right of that individual citizen to make decisions for himself or herself.

Because they don't have any monopoly on brains there is a tremendous penchant for making mistakes. Everyone makes mistakes. I attempted last evening to present to the Members opposite and they laughed at my suggestion, one of my experiences in the business community, when I lost, I'm not ashamed to admit that I lost in business. There's not a businessman worth his salt in Canada who hasn't lost once or twice or three times. Of course you are going to lose. The difference, Mr. Speaker, and I address these remarks to the Premier, as I said last evening was that I was risking my money, not the people's money. The difference was that when you nationalize an industry and take it over and try and operate it yourself with your planners, your party, your group are going to make mistakes and big ones. They are unfortunately going to spread right across the country.

In a free market society, Mr. Speaker, you have the situation in which many power centres operate. Business, labor, the church, varying business groups, boards of trade, labor unions, individuals. The Government's job surely in that kind of society is to ensure that no group becomes too powerful. If it does, to bring in the kind of regulation that is necessary to insure that it isn't, doesn't become powerful. In other words to merely keep a lid on the power structure.

Now, I noticed that one of the Members to my right had a smile there because he's going to say to himself, my goodness, that's exactly what the Prime Minister said, isn't it? That's precisely what the Prime Minister said. But that is not what the Prime Minister said. The Prime Minister said that the regulations and bureaucracy would continue if organizations didn't play ball with the Prime Minister. Now that's far different. I watched that interview, Mr. Speaker, and I saw and heard that. Yes, I did. If they don't play ball we may have to keep these controls and regulations on, beyond the three years.

I noticed also, Mr. Speaker, that the Prime Minister continued to refer to the words, three years, when in fact his own party and the House of Commons has already enacted a clause in the legislation that limits it to eighteen months. But he's now talking about three years.

Mr. Speaker, why is permanent centralization of power wrong? First of all, it takes away the individual rights. Second, it implies to individual citizens that somehow they don't have to be individually responsible. The more you regulate and control people's lives, the more people believe that somehow the state or big brother is going to look after all of their problems and they don't have to be individually responsible. Without individual responsibility, Mr. Speaker, there can be no individual freedom.

Another of the reasons why permanent centralization is wrong is that it gives you a possibility for political patronage. The more involved the government is in the control of the society and the economy of our life, the more susceptible are the officials of government to political patronage. We have witnessed in this province for example the appointment of former candidates, former MLAs and in fact in terms of the community college every single principal of the community college system in the Province of Saskatchewan is either a former NDP MLA, NDP Member of Parliament or NDP known campaign worker, Mr. Attorney General. Known campaign worker, Mr. Attorney General!

Mr. Speaker, it increases the opportunity for political patronage. We've seen an example of the kind of political patronage that occurs in the Federal Government, with the recent disclosure by Alvin Hamilton of political patronage in the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, the largest single reason, I think, for the problem of centralization of power and bureaucratization of our lives is that the chance of human error is much greater. If you dissipate the decision making power throughout society, if you allow many centres of influence to make decisions, decisions notice, not making input, but make decisions, if you allow many centres of influence to do it and the centralized planners merely are there as advisors, then your chance for human error is infinitely smaller, than it is if the centralized planners make the decision. Because the group of centralized planners no matter what the input, will make a decision that is either right or is wrong, or it's blah. It's part way between, it's a compromise. It affects unfortunately all of the people of the society in which we live. Whereas if the decisions are made in varying centres and the decision is wrong it doesn't affect all of our lives, it only affects

those who are involved in that location.

If the centralized planners in Ottawa, as the Prime Minister suggests, make the kind of decisions that are needed, and if you will notice for example, his anti-inflation board which he suggest is going to continue, which is headed up, Mr. Speaker, by a former Liberal Cabinet Minister, another example of political patronage, to suggest somehow that there wasn't someone who was available from the Progressive Conservative side of things or perhaps even better a relatively independent individual to head up the Anti-inflation Board. A former Liberal Cabinet Minister.

Mr. Speaker, if their decisions are affecting the lives of every Canadian, their decisions are countrywide and if their decisions are wrong in the long term and no one suggests for a moment that they shouldn't make these kinds of decisions in the short run, but in the long run they are unacceptable.

Mr. Speaker, the free market system is imperfect. The free market system is not Utopia. The free market system merely means that individuals have an opportunity to come from nowhere, from relatively humble beginnings and to make something out of their lives with hard work and diligence. The free market system says to the people of this country you have a choice to make. You can go out and choose between a red car and a green car and a purple car. But if the centralized planners decide on the color of the car, then you'll have a grey car and no choice.

The free market society allows these choices to be made. A centralized system does not. In our opinion the people of this country have got to be given the opportunity to make a firm decision as to whether they want to retain that kind of free market society and in our opinion, Mr. Speaker, they have only one choice, only one choice to make and that is, that kind of free society that kind of a society in which individual responsibility is expected, in which individual freedom is a right, in which individual initiative is rewarded, in which individuals are the prime essence of the state not the state itself? Mr. Speaker, this kind of society which does offer these kinds of choices can be preserved, can be made to last, but unfortunately it cannot if we are not firm in our resolve to make it last.

The least that the people of Saskatchewan and the people of Canada can expect from their politicians is a firm resolve, one way or another on where they stand as it relates to a free market society. They can expect no less, because in the next election in Saskatchewan and in the next election in Canada, we believe that it will be probably the last opportunity that the citizens of Saskatchewan and the citizens of Canada have to decide whether the so-called irreversible trend of centralization of power shall be ended. Because when the government, Mr. Speaker, acquires a majority of people under its direct aegis, what happens to the political parties in opposition? They must die. They will die because the party, the people who work for governments, who are directly responsible to governments or who owe their day to day livelihood to governments are very loathe to come forward and allow their names to be known as members of the party in opposition.

So what you will end up with, Mr. Speaker, is a party in

which organizations such as giant labor unions control one group and organizations in which giant companies control the other group and each has their own set of spokesmen. But how can the little guy have a spokesman if he is working for the government and is afraid to come forward and stand for a party that doesn't happen to agree with the government? If he's afraid to do that because he might lose his job or at the very least his chance for promotion. Mr. Speaker, we don't think we are very far away from a situation in which that is going to be prevalent. We think the next elections are probably, if not the last certainly close to the last opportunity that the people of this country are going to have to make a real choice.

I challenge the Members to my right and I challenge the Government opposite to stand up and be counted on this issue. Tell the people of Canada where you stand on centralization of power. Tell them where you stand on the increase of the bureaucracy. I know Mr. Attorney General is laughing, Mr. Speaker, because I believe he thinks to himself, well we just did I thought. But tell them where you stand so that the next time around they know precisely where you are at and not one little group in charge or say, well we stand, we're champions of free enterprise and their leader suddenly says, we need a new society, new directions, new attitudes, new everything. New is a wonderful word in advertising, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, we in the Progressive Conservative Party in Saskatchewan, believe strongly that the only possible way to maintain a free society is with the utilization of a free market society. We believe very strongly that unless organizations and small businesses and big businesses are allowed to help us develop our resources, to help us develop our lives as a choice. If the state controls directly all organizations, it will then control the thought process of the people because as a famous socialist from Saskatchewan once said, the man who pays the piper calls the tune. By the way, he got that from Robby Burns, I am sure everyone knows. I didn't want to give him credit where credit wasn't due. But if the man who pays the piper calls the tune and the Government controls and directs everybody's life in Canada, then they are going to call the tune and what opposition is going to be possible after that development.

Mr. Mostoway: — He also wrote, "To a Wee Mouse."

Mr. Collver: — He also wrote, "Ode to a Louse," for the benefit of the Member for Saskatoon Centre.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Collver: — Mr. Speaker, we in the Progressive Conservative Party of Saskatchewan want it known that we are concerned about the direction in which Canada is going and the fact that our Prime Minister is suggesting permanent controls, in the same fashion that we are concerned about the direction in which Saskatchewan is going in the centralization of power here.

Mr. Speaker, for that reason I move this Resolution.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. R.H. Bailey (Rosetown-Elrose): — Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to second this Resolution No. 35 and to speak briefly to this Assembly at this time.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to take any length of time, I think that our Leader has expressed our reasons for moving this particular Resolution. There are a few things which I should like to direct to the attention of this Assembly, both to the Members to my right and to the Members opposite.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that in looking at the Resolution and following it through to its source there are some comparisons that can be made in this Assembly and certainly some comparisons that can be made since last November. I think our Leader has done an adequate job in that regard. At the present time, Mr. Speaker, one of the things which concerns Canadians more than anything else is the attitude of the Prime Minister that he has towards Parliament. I think, Mr. Speaker, that his attitude towards Parliament, the disdain that he has for Parliament is one which is frightening Canadians a great deal. But in taking a look at the Liberal Party and why in fact the federal Liberal Party can allow, can even permit their Leader to make such a statement to cause such national confrontation even among their own party and certainly here in Saskatchewan, one has to go back historically and face the pattern of Liberal leadership. They have adopted a pattern of Liberal leadership which plays into the hands not only of the majority of the population but directly plays into the hands of the two central provinces. They have through the years, and one has to congratulate them because of the greed that they have for power, but they do in fact refuse to accept leadership outside of the two central provinces and when they took Mr. Trudeau, and I suspect very soon that they will, they'll be looking to the Province of Ontario.

Now I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I realize that in retaliation my friends to my right will probably make mention of the great numbers that are lining up and getting into the Conservative leadership and I would suggest if they have this in mind in the way of rebuttal or in the way of even comments in the House that they should remember that the national Conservative Party has at least gone out and selected leaderships from across Canada from the Atlantic to the Pacific and not try to rest the power of the party within the two central provinces.

Mr. Speaker, in taking a look at such slogans as 'participatory democracy' and then we heard the 'Just Society' and now we have the 'New Society' and the comments which now have been associated with the New Society are those which indeed are frightening to the people of this province. The arrogance that has been shown by the Prime Minister of Canada from time to time comes to the surface, his own thoughts emerge and it should not really upset the Members opposite with the statements that the Prime Minister makes. The Liberal Party knew the background and the philosophy of the Prime Minister long before he took advantage of the vacancy in the leadership. You know, Mr. Speaker, when we talk about this New Society and when I believe that I heard the Member for Arm River (Mr. Faris) make mention of Norway or Sweden, I would like to talk just for a moment, Mr. Speaker, about this New Society, about this utopian socialism.

My wife had the opportunity to go to Norway this summer

and as a result I said I would agree to the trip to Norway on the condition that she bring me back answers to 20 questions. I listed the 20 questions and although she is not particularly politically minded she did her homework and she did in fact bring back the answers from this so-called new society of Scandinavian socialism. I am not going to bore this House, Mr. Speaker, with the facts that she brought out, she went and dug them out, only to say, thank God, we don't have that kind of a new society in Canada. I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the information she brought back, the documents that she brought back, no person even on that side of the House would concur with that particular type of socialism.

Mr. Faris: — Let's have the facts.

Mr. Bailey: — You want some facts, I'll tell you some facts. My wife happens to have five first cousins still living in Norway, all expert tradesmen. What does a top rate carpenter get in Norway today, \$5.48 and over 58 per cent of that directly or indirectly is paid in taxes. That's the facts. Two dollars a dozen for stale eggs; \$2 a gallon for gas; \$6,000 for a poor Volkswagen. Don't tell me about your new society in the Scandinavian countries, Mr. Speaker. We don't want anything to do with it here. We don't want anything to do with the Prime Minister's New Society either. And they would be well advised if the Members opposite would wholeheartedly support this Resolution as I am sure that the people to the right will do as well.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. C.P. MacDonald: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I am going to go back a few weeks when I watched a man come into this House and into this Assembly, I watched him stand on his feet and lecture me on my behavior and on the behavior of Members all around on both sides of the House. He told me not to chew gum, he told me not to read newspapers and I quit all of those things because he was right.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — Mr. Speaker, then I heard him stand up on two or three occasions and say, "May God help him." I thought, oh, my goodness, a new look, a new man, a new philosophy has come into this Legislature, then this morning that philosophy and that new look went right out the door. Because if anybody had stood up in this House and called somebody on that side or this side two-faced and dishonest there would have been a brawl. But he stood up and attacked an individual who doesn't sit in this House. It was one of the cheapest political, gutter attacks that I have ever seen in this Assembly.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — Mr. Speaker, and the funny part of it is I have seen many resolutions attacking the Federal Government, that's the name of the game in Saskatchewan, the NDP have been carrying that on for 20 years, but it is always the Government of Canada, it always relates to an institution or to the Federal Government as a whole, not to a man or an individual. And you know something in some ways I can disagree with many things the

Federal Government does and I will say what I agree and what I disagree with but there is no way that I am going to belittle a man personally, individually, his background in the same, cheap, gutter way that you have done this morning, of that I am sure.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — The funny part of it, Mr. Speaker, when we talk about two-faced, I am going to tell the Leader of the Conservative Party, I don't know what you consider two-faced, but I will tell you what I consider two-faced. When a man who sits in this Assembly quietly and watches the free enterprise system in this province and perhaps in this country destroyed because of the expropriation of the biggest industry and sits there and says, I hope they pass the Bill, I want to make them accountable in four years. He stands there and does more to destroy free enterprise than any individual I have seen in this province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — I am going to tell you something. I am going to tell the Leader of the Conservative Party something and there are a lot of people who believe me, that if the Conservative Party had the courage of their convictions as you say and stood up and fought the potash bills, I don't believe that that Government would have ever been able to pass them.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — As you sat idly by and silently they laughed all the way to the bank. They laughed all the way to the bank. Instead of having 60 per cent of the people oppose the potash takeover, there was 30 per cent. The representatives of 30 per cent. You did more to pass the potash bills and destroy free enterprise in this province than any man whom I have ever seen in this House who is supposed to stand for free enterprise.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — And then he would stand up two months later and espouse the free enterprise system. Then you turn around and try for cheap political advantage and that's all. You know, the Conservative Party, somebody mentioned the leadership convention. Yes, there is a leadership convention and thank God the Conservatives have found something to talk about because they have got nothing else to talk about.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — But you as a party couldn't stand up in this House and talk about potash, you didn't talk about Saskatchewan, you didn't talk about free enterprise, all you can do is stand up in this House and attack somebody.

The other day I watched the Member for Moose Jaw South or North, or wherever he comes from, attack a Member in your House and it made me ill. But I didn't make me any more ill

than when I watched you this morning and I want to say that honestly. You know it is about time, it is amazing, the Leader of the Conservative Party finally found something he can get his teeth into. I don't think he understood the economic significance of the potash takeover but that is the kind of thing, oh, I'm not going to go into your background or your reputation because that is something that shouldn't come up in this House.

Mr. Speaker, free enterprise is at stake in Canada, no question about it and the whole concept that this country can best manage itself with a minimum of government interference and government bureaucracy is being challenged. It is being challenged in a lot of areas and a lot of places. It is being challenged, in, for example, the provinces of Manitoba and Alberta. They bought out a free enterprise airline and then they turned around and put all regulations and royalties and set up a market system in the oil industry. More regimentation and control of the resource industry until this Government came along, came right out of the Province of Alberta. And I am going to say, yes, it is unfortunate and it is unfortunate because I think that it isn't the free enterprise system that is at fault today. What is at fault is the set of economic circumstances on a world-wide basis where political interference in the oil industry and the middle East, the inflationary spiral that has taken place in some countries in Europe, particularly socialist countries, has had an impact on the free enterprise system. Certainly it does require some strong measures whereby it is going to turn around and do what it can to prevent this particular inflation from destroying the very free enterprise of the free economy that all of us believe has built such a great country. But to suggest from an individual philosophizing that that means that a political party or a political institution in this country is turning away and throwing out the can with the milk, or whatever the word or expression is, that is just as nonsensical as your remarks here this morning.

I am going to tell you something, there are two or three things that we in this Assembly must do and I am going to propose an amendment. That amendment is a very clear amendment. What it does, it states very categorically that Canada does have a crisis and just as Mr. Stanfield and the Conservative Party recommended strong measures, we are suggesting that strong measures are required at this moment and it is time that the Provincial Government of Saskatchewan got off its prat and did something about it. I suggest that the Premier and the Minister of Finance are doing nothing in Saskatchewan is simply because they want to get all those happy little contracts signed, the 20 per cent or the 18 per cent. Get all the problems out of the way. Invest all the money in additional wages and expenditures in the next four or five years built into costs. Then when they get the problems out of the way, they'll sign the agreement. I am not sure whether the Federal Government should have changed its mind, in a year some people may say that was courage to recognize the mistake or to recognize a changing situation one year later. I am not going to discuss that. I am going to tell you something, that it is time for action and they did take some action. I support that action right now, and I abhor controls as much as any Member of the Conservative Party and any individual in Canada.

The second thing, I also believe is that controls on the Canadian economy must be temporary.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — I believe that they must be taken off at the earliest possible opportunity. That's why I wonder what the NDP are going to do, because in rent control they are leaving a blank cheque, they refused to put a time limit on it. The Federal Government at this time has recommended three years. As far as I am concerned they have a responsibility to live up to that three year period that is endorsed in their legislation and put before the Parliament of Canada. I believe that we should remove those controls at the earliest opportunity and if they are no longer necessary after 12 months or 18 months or two years, then I think we should once again restore the economy to as much freedom as humanly possible to see it grow and develop in the free market system as it has been in the past.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — What is even more important is that Resolution of yours said nothing. It didn't zero in on the problem, it didn't try to emphasize the need of leadership in this province and of all governments of Canada.

The third thing that amendment is going to do is call upon government at all levels federal and provincial to show genuine leadership by having real cutbacks in their own expenditures and that this should be done immediately, not six months down the road when there are already built in costs continuing to go on. I think that is important in a resolution calling for the removal of controls on a period of time. I think it is time that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Smishek) showed some responsibility in this regard, spoke to this Assembly indicating where this Provincial Government is going.

You know when the Prime Minister of Canada stands up and talks about big government and big bureaucracy I am very interested in seeing how sincere the Federal Government is in its cutbacks and its attempts to remove bureaucracy and big government control. There are a lot of things that were said that evening that I agree with, even though I don't agree with the continuance of controls beyond the legislated responsibility for legislative control. I think there isn't a farmer in western Canada who doesn't believe that big labor has got completely out of hand.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — That doesn't believe that today in a labor dispute there are no longer two parties that are fighting, the employer and the employee, but the third party the innocent public. Already today western Canadian farmers have seen four and five hundred dockworkers or longshoremen attempt to destroy the very economy of every western farmer, and they think that it is time something was done about big labor. I don't think that any of us can deny that there are occasions when big business certainly gets out of hand as well.

So all I can say is, when somebody sits down and philosophizes and then people like to pick out that little point here and there and try to make the cheap political issue that this Resolution indicates. I don't agree with it and I think this

House should destroy it by voting against it. I think it does discredit to the Leader of the Conservative Party and discredit to his entire caucus.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — The last thing that it should urge, big unions, big business and big government to restrain their enormous and destructive financial demands on the Canadian people so that inflation can be beaten and the Wage and Price Control Board can be wound up at the earliest possible time.

It is no good talking about restraint or wage and price controls unless there is a change of outlook by labor, by big business and most important of all by government and it means less bureaucratic control, less bureaucracy. One of the most astounding things that has come into this Legislature — I should like to ask somebody to look at the Government Directory of 1971 and the Government Directory of 1975. It is frightening! One is seven or eight times as big and indicates the growth and bureaucracy in civil servants.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to speak any longer. I want to repeat what I have said. I think this particular Resolution is a disgrace. First of all it is badly drafted. Imagine, whoever heard of anybody having a permanent movement. The only permanent movement I know of just happened to my left here an hour ago. That is the kind of phraseology and that is the kind of thing that occurred in that particular thing. It is nice to see the Conservatives respond as they did last night. It is too bad they couldn't — it reminded me about the story of the widow who got married again. She said, my God, it is amateur night again. Here last night as we watched him respond, after three months in this Assembly we had three or four of them make their maiden speeches. Then today they get into the House with this kind of cheap political Resolution. I urge them to come to their senses. I urge the Government, amend it sure, amend mine, but make it something that is worthwhile so that it indicates to the people of Canada how you and I feel about controls, about restraint, about inflation and the direction of the Canadian economy.

Mr. Speaker, because of that, I should like to move the following amendment, seconded by Mr. Cameron (Regina South): That all the words after the word "Assembly" be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

Urges the Federal Government to continue to recognize:

- (1) That the critical economic situation now facing the Canadian economy as a result of the national and global inflationary spiral demands urgent action.
- (2) That any controls placed on the market place must be temporary and must not be allowed to hinder the free growth and development of our system that has provided Canadians with one of the highest standards of living of any nation in the world.
- (3) That any program of restraint must begin with real cutbacks in government spending both at the provincial and federal level.
- (4) And urges big business, big unions and big government to restrain their enormous and destructive financial

demands on the Canadian people so that inflation can be beaten and the national wage and price control board can be wound up at the earliest possible time.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. S.J. Cameron (Regina South): — Mr. Speaker, I am happy to rise to second the amendment which obviously I will be supporting. I will not be supporting the Resolution for reasons I will indicate.

The Hon. Member spoke during the course of his remarks and made some rather interesting statements I thought. One, he found some particular magic in consistency and said in effect that I would rather be wrong and consistent, than right and inconsistent. I am going to remind the Member of the words of Ralph Waldo Emerson who said, "Foolish consistency is a hobgoblin of little minds." And I want you to bear that in mind when you speak about consistency in the future.

The Member for Indian Head-Wolseley (Mr. MacDonald) has indicated that if there is some significance to this Resolution the chief significance I think that it affords us yet another opportunity to assess the work in the capacity of the Member for Nipawin who leads the Conservative Party. We have had the chance these last two months to come to some assessment of what this individual who aspires to be the Premier of this province has behind the image. I think, as the Member for Indian Head-Wolseley said when we came to this House on November 12th, two months ago, few, if any of us, knew very much about the man behind the image. Oh, we saw the image through May and June, we've seen the slicker than slick Madison Avenue approach. We have seen the Leader of the Conservative Party riding into Moose Jaw on a white horse, crying, "Workers or Conservatives of the world unite you have nothing to lose but your chains." These were words of a great leader. In the mouth of the Member for Nipawin they were nothing but words, words, words. I am told that some years ago this Assembly had in the way of an Attorney General, a Mr. Corman, under the days of the old CCF, who never had very much to say in the House, indeed they told me he was very quiet in the House. But he had a radio program I am told and each week he went on his radio program with scathing attacks on the Liberals and scathing attacks on everything in sight except his own Government but never had anything to say in the House and that reminded me of the Member for Nipawin. They used to refer to Attorney General Corman as a lion on the airwaves and a mouse in the House.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cameron: — I think it is fair to say that in some small part maybe that applies to the Member for Nipawin, the corridor orator, as he has become known. I think it is fair to say, too, that we all wondered with some considerable interest a couple of months ago when this man took his seat, what qualities of leadership, what capacities of statesmanship, what powers of mind and judgment and purposes and commitment were here housed in this leader. That was the subject of keen speculation among us on this side and I expect pretty keen speculation by Members opposite and I know, some keen speculation among the thoughtful and non-aligned electorate of the province. What is now emerging little by little, it is taking some time, is that we are

beginning to see laid, little by little and block upon block bits of evidence upon which we can begin to assess those questions that I referred to about this Member and his leadership. And I want in respect of this particular Resolution to invite an analysis of it, is yet another of the slowly developing bases upon which we can make that analysis about the leadership capacity of that Member.

I want to refer to the remarks directly of the Prime Minister. I was interested indeed to hear the Member suggest that he had actually heard the remarks. I think he said he saw it, I don't think he said he heard it. Because based upon some of the statements he made one would surely come to the conclusion that he didn't pay very much attention if, indeed, he had seen what was said. Members know that in the Program W5 just before the New Year, the Prime Minister was interviewed by Carol Taylor and by Bruce Philips, which has become, I understand, a standard routine and a bit of a tradition with CTV at the end of the year. It was in a sense a very excellent interview by two professionally capable people. It did in its course elicit from the Prime Minister of the country some rather significant statements about where we are at present and about where we are going in the future. It deserves in my view a careful analysis by all Canadians and by all Saskatchewanites as well and it deserves in particular a fairly careful analysis by the leadership in this province and those who would aspire to the leadership of this province.

I want to ask you if what he said earlier in the morning when the Member for Nipawin was speaking to this Resolution was a careful and thoughtful analysis of those statements or was it instead as the Member for Indian Head-Wolseley has indicated, a pretty crass political effort to ride what is perceived by him to be a wave of negative criticism.

What the Prime Minister said in that interview has a very real effect upon us as it does upon all Canadians. I want to refer therefore to some of the statements that were made by him and I can assure the Member for Nipawin that we on this side of the House have the courage to say frankly and forthrightly what we agree with and to say just as candidly what we disagree with. The Prime Minister spoke in the first instance of value. He said and I quote from the transcript of the CTV interviews:

The values which served in other times were probably values which could serve well now. Belief in sharing, belief in being good trustees of what we have, belief in tolerance and in freedom.

I would ask the Member for Nipawin whether he would disagree with that statement? To be fair-minded about it I would guess that you would not disagree with that statement. That's one of the five or six core principles mentioned by the Prime Minister.

He talked secondly about the economy being out of joint, but he preceded his comments by saying:

I am no missionary in this, I just think that there are certain basic realities which obviously are showing that the economy is out of joint, when you have very high unemployment and very high inflation at the same time.

It doesn't take the Prime Minister of Canada to convince anybody in Canada that for some period of time our economy has been out of joint with the type of inflation we have seen and the high levels of unemployment we have seen. Again I am certain the Member for Nipawin would not disagree with that statement.

Let me turn to a third statement. The Prime Minister was asked by Bruce Phillips, referred to a syndicalistic or corporate state where the Government deals directly with big groups such as corporations and labor unions and every year makes a social and economic contract, is that the kind of thing you want, he said to the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister said:

I think if we are going to carry on this discussion one thing I want to make clear at the outset is that there is no master plan in my mind or in some elite group in the Prime Minister's office to tell the world in general and Canada in particular where it must go over the next little while. I think there is a great deal of unease in society.

I draw that to the attention of the Member for Nipawin because that opening statement was to refer to the several points of principle which the Prime Minister was making.

He spoke of liberalism and so did the Member for Nipawin saying that the Federal Liberal Party had somehow sold itself short in pursuing the goals of liberalism. The Prime Minister said:

Liberalism is a way of thinking, a way of approaching problems to make sure the individual gets the maximum of respect and hopefully as great an amount of equality or opportunity in Canada and in the world as is possible without being doctrinaire about it. And if the times as I have described them indicate that you need more control of the big people as we are doing exactly in our anti-inflation program which was endorsed by Bob Stanfield, incidentally, then we are making them enforceable as against what, big companies, big unions and big governments. (He said), if you need that kind of control in order to permit more flourishing liberty, in all other areas including small enterprise, then liberalism hasn't taken a fallback, it has advanced.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cameron: — I don't expect because those comments are couched in terms of liberalism that the Member for Nipawin would agree with them. I wouldn't expect he would agree with them either because they are founded on commonsense, which liberalism is founded in its form and in reasonable dogma.

The Prime Minister was asked another point, the question was, would this not — with that kind of a relationship evolving — would that not be taking us somewhat closer — and I know you resist labels but for ready reference — would that not be bringing us closer to something such as a corporate state or a syndicalist state with, for example, a much greatly reduced role for power. The answer was, which comes back quite

differently than the Member for Nipawin would lead us to believe, the answer was:

No I do not see it that way. I was never a follower of syndicalism or corporatism or guild socialism.

I don't know what more a man has to say than that to be freed of the kinds of charges that the Member for Nipawin would make.

Then he makes a point about the controls being permanent, that is the Member for Nipawin. The Prime Minister was asked this question about the permanency of the controls. Carol Taylor asked him:

There has been hints along the way in your discussions about this and also the fact that most of what you have done in the past couple of months seems very much like Galbraith; things he is recommending for the planning sector of society versus the free market. He suggests (Galbraith) that there would have to be some kind of permanence and I haven't heard you rule that out.

The Prime Minister says:

Perhaps, I am not as wise and experienced as Galbraith, but there is no doubt that his thinking has permeated my thoughts and a lot of other people. Perhaps where I would not want to make the statement that Galbraith makes about these controls being permanent, is perhaps that I am less of a pessimist than he or perhaps even less of a realist. The way I view it, is that we are going to use three years of controls in order to get people to change some attitudes and some institutions, and because I believe they will change, then we won't have to keep the controls.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cameron: — He said:

I view this control period as breathing space. Give us time to make the changes and I think that at the end of the three years we will be able to decontrol a great deal of sectors and a great deal of people.

Again, I say that is a far cry from what the Member for Nipawin would lead us to believe what the Prime Minister said, which led me to question whether he had watched the interview or indeed had taken some time to read it since.

The Prime Minister talked also about government, and I am going to ask the Member for Nipawin if he would agree or disagree with this statement because again it is one of about six essential statements that were made in the course of that interview. The Prime Minister said:

I think it is true and I think it is probably not a bad reaction of people saying, well, we have been, you know, trying to do too many things at once. That means that we have probably been a bit over-governed at the federal-provincial and municipal level.

I pause and ask the Member for Nipawin whether or not he would

agree with that statement. And that again is one of the half a dozen crucial statements made in that interview. The Prime Minister is saying we are over-governed. Then he goes on to say:

People are saying to the Government, stand back awhile, let us survey the scene. Tax us a bit less. Give us a little bit less of the free stuff and we will take a new inventory in a year or two down the road. I think that is a good reaction from people.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cameron: — He went on to say and again I ask the Member for Nipawin if he wouldn't agree with this statement. And again I say it is a fair guess that he would, if he is at all consistent, if he finds so much magic in consistency. The Prime Minister said:

Certainly that is what the Government is attempting to do in its White Paper on Inflation. It says, that we are going to try and reduce the percentage of all goods and services we have consumed by government . . . and I think that is a good reaction (he said).

Of course, I assure the Member for Nipawin, the Liberal Party in Saskatchewan has no problem whatever with those kinds of statements.

Mr. Speaker, I said we would have first of all the responsibility to look at what was said and pay more attention to what was said than what is being perceived as having been said. To have the courage as the Member for Nipawin challenged us to do, to say where do you agree and where do you disagree. I have outlined a series of four or five basic principles that emerged in that interview with which we agreed. There is one more.

The Prime Minister was asked about strikes. He was asked:

Do you think that the moves you are taking now or perhaps some moves you are anticipating in the future are going to lessen the number of strikes that we have been having to live with as Canadians?

Here is the answer, and I wonder what the Member for Nipawin would say to this answer:

Question, is it going to reduce the numbers of strikes?

Answer, yes. If we understand and believe in what I am talking about, there will be less strikes because we will agree more in advance on what a reasonable share of the pie is.

I am sure that the Member for Nipawin wouldn't disagree with that statement. That is why I tell you if you had looked at the statement and analysed carefully and thoughtfully as is now your responsibility as a leader of a party in this province, you couldn't have stood on your feet this morning and said what you said.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cameron: — We have some concerns about not so much perhaps what was said as what was not said in that interview. We have some concern with emphasis about what was said and what was not said. I want to refer, as the Member invited us to do very specifically, to those points with which I said we agree and those with which we disagree. We had hoped that the Prime Minister would have emphasized more clearly the need to have these controls removed two or three years down the road. We were concerned with the quiet implication that may have been left in what he said about the inevitability of having to maintain some control of that drive. He didn't state it in the terms in which the Member for Nipawin has indicated but there is enough ambiguity about what he said, so that one, even of a reasonable mind, can say I am a little concerned about the emphasis, and we have that concern about the emphasis. We would have liked to have seen the Prime Minister say more forthrightly what we have believed to be the essential strength of our society as a matter of philosophy in the Liberal Party. I am going to refer the Member for Nipawin to what we consider to be of fundamental importance in terms of philosophy, he invited us to do that. And where we perhaps differ from his party and where we most assuredly differ from the Members opposite.

I had occasion to have been invited by the Chamber of Commerce in Regina, as was the Minister of Consumer Affairs (Mr. Shillington) to submit to the Chamber of Commerce magazine an article in September and October about what we believed in fundamental terms in what directions we saw governments going in. I said, that I thought, we as a Liberal Party believed that our greatest fundamental strength as a people was rooted in our freedom, freedom of enterprise and our attitudes about ourselves and our society and our values. We said that we are still confident as a people in our ability to achieve whatever we set out to achieve. We like to work hard because the benefits of our hard work flow quickly and directly to us and we are determined that the fruits of our labor not be wasted. We strive as a people by nature to continuously improve, and this for the Members opposite, particularly, and by nature as a people we are trusting. We are not ungenerous in appreciating and meeting our social responsibilities. But we are independent. We cherish our freedom, we are confident of our abilities and we don't take readily to notions born of mistrust and suspicion of us by government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cameron: — We don't take readily to government notion that constrains our freedom to choose or that assumes that we must be protected constantly, even from our own folly.

Government action that chips away at these fundamental attitudes of ours, whether it be provincial government action or federal government action, that would erode our will to work, would sap our confidence or initiative and mistrusts our freedom is a misguided and indeed a foolish government.

Inevitably that kind of misguided government that has no sense of what has been our real strength in terms of our attitude and our freedom of enterprise, would lead us inevitably all to a common mediocrity.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cameron: — I say that we will say that with respect to policy or legislation by a provincial government, this government or a national government because that is what we believe. It matters not to us whether the Federal Liberal Party is in power nationally, if they begin to chip away and erode those attitudes that we think are our fundamental strength in terms of philosophy, we will be critical of it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cameron: — These fundamentals need to be articulated more today perhaps that at any time in the last several years, as we more and more embrace the notion that the collective and that the government is all wise and must be all protective and all powerful. That the government can and must solve all our problems and set all our courses because we are not capable of rational choice. It said that we had to approach from our party's point of view in terms of philosophy the work of government with the fundamental assumption that it had not to interfere with the freedom of the individual except in the clearest cases of necessity.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cameron: — That it ought at all times respect the right of people to choose for themselves and not assume that government is somehow better equipped to make the choices or indeed necessarily has the right always to make them.

We said surely the right approach by government is to respect people, the right of the people to choose for themselves. In any other approach whether philosophically or practically it is bad. And to the underlying and fundamental principle therefore is that to the maximum extent possible people should be left to choose for themselves.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cameron: — I want to remind the Members opposite that that is what we find is so wrong with the approaches that they use, particularly economically, rooted as they so often are in the dogma of the left rather than in reason. And in their rigorous moving over and taking the province in those leftist kind of directions, economically, I am not speaking socially, all Members would agree that in terms of social programs, your party and its predecessor had a reasonably good record, in terms of economics it is very bad indeed.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cameron: — We say too, it is bad fundamentally for several other reasons. Because it is based so often again as I say on a mistrust and a suspicion of the ability of people to do things for themselves. Because for some reason you cannot accept the capacity of the individual to begin to do something for himself. Because you mistrust the notion of earning money and

because you are suspicious of people who prosper. I say to you that is what we on this side of the House consider to be so very, very important in terms of our fundamental strength as a people. It is an attitude and a notion that we have held throughout all these years which you people, little by little, are eroding. And which in the end result, as I say, leads Saskatchewan to a common mediocrity in a nation which is going to be anything but mediocre.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

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

Mr. Cameron: — Mr. Speaker, before lunch I was directing a number of observations in a number of areas. The first one I asked Members to consider was this Resolution. With this question in mind, did the Conservative Leader give us a thoughtful close analysis of what was actually said by the Prime Minister in that interview or did he opt instead to give us a shallow partisan, carefully calculated effort to ride a crest of what he foresees as negative public opinion. As I said I would leave that to Members to decide. It didn't escape my attention that this Resolution appeared on the Order Paper the very day the Member rose and introduced the two Conservative Members of Parliament, Alvin Hamilton and Frank Hamilton, to us. That is the day the Resolution appeared on the Order Paper.

Mr. Collver: — On a point of clarification, that is not true.

Mr. Cameron: — Not only did the Resolution tend to coincide in time with the visit by Alvin Hamilton, when one looks at the substance of the Resolution, one can see Alvin Hamilton all over it.

I said the second area that I wanted to make some comment about and which I directed some comment to, the seven key statements which appeared to have been made by the Prime Minister in the interview. And I quoted those seven statements. The first one you will recall was as to values, his perception of where we are going in terms of value. I put that to the Member for Nipawin. I talked secondly about the statement of the Prime Minister's that the economy was out of joint in view of the high inflation we have had. The third one was the need at present that he expressed — that is the Prime Minister — to intervene with big companies, big unions and big government, in order to protect the average citizen and small enterprise. The fourth one was the Prime Minister's rejection of syndicalism, corporatism and socialism, which he made clearly. The fifth key comment which he made was the need for government to tax less, to give us less of what he called the free stuff. And to talk about the need to curb strikes and how he foresaw the period ahead of us resulting in fewer strikes than what we have had in the past months. I said of those seven statements we could live comfortably with six. And indeed any fair-minded person I think on both sides of the House, including the Member for Nipawin could live with six of those statements.

I said we found some difficulty with the respect to the seventh. Talking here about the permanency or lack of

permanency of the controls. I said there was one area where we have some disagreement with the emphasis which the Prime Minister did not give to the need clearly to end the controls after the three year period. He said, as I read the transcript, that he was optimistic about the controls being taken away and dropped after three years. But on the other hand he left the impression that in some circumstances those controls may have to be maintained. If we have a difference, we have a difference in that area. I said that our position and the position of the Saskatchewan Liberal Association is that these controls must be temporary and these controls must not be permanent.

I then referred to some fundamental beliefs of ours and some fundamental philosophy in this respect and how we viewed with concern, any government, national or provincial, that would chip away at which we perceive to be our fundamental strengths. Our attitudes of independence, our will to work, our confidence in ourselves and our abilities, our freedom and our place as individuals. I said that any government, national or provincial, that would begin to erode those fundamentals which we consider so important would be a foolish government, and we will not hesitate to say it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cameron: — I should be very clear that we reject the notion, wherever it might originate, that governments must do everything for us short of relieving us of the burden of thought. As I say wherever that notion may originate and there are some people including some people in this Assembly who advance that notion, that governments somehow have to do everything for us, short of relieving us of the burden of thought, some, indeed, would even takeover and relieve us of having to think for ourselves in respect of some issues. I think the advertisements on the potash legislation is an example of that kind of an attitude.

I was referring, Mr. Speaker, to an article which I was asked to write some months ago, in the month of October, before this Session came into sitting in November and I want to read another extract from that article to make this point; that we didn't come by our position on the need for wage and price controls to end in a three year period, at most, in the last little while. That has been our position from the very moment that these controls were announced. We didn't come by it only a few days ago, or only in connection with this debate and to prove my point I want to read again from that article.

It said:

Turning then to legislative priorities in the province I expect that in the immediate period ahead of us we would be concerned with the provincial application of national wage and price control program. We will, therefore, be concerned with the wage guidelines as they apply to provincial jurisdictions, with rent controls and with controls on professional fees and the like.

This was written in October anticipating the Session.

We do not yet know whether the Provincial Government will agree to abide by the guidelines, whether it will set up its own apparatus or whether it will sign an

agreement with Ottawa divesting to the National Anti-inflation Board jurisdiction to enforce the program within Saskatchewan's boundaries.

And, indeed, here it is some three or four months later and we still wonder about those very questions. It went on to say, and this is the key:

But of one thing we can be certain, this period is ready made for those who advocate a government planned and controlled economy and in dealing with this program I think we have to remember always, that it is a temporary expedient, an extraordinary measure to meet an extraordinary problem. There is great danger for the future at our being conditioned to accept intervention of this kind on a permanent basis. We will have to exercise a greater measure of vigilance than ever to ensure that the Provincial Government not use the present circumstances for further permanent intrusion into the private sector.

That is the Liberal position, that has been the Liberal position much earlier than today or the day that this Member put his Resolution on the Order Paper. That was our position, clearly stated, in October of last year, in anticipation of this Session and if I may say so, was a rather perceptive appreciation for what was going to happen when this Session came in.

We also said, at that time, that we saw that the resource policy will continue to occupy much of the attention of the Legislature. As the Provincial Government retreats a bit from some of this legislation in the past two or three years and we saw that with the announcement from the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Whelan) about changes in the Bill 42 policy. So we said we anticipated some minimum retreat, but then the Provincial Government will follow through on the extension of its oil and gas and potash policies to other resources.

Mr. Speaker, I was interested last night in particular to observe the Members opposite cheer and applaud as their House leader wound up the debate on Bill No. 2 for them. And, again, I wondered as I have so often done, and I make this point to underline the independent critical attitude which exists on this side of the House, in this caucus, in this party as distinct from the guise that appears over there. I wondered how they had, in such a short time, surrendered their independence and their judgment. I wondered to whom they had surrendered it. Was it to the Premier and his name; was it the style of the Attorney General that so infatuates them? Or were they relieved of the burden of thought by the 17 or 18 people who occupy the Cabinet.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cameron: — I was reminded then and reminded again this morning and when I went out at lunch time to pick up a book of a little piece of poetry by William Cowper, Mr. Speaker, he was one of the earlier romantic poets. I want to read a little passage of that piece of poetry written so many years ago, and which has stood the test of time so well in respect to the Members opposite, I refer to the backbenchers. He wrote:

Some, to the fascination of a name
Surrender judgment hoodwink'd. Some the style
Infatuates, and through labyrinths and wilds
Of error leads them, by a tune entranced,
While sloth seduces more, too weak to bear
The insupportable fatigue of thought,
And swallowing therefore, without pause or choice,
The total grist unsifted, husks and all.

I don't know that there is a clearer expression than what we have seen by the Members opposite who don't form the front Treasury Benches in connection with that debate.

Mr. Speaker, I want to pursue that line more at greater length. I want to pursue the position that I have put to you that we have taken an independent course, where we agree with certain things we will say forthrightly we agree and where we don't we will be candid in that too. I say, I want to develop those points a little further and I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

RESOLUTION NO. 38 - PROVIDE ADDITIONAL FUNDS TO IMPROVE RECREATIONAL FACILITIES IN RURAL SASKATCHEWAN

Miss L.B. Clifford (Wilkie) moved, seconded by Mr. McMillan (Kindersley):

That this Assembly requests the Government of Saskatchewan to consider providing additional funds to improve the recreational facilities and opportunities in rural Saskatchewan.

She said: Mr. Speaker, I have proposed this Resolution which I will speak very briefly on today because I feel that it is a Resolution that is not condemning the Government, it is just asking them to consider some new alternatives, perhaps some new priorities for the area of opportunities in rural Saskatchewan recreational facilities.

I have put it in that form not to limit cities in any sense but I feel that it is especially significant in rural communities because to keep rural communities together is one of the topics that has been much talked about in the House and this is one of our main aims. Recreation, we find, hold communities together in rural Saskatchewan.

There are a number of reasons why recreation is important and how it can act as a catalyst in rural Saskatchewan, mainly because the rural communities are smaller in number. The people there know each other and they can work together for a common goal. It seems to me that one common goal in these areas is recreational facilities and opportunities.

There are a number of reasons why I feel we should be concerned about this and that is that as our jobs are more technically advanced, as you well know, more leisure time becomes available, community involvement, as I mentioned, becomes more significant. You can also get unity between governments, between municipal affairs, between the people in the communities working for a common cause. There are a number of reasons why

these goals in recreation can succeed and I don't by any means, propose that the Government should support all recreation facilities, because one of the things that keeps the rural communities together is the fact that they are working together and they don't need a handout by government. But we must look and see what our priorities are in these areas and, perhaps, we could give them additional encouragement and assistance if we feel our priorities are not being affected to as great an extent as they might be.

I have mentioned that the rural communities can work together and rural people work together, and I think it is significant to mention at this time that there are other ways beside government assistance that have helped communities. Donations, by the people there naturally helped recreational programs. I know, for instance, in our area the people have given \$10,000 just for a heating plant in their recreational facility, so that they are more than willing to contribute their funds to help in this way. Besides this there are communities, and I would just like to mention a couple of them that have been assisted by companies, and I am not trying to say that one way is better than another, but I am trying to stress the point that there are many ways to improve recreation facilities.

Communities like Delisle and Vanscoy — and I think you might find this interesting as far as recreational facilities are concerned — the mayor of Delisle has given me some information as well as an accountant of one of the potash companies. I am not trying to renew the potash debate. The mayor said that from \$10,000 to \$15,000 of supplies in use of heavy equipment were donated and these are just some of the things that were given by the potash company to build their recreational facility there. At Vanscoy, \$5,000 was given to a skating and changing room to develop recreational facilities. A local golf club has given \$1,000 a year in Delisle; raffle tickets are printed by the companies to help the communities raise money for recreational facilities; all of the recreational organizations, whether they be for 4H, Boy Scouts, or minor sport organizations are supported by Cominco Mines; rubber matting in the community and Delisle centre for \$2,000 was given for backstops for baseball. What I am trying to point out is that not only the people in the communities contribute to the financing of recreational facilities in these areas. So that there are a number of ways in which recreational facilities can be supported in the rural communities, not just by government or by government funds. I think that we all would admit that no one is looking for a handout in these areas, but I think that we have to realize that perhaps this is one of the needing areas that will be upcoming in the future, because whether or not we would like to admit it, work increases leisure time, we have to support methods by which, not only young people, but people of all ages can use their time to the best of their ability. That this what we should be looking for.

The Department that bests looks after recreation in rural areas, or in all areas, I think you would agree with me would be the Department of Culture and Youth. I would read the primary objective of the Department of Culture and Youth in 1970 and I presume their objective, although it wouldn't have to be the same one, I presume it has the same ideas behind it and it says:

The primary objective of the Provincial Youth Agency is to improve the quality of life through the establishment of greater opportunities for youth, to discover and develop their talents. The school system is facing and will continue to face increasing demands for our changing society. The out of school hours, the leisure time provides an opportunity for young people to broaden their education, improve their vocational competence, develop their skills and talents and become actively involved in community and provincial affairs. The Youth Agency realizes and appreciates the contributions made by thousands of volunteers. The preservation of economy, freedom of planning and action is essential to ensure effective involvement by volunteers. The roles of the Agency are therefore those of a catalyst, a consultant, a stimulator, a researcher and a helper.

This Department, the Department of Culture and Youth has done an admirable job in Saskatchewan and is continuing to do so. It was started in 1965 and when you look at the amount which was spent just on recreational facilities in 1969; for the first nine months it was about \$250,000 and now for the same area it is about \$330,000 for recreational facilities.

Now I am the first one to admit that the programs in the Department of Culture and Youth have been expanded and that the budget is \$6 million. The idea that I am trying to get across is that perhaps we could look at what our priorities as a government should do. I said that the priorities for the Department of Culture and Youth as I have read them, are admirable ones and they do help the people of Saskatchewan. But, for too long recreation has been considered as only a fun time for people, so there has been a token department or token area, that we, perhaps should put some extra money if there is any. It is our job to investigate our priorities in this Department. I am not meaning to condemn or whatever and I have said that they have done a great job. It is up to us to decide that perhaps we may be looking at higher priorities for this Department.

I was very pleased to see that the Minister who is responsible for Education and for Culture and Youth are one and the same and I think that we can work together in municipal affairs, in education, in community colleges and we can combine our recreational programs and our community college programs so that they are not working against one another. In some cases this is happening, unfortunately, because where recreational departments in towns are not being consulted by community colleges, there is a disadvantage because they could be working the same programs together. Added planning and working together could help in this department and help for the progress of the people of Saskatchewan.

I don't have much more to say other than that I would hope that everyone here could consider this motion. We are attempting to propose more positive and realistic solutions that will put our province ahead of other provinces in this area by putting recreation as a top priority and not just as a token department in Saskatchewan.

I so move this Resolution.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. A.E. Blakeney (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I know that the Minister of Culture and Youth and the Minister of Education (Mr. Tchorzewski) will want to enter this debate so I propose, in a moment, to adjourn the debate to give him that opportunity. Before I do so, I think it perhaps would be useful to call to the attention of the House the fact that during the last short number of years there has been a very great increase in the amount of funds provided for recreational facilities and for recreational opportunities in rural Saskatchewan and that the results are there to be seen in many, many communities in rural Saskatchewan.

I have had the opportunity during the past number of years to go about the province a good deal. I make a point, when the opportunity permits, to travel about the province in the summer time to see what is happening in rural Saskatchewan. And it has been my good fortune to see many, many new recreational facilities.

I could mention Wilkie where I believe I saw the large recreational complex there nearing completion. That complex, I believe is now completed.

Miss Clifford: — It has been completed for two years.

Mr. Blakeney: — That's right about two years. Two or three years ago I would have been at Wilkie on the bus tour. The Member for Shellbrook has said, "hear, hear" and I recall in his area, seeing rinks under construction and which must now be completed at Shellbrook and also at Leask, which was formerly in his constituency and now is in the constituency of Redberry. I could think of many others. Ponteix, where there is a new swimming pool and an improved rink. Carrot River where I had the occasion to participate in the opening of an outdoor swimming pool. One might mention some of the Indian reserves. The town of Badgerville on the Cote Reserve has new and rather elaborate facilities. The community of Wawota has a new rink that I have visited not too long ago.

I don't want only to talk about rinks and swimming pools. One could talk about senior citizens' recreation centres and of them there are many. One might mention Dinsmore. I remember it particularly because it was an old theatre which was converted. And clearly the senior citizens had done a great job and were enjoying it as a recreational facility. There are a good number of regional parks. I think it would take too long to mention all of the regional parks and the recreational facilities which have been improved during the past ten years. I think that it has been a little bit more rapid during the last five. Certainly there has been a real flowering of recreational facilities in rural Saskatchewan.

I recall one which has had some difficulties. The Member for Indian Head-Wolseley (Mr. MacDonald) is not here, but I believe the one at Grenfell which has received a substantial amount of government funds, is I believe now about to open or has opened. There is a swimming pool at Bienfait and I recall that project because it and the project at Grenfell were under similar programs. It has done well. One thinks of a little community like Glentworth. If there are 200 souls in Glentworth it would surprise me. There is a rink at Glentworth which

has been built, a skating rink and a curling rink, and now in the last few months they have installed artificial ice.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Miss Clifford: — Enterprising people.

Mr. Blakeney: — They are enterprising people. Indeed they are. I know Mr. Boyd Anderson well and some of you may know him. Members who sit to the left of the official opposition will know that gentleman.

However, I am sure that any Member in this House could stand and give a long list of recreational facilities which have appeared in the last two or three or four years and which are contributing very much to the quality of life in rural Saskatchewan.

I do not have my complete list here with me. I know that the Minister of Culture and Youth will want to contribute to this debate when he has an opportunity to check his records and accordingly, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Debate Adjourned.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

RESOLUTION NO. 9 - BOARD OF INQUIRY INTO CROWN CORPORATIONS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution by Mr. J.G. Lane (Qu'Appelle):

That this Assembly urges the Government of Saskatchewan to immediately set up a board of inquiry, consisting of independent management consultants, to study the operations of all Crown corporations to ensure that the decisions made by the management of these Crown corporations are in the best interests of the general public and according to sound management principles, and that the decisions are not based on political expediency.

Hon. E.L. Cowley (Provincial Secretary): — Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on this motion which is yet again another attack on the integrity and the efficiency of the Crown corporations in Saskatchewan by the Members opposite.

Mr. Speaker, the Crown corporations in this province are under an attack, I might say an unwarranted attack by the Members opposite. These corporations have been accused of incompetence, attacked for inefficiency and this Resolution adds political expediency to the list of the insinuations from Members opposite.

Mr. Speaker, these attacks are uncalled for and they cannot be justified, like most of the other statements made from time to time by Members opposite. There are those who see Crown corporations or public enterprise as an economic panacea, a cure to end injustice and solve the problems of

inequity, to provide service and satisfy needs in a more human, just manner than can private enterprise. While that may be a result, I do not believe that that necessarily follows from Crown corporations, Mr. Speaker. I think in Saskatchewan we have for example the rail industry, part of it being Crown owned and part of it being privately owned, and from my experience, Mr. Speaker, in terms of rail line abandonment, in terms of other operations in this province, it's difficult to separate the two.

Mr. Speaker, there are also those who would argue that by definition a Crown corporation or public enterprise is inefficient. That government cannot run a business. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that either. A Crown corporation is neither more efficient nor less efficient than any other type of corporation or enterprise. As in any form of human enterprise it depends primarily on the individuals who run it and who work for the organization as to whether it's efficient or inefficient, as to whether it meets its goals or falls short of its objectives.

To illustrate this point, Mr. Speaker, I'd refer Members to a study of telephone systems through the world which was done by the Canadian Magazine a few years ago. That article argued that beyond a doubt the three most efficient telephone systems in the world were, Alberta Government Telephones, Manitoba Government Telephones and Sask Tel. They were far and away the best companies in the field in terms of cost and service to the customers.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cowley: — Mr. Speaker, these three companies are Crown corporations. This study was no argument for the nationalization of telecommunication systems for it also showed telephone companies in other parts of the world, some Crown owned, to be the worst systems by the same yardstick. The particular deficiencies I remember some of them to have had were, corrupt operators who would accept bribes to put through a long distance call. Without the bribe it could take up to 30 minutes to make a connection. Some countries experience a one hour waiting period to merely get a dial tone. Such instances are difficult for us in Saskatchewan to accept because we have become used to the high level of efficiency which we find in Saskatchewan through our Crown corporation.

Mr. Speaker, the point of this is to show that simply because an operation is owned by the Crown it is not by definition inept, nor is it by definition more efficient than private enterprise.

I want to say here, Mr. Speaker, that I reject, I reject categorically, that it takes ten times as many people in the public sector to do the same job as someone does in the private sector. I reject categorically that it takes two people in the public sector to do what it takes one to do in the private sector. I do accept that under efficient management, as we have in both the private and public sector, it takes the same number of people to do the same job.

Mr. Speaker, if a corporation attracts capable people, dedicated people, efficient people, then it will by and large

perform well. If not, it will generally encounter problems.

The Saskatchewan family of Crown corporations have a record we can be proud of. Certainly there have been failures. But those Members opposite who laugh about the shoe factory are strangely quiet about Sask Tel, Sask Power, Sask Minerals, Sask Computer Corporation and many other successes. The Government of Saskatchewan I think has had fewer failures than the Hon. Member for Nipawin (Mr. Collver). Mr. Speaker, I think if one looks at any group of enterprises by any government in Canada that have been carried on, the success rate is considerably higher than the success rate in private businesses in the private sector.

Mr. Speaker, the shoe factory didn't fail because of some inherent problem with the Crown corporation. It didn't fail because it bowed to political expediency. It failed because of the economics of the commodity at that time. The operation was unable to achieve the economies of scale necessary to survive. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that in Saskatchewan at that time, it would have fared no better in private hands than it did in the public sector. It was perhaps a mistake, indeed it was undoubtedly a mistake.

Mr. Thatcher: — How about the woollen mill in Moose Jaw?

Mr. Cowley: — Mr. Speaker, that's another example of a mistake. I notice that the Members always talk about the woollen mill or the shoe factory. They never talk about Sask Minerals. They never talk about Sask Tel. They never talk about Sask Power Corporation. They never talk about the computer utility. They talk about those two old tired corporations, which are the only two they can remember.

Mr. Speaker, it was a mistake, but it was an attempt worth trying in my view, if a failure, at least one that the public could learn from.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cowley: — Mr. Speaker, the main point of the Member for Qu'Appelle's (Mr. Lane) Resolution is that of political expediency. I'm upset, I'm truly upset that the Member could so callously attack the dignity, the dignity of the board members of our Crown corporations and the management of those corporations. Some of the members of those Crown corporations I believe are members who were appointed by the Members opposite when they were the government. Such unwarranted attacks do harm to the morals of the corporations' employees and the management. If anyone could be accused of political expediency, Mr. Speaker, it is the Member for Qu'Appelle. He is attempting to make political brownie points on the backs of the fine dedicated men and women who serve as board members, management and employees for Saskatchewan Crown corporations.

To the point of the board of inquiry, that board of inquiry already exists. Mr. Speaker, and all Hon. Members, it exists in the form of Crown Corporations Committee of this Assembly. Now I realize, Mr. Speaker, that it is much easier for the Member for Qu'Appelle and his cohorts to scream for a board of inquiry

than it is for them to get down and to work as committee members. And I realize that kind of hard solid work as a committee member won't get that gentleman the Press and the media that he craves so badly, but it will get the job done. The committee has existed for years, it has been an excellent opportunity for Members to review the activities of the corporations and has provided an adequate method of accountability to this House for our public corporations.

Mr. Speaker, in the light of these facts, I move, seconded by the Member for Last Mountain-Touchwood (Mr. MacMurchy) that Resolution No. 9 be amended as follows:

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

Commend the Government of Saskatchewan, the Crown corporations active in this province, and the management and employees of those Crown Corporations for the competent and effective manner in which they provide service to the public and perform their duties and that this Assembly strongly disapproves of the continued deplorable and unwarranted attacks on the efficiency of these corporations.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Malone: — On a Point of Order. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the amendment is indeed in order. The amendment speaks of the competency of the organizations and talks about alleged attacks. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that on a reading of the proposed Resolution by the Member for Qu'Appelle, there is no suggestion as to the competency of the Crown corporations and I don't believe at any time have there been any suggestions in speeches by the Member or other Members of an attack on the Crown corporations. I would submit that the Resolution deals with independent management consultants to study the operation of Crown corporations and really it deals with a method by which Crown corporations could be made more effective and more efficient in their day to day operations. I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that the amendment is out of order because it does not deal with the essence of the Resolution.

Mr. Speaker: — I'll reiterate the point that I find that the amendment that has been offered is in order and debate would proceed because it is relevant to the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. W.C. Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker, it has been rather a dull day here in the Assembly and outside of a couple of good speeches from our side of the House, I should emphasize from our little corner of the House, there really hasn't been all that much go on and I question there has been very much in content that we have felt obligated to comment on. But I think when I noticed the Minister, the head of one of the newer, more powerful Crown corporations standing up to talk on a very innocuous Resolution such as the one on the Order Paper, and of course, wearing a new suit today, another stylishly mod suit, for a moment I thought he was going to talk on Bill 1 or Bill 2. I realize this

is Private Members' Day. It is very difficult to stay awake on a day like this but I found it very amusing that this Minister who so many people had told me was maybe the brightest that they had over there, one of the smartest, one of the most able, the most competent, and I found it strange a couple of months ago that someone else was shepherding his legislation through this Legislature. Oh, he did get up, I believe he was up on the Throne Speech, and he has been up on a couple of resolutions, but when the big one comes along he is strangely silent. In fact, he is not often in his chair. Frankly, I must confess that I have come to the conclusion that the Minister is vastly overrated.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — Now in his little dissertation on Crown corporations that we have just been through, again, which is so typical of this Government across the way, he philosophizes on the Crown corporations. I think as we go through Bill 2, some of his points will be rather soundly contested to say the very least. I would ask him to be in the House at the time when this Legislature shall be reformed as to the day when Crown corporations went on trial some 20 years ago. Since the Attorney General has declined to take the part of the former Premier, T.C. Douglas, I would therefore invite the Minister for the Potash Industry if he would care to do it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker, I find it a very shocking thing when a Minister from a powerful Crown corporation involved in the most controversial legislation that has gone through this Legislature, hadn't got the courage to stand up and speak on his own Bills. He hasn't got the courage to take it through the Committee of the Whole, yet on a little Resolution on Crown corporations he stands up as the big, tough fellow and goes on for five or six minutes. Is it possible that he is afraid of being sliced to hamburger in Committee of the Whole.

I really find it amusing that the points that he stands up to talk on today, the wonderful Crown corporations we have in Saskatchewan, making an amendment commending the Government, etc., but he didn't say too much about the vicious increases that the Crown corporations have put into effect. All have come since the wage and price guidelines were announced by the Prime Minister. I haven't heard all that much comment about the increase in Sask Tel, the increases of over 54 per cent in some areas, as high as 65 per cent in some areas. And SPC, we haven't heard too much about it. Well, I suppose we can look forward to hearing the Minister since he slowly but surely seems to be getting the courage welling up inside him. It didn't quite come true on Bill 1 but hopefully we can look forward to this high powered, highly rated individual to blossom forth as the Bill 2 debate continues.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. E.C. Malone (Regina Lakeview): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a few remarks about this Resolution. I won't be quite so wishy-washy about the Minister as the Member for Thunder Creek was but I really

have nothing to say about that particular Minister in this, Mr. Speaker. He has chosen not to enter the debate on potash for reasons known only to him, I guess. I am sure that if he does at a later date enter the debate on potash we will sit and listen very attentively to what he has to say.

Mr. Speaker, I think the reaction of the Minister to this Resolution is indicative of how sensitive the Government is to the slightest little bit of criticism of any of their actions. A careful reading of the Resolution indicates really no criticism of Crown corporations except for the possibility of political influence therein. It merely suggests that perhaps these Crown corporations could be run in a more efficient and effective manner for the people of Saskatchewan if this independent study was conducted and that is all the Resolution deals with, Mr. Speaker. It is not an attack on SPC, it is not an attack on Sask Tel. I wish it was an attack on Saskoil because we have yet to find out anything about this company. But most of Crown corporations that the Minister referred to we have acknowledged have been carrying on business in this province for a long time and have been doing their best to carry on business in a manner which will best serve the people of Saskatchewan.

But there is a concern about Crown corporations, about the effectiveness of the employees whom they hire, about whether or not political types are put into those Crown corporations as rewards for past political services. And I would just like to read into the record, Mr. Speaker, a very brief portion of a speech that was given by a very highly respected civil servant and manager of a Crown corporation in Saskatchewan, Mr. Dave Furlong. I know Mr. Furlong, I think he served well under Premier Ross Thatcher and I think he served equally as well under Premier Allan Blakeney at the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. I am not sure where he is employed at this time but I think prior to going with SPC and prior to coming to Canada he was employed by a British Crown corporation or a British company that was owned by the Government. And I think his opinions and his comments are something that can be considered by this Assembly in considering whether or not they should vote on the Resolution that is before us. There are a couple of excerpts from his speech that he gave I believe in January, 1974 and it dealt with Crown corporations. I don't intend reading the whole speech, just a couple of paragraphs. He says this:

But we do have a problem with Crown corporations which needs to be watched carefully. In business a corporation tends to be eliminated or drastically revised if it is no longer useful. Economic pressures take care of them. These pressures don't affect government in the same way and perhaps even worse economic pressures in government affect good and bad ventures equally so that a valuable venture is starved for money or people while an almost useless exercise continues to hang on to budgets and good people. I think my consideration of Crown corporations should include regular and drastic review of her contribution. The world changes so fast that this sort of thing is essential. Somehow or other this review needs to be partially divorced from the political scene. Perhaps instead of the venerable and useless exercise of Crown Corporations Committee, these corporations should report annually to a management's

review board consisting of accountants, business people and professional and academic people, paid to advise government or parliament publicly about the relevance of each to the present time. So my general conclusion, Crown corporations are an established feature of the Canadian provincial scene. Many are useful, many are almost useless. Some machinery or pressure needs to be devised to eliminate the least successful.

I think really, Mr. Speaker, that this is all this Resolution is dealing with. I think the remarks of Mr. Furlong who I know enjoys the respect of the Members opposite and the Premier and the Treasury Benches and enjoys our respect, should be considered by the Members of this Legislature before voting on the Resolution.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the mover of the Resolution is unfortunately not able to be here this afternoon. I think he would like to reply to the remarks of the Minister. Also I should like the other Members opposite to consider the comments of Mr. Furlong, accordingly I would ask leave to adjourn the debate at this time.

Debate adjourned.

RESOLUTION NO. 13 - TO ESTABLISH LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE TO STUDY PROPOSALS OF ELEVATOR ABANDONMENT

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution by Mr. Wiebe:

That this Assembly urges the Government of Saskatchewan to establish a Legislative Committee to study the proposals of elevator abandonment being made by all elevator companies, in order to determine the effects of such proposals on rural Saskatchewan; and further, that the major role of the Committee will be to obtain the views of the residents of rural Saskatchewan through a system of public hearings.

Hon. G. MacMurchy (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — Mr. Speaker, it is some time since we had this Resolution before us. I made a few remarks when it was before the Assembly some time ago and I want to pick up my remarks and in picking them up I want to read briefly from a radio report, Pool broadcast, for December 22nd, 1975. Mr. Speaker, it starts out:

A source of great irritation to farmers is what appears to be a deliberate attempt to downgrade the prairie grain-handling system. The feeling in many quarters is that it is a deliberate attempt to divert attention from the central issues or the criticism it makes on lack of knowledge.

Now it seemed to me in considering the Resolution that was supported strongly by the Members of the Conservative caucus that it would not be so much a lack of knowledge as a deliberate attempt to divert attention. The motion, Mr. Speaker, raises a larger question facing the rural economy. The question of grain-handling, the question of transportation and the question of how we hope to maintain a network of elevators and

rail lines designed to serve our farmers and designed to serve our small towns. I do not believe and it is the position of this Government that meaningful discussion of the question can be conducted by focusing on one part of a system in isolation from the other.

The Resolution of the Member for Morse which was supported by the Member from the Conservative caucus attempts to deal with elevators alone. That is inadequate and it is short sighted. I suggest it tends to stir this Assembly away from the sensitive issues of Crow's Nest rates, of rail line closures, on which the position of the Liberal Party opposite is compromised and it's weak.

Mr. Speaker, the thread of Liberal politics runs through these issues. It is evident in the slow but determined undermining of the Crow's Nest rates which the federal Transport Minister began some time ago and continues today. It is evident in the proposals for rail line abandonment. It is evident in proposals for differential freight rates. It's evident in the actions of the federal authorities responsible for setting elevator and terminal tariffs.

All of these issues that tend to threaten the strength of farmer owned co-operatives, that tend to weaken the voice of the organized farmers, and reduce resistance to the profit oriented competition policy of the Liberal Party, that party is doing its best to foist these upon us whether we want them or whether we don't want them.

Mr. Speaker, it's essential that we in Saskatchewan understand the relationships between the abandonment of country elevators and the Crow's Nest rates. The Crow's Nest rates apply uniformly to all elevators, regardless of the volume of grain that they handle or regardless of the rail line that they stand on. Uniformity averages the cost so no farmer is penalized for delivering to a small elevator or a large elevator on a branch line, whether he delivers to a small elevator on the main line or a small elevator on a branch line.

The Crow's Nest rates is a key element in retaining country elevators. Besides the Crow's Nest rates for shipping grain the farmer also pays an elevating fee to cover costs of running the elevator.

Mr. Speaker, a short while ago the federal authorities raised the maximum fee that may be levied by several cents, which permitted the elevator companies to charge any rate they wish up to a limit. This is important because the higher fee leaves room for elevator operators to vary the rate, to charge more in one place than another. Thereby it influences where farmers might deliver.

In Saskatchewan as we all know the largest elevator operator is Saskatchewan Pool. The Pool charges the same fee at all its elevators. Because it's strong, it forces the other companies to meet their competition and do the same. I say in this Assembly, Mr. Speaker, that the Pool should receive the credit for keeping elevators operating in many places which the private companies would otherwise have abandoned a long, long time ago.

The elevating fee, the Crow's Nest rates are obviously very

important factors in determining which delivery points stay open. Both of them stand in danger of manipulation by Ottawa and I believe it is this manipulation we must try to prevent if we hope to save some of our small rural communities.

Consider for the moment what consequences might result if the federal Transport Minister succeeds in changing the Crow's Nest rates. The first effect of losing the Crow's Nest rates would be a massive increase in the railway's charges to haul grain. Today the average rate per bushel is roughly twelve and a half cents. Down in Montana and Minnesota for the shipping distances the same as from Saskatchewan the railways charge 65 cents per bushel. Twelve cents under the Crow's Nest rates, 65 cents under the competitive system. There is every reason to believe our rates would rise to at least the American level, which means we would be looking at increases in the range of 500 per cent should the Crow's Nest rates be removed. Mr. Speaker, the 500 per cent increase in freight rate costs is but one aspect of what we could face.

If the railways were no longer required to charge a uniform rate to ship grain from all points, they would be free to set differential rates, higher at delivery points they want to get rid of and lower at points that they want to encourage. The railways are very eager to get rid of the branch lines. Through the simple mechanism of differential rates they could do so by making it too expensive to deliver at elevators on lines they want to drop.

Mr. Speaker, all the work of the Hall Commission, all of the work of any legislative committee proposed in this Resolution would be wasted if we allow Ottawa to lift the Crow's Nest rates. With a single act, the power to decide which towns would survive, which towns would disappear could be handed over to the railways and Saskatchewan and the West would have come to full circle from the days of competition when the railway caused our rural communities to be created.

The CPR giveth and the CPR taketh away. A case of corporate power controlling the lives of thousands, it is frightening and we are on the verge of seeing it become a fact. Just as the proposals for changing Crow's Nest rates tend to undermine the country elevator system, the proposals for outright abandonment of rail lines do the same.

The federal Minister of Transport, the Member for Saskatoon-Humboldt has stated:

No lines will be dropped, unless the farmers want them to be dropped.

The question is, of course, is how do the farmers express their wishes? Do they get a vote? Do their farm organizations decide? Who actually makes the final decision? Is there to be a final decision?

Mr. Speaker, it is now becoming more and more obvious that the farmers will never get a direct vote on rail line abandonment. They will make their wishes evident by voting with their deliveries. In short, if farmers can be influenced through differential rates, bonuses and other incentives to haul to other lines, that will be considered. What appears to be a concrete and clear cut promise from the federal Minister of

Transport proves in fact to be little more than an opportunity to work behind the scenes to manipulate the farmer and his co-operative organizations.

While the Ottawa Government plays cat and mouse with freight rates the railway companies have undertaken what amounts to a program of abandonment without permission. Many lines in this province built years ago with 65 lb. steel have never been upgraded. Other lines built with 85 lb. steel have been allowed to fall into disrepair so that in both cases trains can only creep along at ten miles an hour, 15 miles an hour, sometimes even less. Mr. Speaker, we have lines that are so weak they cannot carry the new hopper cars. Or only at such a slow speed that the line is virtually unusable in terms of efficient grain movement.

In 1974 many lines went without service for weeks, in fact for months because the railways refused to clear them of snow or because the runoff weakened the road bed and made train movement unsafe. The National Farmers' Union reported boxcars sitting idle for 90 days, elevators plugged, farmers unable to deliver on their quotas. Protests by the farmers, the National Farmers' Union and the Pool failed to get results because even under pressure the railway companies could not supply locomotives enough to clear up the backlog that they had permitted to build up.

This sort of irresponsible attitude constitutes a far greater threat to the country elevator viability than any individual proposal to consolidate and this Government feels strongly that this behavior must be stopped if we are serious about providing service where it's required.

Mr. Speaker, the Resolution as presented by the Member for Morse (Mr. Wiebe) is inadequate to deal with the total problem. I therefore move, seconded by the Member for Melville (Mr. Kowalchuk):

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

the Government of Canada to:

- (1) Give immediate and positive assurance to the farmers of this province that the Crow's Nest Rates will be maintained.
- (2) Maintain the freeze on branch line abandonment until an integrated plan of service satisfactory to those affected is designed.
- (3) Require all elevator companies to adhere to a policy respecting proposed elevator closures similar to that of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, specifically providing: (a) one year's notice of proposed closures; (b) prior opportunity to examine and discuss all factors related to the elevator's viability; (c) full consideration of and consultation on the effect of closure on farmers delivering to the elevator, including provision of accessible alternate service.

The Debate continues on the Resolution and the amendment.

Mr. J. Wiebe (Morse): — In rising to speak on the amendment as proposed, I don't know whether I will have the opportunity to adjourn debate

on this amendment, however, at the conclusion of my remarks I will try, because I would like to have the opportunity to further study the amendment as proposed by the Minister.

In my comments let me say that in many of the remarks which the Minister made, it is not difficult for me to agree with. It's rather disappointing for me, however, to find that the Minister had to drag in or lower the level of debate on this particular Resolution as to which particular petty party philosophy is being expounded over the other.

It was for this reason that I introduced the original motion in saying that we do have a problem in Saskatchewan. I agree that grain-handling and transportation must be handled as one entire question. I might point out as well to the Minister that as far as transportation is concerned the Federal Government has accepted its responsibility and has set up two commissions to study that entire question. The Federal Government has said to the people of Saskatchewan we want your views on what you think should happen to transportation within the Province of Saskatchewan, particularly in regard to our rail lines.

I might point out to the Minister as well that the management asks that the freeze be continued until the full effects of abandonment are studied. This aspect of his amendment is useless because the Federal Minister in charge of Transportation has indicated to the people of Saskatchewan that rail lines will be frozen until the Hall Commission completes their hearings and presents the views of the people to the Federal Government.

As well he has asked that the Crow's Nest rates be guaranteed. Mr. Speaker, the assurance has been given by the Federal Government that the Crow's Nest rates are here to stay and he has said this on many occasions. I am sure that all of us and the people of Saskatchewan can rest assured that the Crow's Nest rates controversy is dead and the benefits of the Crow's Nest rates shall be maintained in its present statutory legislation.

I must comment though on some of the remarks which the Minister made regarding elevator closures. Let me point out as well that I hope the Members opposite do not feel that my remarks are generated because of some ulterior motive in which I want the emphasis to be shifted from railways to elevators and I hope that they don't feel that the reason for my introducing this particular Resolution is because I have some vendetta against some co-operative grain-handling company, that certainly is not the case. For the edification of the Members opposite let me again point out that I am the past chairman of my local Wheat Pool Committee, because of my involvement as an MLA I have had to resign from that position and I am now just sitting as a committee member.

I am concerned about what my company is doing and what my company is proposing. I can say my company because I am a member of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool and I haul my grain to that particular organization. I say that regardless of what the Hall Commission recommends in regard to retention of particular lines, the proposals which elevator companies have made, and I include all of them, are the proposals that will affect the lines that will be maintained until the year 2,000. We cannot expect an elevator company to maintain an elevator

at a point where there no longer is a rail line. That would be foolish to ask this Assembly or any company or anybody in the province to suggest that. What I think the people of Saskatchewan are asking is, why cannot we preserve that elevator on that particular line that is frozen until the year 2,000. All I have asked in this Resolution is that we follow the same guideline as has been set by the Federal Government in which they are prepared to go to the people of Saskatchewan and ask what are your views in terms of transportation? What are your views in terms of what lines should be maintained and what lines should be abandoned?

I feel for that reason that we should accept that responsibility here in this province and we as a legislative committee, comprised of eight Government Members and three Opposition Members, do the same and go out to the people of Saskatchewan and say, what are your views about the proposals presently being made by all elevator companies, and I'm not singling out any one elevator company because each and every one of them operating in this province is making various proposals in regard to that elevator abandonment.

It might be that the people of Saskatchewan may say, fine, I agree with some of this elevator abandonment. They may offer suggestions and alternatives. I think then that the legislative committee can come back to this Legislative Assembly and recommend to this Government, and recommend as well to the Minister of Transportation for the Government of Saskatchewan as to what direction they would like to see not only the elevator companies take in this regard but what direction they would like to see this Government and the Department of Transportation for the Government of Saskatchewan take in this regard.

As I mentioned earlier, Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that I can adjourn debate on this particular amendment because I should like to study it further before speaking further on it. I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

RESOLUTION NO. 20 - MULTI-DWELLING HOUSING UNITS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution by Mr. Merchant (Regina Wascana):

That this Assembly urges the Government of Saskatchewan to pass legislation providing interest assistance to encourage the construction of multi-dwelling housing units.

Mr. G. MacMurchy: — Mr. Speaker, I want to make a few comments on the Resolution proposed by the Member for Regina Wascana.

The Resolution when I examine it closely and visualize in my mind what it means, it strikes me this way: it asks us to provide low interest for private developers. That is what comes to my mind when I look at that Resolution. In other words we are being asked to subsidize construction of town houses, of high rises, upper middle class apartment suites. Maybe I get the wrong picture in my mind, but that is what comes in my mind.

When I consider the area that is represented by the Hon. Member for Regina Wascana I just can't help that.

Mr. Merchant: — This is like Gladmer Park. That's also in Wascana.

Mr. MacMurchy: — Mr. Speaker, as the Minister responsible for the Housing Corporation, I just can't see us doing that. I want to point out to the Member for Wascana we are going to continue to follow our policy. We think it is a pretty good policy. It is a policy that consists of programs like the Home Building Assistance Program, the Subsidy and Self-help Program, Co-op Housing, Rural Housing, Public Housing, Land Assembly. Somewhere I heard the Member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lane) suggest that I should give some figures. He was expecting me to give some figures on the accomplishment of the Government in the housing area in the last five years. I don't want to do that today, although I may get an opportunity to do it some other time. And at that same time to compare it with the previous administration.

Let me just give a few. In 1974, 1,935 house building assistance grants were given for new buildings and mobile homes. In 1975 to the end of October this figure had already increased to 1,991. Four hundred and twenty grants were approved in 1974 under the subsidy and self-help program and as of the end of October this year 500 had already been approved. Last year 1975, 75 houses were constructed in Regina and Saskatoon through the Co-operative Housing program and this program is being expanded in 1976. In 1976 the Housing Corporation expects to assist at least 500 families building their houses under this program.

Under the Rural Housing program introduced last year by the Housing Corporation, we expect up to 130 units will be started under this program with expansion each year toward a target of 2,000 between '75 and '78.

Mr. Speaker, we have started a record 1,100 public housing units in 1974 and still another 650 to the end of September in 1974. An additional 500 have been approved for construction since September. We hope to achieve 1,000 public housing approvals this year and then increase it to 1,500 in 1976. Most of this, if not all of it, but a good majority of it will be for senior citizens public housing.

The results of these programs are significant. Housing starts in 1974 in Saskatchewan totalled 7,700; as of the end of November, 1975 housing starts had reached 9,600. We expect to have 10,000 to 11,000 units started by the end of 1975. These figures, Mr. Speaker, are a clear indication of the success of our government through the Housing Corporation to meet the extensive housing needs of the people of Saskatchewan. Needless to say that had been neglected by the previous Liberal government.

Not only did we have to move with housing, we had to develop an industry which could construct the houses because the industry had vacated Saskatchewan for Alberta and Manitoba. If we discover gaps as a result of changes in federal policy rather than subsidize private developers as suggested by the Hon. Member in this Resolution, the Saskatchewan Housing

Corporation may well consider construction of multi-dwelling housing units itself. As we have indicated this is a possibility. It is being considered in the event that there is a serious gap to be filled. At this point however there is simply no concrete evidence that the gap exists.

We are concerned about the attitude of the Federal Government with regard to housing. We are not convinced at this point that private lenders will supply enough funds to keep housing starts increasing at the rate we feel is necessary to meet the demands of the citizens of Saskatchewan.

The past record of banks in the field of housing is not encouraging. In 1974 less than 25 per cent of the funds for housing came from banks; some 37 per cent came from Credit Unions. The rest came from governments. Our Government, therefore, feels that CMHC must continue its role as a lender for housing. We are attempting to attain increased federal funding for federal-provincial cost shared housing programs.

Since coming into office in 1971, we have increased Saskatchewan's share of the national capital housing budget from 2.6 per cent to over 5 per cent in 1975. We expect to receive \$80 million to \$90 million as compared to \$26 million in 1971. A consistent supply of funds must be available to ensure an adequate supply of housing accommodation.

Mr. Speaker, this Resolution asks us to provide, in my mind and in the minds of my colleagues on the Government side, low and subsidized interest rates for the private developers, the people who build the townhouses, the apartment building we can see across the park here. For my part, I can't support the Resolution. I urge other Members to reject it also. I, therefore, Mr. Speaker, propose the following amendment.

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

To commend the Government of Saskatchewan for the introduction and expansion of a variety of housing programs which have assisted in the provision of a record number of housing starts in Saskatchewan in 1974 and encouraged an even greater number of housing starts in 1975 and, further that the Assembly unanimously supports the Government's attempts to obtain increased federal funding for federal-provincial cost shared housing programs to ensure that adequate amounts of reasonably priced housing accommodations are made available to provide for equitable treatment of our citizens requested to participate in the federal wage and price control measures.

Mr. Speaker, I so move, seconded by the Member for Saskatoon Buena Vista (Mr. Rolfes).

Mr. E.F.A. Merchant (Regina Wascana): — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I am able to speak briefly to the amendment without closing the debate. I think that I can. I repeat, speak briefly.

I think indeed I might well have been able to agree with most of the words of the amendment. We do commend the Government of Saskatchewan for the variety of programs that the

Government has, some of which are very good and some of which are better than nothing but perhaps less successful than they might be or perhaps less than adequate as they might be. But again they are better than nothing. We believe that this is an area where extra spending is appropriate. It is an area where the Government has to move away from the general kinds of guidelines that should be going on in government in general and that you should continue your impetus to provide proper housing.

I must say that we don't agree with the implication that is left in the initial words, namely, that because of that variety of programs, housing starts are up. Indeed this Government, though it may have a variety of programs doesn't have much in a substantial way, indeed we have one of the least adequate programs of the provinces starting from Quebec and moving westward. I exclude the Maritimes because the Maritimes don't tend for whatever reason to have the kind of money that we have here. I say that because I am suggesting to Your Honour, that clearly the record construction in '74 and '75 isn't due to the efforts of the Government, particularly it has been due to the excellent economic circumstances in the Province of Saskatchewan. Those excellent economic circumstances are largely due to the results of activities taken by the Federal Government if due to the results of any government at all. Indeed I think they are principally due to the results of economic conditions which have put into demand our primary products of potash, and to a limited extent, oil, and certainly grains. Lastly, I can't imagine with all due respect, Mr. Speaker, how a motion that says in the very words that we 'unanimously' support something can be considered to be in order. You can't move a motion which might be passed, say 38 to 22, saying that this House unanimously supports anything. You can't in the words of the motion present that unanimous approval has come from the House, that has to be an adjective that follows as a result of the vote taken in the House, either on this amendment or on some motion. It is an anticipation of what may happen in the future, and in that way, is improper.

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to consider whether you find that the amendment is in itself in order. I don't think that it is in order and I don't think that we can start a practice in this House of motions being passed, perhaps 16 to 15 because Hon. Members opposite aren't too good at attending, which says that this House unanimously approves or disapproves of anything. In that way I suggest that the amendment is not in order. And that the amendment should not be proceeded with and shouldn't receive further discussion of the House.

Mr. Speaker: — The Member for Regina Wascana has raised a point which I am unable to conclude my decision on at this time. I will defer decision on the matter and if the debate proceeds at this time it will proceed on that basis that a ruling will be coming.

Mr. P.P. Mostoway (Saskatoon Centre): — Mr. Speaker, obviously this Resolution is not getting to the heart of the matter. I think he is trying to say in it that the province should be providing assistance to encourage the construction of multi-dwelling units. No mention is made of the part the Federal Government should be playing in regard

to that suggestion. Consequently I would like to rustle up some information at a later date, showing that the Federal Government is at fault and has reneged on its promises to improve the housing situation in this province and other provinces in Canada, and, consequently, I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

MOTIONS FOR RETURNS

RETURN NO. 12

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mrs. E.G. Edwards (Saskatoon-Sutherland) for Return No. 12 showing:

(a) A copy of the letters sent out by the Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan to the 13 major hospitals, outlining the approved patient days, for 1976 budget preparation. (b) The number of approved patient days for each of the 13 major hospitals for 1975.

And the proposed amendment thereto moved by the Hon. Mr. Robbins:

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

Sample copy of the letter sent out by the Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan to the 13 major hospitals outlining the approved patient days for 1976 budget preparation. (b) The number of actual patient days for the 13 major hospitals in 1973, 1974, and 1975 (as at November 1). (c) The number of approved patient days for the 13 major hospitals in 1975 (as at November 1) and the recommended patient days for 1976.

Mr. C.P. MacDonald (Indian Head-Wolseley): — Mr. Speaker, I do not have much to add to what my colleague, the Member for Saskatoon-Sutherland, has indicated when she moved this Motion, and my brief comments originally. I do want to suggest to the House and to you, Sir, that the amendment by the Minister of Health certainly does nothing except deny the information that was requested by the Member for Saskatoon-Sutherland. And what the Minister has proposed is that instead of giving the per diem rates of the 13 largest hospitals in the Province of Saskatchewan, that a sample letter be provided to the Members of the House, which gives absolutely no information whatsoever.

Perhaps I might comment very briefly on the reason for which this Return was moved by the Member for Saskatoon. There are some people in Saskatchewan who begin to feel that health services in Saskatchewan have gone a complete circle. Originally in the 1940s and 1950s before the passing of medicare, the great cry of the NDP and the CCF of that day was that there were a lot of people in the Province of Saskatchewan who couldn't afford medical services and hospitalization. In 1962 we passed hospitalization and medicare in order to provide from the consolidated revenues of the taxpayers that medical and hospital services would be provided for the people of Saskatchewan, but

now we have gone the complete circle and prior to 1962 a lot of people in Saskatchewan couldn't afford medical services, now in Saskatchewan it would appear that the Government can't afford medical services and hospitalization, and that they are challenging both the quantity and the quality of medical care.

I want to give you just a couple of examples. First of all, Mr. Speaker, everyone in Saskatchewan is aware that there are 13 large hospitals in our province which provide the vast majority of hospital care for the majority of citizens in Saskatchewan. Five of the largest of these hospitals are government owned and government operated. I refer to the four in Regina - the Pasqua, the General, the Wascana and the Base and the one in Saskatoon, the University Hospital.

What this motion asks for is the rated bed capacity per diem — in other words the rate of each of these 13 hospitals. This information should be readily available to the House and to the taxpayers; people should know how much hospital care is costing; how much the Government is spending on health care and what kind of information is being provided. Certainly a municipal hospital provides that kind of information for its own taxpayers, why should the Government of Saskatchewan refuse to give that kind of information.

The Minister of Health has made some rather dramatic statements in the field of health care. He has accused hospitals in our province of providing cadillac care; suggested that they were inefficient. I think the Minister has a responsibility to prove that statement and prove that charge. He should take steps to remedy it if it is true and there is only one way he can do it and that is to show the financial statements and the financial information.

There are really four questions that this motion asks:

1. Is the Government of Saskatchewan forcing hospitals to ration hospital care by rigid restrictions on budget allowances? In other words are they rationing the quantity of care in the hospitals in the Province of Saskatchewan?

2. Are hospitals required to lessen the quality of care because the Government does not allow enough money in budgets to hire the number of registered nurses and so forth and the staff that are required. In other words, are we, second, rationing the quality of care? I don't have to indicate to the Members of the House and to the people of Saskatchewan the number of beds that were closed particularly here in the city of Regina, because of lack of nurses and the nurses' complaints a year or two ago.

3. Is the Government doing anything about Level IV care in the hospitals in Saskatchewan? I don't think that any of us have to indicate the tremendous costs of the prime care in hospitals in comparison to Level IV care, or special care facilities in our province. And when we talk about Level III and Level IV, the actual cost per day for hospital patients is far less than the costs of hospital care in the major hospitals in Saskatchewan.

I don't think anyone can deny, also, that in most of these hospitals, all 13 of them, there are a large number of patients who are old, who are senior citizens, who cannot find nursing care or cannot find special care facilities, and as a result

doctors are reluctant to turn them out of these hospitals until proper facilities have been found. As a result we find our hospitals are looking after a large number of senior citizens in the Province of Saskatchewan at \$60, \$70, or \$80 per day, whatever it costs depending on the individual hospital and in reality their care could be looked after at a far less cost if there was a proper number of Level IV beds available.

4. I think this is pertinent also. What is the per diem rate at the Plains Hospital, where the last figures that I had were something in the neighborhood of 130 patients. The administration unit, the technical services, the medical staff, the nurses, the upkeep of the building and all the rest of it, I suggest that the per diem rate at the Plains Hospital in the city of Regina far surpasses any other hospital in the Province of Saskatchewan.

This is the kind of information the Member for Saskatoon has asked. I believe that the Government, particularly the Minister of Health has a serious responsibility to provide this information. This amendment does nothing more than deny the taxpayers of Saskatchewan, citizens of Saskatchewan, an opportunity to evaluate the quality of care, the quantity of care and the total cost of the medical care in the 13 major hospitals in Saskatchewan.

I urge all Members of the Assembly to defeat the amendment and vote for the original motion.

Amendment agreed to on Division.

The debate continues on the Motion as amended.

Mrs. Edwards: — Mr. Speaker, speaking to the Motion as amended. As our previous speaker has suggested the original Motion really was requested so that we could evaluate the quality and quantity of care in each of the 13 large hospitals. The amendment as it now stands really just gives us the total figures throughout the province, which doesn't give the information, the accurate information, institution by institution that would give the Members of this House and the public generally the opportunity to really see where their health dollars are being spent and assess the quality and the quantity of care being given.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, this information is needed by this House when we have the Minister of Health, from time to time, saying that hospitals are inefficient and making statements of a general nature saying that we must watch there is not a waste of health dollars and we must see that cadillac care, as he called it, is not being given and that essential services and efficient use of the health dollar is the order of the day. I think such general statements and criticisms which are levelled at all hospitals should be clarified. I think there are hospitals that should be commended because they are careful with their budgets and are doing a commendable job with the money allocated to them. And if there are hospitals, and as the previous speaker said, the Government own and operate five of the majors, if there are hospitals that are guilty of such practices and are inefficient, I think this House should have the opportunity to know the facts. I think that the Minister of Health, if he has such information, has a duty to work through the governing boards of those hospitals to see if those situations could be remedied.

Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to prolong the debate on this. I will, of course, welcome any information the Minister of Health can give us. I think that the questions that our former speaker has asked are questions that are pertinent to the debate. I think that in a province where we do boast of our hospitalization plan and yet we have long waiting lists, people waiting for a bed for months in certain services and in certain institutions. I think we would do well to look and to assess and to really see if our plan is working. If, in fact, because of budget restrictions there is a rationing of services, well then I think that the Government should say so. I think the people should know whether because of financial restrictions these measures are necessary. This is the kind of information that should be given to us so that we know where we are going with the health plan that we have in Saskatchewan.

Motion as amended agreed to.

RETURN NO. 13

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by MR. E.C. MALONE (Regina Lakeview) for Return No. 13 showing:

- (1) The amount of money that has been accumulated in the Saskatchewan Energy and Resource Development Fund to March 31, 1975. (2) (a) The amounts, if any, that have been paid out of the fund; (b) the purposes for which it was paid.

Mr. E.F.A. Merchant (Regina Wascana): — Mr. Speaker, my remarks are very brief. I don't understand why that information is not readily available to us. I have at other times, not particularly for the information of the Members but for the information of the Press, pointed out that the way Crown corporations operate it is very difficult for us to get that information in making decisions about things, because Crown corporations by its nature gives us information which, in some cases, could be 15 or 16 months later. This is an important part of the information which, we believe, the people of the province are entitled to have if they are going to make a meaningful decision about the potash takeover and the direction in which the Government is going. I don't understand why the Government should choose to hide that figure. The establishment of the fund was simply a manoeuvre so as to avoid certain federal taxation and I say that was fine and that was a means of maintaining our 'have not' status as far as equalization were concerned, and I say that it is fine too, because as a Saskatchewan person I am always hopeful that we will do as well as we can in relation to the Federal Government. But that historical establishment of the fund doesn't mean that that's not information which the people should not receive.

I suggest to the House that there can be no reason for not giving us the information up to the day it is requested and really not to give us the information in ballpark figures, for instance, to the end of 1975. You will notice that this motion doesn't go nearly that far.

Mr. MacDonald: — Mr. Speaker, I just want to add a comment or two. This is now the 35th sitting day and I can never remember in my

memory of 35 days having less Returns provided the Members of the Opposition on questions asked by the Opposition. I can never remember as much pertinent information that has been denied to the Opposition. I can never remember as many resolutions that have been amended, to deny information to the House.

Every resolution of any significance that has come before this House in relation to potash, in relation to the financial input of the Government of Saskatchewan, any information regarding the financial status of hospitals or of anything else, has been denied to Members of this House and they any Orders for Return that have been passed, only innocuous ones have been handed back to the Members of the Opposition.

I want to draw a note, Mr. Speaker, a note to the Government that this is the most secretive Government I have seen, including any NDP Government, for some strange reason the NDP now is hiding information to the extent they have never hidden it before. They proposed and they promised an open government in 1971 and right now it is a closed door government, it is a secret government and this is very, very disturbing, Mr. Speaker, and I want to make that comment.

Mr. Speaker: — I believe the Member is out of order, in that the Member had spoken on December 2 in the debate.

Mr. MacDonald: — On a Point of Order. I apologize. I went and asked the Clerk if I had participated in this debate and he said he didn't know and there was no record and I had not recalled.

Mr. Speaker: — Well, I have the record and I believe my record to be in order, and it shows that you spoke on December 2, therefore you had no option to speak at this time.

Mr. E.C. Malone (Regina Lakeview): — Mr. Speaker, in closing the debate on this Motion, I should just like to point out a few things to the Members of the Government who sit opposite.

You'd think that it was their money that has been accumulating in this fund. You would think that it personally belonged to the Attorney General and the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Whelan). This is money that belongs to the people of the Province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. They have as matter of right to know how much money has been paid into this fund. Now if there is not an audited statement as of the 31st day of March, 1975, we have indicated in this debate that we would be prepared to accept an approximate figure. But no information is forthcoming, Mr. Speaker.

Really, Mr. Speaker, the guts of this Motion, is not so much the amount that has accumulated in the fund, it's what has been paid out of the fund and for what purpose.

Mr. Speaker, you will recall that when this fund was originally set up some time ago, a couple of years ago, that it was to be used for the exploration and development of energy resources in Saskatchewan, oil, natural gas, coal, uranium, whatever.

One can only assume, Mr. Speaker, that if the Government fails to answer this question, which is a reasonable question, which is not difficult to answer, that this money has been used for some other purposes, whether it's to buy potash mines or going into general revenue, whatever, that's the only logical conclusion, Mr. Speaker. That's the only logical conclusion that I think anybody could come to if they fail to answer this question. I agree with the Member for Indian Head-Wolseley (Mr. MacDonald), there is no reason why the Government couldn't give us the figures up to the end of 1975, or at least a ballpark figure. There is no reason whatsoever. This Government is being secretive for some reason. Why they won't provide this information I cannot understand. But their indication earlier in this debate is that the information would not be forthcoming.

Mr. Speaker, I think the Motion is in order, and it's proper that this information should be made available to the people of Saskatchewan to know how much money has been accumulated into this fund, what it has been spent on if anything, at this stage, and whether it has been spent properly.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I ask all Members, including the backbenchers opposite, to give their support to this Motion.

Motion as amended negated on the following recorded division.

YEAS - 00

NAYS - 17

| | | |
|-----------|----------|----------|
| Steuart | Cameron | Larter |
| Stodalka | Edwards | Bailey |
| Lane | Clifford | Berntson |
| Wiebe | Anderson | Katzman |
| Malone | Merchant | Birkbeck |
| MacDonald | McMillan | |

ADJOURNED DEBATES

RESOLUTIONS

RESOLUTION NO. 5 - FEED GRAINS POLICY PLEBISCITE

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution moved by Mr. Johnson (Turtleford):

That this Assembly requests the Federal Government to call the producer plebiscite promised by the Honourable Otto Lang to decide on the future of the present Federal Feed Grains Policy, and failing this to immediately remove this policy which is having a detrimental impact on producers of both feed grains and livestock in western Canada.

Mr. A.N. McMillan (Kindersley): — Mr. Speaker, I'm confident that the Government opposite will treat this Resolution with the same consistency with which they dealt with Motion for Return No. 13.

This Resolution calls for the Federal Government to call the producer plebiscite that they promised to decide on the

future of the present Federal Feed Grains Policy, and failing this to immediately remove the policy, and I understand, and it has been quite obvious since the inception of this policy that Members opposite have been very much opposed to the implementation of this Feed Grains Policy. And it has really been a source of wonderment to me how Members opposite and certainly some members of the public could be opposed to the domestic sale of feed grains being taken out of the jurisdiction of the Wheat Board and put on what Members opposite call the open market.

I don't know where the sanctity of a monopoly comes from. Certainly this Government seems strongly in favor of a monopoly on public services such as Sask Power and Sask Tel and there may be a case to be made for that. Saskatchewan Government Insurance of course, is another one. And they seem to be very much in favor of a monopoly in the field of grain-handling. A monopoly to me indicates in the first place that there must be a weakness somewhere in a system or a program that is set up such as the Wheat Board to deal with grain-handling. There has to be some sort of a weakness if the only way that program can operate successfully is to have a monopoly on the handling of grains. And I have felt that way for a long time. Maybe mistakenly so. That same situation certainly applies to the Wheat Board. The monopoly that the Wheat Board has held on domestic feed grains has certainly had some weaknesses. Weaknesses that were exemplified in the fact that farmers were not allowed to haul from one province to the next. The borders were closed under the old system. And I live close enough to a provincial border to know the amount of grain that was hauled over those borders by struggling farmers and each time their trucks crossed those borders they were doing something illegal. That wasn't right in my mind. I have always felt that if a farmer wanted to trade grain with a neighbor or with the feedlot or anyone in another province he should have the right to do so.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McMillan: — Certainly there is no question that trading of grain dampened the public interest. It wasn't contrary to the national interest.

I was pleased, therefore, when the Minister in charge of the Wheat Board eliminated the Canadian Wheat Board monopoly on the handling of feed grains in the domestic market. The standard argument put forward by Members opposite and some members of the public, some members of co-operative elevator companies is that this program, the Feed Grains Program, weakens the Wheat Board. Once again, I say I find that suspect because any association or system that needs a monopoly in order to operate successfully I have to question. Now they said it weakens the Wheat Board and I'm not really sure why. I'm positive that the Member for Redberry, I believe it is, or Turtleford when he gets back will enlighten me. But I'm not really sure why it weakens the Wheat Board.

Some people have said well, farmers can plug our grain handling systems. There is no federal quota set and I have heard this argument heard many times on the local level to prevent one farmer from hauling all his feed grain in a few days and therefore preventing other farmers from hauling any feed grain at all. That's not true. There is a built-in system

of quotas so that the normal handling of grain in Canada is not disrupted. The elevator companies, I believe, are maintaining a maximum of ten per cent of their total volume for the storage of feed grains and the handling of non-board feeds. So that problem doesn't really exist, the problem of disrupting our handling of grain in Canada.

The pressure that historically has been on the Wheat Board because of the difference of price of domestic grain from eastern Canada to western Canada through the Wheat Board has been a constant problem for the Wheat Board to put up with the kind of bickering and hassling, that comes from eastern feed grain buyers, when feed grain is handled through the Wheat Board. That's been eliminated as well.

The Feed Grain Program has as well part of its package, a developmental program for domestic storage of feed grains. That was part of the Feed Grains Program and that in itself may do enough, and I should think this would please Members opposite, to stabilize the price of domestic feed grains by ensuring long range supplies in order to eliminate the ups and downs in the domestic feed grains market.

I should think that would be a strength for the Canadian grain handling system. Certainly for the handling of feed grains it certainly isn't detrimental to the Canadian Wheat Board.

The Resolution also says that this policy is having a detrimental impact on producers of both feed grains and livestock in western Canada. Livestock which is subsidized on its way to the East. Subsidized from Saskatchewan for example, to Thunder Bay by the Crow's Nest rates and subsidized from Thunder Bay down East even further with the Federal Feed Freight Assistance Program.

Now the Federal Government has committed itself as part of the Feed Grains Policy to removal of the Federal Feed Freight Assistance Program and I would predict that within the next five or six months you will see this discriminatory program removed.

The Minister in charge of the Wheat Board promised producers of feed grains a vote on the program. He said that vote would come and I think rightly so, at a time when the program had been in place at least for some length of time, so that producers had a chance to see if, in fact, it was detrimental to the handling of grain and to the Wheat Board. That program is not in place yet and I have just pointed out that the removal of the Federal Feed Freight Assistance Program has not been carried out yet, but probably will be in the next few months. The program isn't in place and I think if the Members opposite intend to approach the general handling of Canadian grains objectively and certainly the value of the Federal Feed Grains Assistance Program objectively I think it's only fair that they leave this program in place long enough to make a rational judgment as to whether it is in fact operating in the best interests of grain producers and ultimately the Wheat Board.

In the meantime, farmers do have a vote of sorts on the Feed Grains Policy. They can vote every day. This is something they never had before under the monopoly of the Wheat Board. They can vote every day on whether or not to haul their

feed grains to their local elevator under the protection of a Wheat Board pooling system. They also have the choice to haul it to the non-board feed market. That's a choice or freedom that farmers never had before.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McMillan: — They can, as one Member suggests vote with their truck.

It's for this reason that I am particularly opposed to this Resolution No. 5 because it shows subjective impatience on the part of the Members opposite. I think Members on both sides of the House upon close study would have to agree that unless the program is given time to work, that no rational and objective judgment can be made as to its worth.

It's for that reason that I am opposed to this motion calling for an immediate vote and will be voting against that motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. S.J. Cameron (Regina South): — Mr. Speaker, I want to direct a few comments to this Resolution. As the Hon. Member for Kindersley has indicated the Resolution is in effect premature because the Federal Feed Grains program is not yet fully implemented. He referred to one of the sides of that policy which has yet to be implemented which is currently being worked on that is the phasing out of Feed Freight Assistance from points east of Thunder Bay. There are three additional sides to that program which have yet to be introduced which we understand are currently being worked on.

The first is an increased storage capacity in the country for feed grain which again we understand is being worked on but is not yet in effect. And, thirdly, was an assurance that we would have equity in freight rates in connection with the movement of livestock on the one hand and meat on the other and grain on the third. Those three parts of this policy remain to be implemented.

I should remind Members also that the Feed Grains Policy is not a policy that applies uniquely or particularly to Saskatchewan. Indeed, it is a policy that doesn't only apply to Saskatchewan, Alberta and Manitoba but it is a national policy. So that when a plebiscite is taken in connection with it, it will be a national plebiscite and not a Saskatchewan plebiscite.

The second thing is that that program affects not only producers of feed grain on the Prairies, as I have said, but it affects producers of feed grain in other parts of the country. It also affects in a very significant way the users of the feed grain, so that hog men, livestock men in the Prairies and other parts of the country are affected in a very significant way by the policy. Therefore it is likely that the plebiscite when it comes will be a plebiscite not restricted to Saskatchewan or the Prairies but nationally, and secondly a plebiscite not only of producers of feed grain but users of feed grain as well. That may temper, I think, some of the eagerness of the Members opposite to have a plebiscite.

Mr. Speaker, I want to move an amendment to the Resolution in recognition of what we have indicated on this side, is our view. I move, seconded by Mr. Steuart that Resolution No. 5 be amended as follows:

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

The Federal Government continue the present Feed Grains policy, providing as it does a freedom of choice for the producers and that after:

(a) the policy is fully implemented; and

(b) primary producers in Canada have had the opportunity to fully assess the program they be given the opportunity to decide for themselves whether they wish to retain the program, modify it or return to the old system.

Debate continues on the motion and the amendment.

Hon. E.L. Cowley (Provincial Secretary): — Mr. Speaker, I think many of us will want to consider, not only the amendment offered by the Member for Regina South but particularly some of the comments made by the Member for Regina South with respect to the type of vote and who might vote in such a plebiscite, his understanding of the commitment made by the Hon. Mr. Lang.

Mr. Speaker, with a view to reviewing that, I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

RESOLUTION NO. 6 - ESTABLISHMENT OF BOARD OF ENQUIRY RE TEACHERS LEAVING

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution by Miss Clifford (Wilkie):

That this Assembly urges the Government of Saskatchewan to establish a Board of Enquiry to investigate the numbers of teachers leaving the province or the profession and to determine the reasons therefore in order that responsible solutions can be formulated to deal with this situation.

and the proposed amendment thereto moved by Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:

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

commends the Government of Saskatchewan for its efforts to make the teaching profession in this Province more attractive by its introduction of new collective bargaining legislation designed to improve conditions of work for teachers, by a grant formula which has eliminated the teacher-pupil ratio, by improving superannuation benefits for teachers, and by providing bursaries for teachers in specialized areas. Further, that this Assembly recognizes that through such positive actions, the Government of Saskatchewan has fostered an environment which will be most significant in improving the supply of teachers in this Province.

Mr. W.H. Stodalka (Maple Creek): — Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to enter this debate but some of the remarks that were made by the Minister of Education during the course of his presentation require some comment.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, the amendment introduced by the Member for Humboldt, the Minister of Education commends the Government for its efforts to make the teaching profession more attractive. The Minister refers to four government programs that have been significant in improving the supply of teachers. The following were the four programs that he referred to.

First of all, the collective bargaining legislation which he claims was designed to improve conditions of work for teachers. Secondly, the introduction of a grant formula which has eliminated the pupil-teacher ratio. Thirdly, the improvement of benefits in the superannuation program.

He claims that through these actions the Government has fostered an environment which will be most significant in improving the supply of teachers in this province.

Mr. Speaker, a review of what has happened since the legislation concerning collective bargaining was introduced leads one to question the assumption of that amendment. I should like a few minutes to elaborate on this.

First of all, let us take a look at what has happened to the trustees. The very structure of the collective bargaining team has emasculated the role of the trustee. Mr. Speaker, the format consists of five Government Members and four trustees. And indeed the role of the trustees is really primarily that of observers. Because, of course, the government team in practice has been taking their direction from the Cabinet. Mr. Speaker, I cannot see how trustees can be too impressed with this type of legislation.

Secondly if we take a look at the teachers of Saskatchewan one need only compare some of the salaries that now exist compared to the ones four or five years ago. I recently talked to a young teacher who had returned to the Province of Saskatchewan to be near his home. Last year he taught in the town of Brooks which is not too far inside the Province of Alberta and this year he is teaching near the city of Swift Current. Mr. Speaker, when talking to me he indicated that he suffered a \$2,000 loss in moving from the Province of Alberta to the Province of Saskatchewan. To me, Mr. Speaker, also in talking to other teachers, I have found that teachers in this Province of Saskatchewan are not too impressed with the gap that has increased between their salary rates and those paid in the Province of Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, at the time of the introduction of the legislation there was a two-year agreement which was forced upon the teachers of Saskatchewan by the Province of Saskatchewan. I believe that teachers are a bit skeptical as to why the agreement was a two-year agreement. It seems rather convenient that that two-year agreement moved the period of negotiation past an election date. Mr. Speaker, I contend that was a political gimmick and a political trick in order to take the Government of Saskatchewan beyond a period in which they

would have had some ticklish negotiations with the teachers of Saskatchewan. If this collective bargaining procedure has worked why have we had more strikes in the Province of Saskatchewan since the introduction of this legislation than we have ever had before?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Stodalka: — I speak of Canora and the teachers here in the city of Regina. Mr. Speaker, we are at a state as I indicated a little earlier today in the discussion, in which we have a situation in Saskatchewan where we do not have a contract for next year. I just hope that we don't run into the same situation as they have in the city of Toronto.

Mr. Speaker, the second item proposed by the Minister. He refers to the introduction of a grant formula which eliminated the pupil-teacher ratio. Anyone who has done any work in education knows that this is absolute complete nonsense. The Member for Eston-Elrose (Mr. Bailey) nods his head. He has had experience too. Anyone who has anything to do with determining the number of teachers you are going to have in a system looks at the amount of money that is available to him. It is the amount of money you have available that will determine how many teachers are going to staff your school. Of course, if you have more money available, then you, of course, can have more teachers within the schools. The teacher-pupil ratio is there. You sit down, you look at the money and you look at the number of students within the school and then you assign the number of teachers. Everyone who has to work in staffing determines the number of teachers in their area by the number of students that are located in a particular school. It is a very prime important factor, in fact, the most important factor.

The third point mentioned is the improvement of superannuation benefits for the teachers. I would have to congratulate the former Minister of Education (Mr. MacMurchy), no doubt about it there were improvements made in the Superannuation Act and the teachers appreciated them. There are still improvements needed and I understand that negotiations this year are considering further improvements.

Finally the bursaries for teachers in specialized areas. If I had any criticism it would be that most of the money seemed to be spent in one area, and that was physical education. Mr. Speaker, I feel that there are other areas that are just as important as physical education. And while that money was well spent, I think there is room for more money to be spent in some of the other areas.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I should like to conclude my remarks.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J. Wiebe (Morse): — Mr. Speaker, just a few brief comments in regard to this amendment. I too, had not intended on entering this debate until we were favored with the comments from the new Minister of Education (Mr. Tchorzewski).

I was surprised to say the least, Mr. Speaker, that the new Minister of Education would even bring up anything about collective bargaining legislation for teachers and in fact the amendment. I think that one can say that the fact that the Minister is new in his job, is what precipitated this particular amendment and the comments which he made.

The Hon. Member says conditions for teachers in Saskatchewan are more attractive because of the collective bargaining legislation introduced by his party. Now, Mr. Speaker, they tell us the schools don't do a good job of teaching arithmetic. But I will tell the Hon. Members opposite that I found that teacher negotiators are very able in their mathematics. If this is an attempt to pull the wool over the eyes of teachers, the Hon. Minister will soon learn that teachers will not be sucked in.

Let us, Mr. Speaker, take a look at what the new collective bargaining legislation has done for our Saskatchewan teachers. In 1973, the last year in which we had area bargaining in this province, the trustees of this province had managed to bring all rural salaries in the province in line with salaries paid in our city systems.

Mr. Rolfes: — That is not true.

Mr. Wiebe: — Mr. Speaker, that did more to attract and keep teachers in rural Saskatchewan than all legislation the Members opposite have ever introduced. If the former Minister of Education disagrees with me, I am sure that when I sit down he will be more than happy to jump in and join in the debate.

I think, too, Mr. Speaker, one might ask if what you did was such a fantastic job, how come you are no longer Minister of Education?

Let me go on further to say, Mr. Speaker, that school trustees working with their own teachers and in their own communities were the ones who raised teacher's salaries. Let us take a good look, Mr. Speaker, at what the New Deal collective bargaining legislation has done for teachers in Saskatchewan. In 1973 the salaries for teachers in Saskatchewan were ahead of those in Manitoba by about two and one-half per cent. That is not much, Mr. Speaker, but it is something to keep in mind. We were two and one-half per cent higher in Saskatchewan than they were in Manitoba.

Now, let's look at Alberta. Our Saskatchewan teachers were behind the teachers in Alberta in 1973 but they were in the process of catching up. Salaries on the average were about five and one-half per cent lower in Saskatchewan than what they were in Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, again, I say that the teachers were sold a bill of goods and Members opposite know it. Under area bargaining our teachers were two and one-half per cent ahead of Manitoba; and only five and one-half per cent behind Alberta teachers. Now, Mr. Speaker, our teachers have had two years of the so-called New Deal collective bargaining legislation, and how do they stand now in 1975. Manitoba teachers who were behind us by two and one-half per cent as far as salaries were concerned in 1973 have caught up to us, and, Mr. Speaker, they

have passed us. In 1975 you will find teachers were 4.4 per cent higher than those teachers in Saskatchewan. In other words, Mr. Speaker, in the two years under NDP area bargaining, Manitoba teachers gained seven per cent over teachers in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I say it is not only bad enough to sell our teachers a bill of goods, it's worse to tell them they have had a good deal. If the figures for Manitoba are bad, the comparison with the Province of Alberta is worse. In 1973 under area bargaining, Saskatchewan teachers were 5.5 per cent behind the teachers of Alberta. Today, after two years of this New Deal, teachers are now 12.5 per cent behind those teachers in Alberta.

The situation with teachers' salaries is shameful and that shame is made worse by the attempts by this Government to cover it up.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wiebe: — The entire situation, Mr. Speaker, might I suggest, has been created by the NDP Government when they disfranchised every ratepayer in Saskatchewan by setting up a government controlled committee to negotiate salaries. They attempt to blame the guidelines set by the Liberal Government for keeping the teachers behind. The two-year agreement was set up for the sole purpose of getting past the June 11th election without upsetting the teachers. This Government and in particular the Member for Last Mountain must take full responsibility for the present state of teachers' salaries in this province.

Let's take a look at the matter of pupil-teacher ratio, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. MacMurchy) and the new Minister of Education (Mr. Tchorzewski) wave this one like a banner. There is no more truth as the Member for Maple Creek has suggested that the elimination of the pupil-teacher ratio has occurred than there is to the statement that our teachers have prospered under the new bargaining system. The pupil-teacher ratio is still there, it has only been given a different name. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that the number of students in our school systems are dropping rapidly since the NDP took office in 1971. The number of teachers has not been dropping. The ratio across the province has dropped a bit, and only a little bit.

Mr. Speaker, the New Deal for pupil-teacher ratio is to limit the number of dollars, the old and the honorable way was to name the number of students. It wasn't popular, Mr. Speaker, but it was honest. We end up in exactly the same place. Whether you name it a pupil-teacher ratio or whether you hide it by fooling around with a school grant until you get the ratio you want, the result is still exactly the same.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wiebe: — Mr. Speaker, there are many more comments which I would like to make in regard to this particular amendment and I ask leave at this time to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

RESOLUTION NO. 8 - NATIONALIZATION OF RAILWAY ROADBEDS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution by Mr. Lange:

That this Assembly request the Federal Government to nationalize the railway roadbeds to ensure the provision of adequate rail service to all populated areas of Saskatchewan and ensure complementary operations of the rail line companies required to improve overall operating efficiencies.

And the proposed amendment thereto by Mr. Berntson:

That the words "the Federal Government to nationalize the railway roadbeds" be deleted and the words "the Hall Commission to examine the possibility of federal ownership of railway right of ways" substituted therefor.

Mr. J.L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw North): — Mr. Speaker, in speaking on this Resolution that has been moved by my hon. Colleague, Mr. Lange, I would like to suggest that when I adjourned the debate the other day we were talking about the nationalization of the roadbeds at which time an amendment to the Resolution was made reading along the lines that the Hall Commission would examine the possibility of federal ownership of railway right of ways be substituted therefor. Now before I get into this, Mr. Speaker, I should like to suggest on Friday last I did make one mistake in that I didn't allow a question from the Hon. Member opposite for Rosetown-Elrose (Mr. Bailey) and I can assure the Hon. Member opposite at this time I will allow questions. I was a little excited by the annoying actions of the Liberal Party in the progress of Private Bills on that particular day and in that regard I was a little upset when the Hon. Member for Morse (Mr. Wiebe) decided to ask a question which probably was an irrelevant type of question at that time.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Skoberg: — Mr. Speaker, when we talk about the nationalization of the roadbeds or when we talk about the nationalization of the right of ways, I am sure that we are talking about the same thing in the motion and the amendment to the motion. The only thing that I am suggesting is that, as I suggested when I adjourned debate on this particular Resolution before us, is that the Hall Commission should not be vested with that type of responsibility in making a political decision as to the nationalization of the roadbeds or the right of ways. I am sure that the Hon. Justice Hall is one individual who has all he can possibly do at this time to take care of the hearings that he is conducting throughout this province and, as I said that particular day, each and everyone of us in this House has the highest confidence in the decisions of Mr. Hall insofar as that responsibility is concerned. However, I do not believe that the Hon. Mr. Hall should be subjected to a decision-making process insofar as this amendment is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, when we talk about the nationalization of the roadbeds or the right of ways, I am sure that each and everyone of us here are concerned about our railway system. All of us here are well aware of the fact that at this particular time in

history in Canada and in fact in most of the world, that the roadways, the highways, the airways, the seaways, the canals, in fact all those other areas other than the railway and pipelines are under public ownership. I am also certain, Mr. Speaker, that as time goes on and as we examine this whole area of transportation in Canada we will decide on nationalization of the roadbeds in such a way that those people wishing to use the railway roadbeds should be entitled to do so by paying for the use of it. I am also confident, Mr. Speaker, that if the users of the highways, of the canals and the waterways, or the airways and the airports and all those attendant facilities that go with their use, had to pay their full share, then they would not be as viable as they may appear at this particular time. Only the railways are subjected to this type of treatment in the transportation field.

I am suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that the railways themselves have tried in some cases to bring about a type of transportation system that would serve this country but when they are subjected to the type of competition that they receive from the other forms of transportation then naturally they are behind the eight ball. When they then are given some type of subsidy we hear many people, many political people, scream their heads off that the railways should not be subsidized. I can't help but remember, Mr. Speaker, the words of the then Hon. Minister in Ottawa, the Hon. Mr. Jack Pickersgill, who consistently was an air-borne type of a Minister who consistently damned the railroads, who consistently said that unless the railways can pay their way they should be done away with.

I am suggesting the same thing applies at this particular time in our history when we look at the type of transportation that we have, the type of road congestion that we have in our larger centres and also look at the situation that the province to the west of us has, the province of British Columbia. There we see the Liberal Minister in that particular province suggesting that if the people there can't afford the new insurance rates let them sell their cars. I am suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that that is a further indication that there must be a nationalization of the roadbeds in order that those people that do have to sell their cars in British Columbia because of the coalition in that province and the Liberal Minister in that province, then there must be a nationalized roadbed so that people can afford to use that type of system of transportation. It is quite apparent that the people in British Columbia because of the coalition are not going to be able to drive cars and will have to look to other forms of transportation.

Mr. Speaker, I am also suggesting that unless we do grapple with this situation in all sincerity on all sides of the House and in fact by all political parties across this country, and nationalize the roadbeds of railways, which this Resolution calls for, if this is not brought about we are going to be subjected to a badly deteriorated rail transportation system.

I am also suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that the Federal Government at this time are hell bent to bring in air systems only, air travel only, for one reason. I am suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that unless we look at this Resolution sincerely we are going to be faced with the Federal Government decision insofar as air travel is concerned. I think that everyone in this House is well aware of the fact that the Federal Government now probably has the complete ownership of Canadair, they also own

practically all of the shares of DeHaviland, which clearly spells out that their only interest at this time is air travel and they can let rail travel go to pot insofar as the people of Canada are concerned.

I am also concerned, Mr. Speaker, that if we don't grapple seriously with the situation before us and make the roadbeds, the right of ways a nationalized type of responsibility, then, as some people in the Transportation Department have said, we will be subjected to a type of system where rail passenger traffic will come to an end. I say that the nationalization of the roadbeds is important when we look at statements which have been made in a paper here most recently where it says that a spokesman for the Federal Transportation Department said in Ottawa:

No one is making an effort to make trains unattractive. The simple truth is that existing passenger loads and passenger revenues do not warrant the money required to operate the service.

Mr. Speaker, it is quite apparent there has been no research or development in Canada to any significant degree as compared to the air traffic that they are now trying to bring about and are spending millions upon millions of dollars on. There has been no research and development into that type of equipment to put on a roadbed which would be the most economical insofar as Canadian rail travel is concerned. I am suggesting that we have to look at the situation of all these forms of transportation and those areas that they travel upon being nationalized so that all means of transportation have an equal start and are able to then compare the various advantages that they might have.

Mr. Speaker, as I have said before, there are three areas that we fail to recognize, three areas of the rail transportation system pertaining to rail, can encompass, there are three areas that would be of benefit to all Canadians from a nationalized transportation roadbed particularly. These have to do with energy conservation, land use, and pollution. And I might suggest to the Hon. Members opposite that there is an excellent publication out, the Future of American Transportation, edited by Ernest W. Williams, Jr., which compares the advantages in ecology and economics of rail transportation over the automobile. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Members opposite spend some time in reading that particular publication.

Mr. Speaker, we well know that the Hon. Minister of Transport, the Hon. Minister, Mr. Lang, had indicated that he plans to announce the Government's new passenger rail policy before January 29th. Now whether or not, Mr. Speaker, that will also include consideration of the nationalization of the roadbeds as contained in this Resolution, no one knows. Possibly the Hon. Member for Regina South (Mr. Cameron) who was the executive assistant to that Minister of Transportation, might have some insight in that particular regard. What does bother me is that the rumor is coming out that Canada is going to be subjected to the worst type of treatment of any country in the world insofar as rail passenger service is concerned even if they consider the nationalization of the roadbeds.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that they are looking seriously at only one service to Winnipeg, Calgary, Vancouver, without

sleepers, without diners, they are looking at one service in the Quebec, Montreal, Toronto, Windsor areas that would possibly be a fast service; the light, comfortable, rapid transit system that we have seen and have spent considerable sums of money on without any purchases up to this time. And they are looking at one service in the Atlantic provinces, the Canadian National Railroad, which would service the whole Maritime Provinces area. Mr. Speaker, I am suggesting that the least that we can do in this House is to look seriously at where our transportation system is going, look seriously at whether or not we shouldn't urge the public ownership, nationalization or public ownership, one and the same, of our ground transportation.

I can well imagine, Mr. Speaker, that this has to be federal jurisdiction and I appreciate that, but I would think that a resolution passed in this House, and if in fact resolutions are passed in other Houses of the Legislatures across Canada, then possibly it would have some influence upon those decision-making processes in the Canadian Transport Commission. I do say that as long as we have people who are dedicated to air travel only, that they are dedicated to millions upon millions of dollars being spent on research and development in air travel only. Our rail transportation in Canada is bound to deteriorate and any form of resolution about nationalizing the roadbeds or the right of ways will be useless.

I am suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that there is no way and I oppose the amendment for that reason, that there is no way that politicians should try to pass off their responsibility on to a person with the esteem of the Hon. Mr. Justice Hall.

I do not for one minute say that everything has to be rail transportation but I do say that there has to be an integrated transportation system and to bring about the integration that is necessary, then the very essence, the roadbeds and the right of ways, then has to be integrated with highway transportation, has to be integrated with air transportation and also with waterways and pipelines, which aren't included or course in this Resolution.

I am asking that the Hon. Members opposite realize that there are millions upon millions of dollars being spent in research and development insofar as the STOL aircraft, research and development in other forms of transportation other than rail. But until the time comes that we do have some public ownership of the actual roadbeds, then of course you can't possibly bring about a truly integrated system where the public of Canada, the taxpayers, are being treated fairly. I am suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that it may be fine for those who say that we can have private ownership of the right of ways, private ownership of roadbeds but I am suggesting that if the amendment is defeated and the Resolution accepted by those opposite at least then we have made step number one in a long overdue process insofar as a nationalization of our transportation system in Canada.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. C.P. MacDonald (Indian Head-Wolseley): — Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to participate in this debate but to ask Members of the House to stand and vote for anything as asinine as this Resolution is beyond my

comprehension. I am going to ask some of the Members opposite that have a little bit of economic sense to sit down and look at what this Resolution says. It says to nationalize the roadbeds, not the trains, not the passenger service, not the freight service, in other words it asks the taxpayers to spend hundreds of millions of dollars in subsidy to the CPR and get none of the revenue. Mr. Speaker, my friends opposite are so convinced of doctrinaire socialism, of the desire of the Government to own everything that this Resolution is so lacking in common sense, so lacking in economic reality that it is almost laughable. I say that honestly, it is almost laughable. I don't believe that the Attorney General who is in charge of transportation in this province can even vote for this. I don't believe that the Minister now in charge can vote for this and I want to tell you why.

Of the Canadian people and of all the parties in Canada none have been more critical of the CPR and its subsidies and its costs to the Canadian taxpayers than the NDP. We talked, for example, each year how they are subsidized in operating costs, we are supplying them the boxcars now to move wheat, and we have given them free land to build their railways on, we have given them mineral rights, we have given them hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars, but I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if the Federal Government of Canada nationalized the roadbeds, all the subsidies and all the money given to the CPR over the past 100 years since confederation, this Resolution will make these grants minute. Just think of all the people who work on the track, the thousands across Canada; the cost of gravel, iron, steel, men and maintenance. And the Minister who moved it and just spoke is a man who works on the railway and he should know the costs. And then he made the analysis of Air Canada and the airports and the pipelines, but what he forgot to say, that when Air Canada takes off the revenues of yours and my purchases of tickets it goes to Air Canada. But what he is suggesting now is that we pay the costs of maintaining, operating and purchasing of the roadbeds. He didn't give the revenue of the freight and the hauling and everything else to the CPR to put in their pockets and eliminate 50 to 75 per cent of their cost.

I cannot understand, Mr. Speaker. I am not going to say anything more, but I am going to ask anybody on that side of the House, with one ounce of economic sense, with that one ounce of common sense to examine how asinine this Resolution is and to consider deeply whether they are not going to go on record for voting for something which is as utterly laughable as this particular Resolution is. I hope that everybody will support the amendment of the Member, Mr. Berntson, because at least what he is going to say, is let Justice Hall examine this Resolution, examine the feasibility, what it would cost the Canadian taxpayer and the Canadian public to turn and do what this Resolution suggests, forgive the CPR all its maintenance costs and put them on the backs of the Canadian taxpayer and then when those facts come out, then I should like to see that Member or any Member on that side of the House stand up and vote for this Resolution.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. B. Allen (Regina Rosemont): — Mr. Speaker, along with the Member for Indian Head-Wolseley I had not intended to speak in this debate either but

I thought I would offer a few words of wisdom on the subject of the nationalization of the roadbed of the railway companies.

I would have to agree with the Member for Indian Head-Wolseley when he suggests that we should nationalize the CPR in its entirety. I support the Hon. Member in that. I should point out, however, that the Resolution that we are dealing with now, and if he intends at a later date to introduce a resolution along the lines of nationalization of the CPR, I would support it at that time as well. But this particular Resolution merely brings to the forefront the policy of the Federal Liberal Party in the last federal election.

I recall at that time the Premier of British Columbia, delivering a speech similar to the Member for Indian Head-Wolseley, saying that he thought it was ridiculous that we should nationalize the CPR, nationalize the railway system and make a sensible railway system out of it. I think we have to deal though, Mr. Speaker, with the realities of the day. No Liberal Government is going to nationalize the CPR. No Liberal Government is going to do that. What we have to consider is what kind of a rail system is going to best serve our agricultural producers and our manufacturers in western Canada and particularly in our province. And when the rail lines are in such a state of disrepair; boxcars falling off the tracks, speed limits of 10, 15 miles an hour on many, many branch lines in the province, something simply has to be done. I think this is a sensible Resolution. It calls on the Federal Government to implement their policy which was stated in the 1974 election and I think that we should support it.

Would the Hon. Member for Indian Head-Wolseley suggest that the highway system in the province should be turned over to private hands? That the truckers driving up and down the highway, that they should pay for the highways solely. I think not, I think nobody would want to go back to that kind of Ayn Rand free enterprise, except perhaps, the Member for Wilkie (Miss Clifford) . . . Just off the top of my head . . .

Mr. Speaker, once again, I think it is a very sensible Resolution and one that deserves the support of all Members of the House.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. R.L. Collver (Leader of the Progressive Conservatives): — Mr. Speaker, I wasn't going to enter into this debate either but I thought it might be apropos as this stage to suggest that there is perhaps a little bit of truth on both sides of this question.

To suggest that somehow we should still be paying tolls between Saskatoon and Regina, as I just heard from the Member to my right, I would think that that would be very inappropriate in terms of attempting to operating a trucking system, or a freight system, or a passenger service system, between Saskatoon and Regina on the highways, to attempt to operate that through a privately owned and privately operated roadway.

To suggest, on the other hand that this is some kind of politically motivated motion and should be maintained as a politically motivated motion and that the one side is for the

nationalization of the CPR; the other side is against the nationalization of the CPR, surely is overlooking the point here. This might not be a bad idea. It might not be a bad suggestion that the roadbeds for the railways be owned by the Federal Government and that independent, individual, whether they be government owned or privately owned, railways should perhaps be able to use those roadbeds. The farmers, for an example, could own their own trains, perhaps, and that might not be a bad idea; the Wheat Pool might perhaps be able to own their own trains and with the use of modern computer technology which seems to escape the Members on my right, this is quite feasible. It didn't use to be where you only had one track and the only way that you could operate that track system was by telegraph or by telephone, but with the modern computer it is quite feasible that you could have independently owned and operated trains on a publicly owned railway roadbed, operating across the country.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't think that it is a bad idea. I think it might be a good idea, but I don't have enough facts and I don't think any Member of this Legislature has enough facts to suggest whether or not this is feasible; whether or not this is a good or bad idea; whether or not it would benefit the people of Canada. And, surely, at this particular junction we have a Commission that is studying the problem of rail line abandonment in western Canada and surely this might just be a very good suggestion to present to them, to look at in a reasonable way and a reasonable fashion. And, surely, Mr. Speaker, it would be a good idea to submit this suggestion to them from this Assembly, as a reasonable suggestion that perhaps they could study. If, after they have studied it, after they have spent some time looking at it and they felt it wasn't workable, it wasn't feasible, for whatever reason, because they are an independent study group and because they have been called to study this very problem, surely they are the exact people to be looking at this kind of a problem.

So, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, and I recommend to all Members of this Legislative Assembly not to vote in accordance with what happened in the past; not to vote in accordance with what you read into the Resolution, but to support the amendment as a good idea that may, perhaps, fly, that may perhaps be reasonable and that perhaps should be studied by the Hall Commission in the light of its present study.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J. Wiebe (Morse): — Mr. Speaker, possibly we should make it number four who hadn't intended on getting into the debate until this evening. I had thought and planned on voting in favor of the amendment until I found that the Leader of the Conservative Party (Mr. Collver) is also in favor of the nationalization of our roadbeds.

I can see it now. We were talking a few years back about the RR railroads in British Columbia, which was the Roy Romanow railroad, running for something like 30 miles through the mountains. I can just image the Wiebe Railroad Company from Main Centre. Sure, I am a farmer but heaven forbid I have a hard enough time buying a five ton truck to transport my grain from Main Centre to the main line, let alone to buy a railroad or a train and boxcars to transport that grain from Main Centre

to the Lakehead.

I think, though, that the amendment as presented by the Member for Cannington, is worth consideration and is worth support. The reason why I say this is because it differs so much from the Resolution which the Member for Bengough-Milestone (Mr. Lange) has presented. The Resolution as presented by the Member for Bengough clearly indicates the philosophy and the thinking of the Government Members opposite — nationalize. We know what is best for Canada so let's nationalize the roadbeds.

The Member for Moose Jaw North (Mr. Skoberg) spoke against the amendment. He spoke against the opportunity of the people of Saskatchewan to voice their concerns as to whether they want the roadbeds in this province nationalized or not, for the same reason that they voted against our suggestion that the people of Saskatchewan have an opportunity to voice their concerns on Bill 1. Might I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it is probably going to be the same reason that they are going to vote against my amendment which asks for a study into the abandonment proposals of our elevator companies.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think that we, in this Assembly, whether we be in Government or Opposition can tell the people of Saskatchewan that we know what the answers are, because we don't and let's admit it. And for us to come out and say that the railways have to be nationalized; that the railroad beds have to be nationalized, I don't think we have the right to suggest that. But what I do believe is that we have the right to suggest that the possibility of the nationalization of our roadbeds be considered by the Hall Commission and in turn by being considered by the Hall Commission it is being considered by each and every farmer and resident of the Province of Saskatchewan.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I have no hesitation whatsoever in supporting the amendment but I will be voting against the original resolution if it gets that far.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. A.E. Blakeney (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I gather this is an opportunity for everybody to get into the debate. I hadn't intended to participate in this debate and I welcome the opportunity to say a few words on this particular Resolution.

I certainly believe that it would be wise for the railbeds of this country to be nationalized. Certainly this is not a revolutionary idea. It was put forward by the four western provinces at the Western Economic Opportunities Conference at Calgary. It was put forward on behalf of our group by the Premier of Alberta, Mr. Lougheed. It is not to be thought that this is doctrinaire socialism unless we have converted the Premier of Alberta to that doctrine.

I think it is fair to say that a good number of people believe that the railways of the country should be publicly owned and operated as they are in France, Britain or many other countries, some of which may be thought to be of the socialist persuasion and some of them not thought to be of a socialist persuasion.

But some people feel that there is a halfway house. That we could allow the private operations of the railroads, in the terms of the running and that we could have publicly owned roadbeds and that this would offer opportunities for others to enter into the railway business in a restricted way. And one can certainly see a coal company getting some unit trains and taking their coal from the Rocky Mountains to the West Coast. Or one could see the potash companies getting some motive power — they already have some rolling stock — and moving their potash in that way. One could see this as a way of providing a measure of competition in western Canada that we don't see now. One could see it as a way of resolving some of the difficulties which now surround the movement of freight in western Canada, where the CN does not move freight in the most economical and direct way, because the tracks happen to be owned by the CP or vice versa. And there are some spectacular examples of that in Canada. You can find instances where in any one year 8,000 to 10,000 cars of grain will move from Calgary to Edmonton so they may cross the Rockies on the CN line and another 8,000 to 10,000 cars of grain will move from Edmonton to Calgary so they may cross the Rockies on the CP line.

Somebody may think that that is efficiency. Somebody may think that it is a good idea to have in competing railways, but nobody has explained the merits of those particular movements.

There are many examples of that. You can find them in a smaller way. Around Saskatchewan you can find trains moving in and out of the Meadow Lake - Glaslyn area, deadheading. They happen to be on tracks which are owned by the wrong company. They can't stop and pick up the grain because it is a CP track and there is another label painted on the car. All this is justified under the heading of efficiency and competition. Certainly some of these problems could be solved with joint running rights, but just as clearly they could be solved with the public ownership of those roadbeds.

I happen to believe, firstly, that it would be a good idea for the railroads to be owned by the Crown, the Federal Crown. As an alternative, I believe we should express the point of view that the roadbeds should be owned by the Federal Crown, a view similar to that put forward by the Western provinces at Calgary.

I would not wish to see this subject considered by the Hall Commission . It is not that I think that the Hall Commission would not be competent to look into it, except that I think it would be one more major subject for that Commission to consider, and I think they have their plate full.

I think on that basis, and really on that basis alone, I am going to vote against the amendment, because I think it really suggests that the Hall Commission examine this issue. I would like to put it in more positive terms and to suggest that we take a position on it. In my judgment there is enough evidence in. Certainly when we pass resolutions here, we don't ask for all the evidence and I believe there is enough evidence for us to make a judgment, that the Federal Government should own the roadbeds.

I am not attracted to the word 'nationalize' because it conveys so many different meanings to different people. I don't know whether the sodium sulphate plant at Chaplin is a

nationalized plant or not. I know it is publicly owned, but it was built from the ground up by the Government. I don't know whether that is nationalization or not. I don't know whether some of the other operations that the Power Corporation has purchased are nationalized or not. I don't know whether it is necessary, as that word is used by some people, that there be some measure of compulsory taking, I don't know that. I don't use that word because it seems to me to be fraught with ambiguity.

But having said that, I believe that they should be publicly owned and since the Resolution expresses that point of view, that we do publicly own the railway beds to insure the provision of good rail service to all the populated areas of Saskatchewan, to improve overall efficiency, which could be done by this method and other methods, but certainly by this method. I think this Resolution is one which is worthy of support.

I certainly do not object strongly to the amendment. My principal objection to the amendment is that if passed it would prevent me from voting for the Resolution. If the amendment were a separate resolution standing by itself and the first resolution wasn't on the Order Paper, I for my part would support an amendment suggesting that an appropriate commission — and for the reasons I've indicated I don't think it should be the Hall Commission — examine the possibility of federal ownership of the right of ways. It's a good idea. All we are really arguing about here is whether it should be done now, whether we should express a point of view now or whether we need some more study before we adopt the same idea and whether that study should be by the Hall Commission.

I think all will agree that those are differences of degree and not of substance. So I think that it doesn't much matter how this comes out. I think this House will be expressing a point of view favoring the idea of federal ownership of the roadbeds. Or, at least, a very careful analysis of that problem. Because anyone who votes for the amendment is at least proceeding in that direction and if he finds that the Resolution is too strong for him it will only be a matter of degree.

Those who vote for the main motion will be in favor of the same idea as well and I think we will then be expressing our support very clearly, whether we support the amendment or the motion, for the idea of federal ownership of the railway roadbeds. Those who don't like that idea should be voting against both the amendment and the main motion and I don't think there will be too many.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Collver: — Mr. Speaker, before the Premier takes his chair would he permit a question?

Mr. Speaker, at the Calgary Economic Development Conference, as I understood, the resolution of the four western provinces as it related to, not only the federal ownership of roadbeds, but as it related to the suggested changes in the freight rate structure and so on, that these were suggestions for study and possible implementation if I am remembering the wording correctly, and did not suggest that they were the only alternatives but should be considered as one of many alternatives that were at the disposal of the Federal Government to make a

significant change in the freight handling system in western Canada. As a result of that, as I understand it, the Hall Commission was created to do just that. To examine not only the possibilities of rail line abandonment, but also to examine the possibilities of improvement of rail traffic in western Canada and surely the motion here with amended motion, would suggest that. Would the Premier not agree that that was what was presented to the Calgary Economic Conference and not a specific statement that the Government of Canada should nationalize the roadbeds of the rights of way?

Mr. Blakeney: — I wouldn't put quite the same emphasis on it as the Member for Nipawin, but I think it's fair to say that the problem as seen by the four western provinces was outlined and two or three proposals were put forward. One of them indicated that there should be a new freight rate structure to prevent any short haul rate from being higher than a long haul rate. Another freight rate structure was put forward asking for some proportional freight rates based upon distance. I'm summarizing rather inadequately some very elaborate proposals. I hope Members will understand that. The third proposal put forward was for public ownership of the roadbed. They were all put forward as proposals for dealing with the particular problems which were identified by the four western provinces.

They were not part of the problem of rail line abandonment as such, but of the whole freight problem of western Canada. Now, those are related problems, but they are in some sense separate. We weren't talking primarily about grain movement but movement of all kinds of goods.

Therefore, I think that while there is some substance to what the Member for Nipawin says, I would not have thought that the rail line abandonment problem being analysed by the Hall Commission was a very large part of the problem, as identified by the four Western Premiers, to which they suggested these solutions. The solutions put forward were the two different freight rate packages that I talked about and the public ownership package. They are related but I wouldn't have thought they were identical or even that close.

Mr. Collier: — Mr. Speaker, I have one further brief question, if I might, Mr. Premier. I do not have the terms of reference of the Hall Commission in front of me or with me, but as I understood those terms of reference, Mr. Speaker, would the Premier clarify that, as to whether or not the Hall Commission was specifically established to examine only rail line abandonment or was its terms of reference and scope of work to have gone beyond that and to have discussed the entire spectrum of rail lines in western Canada and rail traffic and rail travel as it related to western Canada?

Mr. Blakeney: — My impression is the other way. Certainly it is not rail line abandonment only. It's grain-handling primarily and rail line abandonment is a major component of the problem. I think that the Hall Commission is not addressing itself, except only at the periphery, to the movement of potash or the movement of coal or the movement of wood pulp, or the movement of meat, to name four or five sore points. You all know our sensitivity on the feed grains freight rates to eastern Canada

in relation to the meat freight rates in eastern Canada. I don't think the Hall Commission regards itself as addressing itself to those particular problems, although I am speaking from memory and I may have misconceived the full breadth of the Hall Commission study as well.

Mr. J.G. Lane (Qu'Appelle): — Assuming the Resolution is passed, Mr. Premier, would it then be your desire that the Hall Commission then, if feasible, take this into account in its studies? Is that your desire?

Mr. Blakeney: — Certainly if the Hall Commission felt that they could do it without unduly prolonging their other work I would be perfectly satisfied with that. I think there are a number of decisions in western Canada hinging upon the outcome of the Hall Commission and I wouldn't want to see their work unduly delayed. I think, knowing Judge Hall, that it won't happen, because I think he will so order his affairs that a report will be coming fairly promptly. I wouldn't want to overload the Commission, but if it were felt that this could be easily worked in with his work, that would be entirely satisfactory to me and I believe to the Government.

Mr. Lane: — Would it then be fair for me to say that you would have it as a lower priority than the framework on which the Hall Commission is working right now and if they had to make an either/or that you would prefer them to consider the matters that they are now addressing themselves to? Is that fair?

Mr. Blakeney: — Chronologically lower. I'm not saying less important. I'm just saying that in terms of the time urgency. Now that we've started on this Hall Commission I don't think it should dangle too long.

Mr. R.H. Bailey (Rosetown-Elrose): — I wonder if I might just say a few words to this. I think the Resolution and the amendment that was moved by my colleague for Souris-Cannington, I would hate to see the proposed Resolution or the amendment die within these Chambers because of political differences like I've seen so many other amendments and motions die in this House in that way.

Now, the Member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lane) asked the Premier a question, two questions I suppose. The deleting of the words, "the Hall Commission to examine the possibility . . ." I'm wondering, Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of those on both sides of the House if we keep in the proper perspective and because, in fact, the railways do involve more than just people from Saskatchewan. They are interprovincial in nature, of course.

I had originally thought, was thinking before the Member for Qu'Appelle asked his question if perhaps instead of moving this to the Hall Commission to examine the possibility of federal ownership, if we had further time to consider asking the Federal Government to set up an interprovincial committee so we could get a cross section from the Atlantic to the Pacific in the operation of the total amount of rail traffic for the various commodities including travel.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that rather than just

nationalizing the roadbeds, we have a great deal more to consider in this and I haven't really followed the argument as to what is going to happen. I know that the Premier spoke on it, I know that my Leader has spoken on it, but it seems to me that there is a great deal more than should be done. And instead of just having a western conference on it, maybe it is a good idea if you don't think the Hall Commission can handle it — I think they can — I wonder if the House would consider an amendment to the amendment, and I am not suggesting it at this time, all I am suggesting, Mr. Speaker, is, let's not let a timely amendment and possibly a timely resolution fall on the books because of the differences that may exist politically in the House at this time.

Mr. J.G. Lane (Qu'Appelle): — Mr. Speaker, in that regard following up what the Hon. Member for Rosetown-Elrose has stated, I think that in the interest of the debate that has gone on in this particular Resolution, that if I may beg leave to adjourn debate tonight in the interest, of perhaps, an amendment being worked out among the various parties so that the intent of the Resolution and the amendment are not lost.

Debate adjourned.

RESOLUTION NO. 24 - USE OF PUBLIC MONEY TO CARRY ON POTASH CAMPAIGN IN THE NEWS MEDIA

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution by Mr. E.C. Malone (Regina Lakeview):

That this Assembly deplores the use of public money by the Government of Saskatchewan to carry on in the news media of Saskatchewan what is essentially a political campaign, and an effort to manipulate people's thoughts in support of the takeover of the potash mines in the province.

and the proposed amendment thereto moved by the Hon. Mr. Cowley:

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

commends the Government of Saskatchewan for providing the people of this province with information concerning the programs, activities and policies of their Government and thereby creating an aware public and an atmosphere conducive to responsible government.

Mr. A.N. McMillan (Kindersley): — Mr. Speaker, it gives me a good deal of pleasure to enter this debate. It is particularly disturbing to me that the Government, in the past four and a half years has entered upon a political campaign with the use of the taxpayers' money that is certainly unprecedented to the best of my knowledge at any time in the history of Saskatchewan. It says a good deal about the people who are involved in government policy and the people who make the decisions about government advertising with taxpayers' money. I think, rather bluntly, that the Government's move in the advertising field in the way that it has been done here in Saskatchewan is unethical to say the least. As well it is an insult to the integrity of this Legislature and certainly, I think, an insult to the people of Saskatchewan.

It is an indication, in many respects, that those Members opposite seem to feel that perhaps the ends will justify the means. I am sure they feel, in many respects, quite comfortable in what they are doing. I would use the example of the potash advertising as an example in that I am sure that Members opposite are convinced that nationalization or expropriation of the potash industry is in the best interest of the people of Saskatchewan. I certainly hope so, or you should have withdrawn it a long time ago. I can understand that you might feel that way about legislation like that, I think that you are well aware though that probably the majority of the people of this province disagree with you. I don't think there is any question about that at all either. The fact remains, however, that knowing that this opposition is there and despite the fact that it is there, you seem willing to use virtually any means to sell your case to the public. The sad part of that is that it is using the taxpayers' money. In effect, you must seem to feel that the ends justify the means and that any unethical means to justify your position on potash, can be done in good conscience by Members on that side of the House.

I find that disturbing. If I was a member of the media in this province I would be a little insulted as well. What you are in effect saying is that these objective and independent members of our press gallery, certainly, and other media in Saskatchewan is unable to report to the people of Saskatchewan in a fair and intelligent manner. I think that is obvious that is what you are saying when you take it upon yourself, with the taxpayers' money, to inform the people of this province about the situation that traditionally would be done by members of our press gallery here.

You seem to have a lack of confidence in the media and some days, I guess, that is probably warranted. But it certainly isn't justification for you to take money that you have taken from the taxpayers and use it to bribe people into supporting a controversial policy.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McMillan: — There are some other serious implications here and other things disturbing for someone as young and ideal as myself.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McMillan: — Idealistic, well I wasn't entirely wrong the first time.

Another disturbing fact is how this advertising relates to The Elections Act that was brought in in time for the election last June. I was one of those in this province, among many in the Liberal Party who lauded the Government's action in bring in The Elections Act. And we said, and I said particularly, that it gave people like myself the opportunity to run for political office and it did. We appreciated that and I particularly appreciate that. What we were afraid of at that time, we expressed the concern, was that it drew up two different sets of rules in Saskatchewan. One set for political parties and another set for the party that formed the Government. This, I suspect, is the classic example of the abuse that we were afraid of. I may be mistaken, but I am afraid that

this is probably the classic example.

What you have here is not government advertising, because the potash legislation hasn't been passed; it is not government policy and it may, in fact, never become government policy. What you have is the New Democratic Party campaigning in Saskatchewan, it happens to be three and one-half years before the next provincial election probably. But you have the New Democratic Party campaigning on the public's tax money and supposedly outside of The Elections Act. That's the kind of fears we expressed when that Elections Act was tabled in this House. We said at that time we were afraid of Government advertising.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McMillan: — And what did the Government do in response to those fears of ours, they brought in restrictions that Cabinet Ministers couldn't advertise up to a specific time before the election and those measures were well brought in. But what in that Elections Act avoids to cover was a government with questionable ethics campaigning on the public's money outside of The Elections Act three and a half years before an election and that is exactly what is happening. If you found it within your good nature to supply the equivalent amounts of taxpayers' money to the Liberal Party and the Conservative Party to put our views on the potash question before the people of this province I would suggest there would be nothing wrong with your advertising. No one to the best of my knowledge from that side of the House has suggested that we should find means to achieve or to receive \$50,000 to advertise on the potash question and in fact when the Conservative Party to my left runs and advertisement, a full page ad in at least the daily newspapers, it is hinted that this will probably count against their allowance during the next election under The Elections Act. Two significantly different sets of rules as far as politics in Saskatchewan goes.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McMillan: — I am not sure what reactions you have among yourselves when you go home at night and stop and think about this sort of thing. I think a lot of the Members opposite are bright enough to realize the implications. I only hope that what I suggested at the first part of my talk was that you don't really believe that the ends justify the means. If you are willing to sacrifice your ethics in order to promote the socialist cause in this province you aren't fit to govern this province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McMillan: — I am very much in favor of the Resolution as moved by the Member for Regina Lakeview (Mr. Malone) that says this Assembly deplores the use of public money by the Government of Saskatchewan and I say for the New Democratic Party to carry on in the news media of Saskatchewan what is essentially a political campaign. I don't think those facts are even arguable. The fact that you have found it perhaps politically expedient to stop that advertisement, or at least to the best of my knowledge it has been slowed down, is an indication that perhaps some of the Members in your organization provincially have

consciences and I am glad that there may be a ray of hope there. I suspect that's where the pressure came from.

I urge all Members of this House to support the Resolution, not as it has been amended commending the Government of Saskatchewan for providing the people of this province with information concerning its programs. The fallacy of that amendment has been pointed out here in that it is not a government program as you suggest that it may be somewhere down the road. Well, when that time comes and if there is information about that program that is in the best interests of the people of Saskatchewan or that it is worthwhile spending tax dollars on getting across that information, I suggest this Opposition may take a different approach to your advertising.

It is for these reasons that I will not be supporting the amendment and will be supporting the Resolution as proposed by the Member for Regina Lakeview.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. G.T. Snyder (Minister of Labour): — This Resolution deserves some further comment. The Resolution itself seems to convey the message that in the opinion of the mover the Government of Saskatchewan would refrain entirely from some kind of informational media advertising which would acquaint the people of Saskatchewan with an event which I believe is an event of real major significance. I think it has to be said that the entrance of the Government into this venture represents probably the most significant happening in a decade.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Snyder: — Now, Mr. Speaker, Members opposite have attempted to mislead the public, aided and abetted by the industry, in an attempt to obscure the true facts of the case. This is symptomatic of an event that happened something better than a decade ago, at a time when the significant event of that decade was the whole question of the provision of medical care for the people of this province. And the same kind of a scurrilous campaign was engaged in at that particular point in time. I remember, Mr. Speaker, when political writers or hacks were brought in from eastern Canada who conveyed the information to pregnant women that somehow or another with socialized medicine, maternity would become an assembly line project and virtually this common touch, this bedside manner of the physician would be virtually destroyed. This was the sort of thing that was being propagated in the minds of the people of the Province of Saskatchewan.

I suppose, Mr. Speaker, that it is not at all surprising that Members opposite would like to disseminate their views without any response from the Government of Saskatchewan and I can appreciate their point of view. Obviously they would like to have us sit quiet while they misinform the public. I am sure that they would react with real enthusiasm to a one-sided dialogue with the Government remaining silent while the potash companies and the Liberals present their points of view of the situation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, very recently the Conservatives have emerged and they have entered into this war of words in print. Now here is a political party, Mr. Speaker, that was so financially embarrassed in that period following July 11th that they offered themselves, they sold their bodies, that's not a very good way of expressing it perhaps, but they offered themselves for sale, if you like, as after dinner speakers to help defray the post-election expenses. You know, Mr. Speaker, from quantity and the quality of the speeches that have been delivered in this House I rather suspect that that July post-election debt must still remain as a rather sizeable albatross hanging around their necks. Suddenly, Mr. Speaker, the Conservative Party is so financially buoyant that they are able to sponsor full-page ads in the newspapers. I think one is inclined to just question for a moment there all of this new-found wealth came from, Mr. Speaker. I could suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, Liberal and Tories are suckling at the same breast, the same corporate breast.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Snyder: — Now obviously, Mr. Speaker, this triumvirate, Liberals, Tories and the international corporations would enjoy a free and an unobstructed route, but that isn't going to be the case, the people of Saskatchewan are going to be informed. We intend, Mr. Speaker, yes, I believe we have an obligation, to inform Saskatchewan people. It has been said, Mr. Speaker, that democracy rests and relies upon a well informed electorate and to do less than properly to inform the citizens of this province I think would be an abrogation of our responsibility. I intend, Mr. Speaker, to vote for the amendment and to vote against the main motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J.G. Lane (Qu'Appelle): — Mr. Speaker, the unfortunate part of the comments by the Minister of Labour is the fact that he has attempted to somehow justify a political advertising campaign as a Government information campaign. He has criticized the Conservative Party to my left for running a full page ad and says that the Government must answer. The NDP has every right to answer but the Government opposite has no right to answer a political statement with a political ad at public expense and that is what you have done.

I think, too, Mr. Speaker, that the Government somehow has a duty if it is going to get involved in an information campaign, as it is called by the Government opposite, to tell the truth.

Mr. Romanow: — . . . Robert Andras.

Mr. Lane: — I am glad the Attorney General has referred and if I can state it is an ad by the Government of Canada under the name of Robert Andras, Minister, I am glad that the Attorney General has mentioned that because it was paid for by the people of Canada. The big difference between that advertising campaign and this advertising campaign is that one tells the truth and this one doesn't.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lane: — We have statements in these ads by the Government opposite for example, in their political advertising campaign that the demand for potash is increasing at a rate of five to six per cent per year. When statements in this Legislature have made it clear that the demand for potash in Saskatchewan is decreasing and is not increasing and that practically every potash mine in Saskatchewan has a large inventory now, Mr. Speaker. That is the statement by the Government opposite. Every single one has an inventory surplus at the present time. Now we have asked the Government opposite for the study to prove their statement. Why haven't they given them to this Legislature? Are they afraid of their statement, or is the statement simply not true? They make a statement further in the ad that they can borrow the money they need and pay it back with the potash acquired. They state further that we won't have to lower the standard of our existing services. We have asked the Government for the financial statement as to how the potash nationalization will be paid for and we haven't got an answer from the Government opposite and one can only imply from the actions of the Government opposite that if they were confident of their position and if it was a true position that we would have tabled in this Legislature the full financial report of where the Government opposite is going to get the funds, how much interest it is going to pay and where it is going to borrow the money and what type of collateral the people of Saskatchewan have to put up. We know that the statement made is simply not true. It is not true because of the actions of the Government opposite by its silence thus giving proof that it doesn't have any grounds or basis for making that statement, that it doesn't have the information that allows it to make that statement. The same thing applies to the demand for it.

We have other comments. The Government under another ad, "What Makes Potash Different," a kind of a flip-flop approach in this particular ad in that the first section starts out, "because we have to make them last," is a comment referring to coal, iron, uranium and potash, we have to manage these, we have to make them last. On the other side the same ad says that potash companies aren't expanding fast enough and as a consequence we have to get them. Now somehow it doesn't ring true. I get the strange feeling that the more potash we use up the less we will have and it won't really make it last. But that statement made by the Government again, statements being made by the Government upon which there is no basis in fact. That the Government, in fact, has not gone on an information campaign, has not said to the people of Saskatchewan where it is getting the money, how much this is going to cost, you know, where the funds will come from, the various sources whether these sources will be politically acceptable to the province of Saskatchewan. We don't have this information nor has the Government given it to the people which would be fair information allowing the people of Saskatchewan to make their own decision on the merits as to expansion in other areas in the world by the potash companies. We don't have any evidence from the Government opposite to back up its statement that Saskatchewan already has a core of highly capable people and they will be joined by a team of outside experts when, in fact, the real situation is that any so-called outside experts or highly trained people have quit the potash corporation because they don't believe what the Government is doing is right and are not allowed to get their point across and their reasons for disagreeing with the Government to the people of Saskatchewan.

I think, too, that that statement is refuted by the obvious fact that the so-called highly trained core of experts consists of one Donald Ching, who is a political appointment, and, secondly, of Mr. David Dombowsky who was involved with SEDCO and to all indications really has not any expertise in the potash field or in the operation of the potash industry. So I say to the Hon. Members that there is a big difference between a government information campaign as referred to by the Attorney General and a campaign of political propaganda which has been embarked upon by the Government opposite at the taxpayers expense.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lane: — One is acceptable in a democracy, information is acceptable, blatant propaganda is usually attributed to another form of government and not an elected democratic government.

I think and I am somewhat surprised that there hasn't been more public criticism of the Government opposite when legislation was passed by the Government prior to 1975 supposedly to limit campaign expenses. Probably an admirable goal if done fairly. I certainly, and I think Members in the Liberal Opposition made it clear at that time that we would support it if it was done fairly. Why, if we are to talk about fairness and election advertising and party promotion, why really hasn't there been more public criticism of the ads that I've referred to. I think without question that the campaign, the advertising campaign that the Government opposite has gone upon is a blatant and flagrant abuse of the election expenses provisions and is in reality making a mockery of the so-called fairness approach that the Government opposite was taking when it decided to limit election expenditures by political parties, because there is nothing in your potash ads which are informative for the people of Saskatchewan. There is nothing in your potash ads that give basic information to the people of Saskatchewan to allow them to make a rational and free choice as to the rightness or wrongness of your decision. What you are trying to do is create a political climate, a selling job of your policy and not an information campaign which will allow the people to make a proper and fair decision.

I think that many backbenchers opposite, or many Government Members who were in the previous government have made speeches on the need for a limitation of election expenses and a limitation of advertising and a limitation of campaign expenditure. I think that the Hon. Member for Saskatoon-Buena Vista (Mr. Rolfes) spoke on that and expressed the need for such legislation. I can't believe that the same Hon. Member would stand up in this Legislature and endorse and support a flagrant propaganda campaign . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lane: — . . . as the Government has embarked upon. You have refuted any attempts that you make to bring in some type of fairness on election expenses because that's not an information campaign, it's a political campaign, it's a propaganda campaign, and there's no basis for some of the facts and allegations you have made. If a private corporation, or a corporation was to embark upon this type of campaign it would be

charged without a doubt with false and misleading advertising, something that should also apply to government obviously in light of this campaign. The political aspect, of course, can be also alluded to in the fact that we find the same ads in a so-called fiercely independent Commonwealth that is paid for by the people of Saskatchewan. I note that in this particular issue there's only one of these ads. I'm a little surprised as I thought there would be both, but I suppose we can also get the highlights of the Throne Speech being placed in the Commonwealth.

Prior to The Election Expenses Bill, it is interesting to note that the way that the Government did this is that they would take excerpts from some of the speeches of the Members of the Party that they gave in the Legislature and then would run them under their picture and under their byline. But since they have brought in an election expenses limitation provision the Government opposite has, under the guise of information, gone on an abusing political sell job of propaganda at the public's expense, a practice which cannot be justified. I think I have answered what the Attorney General has said, or what the Attorney General alluded to when he held up the ad. I think there is a big difference, Mr. Attorney General. We have no objection to a fair information campaign by this Government, by any government, to go upon something that tells the truth for a start, something that puts in information, facts before the people of Saskatchewan. But not statements that cannot be proven or that the Government refuses to prove, or that puts statements before the public of Saskatchewan which are false and aren't true and have no basis in fact, I don't consider that a fair campaign. Just the opposite would be a fair informational campaign. The Hon. Member asked for a distinction between the two and I think I have given it.

You can't justify, and the Hon. Member for Saskatoon Buena Vista knows that he can't justify what the Government has embarked upon. If you wanted to do this fairly and properly it would be correct for you to pay out of party coffers and party expenses exactly what you have done here, and the only difference would have to be the statement at the bottom — Province of Saskatchewan. All that you had to do was come and get Dunskey (or whoever is doing it now) to put on the bottom, paid for by the New Democratic Party of Saskatchewan. The only difference would be that it would be paid for by the New Democratic Party and not the people of Saskatchewan. You are wrong, you know you are wrong. What you are doing is a flagrant abuse of the laws of the province, and the intent of the laws of this province. I also say that by your failure to back up the facts and the allegations that you have made, that perhaps you may be even abusing the laws of the Dominion of Canada on false and misleading advertising.

I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

RESOLUTION NO. 4 - FREIGHT ASSISTANCE ON MEAT PRODUCTS TO EASTERN CANADA

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution by Mr. Larson (Pelly):

That this Assembly urges the Federal Government to

fulfil immediately its commitment to provide freight assistance on meat and meat products moving to eastern Canada in lieu of removal of the Federal Feed Freight Assistance Program, as part of a policy to reduce the unwarranted price spread between live cattle marketed in eastern and western Canada.

and the proposed amendment thereto moved by Mr. Cameron (Regina South):

That all the words after the words "the Federal Government" be deleted and the words "to abolish feed freight assistance in Ontario and Quebec" be substituted therefor.

Mr. E. Anderson (Shaunavon): — In rising, Mr. Speaker, to continue to speak to the amendment, I should like to state that I support the amendment because I believe that feed grain assistance and the movement of feed grains from western Canada to eastern Canada is not, and never has been, designed to help the western grain producer. It was set up for one fact alone and that was to help the eastern feeder.

It also goes against the stated policies of any and all governments which have been in power in Saskatchewan, that has been to try to encourage secondary industries rather than leave us as the hewers of wood and haulers of water.

In putting a motion that asks us to keep this program in place we are only doing one thing and that is assuring that we will never be able to go into the feeder industry, the hog raising or the broiler industry or the dairy industry, in fair competition with the producers of eastern Canada. And in doing this we lose our secondary industries of processing these products, we lose our secondary industries that are attendant with the processing of our beef, our dairy products and canned goods, which would create jobs.

I should like to read some of the last year's study made by the University of Saskatchewan on the effects of feed freight assistance in the western region and the Province of Saskatchewan. The study stated that:

Feed freight assistance cannot technically be classified as a separate freight rate since the railways receive regular freight on the grain moved. However, the Federal Government subsidized the livestock producers or their dealers who must submit claims certifying that the full benefits of the subsidy have been passed on to the livestock or poultry feeders who buy that grain and feed.

This reiterates my point that the subsidy is intended not to help and does not help our western producer, but helps the eastern feeder.

This subsidy program was implemented by the Federal Government by an order-in-council as a temporary wartime measure in October, 1941. Its purpose was to enable eastern Canada feeders of livestock and poultry to obtain western feed grains at a reduced cost so that livestock and poultry production could be increased to

meet the wartime demands. Although the program which started was a temporary measure, subject to parliamentary approval each year it seems to have become a permanent policy.

They have tables here that designate the amount of feed rates but they are lengthy and there is no point in going into them. I have condensed them at the end and anyone who wants to see them will find them in the Library. It says, for example, to ship a bushel of barley in store at Thunder Bay to Moncton, costs covered are from 64 to 77 per cent to that feeder in rebate. In Quebec the program paid for 55 to 63 per cent of the total cost to move a bushel of barley, whereas to Woodstock, Ontario, it pays from 31 to 38 per cent of the total cost. The degree of subsidization increases the further east the product is moved. For example, the Maritime Provinces and Quebec receive a substantial reduction in freight rate costs.

The effect of the subsidy on livestock production has been favorable for eastern Canada.

And this is the part that I find interesting. They have a table of cost of shipping feed grains and hogs from Saskatoon to the three eastern points and they are presented to show the advantage in production.

Without the subsidy, Saskatoon and the surrounding areas has an economic advantage over production at either of these points.

To me, I couldn't vote for a Resolution that has in it the implication that we asked for subsidy in lieu of keeping this subsidy on, which is so detrimental to the people of this province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Anderson: — This, it says after the advantage of production at either point:

This would tend to spur production of hogs in the prairie regions if the freight rate were removed. If they introduced feed freight assistance the situation would alter significantly. Now the points in eastern Canada have an economic advantage in the production of hogs and therefore hog production would tend to shift towards eastern Canada. However, the final product price in eastern and western Canada would play a key role in determining such a shift.

As you know as well as I do the markets in the Toronto and Montreal areas to the producers are consistently higher here so the advantage is still more.

Therefore, if we look at the effect of the Resolution asking that the system be removed for Ontario and Quebec alone, we are not affecting the Maritime regions which are in an economic depressed area. And we find that out of the total subsidy paid last year for feed grain movement of \$21,164,000 two-thirds of the subsidy went to the two provinces of Ontario and Quebec — \$13,668,000. The rest of the provinces, British Columbia, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland

shared the other \$7 million and of that the bulk went to British Columbia. New Brunswick received \$1 million subsidy that their producers received on this; Nova Scotia \$1,784,000. Other Maritime areas, the Province of Prince Edward Island received \$575,000 and Newfoundland \$666,000. And when you realize that out of this Quebec received \$10,165,000 in subsidy and Ontario \$3,403,000 and this subsidy was paid by the taxpayers of this Dominion of ours with no benefit to our producers of feed grains in the West, but only to subsidize unfair competition to them, I feel that I cannot support the motion, but I will support the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. G. MacMurchy (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — Mr. Speaker, as reported earlier the Minister of Agriculture is attending a meeting in Washington and I am aware that he would like to make a few comments on this particular Resolution and in light of this I would beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

RESOLUTION NO. 25 - POSITIVE ACTION PROGRAM - PROMOTION OF WOMEN

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution No. 25, moved by Mr. Merchant (Regina Wascana):

That this Assembly urges the Government of Saskatchewan to pass legislation establishing a "Positive Action Program" to encourage the employment and promotion of women within government ranks.

and the proposed amendment thereto moved by the Hon. Mr. Snyder (Moose Jaw South):

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

congratulates the Government of Saskatchewan for its new endeavours on behalf of women in the public service and in the community at large as announced in the Throne Speech.

Miss L.B. Clifford (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, on the debate on this Resolution last day, I began to relate to the House some of the historic reasons why women were perhaps discriminated against in the civil service. This information would be valuable because as this motion was proposing that we look at the possible discriminations and apply a positive action program for women in Saskatchewan.

Since last speaking on the Resolution, you and I have heard today that an advisory board or agency was put into effect to look at this very situation. The Member for Regina Wascana (Mr. Merchant) had presented this Resolution a number of weeks ago and has been advocating such a Resolution for a number of months, in fact, eight or nine. We are very pleased that such an agency has been recognized and that you as a Government will do your best to alleviate any discrimination

against women in the civil service or in the government ranks. Nevertheless, I feel that it is still important to look at some of the reasons why perhaps there is discrimination against women in government ranks. I shall not give a complete history, as I had intended on doing, because actually in theory the motion has been agreed upon more or less. But I do think that it might be of some value just to look at some of the problems that have been in the past, look at some of the questions that have been asked in other provinces, very briefly, so that this new agency would basically have a head start and would know some of the problems and questions that they could ask so they could implement as quickly as possible some of the measures that other areas have shown.

I was quoting previously from a book called "Sex in the Public Service", which was an accumulation of a number of reports in this area and I should like to continue for a few minutes to quote from sections of this, and I promise you it will be rather brief compared to what I was going to use before.

Mr. Rolfes: — I hope you don't mind if I take some notes as I like that topic.

Miss Clifford: — You take all the notes you want.

It says here:

That occupational segregation limits freedom of choice and tends to lead to inequality of opportunity. The historical record not only confirms this but reveals that occupational segregation was not inadvertent. It was instituted expressly to limit competition and to discourage females. Comparative examinations for higher level clerical positions and with positions for advancement opportunities were limited to men. Not because women were uninterested or incapable of passing the examinations but precisely because they were interested and capable. The formal record shows this much. Informal practices and pressures undoubtedly also helped dampen the career ambitions of women in the civil service.

It goes on to say:

The greatest success of women in professional and in executive classes is noticeable today and has its roots in the early years of the civil service. The history of women in the civil service is useful in revising the pervasive notion that women's interest in working is a new phenomenon. If anything is to be considered new, it should be the increasing opportunities for women to work.

This record of discrimination is by no means peculiar to the Canadian public service. If this were merely a matter of past history it would be of interest only to historians but these early discriminatory policies were a resounding and still resounding success. They accomplished their purposes so well that their effects are still evident in today's employment structure.

I would recommend, for what my recommendation is worth,

to the Members that perhaps they look at some of these instances that are mentioned in this report because I think it would be of benefit to them.

They go on briefly to say what kind of work that women generally do in the civil service and almost 83 percent hold office support or administrative support jobs. A little over five per cent work in administrative jobs and an equal per cent at various hospital jobs. Another two per cent are in the technical and inspection category and two per cent in the postal customs and immigration category. I do agree that this is in the federal civil service. I would imagine it would be equally applicable if we did compare this to the provincial civil service.

It goes on to say that the male and female public servants are distributed differently across the departments in geographic regions which was indicated in the types of work as I pointed out previously.

While women are represented in every broad occupational category within the public service an overwhelming proportion over 80 per cent hold office or administrative support jobs.

In many individual occupations there are no women and a number of others very few, and a number of occupations with large population of almost all women.

I know that my colleague for Regina Wascana pointed out the inequalities that he felt were in Saskatchewan. It goes on to say that there are inequalities as far as salary is concerned.

Clearly women were heavily bunched at the lower end of the salary scale. In 1966 slightly over half the women in the public service made less than \$4,000 compared with 14 per cent of men. In 1966, 67 per cent of all men made less than \$6,000 to compare to 94 per cent of all women. In 1967 these figures changed to 59 per cent and 90 per cent respectively. A decrease of 12 per cent for men and three per cent for women.

It clearly points out as did the Member for Regina Wascana that there are salary differences as far as men and women are concerned, and that most of the women are found at the lower salary brackets.

The question is asked why are there differences of occupational success? What factors might account for these differences in the occupation success of men and women in public service.

Salary differences are more dramatic than level differences suggesting that occupational distribution has more influence than any differences in promotion rates or separation rates. But what accounts for the extent of occupational segregation and what other factors might help explain the differential success of men and women.

They give five categories that might help explain why this is so. The five categories are capability, interest and goals and experience and opportunity.

As we are setting up this committee as has been proposed here and announced today, we have to look at these categories. Capability for instance. Do differences in education help explain for the over representation of women in lower status occupations.

Does the split of responsibility of married women between the home and work affect job performance adversely? Does the very fact of being a woman make it difficult to gain the respect and confidence of colleagues and subordinates.

Under experience I think you have to look at what are the separation rates of men and women. Do fewer women than men stay in their jobs long enough to advance. This question relates to the work pattern of women during their adult years.

Lastly I think you have to look at interests and goals.

What are the motivations and aspirations of working women? What do they want from their jobs and what are they willing to put into them? How many are committed to long-term careers.

Under opportunity, a key question remains: are there barriers to occupational advancement for women with a requisite capability motivation and experience? Do personnel practices, co-worker's attitudes, the occupational structure create barriers?

I have mentioned these five categories because I think these are some of the questions we will have to be looking at in order for us to make this new agency a success.

It goes on to say that there is some reason to suspect that women are less capable than men of performing at higher levels or higher paying jobs. Another thing this agency or this proposal would have to do or look into is that not only are there discriminations that I have outlined here, there are some myths that are repeated not only by men but by women because they believe themselves, as is shown by a number of studies, that they are not perhaps as capable of administrative positions as are men.

Most people now know that intelligence is no respecter of sex, although a number of people, men and women, still act as if it were attesting to the tenacity of custom. If of course the less intelligent women and the more intelligent men were the ones who join the public service, then differential intelligence might help explain differential success.

We have to look not only at what possible discriminations there are as far as hiring practices but as far as experience and as far as occupational limitations. We have to look at how both men and women in the government ranks perceive themselves.

It mentioned that there are a number of areas that we have to look at when we are hiring. We cannot just say, because there are less numbers of women in the civil service, that it is necessarily discriminatory. There are problems with a number of other areas. Education could possibly be one. However, in

this report it says:

No information on education qualifications of persons in the public service as a whole is collected with any regularity.

The figures that they do have indicate that the higher median in education in women does not help explain their over representation at the lowest salary levels within the public service.

On the basis of education alone, one would expect women to do better than men do in occupational groups not requiring a university education. However, there seems to be a discrepancy again when it comes to higher education.

A number of other problems that this agency or this proposal would have to look at would be that of family roles. Women in public service life when it comes to the time when they are married and raise a family, we find that the rate of employment often drops because they are at home with their families, rather than keeping a permanent job. It must also look at the effect of roles on the capability. Why is there a relationship between a woman's marital status and her occupational success in the public service? Is it because family responsibilities affect a woman's capability?

Besides these we should look at difference in supervisory responsibilities. I think it is quite interesting to note that a survey was taken about what women and men feel as far as responsibilities for themselves in supervisory positions. I thought long about what I was going to say on this matter particularly when the announcement was made today that a program such as was put on this Resolution was made. I asked myself, "Would it be worth my while to get up here and and speak on something that was already proposed?" I hope that the information which I am trying to give to you will be of benefit to the committee or to the agency. I have tried to condense and express the points that I think will be of most use to them.

However, there are a number of feelings that when it comes to supervisory positions, and I presume that the agency will be looking at this in particular. This is where there are the least number of women. There are feelings as far as instrumental ability of females in government or supervisory positions. Such myths that are often heard are that women would have bad effects on profits, or women would have bad effects on efficiency. Those, however, in both categories of men and women they did not feel this was applicable. However, when it came down to women's attempt to cope or women temperamentally unfit for management most of the men felt that this was a key factor as far as supervisory promotion.

What I am trying to get across is that you have to cope not only with facts as far as hiring practices but you have to cope with roles as both men and women see themselves.

You also have to look at working patterns and I mention this briefly because working patterns are affected by a number of things. They are affected by marriage in particular. A working woman may follow one of five patterns. This is outlined in the federal civil service, but I suggest also in the civil service in Saskatchewan.

She may work until marriage or birth of her first child, and then re-enter the labor force after her children have grown or as soon as her youngest child starts school, or work continuously with only a short time off before and after birth of each child or work as continuously as most men because she is single or childless.

These are the working patterns that this agency or a committee such as this motion outlines would have to look at in order to have positive legislation made.

I should like at this time to conclude this section of what I am trying to present with an article that outlines the Government of Canada as an employer. This can equally be applicable to the Government of Saskatchewan as an employer.

Attention is focused on the Government of Canada as an employer of women, in fact the largest employer of women in Canada. As an employer economic efficiency has to be the value of foremost concern to the Government. It must get maximum output from tax dollars no less than a private firm with investment dollars. The Government is more than an employer, it is also reasonably responsible for the welfare and progress of the nation as a whole. Thus it can be expected to lead other employers with respect to social responsibilities as it has often done in the past.

This is the key point that we have to look at as far as this positive action is concerned. Whereas private employers really only have to be concerned about the value of their tax dollar, the government has also to be concerned that they are an example to other private employers or public employers. This is going to be one of the key priorities that the government is going to have to consider when implementing this agency.

Now there have been a number of other studies done in other provinces. Ontario is a key example of what should be done or what we could be looking at as far as a positive action program. I am going to quote briefly from an "Equal Opportunity for Women in Ontario" report that was made in 1973:

Their equal opportunity rights state that the Ontario human rights code prohibits discrimination in employment on the basis of sex or marital status.

That is a very common statement that can be made at any length but unless something is done about it, such as a committee you propose, an agency, then it is quite meaningless.

In certain female dominated professions and occupations the work performed appears to be undervalued in relation to male dominated professions, and the occupations requiring similar degrees of skill and training. The pay differential results in part from the fact that an untapped reservoir of our female workers exists thereby depressing the market value of those who are employed.

At present salaries in the Ontario public service as elsewhere are determined largely by factors of supply and demand.

They go on to say that they are also going to take steps to increase opportunities for women to occupy any positions for which they are qualified, they are going to set up a monitoring system. I am just throwing these out as suggestions to what they felt would be good ideas to implement such an agency.

They set up a monitoring system which would be instituted to ensure that female public servants of merit are fully eligible for promotion to positions not usually held by women. Wherever feasible potential rather than experience should be emphasized as a basis for appointment or promotion, since a woman's present classification may be a result of past discrimination. Also volunteer experience where relevant should be taken into account in evaluation of the applicant's qualifications.

They also said that:

The Ontario Government will discontinue all personnel practices that have an effect of barring secretarial staff from advancement and will institute a career ladder in the OPS (Ontario Public Service) whereby secretaries may move up to administrative positions.

The Ontario Government will set goals and devise methods for significantly increasing the number of women enrolled annually in management training courses in OPS.

Part time employment has been identified as a valuable means of enabling women to use their skills and ability in the labor market.

All policies and programs adopted for employees of the Ontario Public Service will be implemented for employees of Crown corporations and government agencies as well, that is, for all public servants in Ontario.

Now we haven't had an outline here of what type of programs or depth this agency will take, but I would presume that this type of thing would be looked at.

I should like to conclude and this time by summarizing a number of points that have been brought out by an implementation report of the Status of Women. They are reporting recommendations by the Public Service Commission. I mentioned that some of the history that I have related here was taken from "Sex in the Public Service." This article was set up by the Commission, it was a commission finance study, the Archibald Report. It came out with a number of recommendations regarding employment in civil service. I suggest that just because they are made in the light of the federal public service, it does not mean that they cannot be applicable or beneficial to us when we are trying to set up such an agency. The recommendations were:

1. We recommend that the Federal-Provincial and territorial governments include in their selection standards for appointment to positions in their respective positions in respect of governments. The assessment of volunteer experience in evaluating the qualifications of applicants.

This was outlined and printed in 1973, and this is one of the points which I just included from Ontario.

(2) We recommend that sex typing of occupations be avoided in the text and that the illustrations of all federal government publications wouldn't have such a direct affect. They also recommended that until sex typing of occupations is eradicated the Federal Public Service Commission and Federal Government departments take special steps to increase the number of women appointed to occupations and professions not traditionally female, review, and where necessary alter recruitment literature and recruiting programs to ensure that it is abundantly clear that women are wanted in all occupations and professions. And take steps to obtain applications from qualified women when appointments for senior levels are being made from outside the service.

(3) We recommend that the Federal Public Service Commission and Federal Government Departments have as an objective elimination of the imbalance in the proportion of women and men in senior positions. And as much as is feasible emphasize potential rather than experience as the base for appointments of promotion. Insure that vacancies are open to employment at a classification level low enough to permit consideration of qualified women and where a job opens make sure that women candidates get full consideration including the evaluation of their experience in volunteer work.

(4) We recommend that the Federal Public Service Commission and Federal Government Departments introduce programs that will ensure consideration of secretaries for administration positions and open up intermediate and senior administration positions to women in traditionally female professions.

(5) We recommend that a special effort be made to attract more women applicants for administrative trainee positions in the Federal Public Service and Federal Government Departments and ensure that women administrative trainees are given the kind of training assignments that will prepare them for advancement to the senior levels.

(6) We recommend that action be taken to increase greatly the enrolment of promising women in the Federal Service Management courses, including the step of waiving salary floors and aid ceilings where necessary in their case.

(7) We recommend that for the next ten years the number of women enrolled in each course in the Career Assignment program of the Federal Public Service is no less than ten per cent of the total number of people enrolled in the course.

(8) We recommend that the Federal Government issue a policy statement to the Minister of all Federal Government and heads of Crown corporations and agencies, and to speakers in the Senate and the House of Commons expressing its intention to ensure equality of opportunity in employment for women and greater use of womanpower and undertake short term special measures where these are necessary to achieve its objectives. And an information program be undertaken so that the management and supervisors at all levels in the

government of Canada be made aware of the government's policy regarding its employment of women.

As I conclude I should just like to say that I have outlined these number of policies that have been suggested at various levels in various provinces to hopefully help in the setting up of this agency. I feel that some of these ideas are good and will be possible and positive alternatives but we shouldn't be stuck by saying perhaps that ten per cent of employees must be women or 15 per cent or 20 per cent. We have to look at all these categories and do what is best not only for women but for both sexes. Again I would say that I am very pleased and proud that such a motion has been considered and that an agency such as the one that has been announced today has been set up.

Mr. Speaker, I will be supporting Resolution No. 25.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. G.T. Snyder (Minister of Labour): — Mr. Speaker, I am particularly pleased on this day, January 13, 1976, to participate in this debate. Particularly in light of the announcement that was made by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Smishek) earlier this day, relating to matters surrounding the Resolution which has been moved by the Hon. Member for Regina Wascana (Mr. Merchant).

Let me say at the outset that I agree with the philosophy behind the Resolution and furthermore, Mr. Speaker, it has been this Government's practice since it took office in 1971 to do more than provide verbal support to the Resolution indicated which gives some indication of concern to the lot of women in the public service and elsewhere.

It is a fact, Mr. Speaker, that women have not been encouraged nor have they been allowed perhaps to play a full part in the manner in which they should have done in the past in spite of efforts that have been made. I think some of the responsibility, Mr. Speaker, rests at the doorstep of the women themselves who have been somewhat intimidated in the past, perhaps by job descriptions and I think they have erroneously assumed that certain jobs were traditionally male jobs.

In the Department of Labour, for example, Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat chagrined to tell you that at the present moment we do not have a bonafide Labour Standards Officer who is a woman. We had one only a short while ago, a girl of native ancestry who did an excellent job with us in the Labour Standards Branch. She has since that time left to assume a position with the Federation of Saskatchewan Indians. There are many positions in the public service which could very logically and plausibly be filled by women in the event that they should apply.

I feel that I should remind some Members of the House that it was the New Democratic Government which took steps to establish a Women's Bureau in 1964 with the declared purpose of evaluating the legislation and the working conditions which were of special importance to women in the work force. Sad to relate, however, once the Thatcher Government took over the new bureau was denied the resources to properly carry on its function and as far as I can tell it was never permitted to

become involved in any nor was it permitted any consideration of new policy where the interest of women were concerned during those seven, long, lean, dry years.

This was rather regrettable in view of the fact that during those years there was growing evidence of two fundamental developments which are continuing still. First of all, the number of women entering the work force was growing at a rapidly increasing rate; secondly, and perhaps even more significant, women were staying in the work force, staying in the employment picture until they reached retirement years.

Now these two factors should have made it abundantly clear even to that unenlightened administration, that positive action to guarantee the rights of working women was not only morally right but economically and politically commendable as well.

Needless to say, I find it more than a little gratifying to see the Hon. Member's Resolution put before the House in 1976 — some 12 years too late, perhaps, but still showing that Liberals can learn if given some good examples to study, and I think we can be justly proud of the examples we have been providing.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Snyder: — When the present government took over in 1971 we were quite aware that in the world of work as well as elsewhere, women are sometimes subject to discrimination. Women, on the average, earn less than men, for example. Furthermore, because of some deep-rooted attitudes in our society and more particularly in our educational system, they are streamed off into certain kinds of occupations and not into others. Often these jobs they have are not especially well paid and they do not, in many cases, contain much potential for advancement.

We know that the equal pay and the maternity leave legislation we had in mind was not going to give women a truly equal opportunity to succeed, simply by the stroke of a legislative pen. Attitudes have to change, I think that has to be said, attitudes must change but the passing of constructive legislation was a necessary first step, Mr. Speaker, to encourage those changes in attitude.

We have seen to it that the Women's Bureau of the Department of Labour was rescued from the limbo of the Thatcher years and we have given responsibility to the Women's Bureau in the Department of Labour for specific equal pay legislation and specific maternity leave provisions which are part of the Labour Standards Act of this province.

Also, Mr. Speaker, we have seen to it that the Women's Bureau was provided with staff to carry out its special responsibility of investigating complaints. And we are, presently, in the process of being expanded in a very major way in the Women's Bureau of the Department of Labour, in conjunction with the New Career Development Office, which was announced by the Minister of Finance earlier today.

Between July, 1973, when the new provisions became effective, and December 31, 1975 equal pay settlements totalling something in excess of \$78,000 have been made involving some 242 employees - 241 women and one man.

Mr. Speaker, numerous inquiries about the maternity leave provisions have been handled by the staff of the Women's Bureau along with several minor investigations which have served to educate and enlighten employees as well as employers concerning their rights and obligations.

In addition to this, Mr. Speaker, the Women's Bureau has carried out an extremely important educational role in providing guidance to students planning careers as well as to older women who may be re-entering the work force. I think it would be fair to say, Mr. Speaker, that the Women's Bureau from 1964 to 1971 was a piece of window-dressing, and I think the Leader of the Opposition, if he cares to be truthful, would have to agree. Women were ignored during the Thatcher years and the existence of a Women's Bureau was the very worst kind of tokenism. We rescued it, Mr. Speaker, we gave it specific legislation to administer and the staff with which to carry out a number of important educational as well as investigative and administrative functions. For example, Mr. Speaker, the Department of Labour has been very concerned that the trade unions in this province should understand the issues involved in equal treatment of women workers. And the trade union, I suggest, has also been guilty of discrimination in the past. To promote this during 1975 the Bureau participated in an awareness workshop for female and male trade union members.

We also took another important step, Mr. Speaker. A woman does not now have to complain in writing to the Minister of Labour. The threat of reprisal always existed when such a formal step was required previously. Now an informal, verbal complaint to any Labour Standards Officer in this province can trigger an investigation.

While all this activity has been going on in the Women's Bureau, Mr. Speaker, this Government has also introduced numerous other legislative changes since 1971 to improve the status of women in this province. The Fair Employment Practices Act and The Fair Accommodation Practices Act were amended to prohibit sex discrimination. The Workers' Compensation Act was passed under which benefits for men and women are the same.

We established the Saskatchewan Advisory Council on the Status of Women in 1973 to ensure continuing improvement in the area of women's right. A Day Care Program has been developed and the Department of Social Services which includes subsidies where parents require them. A Family Planning Committee was established in 1974. The Law Reform Commission has studied marital property law and amendments to the Married Women's Property Act which were introduced as interim measures, pending more sweeping reforms to appear at a later point in time.

All of these, Mr. Speaker, I think are regarded properly as positive action programs. They are part of the determined effort to achieve equal opportunities for women from all walks of life.

As the employer of over 15,000 public servants in this province, Mr. Speaker, we are very much aware that we have further responsibilities to ensure that equal opportunities exist within the ranks of our own civil service.

As was announced in the Throne Speech and verified by the Minister of Finance, we have made plans to broaden the mandate

of the Government of Saskatchewan in terms of providing greater opportunities, and as I suggested earlier, the present Women's Bureau is also to be broadened to create more opportunities and to provide for greater enforcement in terms of equal opportunities for men and women.

I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I was somewhat disappointed in the approach of the Hon. Member for Wascana (Mr. Merchant) when he responded, very briefly, today to the announcement made by the Minister of Finance. I thought it was sadly out of character, Mr. Speaker, for the Member to stand in his place and immediately raise questions and attack the newly developed program, the newly announced program, on the basis of the appointment of the director of that new program. I thought that had a vestige of discrimination in it in the very first sense, Mr. Speaker.

I think that it has to be said that the person named to head up this Bureau is a long-term, a well trusted and able member of the civil service, a person who has served this province extremely well. I think I would have to suggest that it is less than a positive approach to the whole program in terms of the approach that the Member indicated today.

As most of the Members of the Assembly are aware this program of enrichment is a program to provide greater opportunities to women in the public service and was part of the New Democratic Party's platform in 1975, when we pledged ourselves to provide equal opportunity for men and women in the public service. We have taken a great many positive steps in our efforts to eliminate discrimination against women, Mr. Speaker, and I am certain that this new agency, which was mentioned by the Minister of Finance earlier today, will be a giant step forward so far as women in the government are concerned. Also, Mr. Speaker, I am more than pleased that the author of the Resolution before us today is so clearly in favor of it too. I must hope, of course, that later in this Session that neither he nor his colleagues will change their color, as it were, and criticize the Government for any inflationary influence which this new agency may have.

I recognize, Mr. Speaker, that this is a very sensitive matter for the author of this Resolution and I congratulate him for his daring approach in this matter when one considers the very dogmatic, the very chauvinistic, anti-female role that was played by the previous Liberal Government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Snyder: — Mr. Speaker, it was the Thatcher Government after all, which chose to ignore an outstanding woman Member of this Legislature from Saskatoon when they chose their Cabinet in 1964. I think this is particularly glaring in light of the fact that Saskatoon at that point in time, had only one Liberal Member in the House. This lady Member, Mr. Speaker, had all of the credentials, she qualified on all counts, on the count of intellect and ability and geography, but she failed the test, Mr. Speaker, because of sex.

I can only express the hope that the present Liberal caucus has now adopted a more mature, and a more enlightened approach

with respect to the rights of women than has been the case in the past. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, we are glad to see at least one of their numbers opposite assuming a more progressive position with respect to the placing of females in position of prestige and authority in the public service. I can support this Resolution, Mr. Speaker, because I believe that positive action programs by all employees, whether they are employers in private business or in government, are a necessary step along with the constructive legislation to ensure genuine equal opportunities for women.

Equal opportunities is good business and progressive employers recognize this, but more than that, Mr. Speaker, developing the skills and talents of this segment of our provincial work force is particularly important. I am speaking, Mr. Speaker, of approximately 120,000 persons, or approximately one out of three in our total work force and I say it is morally right because of our belief in the fundamental worth of the dignity of each individual and we believe that underlies the entire superstructure of our whole democratic society.

Mr. Speaker, the women's program which this Government has developed since 1971 and the new affirmative action programs which have been announced, I think are currently making it abundantly clear, or should be making it abundantly clear, that we firmly believe in the concept of equal opportunities for women as is implied in this Resolution.

Our programs also make it clear that this Government is committed to the concept of active non-discrimination, rather than being content with passive attitudes where the reliance is upon a few anti-discrimination clauses in a few pieces of legislation and nothing more.

We are committed, Mr. Speaker, to providing equal opportunity to all of the working people of this province and that includes those who are employed by the Government, and more specifically those women employed in the public service.

I think the Resolution in itself is a good Resolution, Mr. Speaker, but in light of recent developments and in light of the attitude of the Government and the recent announcement, I believe an amendment to the main motion would be in order, and accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I should like to amend the Resolution as follows:

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

Congratulates the Government of Saskatchewan for its new endeavours on behalf of women in the public service and in the community at large as announced in the Throne Speech.

I so move, Mr. Speaker, seconded, I believe appropriately by the Premier, who in his own executive council authority has done a great deal in terms of providing opportunities for women in the public service, in highly placed positions.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mrs. E.G. Edwards (Saskatoon-Sutherland): — Mr. Speaker, it was not my intention to enter into this debate, but like so many other speakers tonight I feel a speech coming on and I must get up and say something.

It is interesting for the Member for Wilkie (Miss Clifford) and myself, as the only two female Members in this House and only six in all history previous to us, to listen to the debate among our learned friends on both sides of the House who speak about the role of women in society, in the government service and I haven't yet heard anyone say about the role of women in politics.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mrs. Edwards: — I heard the former speaker chastise the former Liberal Government about their male chauvinist attitudes toward women, but you can see that actions speak louder than words, on this side of the House. The Liberals, in their percentage of Members who represent the female sex, the percentage is much higher than any other party represented here.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mrs. Edwards: — Perhaps attitudes can and will change. On previous occasions of coming down to this Legislative Building before I was elected and I was serving on several boards that often met in this building, it did shock me to see most of the boards, in fact all that I sat on, were composed entirely of men, and one woman.

Mr. Rolfes: — When were you appointed to the board?

Mrs. Edwards: — I beg your pardon. What board? I was on several boards and if you have time, and I don't want to take up the time of the House tonight to list them all for you, but I could do it if you want to have a listing of them.

But the point that I wish to make is this, that I watched from the Assembly and I watched the House, all male elected Members debating so many issues that affect women and I thought at that time, surely in all Saskatchewan some women can get down here and debate the issues themselves and bring their points of view. But the other thing that shocked me was that in most of the meetings that I attended the women who came there were bringing coffee and asking the men, would they like cream and sugar. I think that this move, and I welcome it, that you are going to do something, and I suppose any government in power at this time would be recognizing the great thrust that the women's movement has made, not only in Canada but across the world and this is a result, I am sure, of the change in attitude.

I was glad to see the Member for Moose Jaw South (Mr. Snyder) talking about changing attitudes, because I listened to him in an earlier debate tonight and he was using phrases that I thought didn't really reflect the change in male attitudes toward women. He used phrases like assembly line pregnancies, the PCs selling their bodies, what is he talking about,

prostitution. And then he spoke about political parties sucking at the same breast. I thought, what sexist, male chauvinist remarks . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mrs. Edwards: — So I was pleased when the Member for Moose Jaw South got up to speak on this motion and said that there was a change of attitude in the Government and they they were going to recognize the contribution that could and would be made by women. I congratulate him for that and I look forward to seeing the result of this new thrust. And, furthermore, I look forward to the next election and I should like to see if all the efforts that are going to be put forth now, if some of the seats will be occupied in all parties, by more members of the female sex. I think that would be the greatest contribution you could make.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mrs. Edwards: — I am sure that there are many more things that I should like to say, and if I had time to prepare a speech on it, so I would beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 9:21 o'clock p.m.